

**SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**City & County Building**  
**451 South State Street, Room 326**  
**Salt Lake City, Utah 84111**  
**Wednesday, October 26, 2022**

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at approximately 5:30 p.m. 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: Chairperson Maurine Bachman, Vice-Chair Mike Christensen, and Commissioners, Amy Barry, Aimee Burrows, Andres Paredes, Rich Tuttle, Andra Ghent, and Brenda Scheer. Commissioners Jon Lee, and Levi de Oliveira were excused from the meeting.

Staff members present at the meeting were: Planning Manager Amy Thompson, Planning Manager Kelsey Lindquist, Senior City Attorney Paul Nielson, Associate Planner Trevor Ovenden, Principal Planner Liz Hart, Principal Planner Aaron Barlow, Principal Planner Michael McNamee, Senior Planner Kristina Gilmore, Urban Planner Amanda Roman, and Administrative Assistant Aubrey Clark.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

**Commissioner Aimee Burrows moved to approve the minutes for October 12, 2022. Commissioner Amy Barry seconded the motion.**

**Vice-Chair Mike Christensen, and Commissioners, Amy Barry, Aimee Burrows, Rich Tuttle, Andra Ghent, Andres Paredes, and Chairperson Maurine Bachman voted “yes.”**

**Commissioner Brenda Scheer abstained because of her absence from the meeting of October 12, 2022.**

**The motion passed, seven “yes” votes, and one abstention.**

**REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR**

The Chair stated that she had nothing to report.

The Vice-Chair stated that he had nothing to report

**REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR**

Planning Manager Amy Thompson reported that, as of the prior week, the City Council had approved the Shared Housing and RMF 30 zoning amendments, however the RMF 30 amendments will not take effect for 120 days. She said that the City Council also adopted the Ball Park Station Area Plan and the City’s revised off-street parking ordinance.

She noted that future reports from the director will call attention to proposed amendments affecting historic preservation overlays “early in the process.” The Planning Commission may then determine whether the amendment should be forwarded to the Historic Landmarks Commission.

Planning Manager Kelsey Lindquist reported that the Planning Division is beginning work on the public engagement portion of the new Homeless Resource Center Overlay. The provisions contained in the overlay would be applied to any property established as a homeless resource center. The project reflects specific instructions from the City Council. She then announced dates of opportunities for public

engagement: Tuesday, November 1, at 10 AM on Facebook Live and an open house at the Public Safety Building on November 10 from 6 PM to 8 PM and said that additional information is available on the Planning Division website.

Amy Thompson also called attention to the simplified template for the motion Planning Commission motion sheet, which no longer itemizes conditions listed in the staff report.

### **PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION**

Commissioner Burrows asked whether field trips are planned. Chair Bachman said that she was unaware of any but agreed that they can be very helpful.

### **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**Conditional Use for a Contractor's Yard/Office at Approximately 1638 W Dalton Ave** - The applicant, Tyler Blaine, is requesting Conditional Use approval for a contractor's yard/office located at the above-stated address. The applicant fabricates and installs countertops, fireplaces, and other "hand-crafted, functional works of art." The applicant has stated that no products for sale will be manufactured on-site. Outdoor storage may be permitted as an accessory use to a contractor's yard/office, however, the storage must be located behind the primary facade of the principal structure and screened with a solid wall or fence. The subject property is in the CC (Corridor Commercial) district, located within Council District 2, represented by Alejandro Puy. (Staff Contact: Trevor Ovenden at 801-535-7168 or trevor.ovenden@slcgov.com). **Case number PLNPCM2022-00735**

Associate Planner Trevor Ovenden reviewed the staff report including a site plan, access points, and site photos. He said that the property would be used as parking for company trucks and trailers and staging for products and materials prior to site delivery. A Planning Commission hearing is required because the property abuts a residential property.

Trevor Ovenden reported that the property is currently under enforcement for zoning violations including outdoor storage in prohibited areas. He reported that the conditional use request includes approval of an existing over-height screening fence, later explaining that the unusual shape of the parcel placed the fence between the front property line and the primary facade of the principal structure, where fence height is limited to 4 feet. The existing fence is six feet.

Trevor Ovenden reported that staff recommends approval with two conditions: removal, or screening of all miscellaneous items, and screening of the dumpster with a solid wall or wall fence. He stated that the Glendale Community Council, the only respondent to public noticing, supports the request.

Commissioner Amy Barry asked for confirmation that the existing fence would remain in place. Trevor Ovenden stated that was a correct understanding.

Applicant Tyler Blaine, of Modern Craftsman, declined to speak.

Chair Bachman called for public comment.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

- Eric Flores - Neighbor. Stated a concern that there be no changes to the existing access easement. Chair Bachman agreed that the issue would be considered.

Seeing no one else who wished to speak, Chair Bachman closed the public comment portion of the hearing.

Chair Bachman then asked Trevor Ovenden to address Eric Flores' question. Trevor Ovenden responded that nothing in the proposal would affect the easement. Chair Bachman then asked the applicant if he had knowledge of anything in the proposal that would block the easement. Tyler Blaine responded that there was nothing that would "inhibit" access.

## **MOTION**

**Commissioner Aimee Burrows stated, "Based on the information presented in the discussion, I move that that Commission approve this application with the conditions listed in the staff report." Commissioner Andra Ghent seconded the motion.**

**Vice-Chair Michael Christensen, Commissioners Andres Paredes, Brenda Scheer, Aimee Burrows, Andra Ghent, Amy Barry, Richard Tuttle, and Chairperson Maurine Bachman voted "yes."**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

**Design Review for a Mixed Use Development at Approximately 152 N 500 West** - Evan Haslam with Dwell Design Studio, representing the property owner, has submitted a Design Review application to develop the property at the above-stated address. The proposed development will consist of an 8-story mixed use building, including 344 residential units, a parking garage, and commercial space. In addition to the TSA score of 113 which requires Design Review approval by the Planning Commission, the applicant is also seeking to modify design standards for ground floor use, building materials and glass, building entrances, street facing façade length, and building setbacks. The property is located in the TSA-UC-C (TSA Urban Center Station Core Area) District, within Council District 3, represented by Chris Wharton. (Staff Contact: Liz Hart at 801-535-6681 or Elizabeth.hart@slcgov.com) **Case number PLNPCM2022-00586**

Principal Planner Liz Hart presented the staff report. She described the requested six design standard modifications to the proposed eight story, 80-foot, mixed use building, which includes significant parking spaces. She stated staff approval on the condition that a lighting plan consistent with Design Standard K be submitted for staff approval. Liz Hart described the access routes to the property (which is currently a parking lot) and identified adjacent buildings, including the Hardware office building, [also owned by the developer]. In describing the property boundaries, she called attention to the south property line, which abuts the North Temple viaduct.

