



Millcreek
 3330 South 1300 East
 Millcreek, UT 84106
 Phone: 801-214-2700
 For information regarding agendas & packet, please visit
 www.millcreek.us

**MEETING MINUTE SUMMARY
 MILLCREEK PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
 May 16, 2018 5:00 PM**

Approximate meeting length: 4.5 hours

Number of public in attendance: 20 plus those who did not sign or whose names were illegible

Summary Prepared by: Alexandra Muller

Meeting Conducted by: Chairman Tom Stephens

ATTENDANCE

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

Millcreek	Present	Absent
Jeff Silvestrini		x
Bev Uipi	x	
Francis Lilly	x	
Alexandra Muller	x	
Ashley Cleveland	x	
Robert May	x	
John Brems		x

Regular Meeting began at 5:03p.m.

Chairman Stephens read the opening statement.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

CU-18-002 (Continuing Business) Gary Hassenflu requests a Conditional Use Permit for a 403-unit Mixed Use Multifamily Development **Location:** 4186 S Main Street **Planner:** Francis Lilly

Mr. Lilly updated the Planning Commission on the project and gave an overview of the staff report. He explained how in the development agreement Mr. Hassenflu would agree to develop an open space band along Big Cottonwood Creek while the city would maintain it. He spoke of the potential pedestrian crossing to better access the light rail station nearby as well as the revised traffic study detailing more significant growth: 3.5% instead of the previous 2%.

Mr. Lilly explained the site plan and the grant money to fix the cross section of Main Street to provide off street parking. He discussed how the applicant would put \$375,000 that would be held in escrow for the city to acquire land for a 50 feet wide second access with a time limit of 5 years to do so otherwise the money would be returned to the applicant.

Commissioner Mumford asked when does the 5-year clock start on the \$375,000?

Mr. Lilly answered that it was open ended but city's intent was to update the city's transportation master plan with a potential road for the project area and explained the reasons including the pressing need.

Commissioner Allen commented that he thought they were switching the burden to city to solve the issues with the project. He added the city could end up in court and or the project could cost more with the city bailing out the developer.

Mr. Lilly said the city bears some responsibility as it had decided on the policy which was supported by zoning and master plans in helping to build a street grid. He said they had second opinions from the city engineer who had used a formula for road costs where estimates were around the \$100,000 to \$150,000.

Commissioner Mumford asked whether there would be 2 lanes so 4 lanes?

Mr. Lilly answered 2 lanes.

Commissioner Carlson asked how does this access benefit the city as opposed to just benefitting the development project?

Mr. Lilly answered it would benefit the city by creating a potential new frontage for a mixed used center with office and retail restaurants. He added it would create economic development incentive and would eventually connect to retail planned in Murray.

Commissioner Carlson commented this was not a typical developer situation and it was little unusual to have a specific cost but added developers usually paid fair market value.

Chairman Stephens asked Mr. Lilly asked to discuss fire safety.

Mr. Lilly gave a summary of the fire report including how to provide safe and efficient fire safety. He said the challenge of having fire access for such a large project with the developer proposing fire lane extending the full length of the property that doubles as a plaza similar to techniques employed at City Creek Mall.

Mr. Lilly read the 11 proposed conditions of the project.

Gary Hassenflu, applicant

Mr. Hassenflu said he was there to answer any questions from the Planning Commission and did not have anything else to add to Mr. Lilly's presentation.

Vice Chair Healey asked if Mr. Hassenflu whether he had made any attempts to buy any parcels from Ashgrove and Gibbons?

Mr. Hassenflu answered yes, they had attempted to acquire the parcels but were unable to connect with any of the owners.

Vice Chair Healey why was he putting the burden on the city instead of the developer?

Mr. Hassenflu doesn't feel he has as it would be a joint effort with benefit for both the city and him. He said he would stipulate he would pay fair market value for the land and put up the \$375,000.

Public comment opened at 5:31pm.

