

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
City & County Building
451 South State Street, Room 326
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Wednesday, August 10, 2022

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at approximately 5:30 pm. Audio recordings of the Planning Commission meetings are retained for a period of time. These minutes are a summary of the meeting. For complete commentary and presentation of the meeting, please visit <https://www.youtube.com/c/SLCLiveMeetings>.

Present for the Planning Commission meeting were Vice-Chair Maurine Bachman, and Commissioners, Brenda Scheer, Aimee Burrows, Rich Tuttle, Andres Paredes, and Mike Christensen. Chairperson Amy Barry, Commissioners Andra Ghent, Adrienne Bell, Jon Lee, and Levi de Oliveira were absent.

Staff members present at the meeting were: Planning Director Nick Norris, Planning Manager Casey Stewart, Principal Planner Michael McNamee, Principal Planner Rylee Hall, Senior Planner Eric Daems, Principal Planner Diana Martinez, and Administrative Assistant David Schupick. Senior City Attorney Paul Neilson was also present.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Commissioner Rich Tuttle moved to approve the minutes.

Commissioner Mike Christensen seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Maurine Bachman, Commissioners Mike Christensen, Andres Paredes, and Rich Tuttle all voted “yes”.

Commissioners Brenda Scheer and Aimee Burrows abstained because of absence from the previous meeting.

The motion passed 4 “yes” votes with 2 abstentions.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

Vice-Chair Bachman stated that she had nothing to report, with the exception that Chair Amy Barry was out of town.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR

Planning Director Nick Norris stated that during the last Historic Landmark Commission meeting there was an incident involving a staff member that “put a staff member in a position of being unsafe.” New meeting protocols will be implemented as a result of the incident: staff will not leave the meeting room to speak with applicants in the hallway, and second, the doors to the meeting room will be left open during meetings. This means that the practice of discussing “next steps” in the hallway after a meeting will cease. Those conversations will take place by phone, or virtually. Nick Norris disclosed that during the meeting in question an audience member had closed the meeting room door and somehow, perhaps inadvertently, locked it so that the staff member could not return to the room. Henceforth, only security staff or Planning Division management staff will be able to close, or lock, the meeting room door. This will only be done to avoid a situation such as a hallway disturbance because the Utah Open Meetings Law requires that meeting room

doors be kept open. The Planning Division is reviewing other measures with the police department and the City Attorney's Office.

Nick Norris noted that the City Council has allocated more funding for increased police presence at all the City's public meetings. He said that there would be strict adherence to meeting decorum because clapping or jeering may discourage people with alternative points of view from speaking.

Nick Norris then moved to proposed amendments to the approval process for drive through windows in the Sugar House Business District.

Petition Initiation: Drive Throughs in the CSHBD Zoning District - The Planning Commission will discuss initiating a petition to amend the zoning ordinance related to drive thru restaurants in the Sugar House Business District. The Commission may discuss the impact the land use has on the purpose statement of the zoning district and the Sugar House Community Plan and whether the land use is appropriate in the zoning district. The Commission may vote to initiate a zoning amendment to address issues discussed. (Staff contact: Nick Norris, Planning Director nick.norris@slcgov.com or 801-535-6173)

Nick Norris presented a map of Sugar House Business Districts One and Two and described drive through windows as being part of restaurants, financial institutions, and retail establishments (primarily pharmacies). He reported that the windows appeared on 1100 East 1300 East, 2100 South and Highland Drive. He pointed out that the text amendments pertained to what is now a permitted use.

Commissioner Tuttle asked whether the proposal could be extended to the entire City. Director Norris said that while it could, there would be a significant change in the scope of work, and therefore, the resources required. He speculated that some state legislative action might also be triggered by a City-wide rule change.