Liz Hart said that the project had received a Transit Station Area score of 113, (rather than the 128 requested by the applicant) and so could not qualify for administrative approval [125 points]. She said the Planning Commission design review recommendations given at a September work session had been incorporated into the current proposal.

The applicant is requesting an increase in setbacks along Hardware Avenue of seven to ten feet, and between eight and 16 feet along North Temple. Staff supports these changes because of special circumstances along each street. Hardware Avenue is a private street with an increased right-of-way because of parallel parking. The sidewalk has street trees, plantings against the building, and a corner plaza. The North Temple side of the proposed building abuts the viaduct, creating a "canyon" effect at street grade. The TSA requires that 50 percent of the building be within five feet of the property line but allows a maximum setback of 15 feet if plazas, courtyards, or outdoor dining are included.

Standards require 80 percent of the ground floor use be for a use other than parking and those uses must extend at least 25 feet into the building. The application requests that about ten percent of the ground floor along 490 West be used for commercial use, with other uses including bike storage, bike shop, and residential. The staff position is that the intent of the ordinance—to activate the sidewalk in a "walkable

environment”—has been met. In the case of the North Temple side of the proposed building, Liz Hart indicated that the majority of the street-level façade is the parking garage, however, the staff opinion is that the mitigating factors—variety of building materials, the existence of some commercial space, which includes outdoor seating, and enhanced landscaping—create a visually attractive area thus also meeting the intent of the standard.

Liz Hart explained that the 490 West proposed building ground floor façade is 69 percent durable materials (in the form of brick and concrete panels) rather than the standard 90 percent. However, the staff position is that the building design has a “vertical emphasis,” which along with significant glass use, and the addition of metalwork, create the visual effects intended by the standard. A similar situation exists along North Temple where only 58 percent durable materials are proposed—mostly brick and concrete—and 42 percent is metal panels screening the parking garage. The staff opinion is that the “unique design” of the metal panels achieves the visual interest envisioned in the standard.

Liz Hart explained that along North Temple the applicant is requesting 43 percent ground floor glass (three to eight feet above the grade) instead of the standard 60 percent. She said that, because of the size of the parking garage, most of the proposed building’s glass is at the corners of the elevation. She said that the efforts to create outdoor seating at one corner, and enhanced landscaping along the street, add visual interest and may increase “eyes on the street.”

The standard for this zone is an operable entrance every 40 feet of the street facing façade. The applicant is requesting a reduction from seven to five entrances along the 490 West façade. Liz Hart said the staff opinion is that the proposed entrances are linked to the multiple proposed uses along the elevation and therefore “appropriate.” She cited design elements already described as making the applicant’s request to reduce entrances along the North Temple elevation from eight to zero reasonable.

The zone standard is a maximum of 200 feet. This building is proposed to be 324 feet on the North Temple and Hardware Avenue facades, and approximately 311 feet along the 490 West and 400 West elevations. Liz Hart referred to horizontal, vertical, material, and masking design elements, including increased setbacks to justify the staff position that the increased building lengths were not a contradiction to the goal of the standard.

Commissioner Andra Ghent questioned the renderings showing bikes along a walkway. Liz Hart responded that existing sidewalks are about eight feet wide, and Tim Stanley on behalf of Cherry Tree Partners later clarified that the renderings were linked to the bike shop and storage. He said that the minimum width was eight feet, which was on the ramp [along the North Temple side].

Tim Stanley of Cherry Tree Partners and Evan Haslam of Dwell Studios addressed the Commission. They described the revised proposal as incorporating direction received at the September work session regarding massing, and pedestrian spaces, design features. They thanked Commissioners Lee and Christensen for their suggestions (at the work meeting) to relocate the coffee shop to the southwest corner stating that it will increase activation where heavy pedestrian use tied to the Frontrunner station is anticipated.

Evan Haslam showed the renderings of the parking garage shown at the work session and as contrasted to the revised version.

They addressed massing, particularly along North Temple, where the viaduct is sometimes 25-30 feet above ground level. Evan Haslam described an undulating retaining wall supporting the ramp. He said that the sidewalk widens as it approaches the southwest corner [where the traffic flow is heaviest]. Referring to Commissioner Barry’s prior request to increase the variety of massing he also described the continued concentration of massing at the corners of the building, but an increase in variety of setbacks and massing, and materials, along each elevation. He said that the increased in setback along North

Temple “definitely helps with the spatial feel.” He also showed a rendering of the adjacent buildings along 490 West and North Temple with the proposed building at the corner. Tim Stanley added that the rendering depicted the effect of the setback very clearly.

KDS owner Mark Isaac joined virtually.

Commissioner Amy Barry asked for a rendering of the 400 West elevation and the traffic flow for vehicles parking as residents, and vehicle parking those linked to the Hardware building, which will also use the parking garage because the proposed building will eliminate their parking lot.

Commissioner Brenda Scheer commented that other buildings tied to the Hardware group have been successful in making distinctive building corners that create the impression of separate buildings. She said that in the renderings for this building she saw “overlap” with a “brown section” linking the length of the ground floor, rather than segmenting it. Therefore, a horizontal, rather than vertical focus was created.

Evan Haslam said that he understood the point, but that the rendering doesn’t identify the variation in planes. He said, “We have bumped out the corners at least two feet.” Commissioner Scheer said that the “view” of this building would be one of the first people will have as they “enter downtown.” She said that she admired the “Hardware buildings” and “Salt projects” and felt that a correction of the colors was needed because although the corners were distinctive, they do not create the impression of separate “top to bottom” structures. Evan Haslam said that someone passing over the viaduct would not focus on the ground floor. Brenda Scheer said that the “below deck reading is important too” because of the effect on pedestrians.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

Chair Bachman opened the public hearing. Seeing no one wishing to speak, she closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Barry agreed with Commissioner Scheer’s point regarding the 490 West renderings and reminded the Commission that the building was 311 feet along that elevation. She also praised the improved screening of the parking garage along the North Temple elevation, but again said that Commissioner Scheer had made “a good point.”

