

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Room 326 of the City & County Building
451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah
Wednesday, July 11, 2012

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:36:14 PM](#) . Audio recordings of the Planning Commission meetings are retained in the Planning Office for an indefinite period of time.

Present for the Planning Commission meeting were: Chairperson Angela Dean, Vice Chair Michael Gallegos and Commissioners, Lisa Adams, Emily Drown, Michael Fife, Clark Ruttinger, Matthew Wirthlin and Mary Woodhead. Commissioners Bernardo Flores-Sahagun, Marie Taylor, and Kathleen Hill were excused.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Wilf Sommerkorn, Planning Director; Joel Paterson, Planning Manager; Nick Britton, Senior Planner; John Anderson, Principal Planner; Elizabeth Buehler, Principal Planner; Ray Milliner, Principal Planner; Michaela Oktay, Principal Planner; Paul Nielson, City Land Attorney; and Michelle Moeller, Senior Secretary.

FIELD TRIP NOTES:

A field trip was held prior to the meeting. Planning Commissioners present were: Commissioners Lisa Adam, Angela Dean, Emily Drown, Michael Fife, Michael Gallegos and Clark Ruttinger. Staff members in attendance were Joel Paterson, John Anderson, Ray Milliner and Elizabeth Buehler. The following locations were visited:

1. Epic Brewing – Staff presented the proposal, Master Plan and Zoning Amendment. The Commission asked what residential uses would be demolished and where the proposal D-2/RMU-35 boundary would be. The Commission asked about the D-2 boundary and about Epic’s expansion plan.
2. Signature Books- Zoning Map Amendment and Master Plan- Staff described the proposal. The Commissioner asked about the specific details and why the Master Plan and zoning would be changed so soon after the North Temple Transit Station Area Plan. The Commission asked about future development plans for Signature Books.
3. 2205 East 2100 South- Staff presented the proposed addition to the building. The Commission asked about the design and details of the proposal.

4. 538 East 500 South- Staff presented the proposal, amendments to the Master Plan and zoning map. The Commission asked about the proposed development details regarding the site.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE JUNE 27, 2012 MEETING

MOTION [5:36:24 PM](#)

Commissioner Woodhead made a motion to approve the June 27, 2012 minutes.

Commissioner Drown seconded the motion. Commissioners Gallegos, Fife, Drown, and Woodhead voted “aye”. Commissioners Chairperson Dean, Adams, Ruttinger and Wirthlin abstained from voting. The motion passed.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR [5:36:49 PM](#)

Chairperson Dean and Vice Chairperson Gallegos stated they had nothing to report at this time.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR [5:36:54 PM](#)

Mr. Wilford Sommerkorn, Planning Director, stated he had nothing to report at this time.

[5:36:56 PM](#)

Extension of Planned Development Approval. Originally approved July 13, 2011 PLNSUB2011-00187: Salt City Plaza - A request by Jeff Stockert of Salt City Plaza LLC for a planned development at approximately 154 W 600 South. The purpose is to construct multiple hotels and a shared parking structure located in Council District 4 represented by Luke Garrott (Staff contact: Doug Dansie at 801-535-6182or doug.dansie@slcgov.com

Mr. Joel Paterson, Planning Manager, explained the process the project had taken and reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file).

MOTION [5:37:54 PM](#)

Commissioner Fife moved to extend the Planned Development for PLNSUB2011-00187 as presented. Commissioner Wirthlin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously

[5:38:18 PM](#)

PLNPCM2012-00339 Building and Site Design Review – A request by Josh Footer, represented by Soren Simonsen is requesting approval of a second story addition on an existing building located at approximately 2205 East 2100 South in the CB (commercial business) zone. The property is in Council district 6 represented by Soren Simonsen (staff contact: Ray Milliner (801)535-7645 or ray.milliner@slcgov.com.

Mr. Ray Milliner, Principal Planner, reviewed the proposal as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff was recommending approval of the petition as presented.