Commissioner Brenda Scheer asked what the process would be to change the use to conditional use. Nick Norris stated that it would be a fairly simple matter to make the change but that the implementation should include a review of drive-through-specific regulations, because some locations have serious traffic problems, and some do not. Commissioner Scheer then asked for clarification of the extra staff needed. Nick Norris stated that only a small amount of staff time would be involved because as Commissioner Scheer pointed out only new projects would be affected. Existing businesses would then be categorized as non-conforming and so only limited in changes they might wish to make. Director Norris noted that the petition simply starts the process.

Commissioner Scheer said that she was in favor of a petition because the drive throughs are not consistent with the vision for the area, but she didn't see it as a priority. Commissioner Burrows suggested that the matter be tabled until the next meeting because the Commissioner who suggested the petition is absent.

Commissioner Aimee Burrows moved to table the petition.

Commissioner Brenda Scheer seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Maurine Bachman, Commissioners Mike Christensen, Aimee Burrows, Andres Paredes, Brenda Scheer and Rich Tuttle all voted "yes".

The motion passed unanimously.

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION - The Commissioners may discuss planning, zoning, and general land use items that are not listed on the agenda. This discussion will be limited to no more than 10 minutes. There is no public discussion associated with this item.

The Commissioners had nothing to discuss.

BRIEFINGS:

ADU Amendments Briefing - The Planning Commission will receive a briefing from Michael McNamee, the assigned planner, on the proposed amendments to the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Ordinance. The amendments are proposed to eliminate the conditional use requirement for detached ADUs and update additional regulations on where ADUs can be located, the size limitations, setbacks and height of ADUs. This would be a city-wide change. (Staff contact: Michael McNamee, Principal Planner, at 801-535-7226 or michael.mcnamee@slcgov.com) **Case Number: PLNPCM2022-00475**

Principal Planner Michael McNamee reviewed the petition as outlined in the staff report. He explained that since the current ordinance was passed in 2018 and until shortly after it changed at the end of 2021, a total of 30 ADUs have been constructed, and 28 ADUs are in some phase of approval, or construction. He said that the proposed rules remove perceived impediments to ADU construction and aligns the City ordinance with requirements in HB 82, which passed the Utah Legislature in 2021. As of the effective date of that bill the City became unable to enforce many ADU requirements, notably the conditional use status for internal ADUs. This proposal would remove the conditional use requirement for all ADUs.

Michael McNamee also noted the expensive and lengthy approval process would be removed. Many permitting requirements related to bulk, height and yard areas would be retained. He explained that the research conducted to draft the proposal including using American Planning Association-approved sources. He said Community Councils have been involved in the process and public comments have been received, most of them favorable. Some Community Councils have “expressed some reservations, but positive feedback overall.”

Michael McNamee stated that the proposal would allow ADUs in most areas of the City with the exception of manufacturing, and certain special purpose districts. Multifamily properties would be permitted to have an ADU onsite.

Michael McNamee said that staff is asking the Commission to consider whether the owner-occupancy requirement should be retained. He described it as “very popular” amongst members of the public and community councils, in particular. However, he stated that the requirement is “counter to the goal of increasing ADUs” and may have unintended consequences. He gave the example of a property owner leaving a property that he continued to own. In such a situation the renter would have to be evicted.

Commissioner Brenda Scheer asked questions about how an ADU could be allowed in a non-residential zone. Principal Planner Michael McNamee and Director Nick Norris explained that the ADU expansion areas currently allow residential housing but ADUs have not been allowed. Examples could range from an ADU outside a business to a residence above a business.

Michael McNamee explained the changes in height and size allowances. The proposal keeps the same 17-foot maximum height but does not tie height to a relationship to the principal structure. In cases of increased setback, a height of 24 feet could be allowed, however, required minimum setbacks will be reduced for the standard height.

New requirements for windows, walkways and lighting are included in the proposal for ADUs located near public alleys. Other requirements for balconies, porches, patios and decks have been made clearer. Parking requirements have been made more permissive in certain situations.

Michael McNamee said clearer language regarding short-term rental restrictions and definitions has been added.