Commissioner Burrows commented that there were “a lot of good things” on the TSA scoring list that could have allowed for higher scores and administrative approval. Planning Manager Amy Thompson said that the design modifications would have mandated Commission review independent of the TSA scoring.

Commissioner Andra Ghent then responded to an exchange between Commissioners Barry and Scheer suggesting approval based upon color correction, stating her understanding that modifications generate higher rents.

Tim Stanley said that “a substantial cost to the project” would be created by the repeated delays involved. He pointed out that all points raised at the work session had been addressed. Commissioner Ghent commented that finance charges would be involved. Commissioner Scheer said that a change of brick color should not “be a huge cost.” An exchange between Commissioners Burrows and Scheer clarified that the significant problem with the building corners occurs along 490 West.

Commissioner Ghent said that she did not find the problem significant. Mark Isaac then proposed continuing the white pantone on the brick from the upper to lower levels. Commissioners Scheer and

Barry both agreed. Mark Isaac said that the change would be minor and that making it a condition of approval would be acceptable to the applicants.

Tim Stanley also commented that when staff had not agreed with the applicant's calculations of TSA scores on the original application, the applicants did not make further efforts to address the issue because the design modifications mandated Planning Commission review.

## **MOTION**

**Commissioner Brenda Scheer stated, "Based on the information presented and the discussion I move that the Commission approve this application with the condition listed in the staff report and an additional condition that the façade of the southwest corner of the project is modified to look like one solid building as approved by staff."**

**Commissioner Richard Tuttle seconded the motion**

**Vice-Chair Michael Christensen, Commissioners Brenda Scheer, Andres Paredes, Aimee Burrows, Amy Barry, Andra Ghent, Richard Tuttle, and Chair Maurine Bachman voted "yes."**

**The motion passed unanimously**

### **Design Review for a Mixed Use Development at Approximately 330 W 800 South-**

Stephen Droll of Valerio DeWalt Train, representing the property owner, is requesting Design Review approval to construct a mixed-use building at the above-stated address. The project site is split between the CG (General Commercial) and the D-2 (Downtown Support) zoning districts and is approximately 2.34 acres in size. The proposed building would be approximately 64 feet in height within the CG district and approximately 95 feet in height within the D-2 district. Buildings taller than 60 feet in the CG district and 65 feet in the D-2 district require Design Review Approval by the Planning Commission. The project includes 336 residential units, ranging from 1 to 3 bedrooms, with retail uses on the ground floor. The building wraps the proposed parking garage and incorporates a public midblock walkway running north-south along the eastern side of the project area. The project is located within Council District 4, represented by Ana Valdemoros. (Staff contact: Aaron Barlow at 801-535-6182 or aaron.barlow@slc.gov.com) **Case number PLNPCM2022-00694**

Principal Planner Aaron Barlow reviewed the staff report. He explained that the applicant has requested a modification to the maximum allowed height. The section of the building in the CG zone (which has height ranges of 60 feet, or 90 feet after design review) is proposed as 64 feet in front and 83 feet in the rear. The section of the building in the D-2 zone (which has height ranges of 65 feet, or 120 feet after design review) is proposed as 83 feet with an additional "penthouse" for utilities.

Aaron Barlow mentioned the midblock walkway connecting Kilby Court to 800 South, and increased amenities including trees and added outdoor seating and shade that can be used to justify height increases. He noted that Kilby Court would be the nexus of a system of walkways that will connect not only the north and south ends of the block, but "eventually, 300 West." He noted that the applicant added bollard lighting to the plan since the release of the staff report.

Aaron Barlow showed aerial and street views of the neighborhood including the historic buildings in Kilby Court in various states of disrepair. He stated that the staff recommendation is for approval because compliance with design review and zoning guidelines, and compliance with the master plans Plan Salt Lake and the Downtown Master Plan. He cited improving walkability, redeveloping underutilized land and increased housing. He also noted that "a number of comments" have been received expressing concern related to the preservation of the Kilby Court Music Venue. Aaron Barlow said that applicants have indicated that Kilby Court Music Venue would be preserved, but that they had not provided any details. He explained that preservation of the venue can't fully be addressed through the Design Review process.

He also explained that shade impacts from the proposed building would not be significantly different from impacts from what could be building by right.

Aaron Barlow stated four recommended conditions for approval: the property should be consolidated into one parcel; the midblock walkway should be recorded as a public easement; the midblock walkway cannot be blocked; final approval for details such as lighting and street trees should be delegated to relevant City staff.

Commissioner Andra Ghent asked for assistance in understanding a public comment requesting extension of the walkway to 700 South. She wanted to know about current vehicular traffic in Kilby Court. Aaron Barlow stated that Kilby Court is a private street and that that it was not wholly owned by the applicant. Commissioner Ghent also asked about concerns about restrooms for the venue raised by the Arts Council, and Barlow indicated that the applicant would address that issue.

Chris Oakley, Director of Design at Convexity Properties, project developer, and Stephen Droll of Valerio DeWalt Train, project architect, addressed the Commission. Chris Oakley identified other downtown area projects that his firm has developed. He stated that it had been his goal not to imitate more “prevalent” color schemes. The proposed development would “conceal and mitigate” necessary parking structures and create a “pedestrian connection” With the mid-block walkway that is intended to extend to 700 South and significantly improve public access to Kilby Court. He stated a commitment to preserve the Kilby Court Music Venue “during construction and beyond.” Chris Oakley added that conversations with the city have been held to that effect for about two years. Discussions have also been held with the fire department and Rocky Mountain Power regarding Kilby Court. He said that because construction will be staged from 800 South Kilby Court can remain open during construction.

Stephen Droll stated that master plans and zoning requirements had been carefully reviewed in designing the project. The building’s design takes elements of neighboring buildings—reflecting the “industrial roots” of the Granary area in colors, textures, materials, and massing. He noted variation in building massing, “solar shading” and a 40 foot by 55 foot “urban open space in front of the Kilby Court Music Venue. He said that he considers the music venue as an “amenity” to the development. He said that the midblock walkway will vary between 20 to 28 feet in width, including landscaping, even though a width of only 10 feet is required.

In response to a question from Commissioner Amy Barry, Stephen Droll explained that all the amenities of the building’s inner courtyard—including the swimming pool, and fitness area—were on the ground level.