The Commissioners asked questions regarding additional parking and building materials.

Mr. Milliner stated the Transportation Department would review the need for extra parking when the building permit requested. He stated currently Staff had not received any comments regarding parking. Mr. Milliner stated if the Commission requested Staff to further review the building materials it could be added as a condition of approval.

Mr. Josh Footer, Property Manager stated the additional square footage was to accommodate the growth of the business.

Mr. Soren Simonsen, Architect reviewed the parking for the property, bike racks and shower facility proposed to be added to the property.

PUBLIC HEARING [5:44:52 PM](#)

Chairperson Dean opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Judi Short, Community Council, stated the Community Council was in favor of the project and felt it was a wonderful addition to the area.

Chairperson Dean closed the Public Hearing.

DISCUSSION [5:46:37 PM](#)

Commissioner Gallegos asked if there were windows on the east elevation.

Mr. Simonsen stated there were no windows on the east or north elevation.

MOTION [5:47:07 PM](#)

Commissioner Wirthlin stated in regards to PLNPCM2012-00339 for the Conditional Building and Site Design Review, based on the analysis and findings in the Staff Report, the testimony given and the Commissions discussion; he moved that the Planning Commission approve the request subject to the conditions in the Staff Report. Commissioner Gallegos seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

[5:48:16 PM](#)

PLNPCM2012-00114 Epic Brewing Zoning Map Amendment – A request by Peter Ericksen, representing Epic Brewing LLC to amend the Salt Lake City Zoning Map for the properties located approximately between 828 and 836 South Edison Street. The proposal would modify the zoning map for properties currently zoned SR-3 Special Development Pattern zoning district to D-2 Downtown Support and RMU-35 Residential Mixed Use zoning districts. The purpose of the proposal is to facilitate the expansion of Epic Brewing and the construction of a mixed use development. The amendments would increase the allowed density and the allowed height of any buildings constructed on the subject properties. The property is located in Council District 4 represented by Luke Garrott. (Staff Contact: John Anderson at 801-535-7214 or john.anderson@slcgov.com)

Mr. John Anderson, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff was recommending denial of the proposal as it did not meet the Central Community Master Plan or the standards in the Zoning Ordinance.

Chairperson Dean asked if the property boundaries would be changed with the proposal.

Mr. Anderson explained a property could have two zonings and property line changes were not part of the current proposal.

Mr. Peter Ericksen, Business Owner, reviewed the history of the property and the process the project had gone through. He stated revisions had been made therefore, they were asking for mixed used near Edison Street and D-2 near the existing structure. Mr. Ericksen reviewed the public outreach for the project and explained negative comments had not been received. He stated since the notification of the meeting comments had been made regarding the traffic exiting onto Edison Street therefore, the revisions had been made.

Mr. Bernardo Flores-Sahagun, Architect, stated the property in the area was well kept and parking was available. He reviewed the property use in the area.

Mr. Ericksen reviewed the zoning request to accommodate the proposal.

Commissioner Fife asked what the Applicant was specifically asking for.

Mr. Flores-Sahagun reviewed the placement of the D-2 zoning and the mixed use zoning that would make the traffic enter and exit onto State Street.

The Commissioners stated the newer proposal was not included in the packet of information they received. The Commission stated they might want to table the issue and allow the

Applicant to return with an updated copy of the proposal. The Commissioners asked if Staff had reviewed the new proposal.

Mr. Anderson stated he had seen the updated version of the proposal on July 10.

Chairperson Dean asked if the new proposal was requesting for the residential properties to be rezoned to D-2.

Mr. Ericksen stated Epic Brewing would like to use the residential home as an office space until the addition could be done to the building. He stated this was not permitted in the current zoning therefore; it would need to be changed to mixed use.

The Commission and Mr. Ericksen discussed the residential homes on the property and if the proposal was to replace the homes or leave them as they currently existed.

Mr. Ericksen stated the proposal was to leave the two homes as they were and have the traffic enter and exit from State Street.