Commissioner Aimee Burrows recalled a situation in which approval was given to an ADU that was technically over the size limit, but the owner claimed that part of the structure would be used for storage. Michael McNamee said that the issue would be reviewed. Brenda Scheer suggested the solution might be the definition of livable space should include storage space that could be easily converted to livable space. Commissioner Burrows also asked whether the Planning Commission had ever denied an ADU. Michael McNamee said that it had not. City Attorney Paul Nielson agreed.

Commissioner Aimee Burrows stated that she thought that the owner-occupied provision should be retained. She was happy to see clearer language on short-term rental because her opinion was that “everybody” is concerned with better enforcement of those rentals. Nick Norris explained that current code could potentially allow ADUs as short-term rental if a zoning district allows hotels or motels but creating a definition of short-term-rental ADU means that “it becomes its own use” thereby enabling it to be specifically disallowed. Nick Norris said that the new use will not even appear on the land use tables. Commissioner Burrow asked for confirmation that no ADU could be a short-term rental under the proposal. Nick Norris confirmed that would be the case and clarified, that, in fact, because there have been no approvals of ADUs in areas that are zoned for hotels and motels, there would be no situation in which an ADU that would be allowed to continue the practice. He said that currently, there are simply no legally- existing short-term rental ADUs.

Commissioner Brenda Scheer agreed with Commissioner Burrows position on maintaining the rule on mandating owner-occupancy for properties with ADUs although she said that she saw no way to enforce the rule. She asked for clarification on changes in allowable window sizes. Nick Norris explained that changes were intended to protect neighbor privacy and so the regulations vary depending upon the orientation of a window, distance from a property line, and whether it occupies a first, or second, story of an ADU. A minimum size sufficient for egress is permitted on windows otherwise too close to a property line, or on a second story. Window size limits for other elevations have been removed. Commissioner Scheer also questioned the requirement of an “operable” next to an alley as a security concern. Michael McNamee said that the window requirement is based on the same logic as TSA scoring standards, in that a window is considered a security feature. At Commissioner Scheer’s request, Nick Norris agreed to state all changes more clearly in the proposal.

Commissioner Scheer suggested that the more realistic number of feet allowed for on-street parking would be 22 rather than 20 feet. She also stated that alley fencing might “become an issue” and suggested a “transparent” gate might be helpful. She later stated that the mandate for a gate from the alley was probably a good idea. Nick Norris stated that alley “activation” is a point of controversy because fencing serves the function of security as well as privacy.

Commissioner Andres Paredes stated that he agrees the owner occupancy requirements for ADUs on the premises of a private residence.

Nick Norris asked when the Commission would like to review the requested changes and hold a public hearing. The consensus response was that the issue should return as soon as it could be put on an agenda without a long list of hearing items.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Conditional Use Permit for ADU at approximately 2156 S Oneida St - Tracy Stocking, property owner representative, is requesting approval for a conditional use permit to allow a detached ADU (Accessory Dwelling Unit) on property located at approximately 2156 South Oneida Street. The proposed ADU will be within a new, detached accessory structure located to the rear of the existing house on the property. The proposed ADU would measure approximately 606 SF in size and 16 feet in height. The subject property is zoned R-1-12000 (Single Family Residential) zoning district and is located within Council District 7, represented by Amy Fowler. (Staff contact: Rylee Hall, Principal Planner, at (801) 535-6308 or rylee.hall@slcgov.com). **Case number PLNPCM2022-00387**

Principal Planner Rylee Hall reviewed the petition as outlined in the staff report and stated that the staff recommends a favorable recommendation. She said that the ADU would be at least 20 feet from any neighboring primary dwelling and 28 feet from the primary dwelling on the same lot. The two ADU entrances will not be visible from the street. The primary entrance faces to rear of the primary dwelling. The total square footage coverage of the footprints of all structures on the lot would be well below the 35 percent maximum allowed for the zone. On street parking is available and permitted. The property is within a quarter of a mile of a bus stop. Parking for the primary dwelling is available in the existing detached garage and driveway.