Commissioner Ghent asked whether the restrooms for the Venue would be maintained as public restrooms. Chris Oakley responded that the existing restroom structure would be demolished, and that an “interim solution” is “more than likely,” but ultimately, as a result of working with the Kilby Court Music Venue, they would provide replacement facilities that would be “maintained and managed” by the venue operators. He then added that the approval condition of consolidating the entire project into one parcel may need to be reconsidered in order to allow for a “long-term plan for ownership” of the Venue land by the Venue owners. He also clarified that the Venue is a current tenant of the project owners.

Chairperson Bachman then opened the public comment period by reminding speakers that “the viability of the Kilby Court Venue” would be beyond the control of the Commission and encouraged speakers to be “judicious in their comments.”

Planning Manager Amy Thompson later added that written comments that exceeded the two-minute limit could be given to Planning Division staff. Following technical difficulties with an online speaker Amy Thompson also said that comments could be emailed to staff to be read into the record.

Chair Bachman opened the public comment portion of the meeting.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

- Colby Frazier - Opposed. Owner of Fisher Brewing Company. Stated agreement with the letter from the Granary District Alliance. Stated that the proposed number of parking spaces would directly affect his business, which both manufactures and sells beer. Also, the business depends upon the service alley directly to the east of the development for deliveries and shipments. Noted that his business generates noise, and significant odors, not amenable to residential living. Believes that the height increase does not fit “the character of the neighborhood,” which is “industrial and manufacturing.” Stated that while development is inevitable, the city should preserve the neighborhood’s history of “grit” that includes artists. Suggested that “people who make cool stuff need cool, old, cheap buildings to do it in.”
- Lance Sanders - Tentative support. Co-owner of Kilby Court. Stated that following many exchanges between the developers and Kilby Court Music Venue—over a period of many months—have resulted in a verbal lease agreement and a letter of intent that may lead to the eventual purchase of the Kilby Court Music Venue property by the business. Expressed his commitment to the long-term survival of the Venue, and stated that, while the developers have been very cooperative, “nothing is set in stone.”
- Forbes Slater - Primarily Opposed. Woodworker in a shop about 500 feet from the proposed development. Expressed concern that the current design creates “an 85-foot wall right down the middle of the block,” and he therefore opposes height increase. Encourages east-west mid-block crossing. Identified the location as the “heart” of the Granary District. Stated that walkability, and the preservation of the Kilby Court Music Venue, are essential to the neighborhood. Noted that many buildings that will be demolished for the project were vacant, which he sees as justification for development. Believes that the project has the potential to be an “asset” to the neighborhood.
- Josh Sherman - Opposed. Described 400 South as “an urban canyon,” that does not activate the neighborhood and identified a potential for this project to produce a similar effect. Questions whether a mixed use development is appropriate for the site. Suggests limiting the parcel to the CG zone and limiting the height to 65 feet. Recommends tabling the project.
- Braxton Biers - Opposed. Salt Lake Resident who has been attending Kilby Court concerts since the age of 13. Stated that Kilby Court has great significance to the City’s young people. Opposed to height increase. Predicts that outdoor concerts will generate noise complaints. Stated that renderings depict shade “from eastern perspective,” but that most people will be queuing in the afternoons or evenings.
- Brittany Helmers - Opposed. Developer and designer for BCG Holdings, a landowner in the Granary District. Also representing the Granary District Alliance. Identified negative impact for local business owners along 300 West in single, or double story, buildings that will be separated from the Granary District by the “wall” created by the project. Predicted that the project would interfere with her personal visits to Fischer Brewery. Suggested a building setback to the west.
- Ron Dunn - Opposed. Owns the Granary Building, directly west of the project, for which the Granary District is named. Disapproves of the height increase, which he estimates will limit his building’s exposure to the morning sun. Concerned about the façade of the project elevation sharing his building’s property line. Uncertain about the effect of “the wall” on 400 West and whether there will be fencing or a dumpster area. Also stated that the architects of the “pickle factory” project to the north of his project have met with him “a dozen times” asking for his opinions, but he has had no such contact from the developers of this project.
- Katie Barber - Opposed. (Online.) Believes the project is incongruent to its surroundings—particularly with regard to the height increase, which would physically divide the district. Agreed with some comments from Fischer Brewing. Sees the project as a threat to the existence of Kilby Court. Appeared to indicate that other developments have been more compatible with the area.

Finding no one else who wished to speak, Chair Bachman closed the public comment portion of the hearing.

Commissioner Aimee Burrows asked whether the midblock walkway is a requirement that is separate from the approval of the Height increase. Principal Planner Aaron Barlow explained that the mid-block



walkway is required by the zoning regulations but that the current proposal includes widths, lighting, seating, landscaping, and shade provisions that exceed those requirements.

Chris Oakley said that the CG allows a 60-foot height, but the 800 South fronting within the CG district is about 57 feet. He clarified that the project includes sections of three, five, and eight-story sections and so mass is varied, rather than a 60-foot mass with reduced open space. He said that the current configuration produces mutual benefit. He added that a “shade study” had been conducted that did not show significant negative effects.

Commissioner Aimee Burrows commented that the staff report was available online to the public and may have answered some issues raised in public comment.

Commissioner Ghent asked why the proposal had not included a request for two separate parcels in order to accommodate the eventual purchase of the Kilby Court property by its business. Chris Oakley stated that the choice was made to enable development but agreed with Commissioner Ghent that separating a parcel for Kilby Court “wouldn’t hurt.”

Commissioner Barry asked for confirmation that the current zoning would be unaffected by the parcel consolidation. Aaron Barlow agreed.

In response to a question from Commissioner Amy Barry, Aaron Barlow explained that zoning regulations call for consideration of shade impacts and cited page 90 of his staff report. Commissioner Barry then commented that the purpose of Design Review is to determine whether requested exceptions to ordinance guidelines “would result in a better project.”

Commissioner Scheer said that she agreed, stating that consideration was larger than establishing whether specific Design Review standards had been met. She said that specific land use cannot be protected, however, she did believe that a 25-foot walkway would “take away the funk” of the area. She said that the developers have “quite a bit of land,” and the “wall” effect could have been avoided with many other configurations.

Commissioner Andres Paredes said that he agreed with Commissioner Scheer but added that he liked the “idea” of development in the area. He said that he wasn’t sure that this project “fits.” He then asked for the height of a nearby Art Space complex, but Aaron Barlow was uncertain about the height.