Speaker 1: Dustin Buckthal

Address: 1370 South 900 East

Mr. Buckthal said he wanted to be good neighbors as he was the developer/owner of the climbing gym being built and this would add customers. He added it had been a great experience working with Mr. Lilly and the rest of the planning staff. He said his concern was with the single access and congestion. He described his entryway as 200 feet so he believed there would be a traffic impact on their customers to access his business. Mr. Buckthal spoke of traffic concerns and forecasted increase of population for the area. He spoke of the frontage by his gym and disputed that it would benefit the city.

Commissioner Carlson said developer was bringing 800 people of the targeted demographic into the area could not be a terrible thing.

City Council Member Bev Uipi arrived at 5:20p.m

Speaker 2: Rusty Ballow

Address: 827 Wilmington Ave

Mr. Ballow said he worked with the owners of the property and as a realtor sold property to Mr. Buckthal. He said Mr. Buckthal had a vested interest in killing the deal due to an offer on the same piece of property in question and wanted to make sure everyone was aware. He spoke of the history and deals being made surrounding the area.

Speaker 3: Dave Hogan

Address: 4035 S Main Street

Mr. Hogan said there could only be one car at a time on Central Avenue going west that could pass under the railroad bridge and asked if the issue had been addressed? He said it was the only way to get onto I-15 and added with all the apartment complexes the change in the past 5 years had been huge. He added there had been an increase in crime and wondered where they were headed with high density in the area. He said he would like to see mixed used – something else besides just apartments.

Public comment closed at 5:46pm.

Chairman Stephens opened up the meeting to Planning Commission discussion and motion.

Commissioner Allen reiterated his concerns the project was benefiting the developer or that it would not be a benefit to the city. He said he felt strongly this was wrong for Millcreek.

Commissioner Carlson said it was an important piece of land that borders Cottonwood Creek and in an area targeted for trans oriented development. He said the parcel of land would hold its property value and thought there needed to be a 2nd access due to issues discussed. He said his main concern was that the project gets done. Commissioner Carlson stated he was the City Attorney for South Salt Lake and explained the eminent domain option. He added he thought the developer should hold the City harmless.

Chairman Stephens asked Commission Carlson for his opinion on the language in the motion. Commissioner Carlson said he recommended the city to use eminent domain to acquire access if necessary with developer paying fair market value and holding the city harmless.

Chairman Stephens asked about the timeframe on the second access.

Mr. Lilly said the timeframe was based on traffic study that by 2028 the exit by Mr. Hassenflu's project would fall under service level D which is an industry acceptable standard for mixed used development.

Commissioner Allen asked why the city of Millcreek was always in such hurry when this was an important piece of property where demand wasn't going anywhere. He suggested letting the city use its condemnation power and making that a condition before anything else.

Chairman Stephens asked Commissioner Allen if making a motion that approved the conditional use subject to condition he elaborated or should the matter be continued so that the parties come to an agreement that the Planning Commission could approve?

Commissioner Allen said he preferred the second option but would ok with the first but the concern is the developer should solve the second access issue. He said if the City Council wants to step up and start a condemnation proceeding at the developer's expense prior to any construction.

Vice Chair Healey said he had mixed feelings about the project though the city of Millcreek wanted a high-density area but postponing it could have financial ramifications. He said the process could be done concurrently during development. He said Mr. Hassenflu had made mistake of saying he would pay the fair market value. He said he would add a hold harmless to the agreement and it would not be a good idea to let the project sit for years. Vice Chair Healey said regarding the railroad crossing comment that it was self-regulating. He added he thought the project would benefit the climbing gym.

Mr. Lilly said it was worth mentioning the traffic study said the road does not need to be there for another 10 years which the City Engineer and the developer's team consented to. He said he was worried about imposing a condition on a road that does not need to be there for years may be out of scope.

Planning Commissioners discussed how they were the decision-making body and not just making a recommendation to the City Council.

Commissioner Allen said he was concerned about the cost going over \$375,000.

Vice Chair Healey said he had spoken to two appraisers and they said it would be significantly under \$375,000;

Commissioner Allen said that is now but what about in 5 years? He said property and land could be more so the city was writing a check now for a later expense. He asked why would a city want that even if the developer would want to pay the city back?