The Commissioner stated the Public Hearing was for what was currently being presented. They stated it was great that the Applicant was listening to the Public Comments and trying to be accommodating however, it may be more beneficial if the Applicant were to return with an updated plan.

Mr. Ericksen stated the submission had not changed as they were asking for D-2 zoning in one area and mixed use in another.

The Commissioners agreed an updated version of the plan would be required to address concerns from both the Public and the Commission.

The Commissioners and Staff discussed a development agreement being drafted.

Commissioner Adams asked the Applicant to address the concerns regarding hours of operation, noise levels and the maintenance of the residential properties owned by Epic Brewing.

Mr. Ericksen stated the noise would not be an issue for the neighbors as it would only be while the addition was being constructed. He stated the properties were maintained similar to the others in the area. Mr. Ericksen stated the process had taken a long time and he would like to see the project move forward.

The Commissioners and Staff discussed the validity of having a Public Hearing now or if waiting for the updated plans to be presented made more sense.

Mr. Paul Nielson, City Attorney, stated the item should have been listed as a legislative issue on the agenda as the rezone was the issue being addressed. He stated any changes to the proposal should not drive the decision of the Commission. Mr. Nielson stated the issue at hand was the zoning and that did not change with the new proposal.

Commissioner Woodhead stated a rezone with a development agreement was very different from a rezone without a development agreement.

Mr. Nielson stated that was correct but that was presuming a development agreement would be adopted.

Mr. Sommerkorn stated a development agreement would be something that the Planning Commissioners would have to decide on.

Commissioner Drown asked how the Commission would go about passing any type of recommendation based on the development agreement.

Mr. Sommerkorn stated the Commission would be recommending to the City Council that they approve the rezone with a specific development agreement and specify what would be in the agreement. He stated it would be up to the City Council to approve it or not.

The Commissioners and Staff discussed the possibility of recommending approval for part of the rezone.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:17:40 PM](#)

Chairperson Dean opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke in opposition of the proposal:

Mr. Tom Mutter, Ms. Cindy Cromer, Ms. Cherish Tharpe, Ms. Pat Peterson, Mr. Lloyd Hart, Mr. Don Johnston, Mr. David Richardson, Mr. Steve Stancher, Ms. Loretta Peterson, Mr. Richard Wagner Jones and Ms. Amy Picklesimer.

The following comments were made:

- Epic should work with the neighborhood on a better solution to the project.

- Not the proposal that was advertised and should be brought back after revisions were made.
- Important to protect the pocket neighborhoods such as that on Edison Street.
- Non-conforming status should not be allowed.
- Access to Edison Street should be eliminated and another route planned.
- With a school in the neighbor it would be unsafe for a large amount of truck traffic to use the area.
- The potential of growth to the neighborhood, without the addition to the business, is great and should be allowed to happen.
- SR3 zoning was put in place to protect the neighborhood and should remain in place.
- Traffic on Edison Street is only the start of the changes to the business and effects to the neighborhood.
- Office in residential area should not be allowed as it will only spiral out of control in the future.
- Salt Lake Arts Academy was not in favor of the proposal as it negatively impacted the neighborhood.
- Epic Brewing's property was not cared for currently and would most likely not be taken care of in the future.
- Project would negatively impact the houses on 800 South.
- Traffic on Edison would increase regardless of where the entrance/exit to the property was placed.
- Proposed exit to Edison Street was on an easement and the project should not be allowed.

The following people were in opposition of the project but did not wish to speak:

Ms. L. Maxine Peterson, Ms. Laurin Paterson and Ms. Natalie Pascual

Written comments were as follows:

- Zoning should be kept as is to protect the homes in the neighborhood.

Mr. Flores-Sahagun stated the proposed project was not in a historic district and the land use Master Plan called for RM-35 (mixed use development). He stated if another entity wanted to develop the area it would be more intense than what was being proposed. Mr. Flores-Sahagun stated only thirty eight percent of the properties were owner occupied and the other sixty two percent were rental properties or vacant lots.