Commissioner Andra Ghent said that she liked the midblock walkway, open space, and the increased housing. She described the project as “really thoughtful.” She expressed rejection of this proposal could result in “a gas station” being the only business interested in developing at the location. She said that the “nature of tenancy” is that land rights are not secure, and that the Commission cannot protect a tenant. However, she added that she would be willing to separate the parcels in order to give Kilby Court “the best chance possible.”

Commissioner Michael Christensen said that he agreed that there should be a separate Kilby Court parcel and “correct easement” for Kilby Court. He added that an east-west midblock walkway would be “a lot more amenable to what we would like to see on this block.” He then clarified that the developers “own enough property to connect to the “pickle property” to the west, later citing the Granary District Alliance letter asking for an east-west mid-block walkway connection to 400 West.

Commissioner Amy Barry said that an east-west walkway connection to 400 West is not on the master plan, so it could not be used to evaluate the property. Commissioners Burrows and Christensen then pointed to the east-west walkway within the Downtown Master Plan connecting with the pickle factory. Commissioner Christensen also said that his suggestion would increase connectivity to Kilby Court. Chris Oakley and architect Stephen Droll discussed the fact that future development [through land acquisitions or collaborations] was possible to enable a full east-west walkway, but their proposal was consistent with the master plan for land that they currently own.

Commissioner Ghent said that she would “love to see” the east-west walkway that Commissioner Christensen was discussing, but she doubted how much impact the developers could have on property that they do not own.

Commissioner Burrows then asked Commissioner Barry whether she thought that the proposal is an improved product. She said that (as Commissioner Scheer had stated) increasing the height of the building into the interior of the project did not improve it, however, developing strictly to code with height limits of 60 feet and 65 feet would not have been a good outcome either. She said, “This could have been better.”

Commissioner Burrows then stated that significant negotiation had already occurred between staff and the applicant. Planning Manager Amy Thompson informed Commissioner Andrea Ghent that her proposed motion calling for a separate parcel for the property currently under tenancy by The Kilby Court Music Venue may not account for the restrooms, which must be replaced. She also stated that Commissioner Christensen’s suggested motion for an east-west walkway might be better described as a future project because the full walkway cannot be completed without negotiations with other landowners.

## **MOTION**

**Commissioner Andra Ghent stated “Based on the information presented, and the discussion, I move that the Commission approve this application with the conditions listed in the staff report with following modifications 1. that the condition regarding parcel assembly is stricken 2. that the applicant is encouraged to work to establish a future east-west midblock walkway.”**

**Commissioner Michael Christensen seconded the motion.**

**Vice-Chair Michael Christensen, Commissioners Andres Paredes, Andra Ghent, Richard Tuttle, and Chair Maurine Bachman voted “yes.”**

**Commissioners Brenda Scheer, Aimee Burrows, and Amy Barry voted “no.”**

**The motion passed, five “yes” votes and three “no” votes.**

**Zoning Map and Master Plan Amendment at approximately 865 S 500 East** - Rick Service, property owner and applicant, is requesting to amend the zoning map and master plan for the property at the above-stated address. The parcel contains a single-family dwelling, built in 1905, that the applicant is proposing to convert to an unspecified commercial use. The project involves two applications:

- A. Master Plan Amendment:** The associated future land use map in the Central Community Master Plan currently designates the property as "Low Density Residential." The petitioner is requesting to amend the future land use map for the parcel to "Neighborhood Commercial." **Case number PLNPCM2022-00302**
- B. Zoning Map Amendment:** The property is currently zoned RMF-30 (Low Density Multi-Family Residential District). The petitioner is requesting to amend the zoning map designation of the property to CN (Neighborhood Commercial District). **Case number PLNPCM2022-00301**

The project is located within Council District 5, represented by Darin Mano. (Staff contact: Michael McNamee at 801-535-7226 or michael.mcnamee@slcgov.com)

Principal Planner Michael McNamee reviewed the staff report and described the neighborhood in detail referring to zones and four relevant master plans. He reported that the Historic Landmark Commission had discussed the possibility of some modifications being acceptable, but also expressed concern about setting a precedent in the Central City Historic District or converting low density residential housing to

commercial use. The staff recommendation is that the Planning Commission forward a negative recommendation to the City Council.

Michael McNamee reported having received three emails and numerous phone calls regarding the petition. He characterized the comments as “mixed.” He stated that supporting comments cited walkability and vibrancy of the neighborhood. Negative comments referred to the historic integrity of the building, and problems with on-street parking, noise and privacy.

Michael McNamee described the property as north of the intersection at 900 South and 500 East and currently zoned RMF-30 (low density residential); the applicant requests a change to CN (neighborhood commercial). The single-family home was built in 1905 and is part of the Central City Historic Local District, which, he explained, means that any modifications would require approval and a Certificate of Appropriateness regardless of any change in zone. The house is currently used as a rental property. Michael McNamee stated that it apparently has never been anything other than a single-family home.

Michael McNamee explained that the CN zone currently applies to neighboring structures at corners of the intersection but has not been used for the “block interior” of any block in the immediate area, north of 900 South as this application seeks to do. However, he also said that the requested zone change would not exceed the size limit placed on contiguous Neighborhood Commercial zoning. Michael McNamee explained that, should be application for commercial zoning be approved, requirements for landscaping buffers would only apply were the building to be modified or replaced.

Michael McNamee explained that buildings within the historic overlay are subject to a standard requiring that a property “shall be used for a its original purpose, or shall be used for a purpose that requires minimal change to its defining characteristics.” He noted that “on balance” the “applicable plans and policies” do not support the application and quoted a specific reference to preserving low density residential in the Central Community Master Plan. He added that there was potential support in part of the Plan Salt Lake plan. He discussed available options under the City’s Housing Loss Mitigation Plan and reported that the applicant had stated his intention to pay a fee based on the difference between housing value and replacement cost if the application is approved.

Rick Service, the applicant, addressed the Commission. He informed the Commission, that, in addition to the subject property, he also owns the immediately adjacent properties 501 East and 511 East 900 South, a restaurant and butcher shop, respectively. He described having improved both properties, which were previously an “abandoned gas station,” and a house. He expressed his regard for the neighborhood and the historic characteristics of his property. He described features of the subject property that detract from its continued use as a residence including the bus stop and the access to rear parking that is shared with the butcher shop.

Commissioner Andra Ghent complimented the applicant’s restaurant but expressed hesitation about this application because “right now” there are “two or three vacant spaces” around the “9<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup>” area. She stated that she agrees with the notion that increased walkability is needed. Rick Service responded that he anticipated that with the development of the 900 South corridor “9<sup>th</sup> South is going to become Restaurant Row.”