Commissioner Carlson suggested the motion include that prior to any construction the developer has to acquire land for second access but leave it up to the city and developer to figure out details.

Commissioner Allen said he would be fine with that language.

Commissioner Mumford said the one lane railroad access but that's not correct and suggested options like 39th South. He said since this was an M-D zone there would be some commercial regulations and requirements that would enhance the property. He added they need to be conscious of the traffic patterns.

Chairman Stephens suggested strike out #2 in motion and substitute for what the Planning Commission thinks would be prudent course of action.

Motion:

Commissioner Carlson motioned to approve CUP #CU-18-002, a mixed used multifamily development consisting of a 403-unit multi-family unit and approximately 10,212 SF of commercial space, located at 4186 S Main Street with all conditions stated in staff report but striking out recommendation #2 and instead adding the condition that either the developer acquire property necessary to construct 2nd access or obtain an agreement with the city to obtain the property for the 2nd access prior to commencing of building the structure. Vice Chair Healey seconded.

Commissioner Mumford asked about the developer paying fair market value?

Chairman Stephens said he thought they were handing this over to the City Council to work with the developer. He asked about the hold harmless language.

Commissioner Carlson said the hold harmless language should be up to city leaders to deal with and didn't think the Planning Commission's role was to dictate those terms.

Commissioner Allen said some issues had not been touched like parking standards and that he still had concerns.

Commissioner Claerhout – Yes
Commissioner Allen – No
Commissioner Healey – Yes
Commissioner Stephens – Yes
Commissioner Mumford – Yes
Commissioner Carlson – Yes

Motion passed.

ZM-18-007 (WITHDRAWN) Greg Sneyd requests a Rezone from R-2-10 to R-M & Recommendation to approve a development agreement for a 6-unit townhome development
Location: 1158 East 4500 South **Community:** Millcreek **Planner:** Ashley Cleveland

Mr. Lilly said the applicant withdrew and may come back at a later date.

CU-18-007 Robert Renza requests a Conditional Use Permit for a 10-unit townhome development **Location:** 1612 East 3300 South **Community:** East Mill Creek **Planner:** Ashley Cleveland

Ms. Cleveland presented the staff report that included the surrounding area and history of property. She spoke of the East Millcreek Community Council response.

Mr. Lilly said there was a letter to the Planning Commission from a resident.

Commissioner Mumford asked what would happen when developer sells property and the improvement?

Ms. Cleveland said the new owners would have to adhere to it in development agreement.

Mr. Lilly said the conditions would run with the land.

Robert Renza, applicant

Address: 3667 Brookhaven way

Mr. Renza said he was excited about the project and would be an enhancement. He said he liked the idea of a town center and that Millcreek needs more density.

Vice Chair Healey asked would Mr. Renza if he would consider pushing the building back to keep the 25 feet setback?

Mr. Renza said Mr. Tuttle could answer.

Eric Tuttle, architect

1648 East 3300 South

He said he was the previous developer for the property as well as the architect. They originally, on the previously approved project, had the building further south but the neighbors had asked for more of a buffer. He thought the current plan was the best of both worlds and added that he had met with UDOT and nothing mentioned in the 10-year plan to do with 3300 such as widening the road.

Chairman Stephens asked Ms. Cleveland to give a more detailed on the community council response as there was no community council representative in the audience.

Ms. Cleveland have a summary of the community council history and conclusion.

Public Comment opened at 6:36pm.

Speaker 1: Emily Robinson

1637 East 3350 South

Ms. Robinson said she wanted to give Mr. Renza and Mr. Tuttle credit for finessing the issues and there was open dialogue. She said she was concerned with setbacks and commented about the future of 3300 with the number of townhomes. She added she could rally 50-60 people who are livid over the lack of form based coding. Ms. Robinson said Millcreek has character and different type of building being used and was glad that the Planning Staff had listened to her concerns but wondered if the building material could be more consistent with the fabric of the neighborhood.

