

City of Taylorsville
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
June 11, 2013
Pre-meeting – 6:00 p.m. – Regular Session – 7:00 p.m.
2600 West Taylorsville Blvd – Council Chambers

Attendance:

Planning Commission

Anna Barbieri, Chair
 Garl Fink
 Ted Jensen
 Steven Faurschau, Vice Chair
 Dan Fazzini, Jr.
 Israel Grossman
 Curt Cochran (Alternate)
Excused: Dale Kehl

Community Development Staff

Michael Meldrum – Principal Planner
 Dan Udall – City Planner
 Jean Gallegos – Admin Asst/Recorder
Excused – Mark McGrath

PUBLIC: Pete Sorensen, Brent Overson, Fred Cox, Claron Perry, Brenda Xa, Ann Erekson, Brian Lloyd, David Trimble, Chela Gale, Bruce Gale, Sebastian Arias, Emmet Naw, Paul Nielsen

WELCOME: **Commissioner Barbieri** assumed duties as Chair, welcomed those present, explained the process to be followed this evening and opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

CONSENT AGENDA

MOTION: **Commissioner Jensen** – I will make a motion to move agenda Item #6 (Simple Subdivision) to the consent agenda.

SECOND: **Commissioner Fazzini**

VOTE: All Commissioners present voted in favor.

Agenda/File #	Application	Applicants	Action
1. 23C13	New Antennas on Monopole	Pete Simmons/Verizon Wireless 6008 S Redwood Road	Approved with Staff Recommendations.
2. 1D13	Residential Deep Lot	Brent Overson 5027 S Meadow View Drive	Approved with Staff Recommendations.
6. 5S12	Preliminary – Two lot Subdivision	Luther Parker and Roger Oviatt 1501 W 6235 S	Approved with Staff Recommendations.

MOTION: **Commissioner Fazzini** – I move for approval of the three items on the Consent Agenda.

SECOND: **Commissioner Faurschau**

VOTE: All Commissioners present voted in favor.

CONDITIONAL USE

3. 25C13 Brenda Xa – Four Commercial or Office Buildings (Conceptual) – Dan Udall/City Planner. (7:04:45)

3.1 **Mr. Udall** presented this item. The applicant is requesting a non-administrative conceptual conditional use application for a retail/office development on property located at 2961 West 4700 South. The applicant is proposing four buildings with a total square footage of 18,904. Both buildings in the rear of the project are a total of 6,272 square feet and both buildings in front or close to 4700 South, are 3,180 square feet. The buildings are proposed to be one story. The applicant has chosen an architect and a contractor for the proposed project. The applicant does not know the mix of office and commercial square footage space at this time.

- The applicant is proposing a court yard or commons area adjacent to the landscape strip along 4700 South. The commons area consists of four benches, a water feature, trash receptacles, a bike rack, trees and pavers. The commons area is approximately 1,406 square feet.
- The purpose for the conceptual review is an opportunity to communicate to the Planning Commission the proposed land use(s), building density, land use intensity, general layout, etc. Conceptual review allows the Planning Commission to respond to the applicant and provide direction during the initial design and development stages. The Planning Commission does

not make a motion or grant any official approval on the application at the conceptual review stage. The public is not invited to the conceptual conditional use stage.