Commissioner Aimee Burrows asked for clarification on standards for allowable lot size in the R1-12,000 zones. Rylee Hall responded that the lot is slightly smaller than standard, but that size was approved at the time that the subdivision was approved.

The Tracy Stocking, project architect, speaking on behalf of the property owners stated that the ADU meets all the current requirements for legal ADU's. He commended Rylee Hall for her assistance with project development. He stated that the project meets current restrictions, which are more restrictive than the proposal discussed in the previous agenda item. He added that he lived about "a couple of hundred feet away."

Hearing no Commission questions vice-chair Maurine Bachman opened the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING

Vice-chair Maurine Bachman opened the public hearing.

Judy Short – speaking on behalf of the Sugar House Community Council. She described the ways in which the Sugar House Community Council notified the neighborhood-by flyer, website information, website questionnaire, and Community Council meeting agenda item. Of the five written comments

received, four were strongly in favor, one was strongly opposed. No one spoke against the proposal at the Sugar House Community Council meeting.

Vice-chair Maurine Bachman closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Brenda Scheer cited a comment submitted to the Commission and asked whether it would be legal for the property owner to run a floral business out of the ADU. Principal Planner Rylee Hall stated that it would be a legal use. She added that in 2021 the homeowner's application for such a wedding planning and floral business was approved. The applicant has informed staff that the ADU may be used on an "occasional" basis for the business use--including storage--when the unit is "not occupied." Commissioner Scheer then stated "...that kind of thing" should be in the staff report.

Commissioner Aimee Burrows praised Judy Short's plans to circulate a letter explaining how to report illegal use of ADU's and other issues. She recommended sharing the letter with all community councils.

MOTION

Commissioner Mike Christensen stated, "Based on the analysis and findings in the staff report, the information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, I move that the Planning Commission approve the Conditional Use for the ADU, petition PLNPCM2022-00387."

Commissioner Aimee Burrows seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Maurine Bachman, Commissioners Aimee Burrows, Mike Christensen, Andres Paredes, Brenda Scheer, and Rich Tuttle all voted "yes".

The motion passed unanimously.

Collaborative 1135 Design Review at approximately 1135 South West Temple - Todd Charlton, of Defy Colabs the property owner, is requesting Design Review approval for the Collaborative 1135 apartments. The proposal is for a 4-story, 88-unit apartment building located at address listed above. The property is in the CC (Commercial Corridor) zoning district. The project requires Design Review approval as it is proposed as 45' tall. Buildings over 30' tall, and up to 45' tall, are permitted only with Design Review approval by the Planning Commission. (Staff contact: Eric Daems, Senior Planner, at (801) 535-7236 or eric.daems@slcgov.com). **Case number PLNPCM2022-00327**

Senior Planner Eric Daems reviewed the petition as outlined in the staff report. Staff recommends design review approval of the request for a 15-foot height increase. The additional landscaping proposed exceeds the requirement for the height increase. The proposed use is 88 market-rate studio units with 45 parking stalls, which is the allowable minimum when in close proximity to mass transit. Eric Daems presented the project as meeting the goals of several City and local area plans.

The applicants, Jake Williams and Todd Charlton, designers representing the developer, noted that a safety features included in the designs is the street-level entrances with courtyards providing a focus on pedestrians. They also stated that the design complemented that design of nearby row houses. Also

noted was the fact that they have another project under construction in the neighborhood, and that it received a positive reaction from the community council.

Commissioner Aimee Burrows asked for clarification of the access points to ground floor units. The designers explained that access to the building itself would be by key code and that a central corridor would separate those 11 first-floor units with a street-side entrance, and those 11 with parking area entrances. Landscaping may include fencing for each ground-level entrance. Designers also explained that upper-level units would have a street-facing lounge area on each floor.