Speaker 2: Eric Tuttle

Address: 1648 E 1400 South

Mr. Tuttle said variance in color was planned though he wants both project to look like they belong together. He spoke about the colors and working with the neighbors on this issue. He said there was some discussion on form based code at the Community Council meeting but not a possibility for this project but maybe for the future one.

Chairman Stephens asked why they had not chosen lighter colors?

Mr. Tuttle answered they wouldn't all be dark colors and added that the landscaping would be more important than the architecture.

Public Comment closed at 6:43pm.

Mr. Lilly read the letter from Mr. Pearson and his concerns. Mr. Lilly explained the noticing issues.

Vice Chair Healey said they had done a good job on the project though he would have liked to have seen project setback further but if the neighborhood was fine then he would be ok with it though generally not opposed the project.

Commissioner Mumford said he was concerned with cookie cutter projects and did not want there to be a detrimental effect on 3300.

Commissioner Allen said the project was in an R-M zone and this was as good as it was going to get with the tools at their disposal so he would be in favor.

Commissioner Claerhout said the area was high density and allowed conditional use though he believed the more significant issue was on 3300 such involving telephones poles. He added the project fit in with what was expected.

Motion:

Commissioner Carlson motioned to approve conditional use permit #CU-18-007, two 5-unit townhomes development at 1612 East 3300 South with the conditions stated in the draft motion.

Commissioner Healey seconded the motion.

No further discussion by Commissioners.

Commissioner Claerhout – Yes
Commissioner Allen – Yes
Commissioner Healey – Yes
Commissioner Stephens – Yes
Commissioner Mumford – Yes
Commissioner Carlson – Yes

Motion passed.

Break 6:50 to 7:00pm

Commissioner Carlson left at 7:00pm.

CU-18-006 Steven Robertson requests a Conditional Use Permit for a Hair Salon **Location:** 1005 East 3900 South **Community:** Millcreek **Planner:** Ashley Cleveland

Ms. Cleveland presented the staff report including community council response.

Applicant did not wish to add any comment.

Public Comment opened at 7:04pm.

No comment offered by public.

Public comment closed at 7:04pm.

Commissioner Allen said he thought it was a good use and nice update for an awkward building.

Motion

Commissioner Allen motioned to approve a Conditional Use Permit for # CU-18-006 a hair salon at 1005 East 3900 South with conditions referenced in staff report.
Commissioner Claerhout seconded the motion.

Commissioner Claerhout – Yes
Commissioner Allen – Yes
Vice Chair Healey – Yes
Chairman Stephens – Yes
Commissioner Mumford – Yes

Motion passed.

CU-18-008 Chad Crusan requests a Conditional Use Permit for a 900 square feet accessory structure serving a single-family residence **Location:** 2833 South 2750 East **Community:** Canyon Rim **Planner:** Robert May

Mr. May presented the staff report and gave summary on project information, issues of concern, neighborhood response, and community council response which unanimously approved the project.

Public Comment opened at 7:12pm.

No comment offered by the public.

Public Comment closed at 7:12pm.

Commissioner Allen said he liked it and was ready to make a motion.

Commissioner Mumford asked for clarification on the property line and slab.

Chad Crusan, applicant
Address: 2833 South 2750 East

Mr. Crusan explained using the map how the property line was situated.

Motion

Commissioner Allen motioned to approve the conditional use permit for #CU-18-008 with the conditions stated in the staff report and the removal of the tough shed.
Commissioner Mumford seconded the motion.

Commissioner Claerhout – Yes
Commissioner Allen – Yes
Commissioner Healey – Yes
Commissioner Stephens – Yes
Commissioner Mumford – Yes

Motion passed.

ZM-18-006 Robert Dieringer requests Rezone from R-1-10 to R-1-8 **Location:** 2217 E Evergreen Avenue **Community:** East Mill Creek **Planner:** Robert May

Mr. May gave a presentation on the staff report.