- **Mr. Udall discussed Staff's concerns as being:**

1. **Access.** The applicant has proposed two driveway approaches to the development, which are located 225' from each other. There are three existing driveway approaches located on the north side of 4700 South, which one driveway has access to a church and two driveways have access to a retail/office building. The City Engineer has stated that an engineering study will need to be provided from a certified civil engineer in regards to the locations of the proposed driveways and the existing and future vehicle turning movements that are related to the site and project.
 2. **Open Space.** The applicant needs to provide usable open space such as a commons, pocket park, courtyard and plaza, landscape features, water fountains and features, greenbelts and trail connects. Street furniture including benches, trash receptacles, art work, drinking fountains, etc., could be options.
 3. The front yard needs to be planted with sod, trees, shrubs, ground covers and mulch. The City encourages drought resistant landscaping. Adjacent to a residential district, a minimum 10 foot width of landscaping shall be provided on an applicant's property, including a combination of trees and shrubs (evergreen and deciduous) and ground covers shall be provided to create a buffer for the adjacent residential district. The applicant has provided a combination of trees, shrubs, ground cover, mulch and sod along the perimeter of the development with the exception that shrubs will need to be planted in the landscaping along the south side. The applicant needs to delineate where the landscape covers will be located.
 4. The City has planting material requirements listed in the MU zone for street trees. The applicant will need to specify the species of all trees and shrubs and use the City list of approved types of trees.
 5. The Staff Report made by City Staff outlines exact requirements for this site and the applicant was furnished a copy of same.
 6. Height of the building compared to surrounding homes. They are single story buildings.
- 3.1 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** **Fred Cox** (architect) **Mr. Cox** advised that the buildings are 18 to 20' tall. **Commissioner Faurchou** commented that they are divided into four units and asked if someone wanted to use the entire building would that be possible. **Mr. Cox** said it be structurally possible but would not be a good move during this economic base. **Commissioner Fink** wanted to know if there would be a less rough landscape drawing coming forth and **Mr. Cox** said that would happen after the survey is complete. He advised that the ratio of evergreens is typical. **Commissioner Fazzini** explained his preference not to use the "wave" type bicycle racks and would like something else. **Commissioner Barbieri** asked what type of signage would be included and **Mr. Cox** said having just one sign up front with the number of units being proposed would be cumbersome. **Commissioner Fazzini** commented that they are only allowed one monument sign since they only have one frontage street even through they have two entrances. **Mr. Meldrum** said that was correct. **Commissioner Fazzini** wanted to know then what a "blade" sign was. **Mr. Meldrum** advised that it a sign that hangs down from an overhead canopy or pergola type thing or on the side of a building. That they are not overly used today and it is a unique type sign, which Staff is okay with. **Commissioner Fazzini** said the fact that they are having 12 units, which would be 12 signs on a monument sign, which would not work very well. **Mr. Meldrum** said that he understood that they intend to put a development sign such as displayed on Great Harvest with one sign depicting the name of the center and have individual numbers and signs on the buildings. He added that the way the buildings are off-set would allow a better visual from the street. **Commissioner Barbieri** asked if there were interior sidewalks included and was advised by **Mr. Meldrum** that there were 6' wide sidewalks, which meets City Code. **Commissioner Cochran** wanted to know about the parking lot lighting plan and **Mr. Meldrum** said the applicant is proposing baffled wall packs and not separate poles. **Mr. Cox** said that all the dark areas will have the wall packs that shine downward illuminating them. (7:24)
- 3.2 **Commissioner Barbieri** and **Commissioner Jensen** thanked the applicant for bringing this very nice project/business into Taylorsville.

No motion is required for conceptual review.

4. 24C13 **David Trimble** – 3854 West 5400 South - Dialysis Health Clinic Building.
Michael Meldrum/Principal Planner) 7:25:07

4.1 **Mr. Meldrum** presented this item. The applicant has submitted a request to construct an addition to the existing West Valley Dialysis Center on property located at 3854 W. 5400 S. The proposed addition is 1,755 square feet. The existing building contains 4,900 square feet. In addition to the new construction, the applicant is proposing a new parking area that contains 13 parking spaces. The property is located in a CC (Community Commercial) zoning district.

4.2 **Findings of Fact:**

- 4.2.1 The applicant is requesting approval for a non-administrative conditional use permit to construct a 1,755 square foot addition.
- 4.2.2 An additional 13 parking spaces are provided in this proposal.
- 4.2.3 This proposal includes an additional 2,395 square feet of landscaping.
- 4.2.4 The total landscaping on the property will comply with the 15% requirement.
- 4.2.5 The proposed addition will architecturally match the existing exterior building materials.
- 4.2.6 The applicant is requesting that the Planning Commission authorizes a reduction in the number of required parking stalls (from 34 to 31).

4.3 **Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends approval of File #24C13 with the following conditions:

- 4.3.1 Comply with the requirements of all reviewing agencies.
- 4.3.2 Obtain a building permit prior to any construction.
- 4.3.3 The new landscaping must be installed as shown on the plans presented to the Planning Commission on June 11, 2013.
- 4.3.4 Amend the City business license if the number of employees exceeds 50.
- 4.3.5 The number of parking stalls for this application may be reduced from 34 to 31.

4.4 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** **David Trimble** was present to answer questions. **Commissioner Jensen** asked about the status of the present parking and **Mr. Trimble** said it is working out well because most patients are dropped off by family and picked up when finished. The parking lot is never filled to capacity. (7:28:22)

4.5 **Commissioner Barbieri** opened the public hearing for comments. There being none, she closed the public hearing and opened the meeting for Planning Commission comments.

4.6 **MOTION:** **Commissioner Fauschou** – Based on the Findings of Fact and five staff conditions, I move for approval.
SECOND: **Commissioner Jensen**

VOTE					
Commissioner	Vote	Commissioner	Vote	Commissioner	Vote
Fauschou	AYE	Barbieri	Chair	Kehl	Excused
Jensen	AYE	Fazzini	AYE	Fink	AYE
Grossman	AYE	Cochran	AYE		
Motion passes 6 to 0.					