In response to a question from Commissioner Brenda Scheer, designers reported that all units meet ADA requirements, and “a certain amount” are handicapped-designated. Commissioner Scheer then asked about the status of a similar Housing Authority of Salt Lake City project nearby that has similar features, but larger units. Director Norris said that an extension for modification had been granted by the Planning Commission, approximately in December, and that he did not know the current status of the proposal. Commissioner Scheer then asked whether any of the units would be considered affordable. The response was that there would be no subsidized units, however, the smaller size of the units would target renters below 80% AMI. They also stated that their other project in the area was “a tax credit project” that “hit all incomes.”

Commissioner Burrows then asked whether the 45-foot height was consistent with other nearby buildings. Eric Daems stated that it was not, but that it is “an area in transition.” Applicants noted that their “other project” on 1300 South is “60 feet.”

PUBLIC HEARING

Vice-chair Maurine Bachman opened the public hearing.
Seeing no one wished to speak she closed the public hearing.

MOTION

Commissioner Mike Christensen stated, “Based on the findings listed in the staff report, the information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, I move that the Planning Commission approve the Design Review request for the Collaborative 1135 project located at approximately 1135 South West Temple for petition PLNPCM2022-00327.”

Commissioner Andres Paredes seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Maurine Bachman, Commissioners Aimee Burrows, Mike Christensen, Andres Paredes, Brenda Scheer, and Rich Tuttle, all voted “yes”.

The motion passed unanimously.

Bolanos Subdivision - Preliminary Subdivision Plat, Planned Development and Conditional Use at approximately 918 So. 1500 West - The property owner, Victoria Bolanos, is requesting three application approvals for the property at the stated location. The project proposes to subdivide the

existing lot into two-lots. The total site is approximately .24 acres (10,454 SF). The proposed project is subject to the following applications:

- a. **Preliminary Subdivision Plat** - to subdivide the property into two-lots. **Case number PLNSUB2022-00248**
- b. **Planned Development** - Seeking modifications to the lot width requirement: Lot width modification from 50 feet to 42.93 feet on Lot 1, and 47.63 feet on Lot 2. **Case number PLNPCM2022-00250**
- c. **Conditional Use** - for a detached Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) to be built on Lot 2 in the rear yard, detached from the existing dwelling. The proposed ADU will have an approximate square footage of 345 square feet and will be 11 feet tall. **Case number PLNPCM2022-00249**

The project is located within the R-1-5,000 (Residential) zoning district within Council District 2, represented by Alejandro Puy (Staff contact: Diana Martinez at 801-535-7215 or diana.martinez@slcgov.com).

Principal Planner Diana Martinez reviewed the petition as outlined in the staff report. She stated that the proposal “generally meets all standards except for lot width,” and later pointed out that the requested allowed widths are “very compatible” with other lots in the area. The width modifications would be the exceptions of 42.93 feet, instead of 50 feet, on lot one, and 47.63 feet, instead of 50 feet on lot two. Another modification needed for the subdivision would be the placement of the driveway for lot two. The proposed new property line between the two lots would split the existing driveway and the applicant has chosen not to have a shared driveway. She has opted to move the driveway to the north of lot two where she plans to continue to live. Moving the driveway would require another modification from the standard 18 feet to 13 feet in driveway length. The buffer between the driveway and the property line will be about a foot. The option of moving an existing fence does not apply in this case because the applicant does not own the fence.

This property abuts a usable alley to the south adjacent to the 9-Line Trail. An alley on the west side is not usable.

Another request is for an 11-foot ADU to the rear of lot two, which has the existing dwelling on it. The ADU would be approximately 345 square feet plus porch space. It meets the current proportional square footage requirements between structures on the same lot. Parking is available for the ADU on 1500 West, or in the alleyway. Diana Martinez recommends approval with one condition. She noted that the initial condition, that the existing shipping container be removed from the property prior to building permit application, has been altered to state that the container be moved to a compliant location on lot two so that it can be used for storage.