Chairman Stephens asked if the Planning Commission would be doing 2 motions for this project: one for the rezone and one for the flag lot?

Mr. May said there would only be one motion for the rezone.
Mr. Lilly added if the rezone was successful then the flag lot would return on a separate occasion.

Chairman Stephens asked regarding the community council response.
Mr. May said the community council gave a unanimous approval.

Edward Dieringer, property owner/co-applicant
Address: 2217 E Evergreen

Mr. Dieringer said this wasn't an apartment complex being crammed into a half acre but to have affordable housing, improve the area, and stay within character of neighborhood. He mentioned he had a neighbor who had a duplex on an even smaller lot. Mr. Dieringer reiterated that this project would improve the neighborhood and housing affordability. He added they were aware of the property lines issue and were working on how to resolve it.

Public comment opened at 7:27pm.

Speaker 1: Jay Jenson

Address: 2205 E Evergreen Avenue

He doesn't have any issues with project unless they don't disturb the Brigham Young irrigation ditch on the north side. He said on his property line to the west side there was another irrigation ditch. He said if the surveying was off then there would be huge problems as all the irrigation lines run with the property lines. He said whatever it took to get the surveying issues resolved needed to be done.

Speaker 2: James Allyn

Address: 2197 E Keller Lane

Mr. Allyn said he was neutral on the application but that his primary concern was about drafting a motion to approve the application in a way where future applicants could not piggy back their project so there wouldn't be a precedent.

Chairman Stephens responded this wouldn't be a precedent because everything was dependent on the zoning ordinance and not personal preference.

Public Comment closed at 7:33pm.

Chairman Stephens opened up the meeting for Planning Commission discussion and motion.

Commissioner Mumford said he would like to do it right the first time where the property lines are sound and defined as it will affect what the applicant was trying to accomplish.

Chairman Stephens asked if they would even be able to get to the development agreement stage if it turned out there were insurmountable survey boundary line problems?

Mr. May said there was a model motion for continuance but said staff was not sure what the surveying issues would be. He said it could create a legal non-confirming lot but added it wasn't just the lot but the entire block where there were inconsistencies. He said he recommended to the applicant that he would help facilitate by going to the surveyor's office to find a reasonable way to establish the property lines.

Chairman Stephens said the consensus of the Planning Commission was not in opposition to go forward but rather not have this item return.

Commissioner Allen said surveying was a big task and holding it up could be indefinite. He added his real concern was the precedent as they had just changed Millcreek's flag lot policy to toughen it up.

Chairman Stephens said it hasn't been changed yet, only discussed.

Commissioner Allen said now the sole purpose of this rezone was because it didn't fit in the current flag lot policy which the Commission thought was too lenient in general as previous discussions had been to toughen it up. He said he wondered why yes to this one and no to the next one. He said the easy answer was to just to rezone them and thereby creating a slippery slope. Commissioner Allen said he would be willing to look at each application but this particular one did not stand out because it wasn't surrounded by R-1-8s. He said he would not be in favor as a matter of policy.

Chairman Stephens said the R-1-10 was an artifact and overlaid on a very old neighborhood.

Commissioner Allen asked which zones aren't artifacts?

Edward Dieringer, property owner/co-applicant
Address: 2217 E Evergreen

Mr. Dieringer said the survey lines were not in error but the fence lines were. He said that was an area they had spoken to neighbors on each side. He said the issue was on affordable housing and to preserve character while allowing home ownership in Millcreek.

Vice Chair Healey asked whether his brother or he lived at the property?

Mr. Dieringer said his brother lived on the property.

Chairman Stephens said rezoning from R-1-10 to R-1-8 wasn't unreasonable but understood Commissioner Allen's perspective. He added once the flag lot policy was updated there would be a new set of standards.

Commissioner Allen said the new flag lot policy would then create more rezone applications as the standard would be tightened.

Vice Chair asked Mr. May regarding the color coding on the illustration. He said he understood Commissioner Allen but he could not tell people that they are not entitled to ask.

Mr. May explained he was trying to be a neutral party but added they were not changing the housing type or asking for any exceptions as this lot had large square footage.