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

- Cindy Cromer - Opposed. Landlord “in the 700-800 block in the Historic District.” Agrees with the analysis of the staff report and noted that the Salt Lake City Preservation Plan has been adopted as ordinance. She expressed her opinion that the most “compelling” information is within the Thriving in Place study, which is in progress [and was not included in the staff analysis]. She said,

“The gentrification and displacement in Central City affects its traditional working class residents.” She referred to a “massive shortage of housing,” acute need for family housing, and the “abundant commercial zones” in the area. She cited the October 6, HLC meeting saying that the HLC “got off course” from its function as a “design review board.” She said that the intersection in question is “not commercial node” and compared it to 700 East and 900 South—discussed by the Planning Commission at its previous meeting— as having “two commercial corners and two non-commercial corners.” She said that the HLC had accepted that the bus stop “degraded the house;” she then said that the bus stop and its “incredible piece of hardscaping” [cement slab that replaces the park strip] were put in place because the restaurant used “a loophole in the parking ordinance” that was closed in the week prior to the October 28 hearing. She reminded the Planning Commission that the City Council had acted (after long delay) upon the Planning Commission’s recommendation.

- Steven Spier(online) - Tentative. Neighbor. Concerned about additional commercial parking depriving residents.
- Anthony Medina (email read into the record) - Opposed. Neighbor and owner of one additional property. Concerned about integrity of the Historic District; housing loss; parking congestion (noting that employee of the current businesses consistently take-up residential parking spaces to leave business spaces for patrons); reduced privacy for the neighboring house; increase of an existing problem with trash can placement related to the position of the bus stop; his preference for low density housing within the neighborhood; the fact that no other property above the intersection has such zoning. Also noted was the fact that a small rear garden was removed from the property when the butcher shop was developed.
- Robert Wein (email read into the record) - Opposed. Neighbor. Praised the character and walkability of the neighborhood. Concerned about housing loss. Described parking problems related to the butcher shop and restaurant in detail.

Seeing no one else who wished to speak, Chair Bachman closed public comment portion of the meeting.

Commissioner Andra Ghent commented she teaches a graduate course in housing affordability and holds serious doubts about the effectiveness of housing mitigation plans. She said that, as a resident of the neighborhood, she is dissatisfied with retail options available to her and stated her strong support for the proposal.

Commissioner Aimee Burrows said that a recommendation of denial would be consistent with “the point of the neighborhood.”

Commissioner Amy Barry commented that the current RMF zone is not low density, and so the current zone is inconsistent with the master plan.

## **MOTION**

**Commissioner Brenda Scheer stated, “Based on the information presented, and the discussion, I move that the Commission recommend that the City Council DENY this proposal for zoning map and master plan amendments.”**

**Commissioner Andres Paredes seconded the motion**

**Commissioners Brenda Scheer, Andres Paredes, and Chairperson Maurine Bachman voted “yes.”**

**Commissioners Richard Tuttle, Amy Barry, Andra Ghent, Amy Burrows, Michael Christensen voted “no.”**

**The motion failed, five “no” votes, three “yes” votes.**

Commissioner Andra Ghent stated, “Based on the information presented, and the discussion, I move that the Commission recommend that the City Council APPROVE this proposal for zoning map and master plan amendments for the following reasons: that it is extremely consistent with the City’s goal of increasing walkability and bikeability and improving our air quality as well making denser housing actually pleasant.”

Vice-Chair Michael Christensen seconded that motion.

Vice-Chair Michael Christensen, Commissioners Amy Burrows, Andra Ghent, Amy Barry and Richard Tuttle voted “no.”

Commissioners Brenda Scheer, Andres Paredes, and Chairperson Maurine Bachman voted “no.”

The motion passed, five “yes” votes, three “no” votes.

**Northpoint Small Area Plan** - A request by the City Council to revise and complete an update to the Northpoint Small Area Plan. The staff recommendation is for a positive recommendation to the City Council. The Northpoint Small Area Plan is a land use plan for the land that is generally located between the Salt Lake City International Airport and the northern boundary of the city along the 2200 West corridor. The Northpoint Small Area Plan was adopted in April 2000. The updated plan will provide guidance on existing and anticipated development in the area, as well as annexation-related issues. As part of the plan update, the Salt Lake City Major Streets Plan will be amended to reflect recommended roadway alignments. The subject area is located within Council District 1, represented by Victoria Petro-Eschler. (Staff contact: Kristina Gilmore at 801-535-7780 or at kristina.gilmore@slcgov.com) **Case number PLNPLC2022-00687**

Senior Planner Kristina Gilmore reviewed the revised plan in person joined by consultant Olivia Cvetko via Webex. After identifying the master plan boundaries, Kristina Gilmore described “limited development potential” of the large southwestern portion of the area because it is owned by the Salt Lake City Airport Authority. She then noted areas currently zoned for Business Park, including the Scannell-Swaner subdivision that has already been approved by the City Council. She noted the section of the area under the jurisdiction of Salt Lake County, rather than Salt Lake City and said that the last plan update was in 2000 because of a need to address uses incompatible with the airport.

Kristina Gilmore outlined the community outreach process used to create the current amendments included four steering committee meetings, a public open house, visits to a variety of stakeholders, and visits to the Westpointe Community Council and events at the Westpointe Night Out.

Key concerns in shaping the Plan centered around “intense development pressure.” Areas addressed included annexation potential, “appropriate” buffering and other design standards (including clustering of buildings), protection of wildlife habitat, and human quality of life as it relates to noise, light, air quality and water quality.

Key land use categories were identified as “Natural Open Space;” a “Transitional zone,” which would ban residential development to enable future development as Business Park/Industrial; “Business Park/Industrial,” which is expected to convert to industrial and business park; and “Airport.”

Kristina Gilmore noted the implementation actions recommended in the plan, such as acquisition of City-owned open space and annexation of contiguous land. She also referred to a “purchase of development rights program” as a tool for preserving open space. Plans for municipal services such as police, fire and utilities extending beyond the small area master plan area are included.

Kristina Gilmore briefly described the amended a Salt Lake City Major Streets Plan contained within the Northpointe Small Area Master Plan. Anticipated flow needs include major truck traffic on 2900 West and a new airport road connecting with 2100 North.