Commissioner Woodhead asked the Applicant if they wanted an opportunity to bring an updated proposal before the Commission prior to a recommendation being sent to the City Council.

Mr. Ericksen stated that would be preferred as they had been asking for a development plan from the beginning of the process.

Chairperson Dean stated clarification was needed as to if the proposal was possible from a zoning stand point such as creating the non-conforming lots on the residential properties and if the Planning Commission wanted to entertain such a proposal. She stated if it was not then the option to return should not be given. Chairperson Dean asked about the easement on the residential property and how the proposal would affect the neighbor.

Mr. Anderson stated he had not researched the easement as it was a private matter. He stated a zoning change would not override any existing easements on the property.

Chairperson Dean asked if creating the non-conforming lots would be justified.

Mr. Anderson stated it was something that could be done but if the houses were to stay they would no longer meet the rear yard setbacks, although not by a large amount as it was assumed that the lots were small to begin with.

The Commissioners and Staff discussed the Master Plan for the area and the suggested zoning in the Master Plan. Staff stated if the goal was to preserve the area as a single family neighborhood the Master Plan would need to be amended.

Mr. Nielson read the Utah Code relating to Master Plans being a general guide for land use decisions. He stated zoning did not have to perfectly match what was in the Master Plan as it was an advisory guide and the exception was when referring to public places such as parks and streets.

The Commission and Staff discussed the setback requirements for the subject area and what the changes would be with the proposed zoning. It was stated that a landscape buffer would be required if the zoning were to stay residential or when adjacent to single family dwellings.

Mr. Ericksen stated he was taken aback by the outrage of the neighborhood and that they were willing to work with the neighbors to make the proposal fir the area. He stated the goal was to expand the building for business purposes.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the entrance and exit changes that would accommodate the neighbors. It was stated that the public was probably not afraid of the proposal but the fact that if the zoning was changed future owners could further develop the property for commercial purposes.

The Applicant stated if the entire site was rezoned to RMU then it would solve the problem. He asked if the Commission would be willing to do that.

The Commissioners stated that was something to talk about but the Planning Commission could only address what was being presented. They discussed having the Applicant return with a revised proposal and the option of tabling the issue until that could be completed.

Mr. Sommerkorn stated if the Commission felt comfortable with tabling the issue that would be fine but they needed to discuss what they were willing to consider.

Commissioner Drown asked if the development agreement could be considered prior to forwarding a recommendation or was it done separate from the recommendation to the City Council.

Mr. Sommerkorn stated the Commission could send a favorable recommendation with a specific development agreement to the City Council. He stated the specific details of the development agreement would need to be finalized prior to the City Council considering approval of the rezone.

Commissioner Woodhead stated the Commission's recommendation would be contingent on the development agreement with specific language.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the options for denial, approval or tabling the issue to reach a solution. They discussed the terms of a development agreement and how it could be detrimental to the property. They discussed the plan options and what would need to be done to move the project along. The Commissioners agreed that they would like to table the issue for further discussion after research was done and a new proposal presented.

Mr. Sommerkorn asked if it included an idea of whether the two houses were rezoned or not as it would be part of the recommendation to the City Council.

The Commission discussed the fact that the neighbors did not want to see the area changed or rezoned and whether or not a new proposal would change the neighbor's opinion.

MOTION [7:01:21 PM](#)

Commissioner Fife stated regarding PLNPCM2012-00114 requesting master plan and zoning map amendments for property located at 828 to 836 South Edison Street, based on the Staff Report, information from the Applicant and the testimony given, he moved that the Planning Commission transmit a negative recommendation to the City Council relating to the request. Commissioner Adams seconded the motion.

DISCUSSION

The Commissioners and Staff discussed what the motion meant and whether or not it tabled the matter or forwarded the decision to the City Council. It was determined that it went to the City Council but in the mean time the proposal could be revised and presented to the City Council for approval. The Commission stated then denying the proposal was the proper process to allow the Applicant to change their proposal. Staff stated the proposal could be changed with the City Council or with the Planning Commission to acquire a favorable recommendation. The Commission stated it would be faster to send it to the City Council with a negative recommendation and allow the Applicant to make the changes. Staff explained if the changes were significant enough it would be brought before the Planning Commission. The Commission and Staff discussed what would be best for the proposal in terms of tabling the issue or denial and the process for each option.

[7:05:43 PM](#)

Commissioner Drown asked to make a substitute motion.

Commissioner Drown stated regarding PLNPCM2012-00114 828 requesting master plan and zoning map amendments for property located at 836 South Edison Street, based on the Staff Report, information from the Applicant and the testimony given, she moved that the Planning Commission table the proposal and ask that the Applicant bring a development agreement before the Commission.

Commissioner Woodhead asked that the plans be revised.

Commissioner Drown agreed the additional language should be included in the motion. Commissioner Woodhead seconded the motion.

Mr. Nielson stated they would not actually be bring a development agreement but would bring concepts to the Planning Commission for discussion.

Commissioner Drown stated the motion should state the Applicant would bring concepts and talking points to the Planning Commission for discussion. Commissioner Woodhead seconded the change.

The Commissioners and Staff discussed what would be faster for the Applicant. It was determined that a negative recommendation to the City Council could take a while to address. However, the Commission would not meet until August and Staff needed direction from the Commission on what they would be willing to consider as talking points for the development agreement in order to approve the rezone.

VOTE [7:08:21 PM](#)

Commissioners Wirthlin, Fife, and Adams voted “nay”

Commissioners Drown, Ruttinger, Woodhead and Gallegos voted “aye”. The motion passed 4-3

Vice Chairperson Michael Gallegos left for the evening.

The Applicant stated they would work with Staff and the Community to address the concerns and bring forth a new proposal.

The Commission stated they would be interested in considering a proposal that protected Edison Street from an increase in traffic and that protected the residential neighborhood. They stated they would generally not be recommended converting the homes into offices and would look at restricting the future development of the parking area in terms of setback and height.

The Commission agreed to email staff their idea for the development agreement.

[7:12:32 PM](#)

The Commission took a short recess.

[7:23:52 PM](#)

PLNPCM2010-00656 West Salt Lake Master Plan (Continued from June 13) – A request by Mayor Ralph Becker to update the West Salt Lake Master Plan. The public draft of the proposed updated master plan is available at www.westsaltlake.com. The West Salt Lake planning area is in Council District 2, represented by Kyle LaMalfa (Staff: Nick Britton at 801-335-6107 or nick.britton@slcgov.com).

Mr. Nick Britton reviewed the project as explained in memo sent to the Planning Commissioners (located in the case file). He stated Staff recommended the Planning Commission initiate petitions for two implementation strategies as outlined in the memo.

The Commission and Staff discussed what the petition would entail and include. The Commission asked if a Public Hearing for the imitation of the public was needed. Staff stated the Public Hearing was still open for the petition and comments could be heard, however, a public hearing is not required for the Commission to initiate petitions.

Mr. Sommerkorn stated the full plan would not be reheard by the Planning Commission for a few months but in the mean time Staff could be working on the proposals to move the project forward.

Mr. Nielson stated the petition was originally continued to a certain date and the motion would need to continue it again.

PUBLIC HEARING

Chairperson Dean closed the Public Hearing.