Commissioner Paredes asked for clarification on the driveway options for the new lot. Diana Martinez said that the owner could make use of the existing curb cut or use the alleyway to the south. There was later discussion as to whether an exemption would be needed for a new driveway using the existing curb cut that was unresolved, but tied to the angle of the replacement driveway.

Commissioner Burrows asked why the applicant needs an exception when “everyone else” has a driveway one foot from the property line. Director Norris said that it is a current standard for new development. Exceptions are based upon an inability to comply, or an advantage to non-compliance. This means that the Planning Commission has the authority to “modify almost any zoning regulation through planned development.” He speculated that the driveway of the duplex next door is probably about a foot from the property line because of the rules existing at the time of construction, and that would be true of the existing driveway. The proposed placement of the new lot two driveway would be next to the duplex driveway. Each would be about a foot from the property line. The new lot could use the curb cuts, for a driveway or use the alley entrance.

The applicant Victoria Bolanos stated that she would build on lot one and live in lot two with the ADU in the rear.

PUBLIC HEARING

Vice-chair Maurine Bachman opened the public hearing.
Seeing no one wished to speak she closed the public hearing.

MOTION

Commissioner Brenda Scheer stated, “Based on the information in the staff report, the information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, I move that the Commission approve the Bolanos Preliminary Subdivision Plat PLNSUB2022- 00248 be approved with the condition listed in the staff presentation.” Condition in staff’s presentation: Prior to final subdivision plat approval, the container to be moved to a complaint location or be removed from the property if it will result in over-coverage of accessory buildings.

**Commissioner Mike Christensen seconded the motion.
Vice-Chair Maurine Bachman, Commissioners Aimee Burrows, Mike Christensen, Andres Paredes, Brenda Scheer and Rich Tuttle all voted “yes”.
The motion passed unanimously.**

Commissioner Brenda Scheer stated, “Based on the information in the staff report, the information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, I move that the Commission approve Bolanos Planned Development PLNPCM2022-00250.”

**Commissioner Mike Christensen seconded the motion.
Vice-Chair Maurine Bachman, Commissioners Aimee Burrows, Mike Christensen, Andres Paredes, Brenda Scheer and Rich Tuttle all voted “yes”.
The motion passed unanimously.**

Commissioner Brenda Scheer stated, “Based on the information in the staff report, the information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, I move that the Commission approve Bolanos Conditional Use application PLNPCM2022-00249.”

Commissioner Mike Christensen seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Maurine Bachman, Commissioners Aimee Burrows, Mike Christensen, Andres Paredes, Brenda Scheer and Rich Tuttle all voted “yes”.

The motion passed unanimously.

Lincoln Street Subdivision - Preliminary Subdivision Plat, Planned Development at approximately 1492 S. Lincoln Street - The property owner, Janae Briggs, is requesting a Preliminary Subdivision Plat approval and a Planned Development approval for the property located at 1492 S. Lincoln Street. The subject property is approximately 0.32 acres (13,939 square feet) in lot size. The proposed application is subject to the following applications:

- d. **Preliminary Subdivision Plat** - to subdivide the existing lot into two lots. **Case Number PLNSUB2022-00341**
- e. **Planned Development** - approval is required for the reduction in the lot width from the required 50 foot to 49 feet on Lot 1, and to 41 feet on Lot 2. **Case Number PLNPCM2022-00378**

The project is located in the R-1-5,000 zoning district within Council District 5, represented by Darin Mano (Staff contact: Diana Martinez at 801-535-7215 or diana.martinez@slcgov.com).

Principal Planner Diana Martinez reviewed the petition as outlined in the staff report. The current staff position is approval without conditions. Previous issues regarding the garage have been resolved. Like the previous agenda item, two lots are created by dividing the original lot. Lot one will be 49 feet wide and lot two will be 41 feet wide. Like the previous item, one lot would be vacant. Diana Martinez showed a diagram of several housing lots in the near the property that have widths well-below 50 feet.