Kristina Gilmore noted that multiple drafts have been created in response to stakeholder comments. She said that the Airport had requested its own category for its property because it does not intend to allow for non-airport uses. She said that an earlier July draft had shown the area along the City drainage canal and the Jordan river as part of the Natural Open Space Zone, but later staff discussions determined that such designation might be construed as a “taking” (violation of private property rights) and so the area was reclassified as Transitional. She also said that business representatives had criticized some aspects of the plan as “too restrictive.”

Commissioner Amy Barry asked why the recommendation is to change AG 2 and AG 5 to M1. Kristina Gilmore explained that the change reflects “what’s already happening,” in terms of recent petitions, and the fact that “some property owners have expressed that they are not interested in keeping agriculture, so M1 (light manufacturing) seems like the next logical step.” She added the Planning Division would not be supportive of a residential zone because of the proximity to the airport. Olivia Cvetko added that the fiscal analysis contained within the appendices shows a market demand for industrial development.

Commissioner Scheer asked whether the changes in standards of the M1 and BP zones contained in the plan would apply City-wide. Kristina Gilmore said that they would unless a special overlay zone were created.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

- Dorothy Pappas Owen - Requesting Deferred Decision. Northpointe Community Council Chair. Cited the multiple major development projects that the Community Council has faced over the past six years: the new prison, development of the Swanner Property, the Inland Port, the annexation from North Salt Lake. She said that the Community Council lobbied for the master plan project for a year before the money for this project was allocated (over three years ago). She stated that, while there had been opportunities for Community Council residents to give their “input” to help planners develop the draft, it was not until September 14<sup>th</sup> that the public was able to see the “vision map” and the recommendations. She said that “the public needs to be engaged in responding to that.” She said that the meeting in September was “fantastic,” “standing room only,” and included online participation, but the 139-page draft is “not an easy document to navigate.” In addition, the draft of the September 14<sup>th</sup> meeting “is not what is being presented to you.” She stated that the current draft was sent to her October 13<sup>th</sup> and that it contains “substantial changes” that merit a delay of the review process until there has been time for public review.
- Jason Head - Primarily in Support. On behalf Dave Tollman of Excel Development and (inaudible) owners of 150 acres of property within the master plan area. Expressed support for the plan but requests elimination of the maximum building frontage along 2200 West and reduction of the setback from the city canals from 75 feet to 50 feet. Noted that there is a current 100 foot set back off the Jordan River and a fifty foot setback from city canals, which are “ample and adequate to protect open space,” and “75 feet are an overreach.” He said that if the city intends “to see industrial development in this area 200 feet and 400 feet just simply don’t work for modern industrial buildings.” He cited the Scannell property that is “across the street,” that will be “four million square

feet, or six million square feet,” will have a first phase building that is “2,000 feet long.” Also stated support for the annexation petition “for 160 acres.

- Soren Simonson - Requesting Deferred Decision. Executive Director of the Jordan River Commission (Salt Lake City is a member of this 30-member interlocal organization.) Concerned that substantial changes since the previous Planning Commission briefing include removing a buffer area. Should the Planning Commission not agree to a deferral, he proposed three recommendations: 1. Reinstatement of the buffer between the Jordan River and the freeways as presented in the previous, and initial Planning Commission briefings (disagrees with the idea that the action would be a takings because both this plan and Plan Salt Lake include purchase of development rights as a means to create buffer zones) 2. Create 200 to 300 feet buffers for the uplands area of the Jordan River. The area had been deleted from the latest version because it is not wetlands, but he described upland areas as “critical habitat” connected to wetlands and 3. Suggest a business Park east of 2200 West because it would be more appropriate for residences.
- Jack Ray - Primarily Supports. Speaking for Rudy Reclamation. This business owns 1800 acres abutting the area on the west side of 3200 West. Appreciative of City’s outreach efforts. Stated that 80-90 percent of the migratory birds that depend on the Great Salt Lake also depend upon freshwater marshes. Those marshes abut 3200 West. Supports the recommendation that the road remain unpaved. Support the recommendation that development does not face 3200 West. Requests buffering requirements along 3200 West. Noted that Salt Lake County has designated the area as The Shoreline Heritage Area in its master plan.
- Carson Kronk - Supports. Real estate broker representing two area families. “As a real estate broker, and as an American, I believe it is my right to buy use and sell property with an intent to make a profit for the highest and best use.” Stated that he and his clients believe that industrial use is the best designation for the area. Commended Kristina Gilmore’s efforts to listen to “everyone’s opinions and reflecting those” in each version of the plan.
- Eric Orem - Opposed to Increased Buffers. Concerned with the impact on about 32 acres representing his own property and his neighbor’s property around 3000 North and 3300 North, west of 2200 West. Stated that USGS, and the Army Corp of Engineers, has found that 50-to-100-foot buffers provide adequate filtration to protect wildlife. He stated that he has consulted experts who have called 200 feet “excessive.” He said that his property rights have been damaged because the development potential of his land is threatened.
- Brad Auger - Primarily Supports. Pointed out that perhaps 48 residences exist alongside 1,000 acres of property that could be commercially developed. Characterized people who oppose industrial zoning as newer residents. Characterized the plan as consistent with the nature of land use around airports in other major cities.

Seeing no one else who wished to speak, Chair Bachman closed the public comment period.

Commissioner Ghent commented that she was “wary” of the conditional use status for requirements pertaining to toxic runoff and felt more information was needed.

Senior City Attorney Paul Nielson responded to Commissioner Burrows’ question regarding the possibility for tabling by saying that the action was appropriate when linked to a rationale. Senior Planner Kristina Gilmore also responded to Commissioner Burrows questions stating that the plan schedule followed the timeline outlined by the consultant and that staff made it clear that the plan would be revised to account for public input received. Commissioner Scheer wanted to know specifically what significant changes had

been made between the present draft and the one previously presented to the September “community input meeting.” Kristina Gilmore said that changes to the vision map were deleting the open space requirement between the river and the city drainage canal and creating a distinct Airport zone and implementation additions were plans for utilities and the amendments to Salt Lake City Major Streets Plan. However, the former draft contained similar information regarding streets that were not presented as amendments to the Streets Plan. Kristina Gilmore said that the consultant added references for the buffers to justify recommendations.

Commissioner Amy Barry said that she would justify tabling based upon the community need to review changes; her own disapproval of the change to the AG areas without a plan to preserve open space elsewhere; her wish to explore the idea presented that the Army Corps of Engineers has separate standards for different types of vegetation that could be used for City standards; she also said that she wanted to explore the notion that goals in a vision statement should not be viewed as a takings. Paul Nielson stated that a master plan was “the groundwork for zoning,” and “the action of zoning would be the taking.” Commissioner Scheer suggested, “You could be laying the groundwork for a transfer of development rights.”

Planning Manager Kelsey Lindquist suggested that an option exists to provide a motion asking the City Council to consider the points raised this evening. She said that zoning map amendments would be “private petition-initiated.”

Commissioner Ghent suggested that she thought that agriculture would be more water intensive than any other use, but she was open to tabling. Commissioner Christensen said that he supported Commissioner Barry’s remarks, particularly with regard to the transition to industrial. Commissioner Rich Tuttle agreed, adding, “why here?” He pointed out the nearby Utah Inland Port and said that given the “impact on the surrounding area,” he thought that more time was needed. Commissioner Scheer said that when the initial small area plan was created in 2000, it allowed the BP zone and entitlements were created. She said that changes to the M1 zone will affect the entire city, including the Inland Port and that would be a very important reason to table the plan.

Kelsy Lindquist reminded the Commission that the update to the plan was a request by the City Council as the result of the recent annexation petition and development inquiries.

## **MOTION**

**Commissioner Amy Barry stated, “I move that the Planning Commission TABLE this project for further community review regarding the most recent changes; for a review of vegetation in landscaping requirements in buffer zones for possible reduction of buffer zones if we have very specific requirements”**

**Vice-Chair Michael Christensen seconded the motion.**

**Vice-Chair Michael Christensen, Commissioners Aimee Burrows, Brenda Scheer, Andres Paredes, Andra Ghent, Amy Barry, Rich Tuttle, and Chairperson Maurine Bachman voted “yes.” The motion passed unanimously**



Upon the advice of Planning Manager Amy Thompson and Senior Attorney Paul Nielson, Chair Bachman reopened the public comment period for the Northpointe Small Area Plan and the Salt Lake City Major Streets Plan.

**Urban Forest Action Plan** – A request by Mayor Mendenhall to develop a city-wide Urban Forest Action Plan. The Plan provides goals, objectives, and actions to realize the vision for the urban forest as established in “Plan Salt Lake”. The plan is intended to provide guidance for Salt Lake City to align its resources and actions in the built environment with its goals for sustainability and equity and describes concrete steps to implement equitable practices for a resilient future. The plan will also inform a future zoning code amendment that supports the preservation and promotion of trees on public and private lands and within the public right-of-way. (Staff contact: Amanda Roman at 801-535-7660 or amanda.roman@slcgov.com) **Case Number PLNPCM2022-00987**

Urban Designer, Amanda Roman, reviewed the Action Plan as updated following the Commission briefing in January. She stated that the staff recommendation is that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation regarding the plan to the City Council. She explained that the Action Plan was first developed because the City’s urban forest had been identified by the 2015 master plan, Plan Salt Lake as one of the City’s greatest assets. She noted the value of the urban forest as contributing to temperature moderation, moderation of storm water flows, and documented increased property values in retail districts. Other benefits include reduced energy consumption, improvement of physical and mental health and promotion of “active transportation.” Therefore, a plan objective is to distribute the forest equitably while incorporating “attractive” design principles that create “sense of place in different neighborhoods.”

Amanda Roman noted that the west side of the City has about half the tree canopy of Sugar House and the Avenues, however, the smallest tree coverage (and harshest growing conditions) is in the downtown area. She noted corresponding temperature differences. Details such as asthma rates and “historical redlining” were evaluated in the plan. Amanda Roman provided mapping of the 2014 forest but stated that more recent data has not been received as yet. Sources used included the US Census and EPA health documentation. The plan process included plan development by multiple City departments, (principally Planning, Urban Forestry, Public Utilities and Sustainability) and non-profit groups. Considerable public engagement targeting the west side through community events, community council visits, and a Planning Division open house was followed by briefings to the City Council, Planning Commission, and the Downtown Alliance.

Plan recommendations include protection of the urban forest through land use policy including accommodations for trees in utilities rights-of-way.

Commissioner Andra Ghent praised the overall plan but questioned the legality of charging impact fees as funding mechanisms because her understanding would be that the fees should be tied to a proportional increase in services provided. Amanda Roman agreed to consult with Paul Neilson and if necessary, make changes to the relevant language.

Commissioner Scheer praised the study and asked whether the landscaping requirement for residences could be counted towards the calculation of the canopy. Amanda Roman stated that the requirements were currently being considered and Planning Manager Amy Thompson added that a City Council

briefing has been held, and although a petition to amend the landscaping ordinance has not been initiated yet, it is anticipated that it will be combined with the Plan. In response to Commissioner Scheer next question, Planning Manager Kelsey Lindquist said that a recent ordinance for the Downtown Building Heights Study, which was forwarded to the City Council with a positive recommendation, mandates landscaping requirements specific to street trees and tree canopy coverage. The Urban Forester will also no longer be approving the removal of street trees for private development.

Commissioner Scheer suggested a requirement of including trees in projects in the historic districts to mitigate situations like the bus stop issue discussed in an earlier agenda item. She said that she would like the requirement to extend beyond the current “specimen” tree designation. Commissioner Ghent suggested that stringent rule might increase development costs and send developers to other cities, thus increasing the need for longer commutes. Commissioner Christensen said that coordinated planning would also be considered because trees are sometimes cited in inappropriate locations. Amanda Roman agreed stating that appropriate varieties of street trees have been reviewed also.

Commission Chair Maurine Bachman opened the public comment portion of the meeting.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

- **Cindy Cromer**—Support. She suggested that since she believes that development contributes to the “urban heat island effect,” she sees a direct connection between a tree requirement and impact fees.

Seeing no one else who wished to speak Chair Bachman closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

## **MOTION**

**Vice-chair Michael Christensen stated, “Based on the information presented, and discussion I move that the Commission recommend that the City Council APPROVE this proposal to adopt a City-wide Urban Forest Action Plan.”**

**The motion was seconded by Commissioner Amy Barry.**

**Vice-Chair Michael Christensen, Commissioners Andres Paredes, Brenda Scheer, Amy Burrows, Andra Ghent, Amy Barry, Rich Tuttle and Chair Barry voted “yes.”**

**The motion passed unanimously.**

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:55 PM.

*For Planning Commission agendas, staff reports, and minutes, visit the Planning Division’s website at [slc.gov/planning/public-meetings](http://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.*