DISCUSSION

MOTION [7:28:24 PM](#)

Commissioner Wirthlin stated regarding the West Salt Lake Master Plan, he move to continue the hearing to a future Planning Commission meeting and that the Planning Commission initiate a petition to examine and modify the zoning in parts of West Salt Lake as indicated in the proposed Master Plan to reflect the future land use map and a petition to examine and modify as needed the certain regulations in the Zoning Ordinance as indicated in the proposed Master Plan to reflect recommendations of the Master Plan. Commissioner Woodhead seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

[7:29:33 PM](#)

Signature Books Master Plan and Zoning Map Amendment – a request by Dave Richards, representing Signature Books to amend the North Temple Area Plan and the Salt Lake City Zoning Map for the property located at 549 West 400 North. The amendments as proposed would allow the development of a mixed use project. The property is located in Council District 3 represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff Contact: John Anderson at 801-535-7214 or john.anderson@slcgov.com)

- a. **PLNPCM2012-00254**: Master Plan Amendment – a request to amend the future land use classification of the subject property as designated in the North Temple Area Plan from Transit Station Area Stable to Transit Station Area Transition.
- b. **PLNPCM2012-00255**: Zoning Map Amendment – a request to rezone the subject properties from SR-1A Special Development Pattern Residential to Transit Station Area Urban Center District.

Mr. John Anderson, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff recommended the Commission forward a positive recommendation to City Council with the condition that the initial rezone, PLNPCM2011-00065, be approved prior to the approval of the current proposal.

The Commissioners clarified the proposed rezoning and what lots would be affected.

Staff explained the location of the lots and the previous rezone proposal. Staff explained the current proposal would bring the property in conformance with the neighboring property. And explained if the previous proposal was not approved it would not make sense to rezone the subject property.

Mr. Dave Richards, Architect, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report, gave a history of the business and property. He stated the structure on the property would be demolished and a new apartment structure would be constructed.

PUBLIC HEARING [7:40:59 PM](#)

Chairperson Dean opened the Public Hearing.

The following people spoke in opposition of the proposal: Mr. David Galvan and Ms. Maria Garciaz.

The following comments were made:

- Noticing was not properly done as neighbors were not notified of the proposal.
- Signature Books was great neighbors and took care of the property.
- Area plan was just amended so why was this not included in the amendments.
- The proposal was not consistent with neighborhood.

The following person spoke in favor of the proposal:

Mr. Jason Walker stated the proposed project would be a great addition to the area as it was an at risk neighborhood. He stated he was in favor of the mixed use zoning and similar projects were needed in the City.

Chairperson Dean closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Richards stated he was surprised to hear of the mailing issues but it was mailed to a three hundred foot radius. He reported that no one from the community attended the Open Houses or Community Council meetings. Mr. Richards stated the rezone that was already going through the TSA had created the split and they were trying to remedy it, in the best possible way.

Chairperson Dean asked why it was being referred to as a split because the subject area was farther west than the previously purposed area.

Mr. Richards reviewed the proposed areas, the zoning and why it was contingent to the previously proposed petition. He stated the size of the lots did not conform to the current zoning.

The Commissioners asked about the easement on the property.

Mr. Richards stated the ownership of the easement was under investigation and they were working to clarify it.

The Commissioners and Applicant discussed the requested zoning and whether or not it would be a benefit to zone the property SR1-A.

Ms. Keiko Jones, Signature Books, stated the company purchased the property nineteen years ago and had since improved the area in reducing crime and cleaning it up. She reviewed the various developments Signature Books had done in the area.

Mr. Anderson stated one of the things he had looked at in reviewing the recommendation was that the TSA zoning came with very strict design requirements that are not required in other zones, including larger buffer areas between single family homes. He reviewed the point system for the area.

MOTION

Commissioner Ruttinger stated regarding PLNPCM2012-00254 and PLNPCM2012-00255 he moved based on the analysis and findings in the staff report that the Planning Commission forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council that the zoning for the property at 549 West 400 North be modified to Transit Area Station Transition to bring it into conformity with the proposed zoning change to 543 West 400 North. Commissioner Woodhead seconded the motion.

Commissioner Fife asked if they were addressing both petitions in the motion as the second petition was a Zoning Map Amendment.

Commissioner Ruttinger added to the motion 549 West 400 North to the proposed Zoning Map Amendment.