Mr. Lilly said they get many applications and this one would be test case to help staff understand how to direct the applications.

Commissioner Mumford asked how many lots could be rezoned to R-1-8 in the neighborhood? Mr. Lilly answered probably a handful but he would have to look at the lots individually to check width and depth.

Commissioner Allen said looking at the parcel map from 3380 South to Evergreen showed almost all parcels being from .26 to .40 and said this was an example of where the zoning was too small for the lot size.

Vice Chair Healey said this was his neighborhood and it was full of flag lots but they are all R-1-10s. He added that if the issue with the applicant was fence lines instead of surveying error that would be a much easier fix as he had dealt with similar issues with his parcels. He said the issue needed to be resolved because the applicant would need to get settlement agreements.

Chairman Stephens asked Vice Chair Healey if he was in favor of the rezone?

Vice Chair Healey said he did not have enough information but had initially agreed with Commissioner Allen. He said they had standards and there were probably 30 lots within walking distance of this project that could ask for flag lots. He added this was an area in Millcreek that had rural flavor which he would like to see retained.

Commissioner Claerhout said that was the main question: whether they wanted to invite that type of development?

Chairman Stephens said the issue was whether to accommodate a rezone for a flag lot and was it good policy?

Mr. Lilly said they had gone out in early winter and looked at flag lots in the neighborhood. He said there were many issues that stemmed from the flag lots being approved under an exception where the pole portion of the flag lot were not fee title ownership but easements. He said the applicant was not asking an easement or special consideration. Mr. Lilly said one way to tighten up the flag lot policy was to simply take out the easement option but applicant would still be within the policy.

Reopened Public comment at 7:53pm

Speaker 3: Ralph Morelli

Address: 1527 E Woodland Drive

Mr. Morelli asked for the source of the permit to build this? He said since a year ago it was probably approved by the county as it a large home at 6,000 square feet with 2 stories and full basement. He said the lot sat dormant and said it was totally out of character with the neighborhood.

Chairman Stephens said that was a different lot then what they were discussing and he wasn't sure who sourced the permit on the larger home.

Speaker 4: Aaron Ravonsheed

Address: 825 E Springview Drive.

Mr. Ravonsheed said he was also doing a flag lot but saw it as a good thing to have a combination of different opinions. He said the R-1-10 seemed archaic for this application. He said Mr. May previously commenting about not wanting homes on top of homes so he asked if they had adequate acreage why not just permit them?

Public comment closed at 7:57pm.

Motion:

Commissioner Allen recommended to the City Council to deny rezone request #ZM-18-006 of property located at 2217 E Evergreen Avenue from R-1-10 to R-1-8 for the purpose of creating a 2-lot subdivision subject to a development agreement that addressed at the minimum the 8 conditions stated in staff report.

Vice Chair Healey seconded the motion.

Commissioner Claerhout – Yes

Commissioner Allen – Yes

Commissioner Healey – Yes

Commissioner Stephens – Yes

Commissioner Mumford – Yes

Motion passed.

SD-18-002 Aaron Ravonsheed requests Preliminary Plat Approval for a Flag Lot Subdivision
Location:825 E Spring View Drive **Community:** N/A **Planner:** Robert May

Mr. May presented the staff report and the steps in the application.

Commissioner Allen asked whether the garage would be taken down?

Mr. May said yes.

Aaron Ravonsheed, applicant

Address: 825 E Springview Drive

Mr. Ravonsheed said the garage were actually former storage units and since it won't do much for the current home it should be torn down. Currently, the property does not have a dedicated garage. He explained that to get the plat approved the front building needed to be torn down.

Mr. Ravonsheed discussed the setback option he was exploring and the issue of the cars parked in the area concerning neighbors.

Public Comment opened at 8:14pm.

No comment offered by the public.

Public Comment closed at 8:14pm.

Mr. May explained how this project did not need to be presented to the community council.

Commissioner Allen spoke about going with his daughter to look at properties for sale but were deterred by the collective group of cars and people.

Motion:

Commissioner Allen motioned to approve an amendment to Lot #3 of the existing Dorie Subdivision Amended Plat and to consolidate parcel #16-29-309 020 subject to the staff conditions #1 through 8 and require that there be a 2-car covered parking structure and code enforcement visits.

Commissioner Claerhout seconded the motion.

Vice Chair Healey asked Mr. Ravonsheed what his plans were for the property including taking down the garages?

Mr. Ravonsheed answered he had no immediate plans and the city will not let him record. He planned on listing the property for sales.

Chairman Stephens suggested adding code enforcement to the motion.

Commissioner Claerhout – Yes

Commissioner Allen – Yes

Vice Chair Healey – Yes

Chair Stephens – Yes

Commissioner Mumford – Yes

Motion passed.

8:21pm – 8:28pm break.

ZT-18-004 Amendment to Title 19 updating standards for accessory structures in the R-1, R-2, R-4
Location: Citywide **Community:** ALL **Planner:** Francis Lilly

Mr. Lilly explained the scope and synopsis: in particular to give resident flexibility if they reared upon commercial, multifamily, or institutional uses.

Mr. Lilly summarized the community council responses.

Commissioner discussed whether the accessory building should be taller than the main building as well as the heights were from surrounding cities in determining what should the maximum height for accessory buildings in Millcreek.

Public Comment opened at 8:49pm.

No public comment offered.

Public comment closed at 8:49pm.

Chairman Stephens opened up to Planning Commission for discussion and motion.

Commissioners further discussed language changes in the various sections.

Motion:

Vice Chairman Healey motioned to recommend for approval ZT-18-004 to city council subject to changes enumerated tonight.

Commissioner Allen seconded the motion.

Commissioner Claerhout – Yes

Commissioner Allen – Yes

Vice Chair Healey – Yes

Chair Stephens – Yes

Commissioner Mumford – Yes

Motion passed.

ZT-18-002 (Continuing Business) Adoption of Master Development Overlay Zone

Location: Citywide **Community:** ALL **Planner:** Francis Lilly

Chairman Stephens spoke of his observations that City Council would not pass this until General Plan had been adopted.

Mr. Lilly said the City Council would still like to have a recommendation

Chairman Stephens said they needed to come up with definitions that weren't subjective but usable.

Commissioners discussed different issues such as parcel size and parking density as well as material Commission Wilson had forwarded.

Public comment opened at 9:11pm

Speaker 1: Ralph Morelli

Address: 1527 E Woodland

Mr. Morelli voiced concerns over businesses like Tres Hombres he had heard may be moved and described businesses as his Millcreek family. He spoke about the Planning Commission's power to drive the character of Millcreek and described a similar experience in Sugar House during the 1980s.

Speaker 2: James Christiansen

Mr. Christiansen spoke about his concerns about the Wedge and the lot size. He added he thought it could stall development.

Commissioner Allen Left at 9:28pm

Public comment closed at 9:30pm

Motion:

Vice Chairman Healey motioned to continue to review next draft month in June Planning Commission meeting.

Commissioner Mumford seconded the motion.

Commissioner Claerhout – yes

Vice Chairman Healey – yes

Chairman Stephens – yes

Commissioner Mumford – yes

Vice Chairman Healey motioned to adjourn public meeting.

Commissioner Claerhout seconded the motion.

Commissioner Claerhout – yes

Vice Chairman Healey – yes

Chairman Stephens – yes

Commissioner Mumford – yes

Motion passed.

Business Meeting opened at 9:32pm.

Chairman Stephens said the only business were the approval of the minutes for March 21st and April 18th.

Vice Chairman Healey motioned for both set of minutes to be approved.

Chairman Stephens asked if anyone wanted to discuss. There was no further discussion so the Chair asked for a vote.

Unanimous approval and minutes approved.

Vice Chair Healey motioned to adjourn meeting.
Commissioner Claerhout seconded the motion.

Unanimous approval to adjourn at 9:37pm.

Approved