



**Millcreek**

3932 South 500 East

Millcreek, UT 84107

Phone: 385-468-6700

www.millcreek.utah.gov

For information regarding Agendas, please visit: www.pwpds.slco.org

**MEETING MINUTE SUMMARY**

**RM ORDINANCE DRAFT, FENCE ORDINANCE DRAFT WORK SESSION MEETING**

**August 29, 2017**

**(Approved 12.13.17)**

**Approximate meeting length:** 2 hours

**Number of public in attendance:** 2

**Summary Prepared by:** Tom Stephens

**Meeting Conducted by:** Commissioner Stephens

**\*NOTE:** Staff Reports referenced in this document can be found on the State and City websites, or from Salt Lake County Planning & Development Services.

Commissioners	Work Session	Absent
Tom Stephens (Chair)	x	
Fred Healey (Vice Chair)	x	
Shawn LaMar	x	
David Carlson	x	
Scott Claerhout		x
Mark Mumford	x	
Heather Wilson	x	
Dave Allen		x
Russ Booth		x

**ATTENDANCE**

Planning Staff & Attorney & City Officials	Work Session	Absent
John Brems	x	
John Janson	x	
Alex Murphy	x	

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**Hearing began at 8:07 AM**

**RM Medium to High Density Residential RM Draft Ordinance Discussion**

John Janson led the discussion that dealt with the following topics.

Design Standards: Mr. Janson went through the design standards for the different project densities, from single family to large multi-family projects. The current RM ordinance has minimal design standards, such as height and setback, only. The draft incorporates many design standards to deal with mass, scale and architectural features. Mr. Janson reviewed each specific design standard. These proposed standards were met with approval by the planning

commissioners. The consensus is that adequate landscaping, parking capacities, open space and quality and variation of building materials are all critical in creating a sustainable, attractive, long lasting project. With some minor exceptions, the current draft states that the 40% minimum public open space requirement cannot be reduced through additional amenities, as is now allowed by current ordinances. A fair amount of discussion took place as respects parking space minimums. The draft requires more parking stalls than what is required by current ordinance. It was questioned whether or not the parking minimums in this draft are adequate, given that a family of four will likely have four cars, along with similar examples, but no change in the parking minimums, as currently drafted, was suggested. It was suggested that guest parking be located within a certain maximum distance from the living units. The parking requirement reductions, in the current draft, will be modified to delete those offerings that are unenforceable, such as car share and bike share.

Height transitions from single family residential neighborhoods: it is not clear whether or not the current draft adequately deals with this issue, as the formula for allowing additional height (one-foot increase in height for each one foot of setback) might create a too great of height too close to the perimeter property line, depending upon the minimum setback from which the calculation is based, such as whether or not the setback is a side or rear yard setback. Alex Murphy discussed the possibility that an RCOZ allowed height for a single-family dwelling might create a greater height than what is allowed for perimeter buildings in an RM project. Tom Stephens responded that most multi-family projects in the RM zone will abut older, single story dwellings, making it unlikely that this particular scenario will be likely to occur.

Amenities: the consensus is that amenities must be useful and scaled appropriately. It was suggested that the amenities from which an applicant can choose need to be only those listed in the ordinance, as opposed to an applicant suggesting an amenity that is not listed, as has been the case many times to date. One example given is a bike lock bar outside of a building versus a secure bike locker room that includes a bike work area. Only a secure bike locker room will be used by tenants, and therefore considered truly useful. Another example is making sure that a playground is adequately sized. In any event, additional amenities above the minimum will not result in a reduction in the public open space requirement.

Commercial uses allowed in this zone: briefly reviewed with no criticisms or changes suggested, other than perhaps not allowing a crematorium use for a mortuary.

Greater height option language reviewed: no criticisms or suggestions offered.

Recycling requirement: reviewed; agreed that recycling services must be provided for projects of all sizes.

Gates: it was agreed that gates will not be prohibited nor discouraged, but that a gate must be set back in a manner than allows one or more cars can be waiting for the gate to open without interfering with vehicle or pedestrian traffic.

Solar energy generation equipment that results in a front setback reduction: it was suggested that “geothermal” should be added to this title.

Other sections of the draft ordinance were reviewed, resulting in no suggested changes or edits.

John Janson will incorporate the suggestions / comments made at this meeting into the staff report for the September 20 public hearing. Public comment is anticipated from interested parties, such as those who are in the business of developing multi-family projects.

### **Fence Draft Ordinance Discussion**

The RM draft ordinance took up the entire two hour allotted for this work session. Consequently, the fence draft ordinance was not discussed. John Brems asked commissioners to read the fence ordinance draft and offer any comments.

**Meeting adjourned at approximately 10:04 AM**