Mr. Paterson stated Staff was recommending a favorable recommendation be sent to the City Council on both the Master Plan and Zoning Map amendments with the condition that the Zoning Map Amendment not take place unless the adjacent map amendment, the City Council was considering, was approved.

Commissioner Ruttinger asked for the discussion to be part of the motion. Commissioner Woodhead seconded the addition.

Commissioner Drown asked if there were notes being taken that the neighbors felt they were not notified appropriately.

Mr. Anderson explained the noticing standards were met but for this project it may not have been far enough to reach some of the neighbors. He stated the notification radius could be expanded for the City Council meeting.

The Commissioners discussed the notification radius and encouraged the Applicant to visit with NeighborWorks and neighboring properties prior to the City Council meeting.

Mr. Anderson stated he had contacted both the Fairpark and Capitol Hill Community councils and neither one had negative comments regarding the proposal.

The Commissioners stated the process had been followed and there was no reason to change the notification boundary at this time.

VOTE [8:00:03 PM](#)

The motion passed unanimously.

[8:00:52 PM](#)

538 E. 500 South Master Plan and Zoning Map Amendment – A request by Strategic Capital Group to amend the Central Community Future Land Use Map and the zoning map for the property located at approximately 538 E. 500 South. The amendments are proposed to allow a multi-family development on the property as part of a larger development proposal. The property is located in Council District 4 represented by Luke Garrott. (Staff Contact: Elizabeth Buehler at 801-535-6313 or elizabeth.buehler@slcgov.com)

- a. **PLNPCM2011-00359: Master Plan Amendment – a request to amend the future land use classification of the subject property from Medium Density Residential to Residential/Office Mixed Use as shown on the Central Community Future Land Use Map.**
- b. **PLNPCM2012-00305: Zoning Map Amendment – a request to rezone the subject property from RMF-35 Moderate Density Multi-Family Residential District to RO Residential Office District.**

Ms. Elizabeth Buehler, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff recommended the Commission forward a positive recommendation to City Council.

The Commissioner and Staff discussed the rear setback changes.

Mr. Adam Paul, Strategic Capitol Group, stated they were excited about the development and reviewed the necessity for the change in zoning. He stated he had received positive feedback from the neighbors regarding the project.

PUBLIC HEARING [8:08:25 PM](#)

Chairperson Dean opened the Public Hearing, seeing there was no one in the audience that wished to speak for or against the petition Chairperson Dean closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION [8:08:39 PM](#)

Commissioner Fife stated regarding petition PLNPCM2012-00305 and PLNPCM2011-00359, the Zoning Map Amendment and the Amendment to the Central Community Future Land Use map for 538 East 500 South, he moved that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for each application based on the analysis and findings in the Staff Report, the information from the Applicant and the opportunity for the Public to Comment. Commissioner Drown seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

[8:09:46 PM](#)

PLNPCM2012-00264 Amend D-1 (Central Business District) Restrictions On Parking Lots And Structures – A request by City Council member Stan Penfold for a text amendment to delete language that may encourage the demolition of buildings to construct parking lots in the D-1 zoning district. The amendment will affect sections of 21A.30 of the zoning ordinance. Related provisions of Title 21A-Zoning may also be amended as part of this petition. (Staff contact: Michaela Oktay at (801) 535-6003 or michaela.oktay@slcgov.com).

Ms. Michael Oktay, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report. She stated Staff recommended the Commission forward a positive recommendation to City Council.

The Commissioners commended Staff and the City Council on correcting the inconsistencies in the ordinance.

Public Hearing [8:14:34 PM](#)

Chairperson Dean opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Cindy Cromer, Resident, stated she was thankful the proposal was coming forward to be corrected. She stated it was a necessary action to protect the downtown area.

Chairperson Dean closed the Public Hearing.

Motion[8:16:28 PM](#)

Commissioner Woodhead stated in regards to PLNPCM2012-00264, she moved that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council based on the analysis and findings In the Staff Report and the discussion among the Commissioners. Commissioner Wirthlin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at [8:17:37 PM](#)