5. 26C13 **Manuel Garcia** – 4515 South Redwood Road – Used Auto Dealership –
(Michael Meldrum/Principal Planner) (7:32:42)

5.1 **Mr. Meldrum** presented this item. The applicant has submitted a request to operate a used car dealership at 4515 S Redwood Road. The building formerly housed a salon. The property is located in a Boulevard Commercial (BC) zoning district. Staff held a Development Review Committee meeting with the applicant to review the use on the site. At that review, the major issue became access to the back (east side) of the building. There is insufficient space on each side of the building to have traffic circulate in either a two-way or one-way pattern. The applicant and staff (including the City Engineer) met several times regarding this issue. The applicant sought approval to have a cross-access agreement with the fire station. This information was taken to the City Administrator who denied the request due to concerns with hindering emergency vehicle response. The applicant has also approached the adjacent property owner to request a cross-access easement and agreement. The adjacent property owner indicated verbally that it would be okay but refused to enter into a written agreement. Due to these issues, the public will not be allowed access behind (east) the building. Only

employees may take vehicles into that part of the property. All parking stalls in front (west) of the building must be appropriately striped. No parking or display of vehicles will be allowed in the landscaping. One accessible stall is required. No additional landscaping is proposed with this application.

5.2 **Findings of Fact:**

- 5.2.1 The applicant is requesting approval for a non-administrative conditional use permit to conduct used car sales on the subject property.
- 5.2.2 No additional landscaping is proposed with this application.
- 5.2.3 Public access to the rear (east) of the building is prohibited.
- 5.2.4 No signage has been proposed with this application.

5.3 **Staff Recommendations:** Staff recommends approval of File #26C13 with the following conditions:

- 5.3.1 Comply with the requirements of all reviewing agencies.
- 5.3.2 Obtain a City business license and keep it current
- 5.3.3 Public access to the rear (east) of the building is prohibited.
- 5.3.4 Building permits must be obtained for remodeling or signs as required by the International Building Code.
- 5.3.5 Any signage used on the property must be in compliance with Chapter 26 of the Taylorsville Land Development Code.
- 5.3.6 No parking or display of vehicles will be allowed on the landscaping.

5.4 **DISCUSSION:** **Commissioner Fink** asked if this building could be used for other things such as maintenance and **Mr. Meldrum** said no, that this use is for office space only. **Commissioner Fazzini** asked about the access to the rear of the building and **Mr. Meldrum** advised him that it would be closed to public access; however, employees would be allowed limited use there.

5.5 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** **Mr. Garcia** was present to answer questions. (7:41:21) He advised that their sales are done mainly on-line and any repairs or maintenance on the vehicles will be done at one of their other locations. None will be performed on this site.

5.6 **Commissioner Barbieri** opened the public hearing for comments. There being none, she closed the public hearing and opened the meeting for Planning Commission comments.

5.7 **MOTION:** **Commissioner Fink - Based on the Findings of Fact and the six conditions placed by Staff, I move for approval of File #26C13.**

SECOND: **Commissioner Jensen**

VOTE					
Commissioner	Vote	Commissioner	Vote	Commissioner	Vote
Faurschou	AYE	Barbieri	Chair	Kehl	Excused
Jensen	AYE	Fazzini	AYE	Fink	AYE
Grossman	AYE	Cochran	AYE		
Motion passes 6 to 0.					

SUBDIVISION

6. 5S12 **Luther Parker and Roger Oviatt** – Preliminary Simple Subdivision (2 lots) – 1501 W 6235 S. (Michael Meldrum/Principal Planner)

NOTE: This item was moved to and approved on the consent agenda.

6.1 **Mr. Meldrum** prepared the staff report for this item. The applicant has submitted a request to subdivide property at 1501 W 6235 S and create two lots. The lots comply with standards established in the Taylorsville Land Development Code. The subject property is not currently located in a subdivision and was recorded by metes and bounds.

6.2 **Findings of Fact:**

- 6.2.1 The applicant is requesting approval for a two-lot simple subdivision.
- 6.2.2 Lot 2 is a "flag lot".
- 6.2.3 The staff portion of the flag lot complies with the minimum width of 20 feet.
- 6.2.4 The existing home on Lot 1 is compliant with required setbacks for lots in the R-1-10 zoning district.

- 6.2.5 The proposal has been reviewed by the Plat Division in the Salt Lake County Recorder's Office.
- 6.2.6 Several of the signature blocks on the submitted plat must be modified to comply with City of Taylorsville requirements.
- 6.3 **Staff Recommendations:** Staff recommends approval of File 5S12 with the following conditions:
 - 6.3.1 Comply with the requirements of all reviewing agencies.
 - 6.3.2 Record the plat with the Salt Lake County Recorder's Office.
 - 6.3.3 Obtain a building permit for the home on Lot 2.
 - 6.3.4 Staff is authorized to complete the final subdivision review.

OTHER BUSINESS: None

CITY COUNCIL MEETING DISCUSSION: Discussed in the pre-meeting.

ADJOURNMENT: By motion of **Commissioner Cochran** the meeting was adjourned at 7:48 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

Jean Gallegos, Admin Asst/Recorder for the
Planning Commission

Approved in meeting held on: October 8, 2013