Brenda Scheer asked if the applicant’s intention is to sell the lot. The applicants, JaNae Briggs and her sister Rhonda Dressen, stated that that it would be their intention to sell the lot “eventually.”

Hearing no further questions from the Commission vice-chair Bachman opened the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING

Judi Short-lives in the Emerson neighborhood and represents the Sugar House Community Council. This matter is within East Liberty Community Organization boundaries, but the representative for ELPCO did not receive the email notice. Judy Short said that she wrote a letter of support for the project. She said that the ELPCO representative told her he agreed with her letter, however, she does not know whether he has written a letter of support to the Commission. She is happy to see such a large lot vacant. This project has made her consider doing something similar on her double-lot property.

Marie Midboe-has lived directly to the south for 20 years. She stated disapproval of the application. She purchased her property based on information that the property is not subdividable. She stated that new construction, will be built next to her bedroom window. She would not be opposed to an ADU in the rear of the property. Also critical of the way that the subject property has been maintained.

Michel Worthheimer-former tenant of the applicant stated disapproval of the application. Also critical of the way in which the subject property has been maintained. Cited 25% rent increase. Reminded the Commission that it is not clear whether the lot will be sold, or retained as rental.

Steven Shake-resident who owns “multiple houses on the street” He stated that neighbors are concerned about the possibility of multifamily homes being built on the new lot. He said that he was “neutral” on other points raised by neighbors because available information was “ambiguous.”

Jennifer Olsen-Forty-year resident living directly across from the proposed vacant lot. Opposed to multifamily development on the vacant lot because there are existing problems related to fourplexes scattered throughout the neighborhood. She repeated concerns about the “ambiguity” of the applicant’s intentions. And affirmed prior statements related to poor maintenance of the property.

Seeing no other comments, Vice-Chairperson Maurine Bachman closed the public hearing, and asked Diana Martinez what potential there would be for the development of a multifamily property on the site.

Diana Martinez clarified that the subdivision application submitted does not allow for multifamily development however, some people may have been confused by the option for a “condominium” on the application. The neighborhood zoning is R1-5,000 single family, low density and it is unlikely that the zoning will change because of the master plan. At the request of Vice-Chairperson Bachman, the applicant stated that her intentions are to keep the property as a single-family home.

Commissioner Aimee Burrows clarifying for the public that lot widths would be 49 and 50 feet so the lots would remain “pretty big” especially compared with other lots and that the owner’s intent was not a consideration in decision-making. She also stated that the homeowner who believed that her property could not be subdivided was somehow misinformed because all standards can change and exceptions to those standards are always possible.

Commissioner Brenda Scheer agreed. Commissioner Burrows encouraged members of the public to make complaints not related to Planning Commission oversight to the correct City entities.

MOTION

Commissioner Aimee Burrows stated, “Based on the information in the staff report, the information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, I move that the Commission approve the Lincoln Street Preliminary Subdivision Plat PLNSUB2022-00341 with no conditions.”

Commissioner Mike Christensen seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Maurine Bachman, Commissioners Aimee Burrows, Mike Christensen, Andres Paredes, Brenda Scheer, and Rich Tuttle, and all voted “yes”.

The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Aimee Burrows stated, “Based on the information in the staff report, the information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, I move that the Commission approve the Planned Development applications and PLNPCM2022-00378.”

Commissioner Mike Christensen seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Maurine Bachman, Commissioners Aimee Burrows, Mike Christensen, Andres Paredes, Brenda Scheer, and Rich Tuttle, all voted “yes”.

The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Aimee Burrows expressed support for Director Norris new strategies for meeting security. She also referred to prior requests for language changes in the motions to more correctly reflect issues or conditions resulting from public hearings.

The meeting adjourned at 7:36 PM.

For Planning Commission agendas, staff reports, and minutes, visit the Planning Division’s website at slc.gov/planning/public-meetings. Staff Reports will be posted the Friday prior to the meeting and minutes will be posted two days after they are ratified, which usually occurs at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission.