

**City of Taylorsville
 Planning Commission Meeting
 Minutes
 Tuesday – February 10, 2009 – 7:00 P.M.
 2600 West Taylorsville Blvd – Council Chambers**

Attendance:

Planning Commission

Kristie Overson - Chair
 Scott Bolton
 Nathan Murray
 Garl Fink
 Stacey Staley
 Bruce Holman
 Ted Jensen
 Dan Fazzini, Jr. (Alternate)

Community Development Staff

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

PUBLIC: Sam Taylor, Gina Baker, Bill Perry, Bob Perry, Harold Woodruff, Brent Holmes, Larry Gardner, Joe Asay, Bonnie Schaller, Byron Colton

[19:00:06](#)

WELCOME: **Commissioner Overson** welcomed those present, explained the process to be followed this evening and opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. She outlined the items on the Consent Agenda and asked if there were anyone in the audience wishing to speak to any of them. There being none, she asked for a motion regarding the Consent Agenda.

CONSENT AGENDA

Agenda/File #	Application	Applicants	Action
1. Review/approval of Minutes for January 27, 2009			Approved as presented.
2. 1H09	Home Occupation - Photography	Gina Baker 4730 S Xanadu Circle	Approved with staff recommendations.
3. 2H09	Home Occupation – Day Care	Bonnie Schaller 5113 S 3600 W	Approved with staff recommendations.
4. 5C09	CUP – Electronic Sign	Hercules Credit Union 3141 W 4700 S	Approved with staff recommendations.
5. 6C09	CUP – Expansion of existing maintenance yard	Taylorsville-Bennion Improvement Dist 1805 W Bowling Ave	Approved with staff recommendations.

No one came forward.

MOTION: **Commissioner Bolton - I move for approval of the Consent Agenda.**

SECOND: **Commissioner Holman**

Commissioner Overson restated the motion to approve the Consent Agenda consisting of Items 1 through 5.

<u>VOTE</u>					
Commissioner	Vote	Commissioner	Vote	Commissioner	Vote
Murray	AYE	Bolton	AYE	Overson	AYE
Fink	AYE	Jensen	AYE	Fazzini	Alternate
Holman	AYE	Staley	AYE	Vote passes unanimously.	

ZONE CHANGE

6. 1Z09	<u>City of Taylorsville – 4674 S Plymouth View Drive</u> - Recommendation to the City Council to Amend the Zoning Map from C-02/zc to R-M (Michael Meldrum/Principal Planner)
----------------	--

[19:02:32](#)

6.1 **Mr. Meldrum** presented this item. The application is for a zone change for property on which the Utah Non-Profit Housing Corporation will be building a senior housing project. As proposed, the project will contain 61 senior housing units on property currently owned by the City of Taylorsville. Condition five of the preliminary conditional use permit granted by the Planning Commission on June 10, 2008, required that a zone change from C-2/zc to R-M be processed. This application fulfills that requirement. The Planning Commission also granted Staff the ability to review the final conditional use permit at the June 10, 2008 meeting. **Mr. Meldrum** advised the Commission

that HUD has approved funding for this project. Some of the criteria that HUD uses in evaluating potential housing sites are the proximity to senior citizen's centers, mass transit and shopping areas. This location scored well in all three of these critical areas. Zoning conditions were explained to be (1) No apartments will be allowed; (2) All other uses in the C-2 zone will be allowed. [19:03:28](#) These zoning conditions were placed on the property by Salt Lake County in 1987 and Staff has been unable to determine the purpose for the restriction on apartments. In order to obtain a conditional use permit, that condition must be eliminated or amended by recommendation of the Planning Commission and action by the City Council.

Findings of Fact:

1. The property is currently owned by the City of Taylorsville.
2. The proposed project contains 61 residential units or senior citizens.
3. Modification or elimination of the existing zoning conditions or a rezone is required.
4. The property is adjacent to the existing City of Taylorsville Senior Citizen's Center.
5. The property is adjacent to mass transit lines (bus).

Based on the above sated findings of fact, Staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to grant a rezone of 2.043 acres from C-2/zc to R-M.

6.2 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** - **Harold Woodruff** [19:06:13](#) (architect on the project). **Mr. Woodruff** said he would be happy to answer any questions the Commissioners may have regarding this application. (The Commissioners had no questions for Mr. Woodruff at this time).

6.3 **SPEAKING:** No one in attendance came forward to speak to this issue, therefore, **Commissioner Overson** closed the public hearing and opened it to discussion/comments from the Commission.

- **Commissioner Overson** felt that if a favorable recommendation were made by the Commission, it would be appropriate to include in the language of the zoning condition that this is for only senior housing.
- **Commissioner Staley** suggested that density also be addressed in the conditions. **Commissioner Overson** asked for clarification on that issue from staff. **Mr. McGrath** said that the Commission could legally place a density cap as a zoning condition, however, the project has already been approved. [19:07:59](#) **Mr. Meldrum** interjected that HUD has only granted approval for 61 units, so the Utah Non-profit Housing Corporation cannot exceed the 61 units that were reviewed and approved by HUD. **Commissioner Overson** commented that it still is appropriate if the Commission wants to indicate a maximum of 61 units.
- **Commissioner Jensen** [19:08:57](#) said he had some questions for the applicant's representative regarding access. He said that there had been a lot of discussion about senior citizens having access to the nearby shopping centers and he was concerned about connecting walkways between the building and the street. He said he could see where they could go to the east but his concern was about the south and west access points. He wanted to know if there were a way for them to get to the sidewalk along the street and then on to the shopping centers. **Mr. Woodruff** said that going to the south would not be a problem and in earlier discussions with the City, one of the issues discussed was creating a walkway that gives access to the west on Redwood Road, which he felt was appropriate. **Commissioner Jensen** then asked if there was going to be one to south so that they don't have to walk in the drive approach and **Mr. Woodruff** said that was also being planned. **Commissioner Jensen** then wanted to know where the dumpsters would be located and questioned why they were proposed to be so close to the entrance. **Mr. Woodruff** advised that did not have to be that close. **Commissioner Jensen** was concerned about the view and access being restricted by where the dumpsters are being proposed. **Mr. Woodruff** said the access to the dumpsters would be the back door. The front door is intended to face the existing senior center. Those parking stalls on the smaller lot would probably be assigned to staff but most of the parking would be located on the west side. He said that they certainly could adjust the site plan to accommodate the Commission's wishes in this matter.
- **Commissioner Overson** [19:11:05](#) clarified at this point that what is being proposed tonight is a zone change. The use has already been approved contingent upon approval of the zone change. She then asked for a motion.

6.4 **MOTION:** **Commissioner Murray** [19:11:58](#) - **I move that the Commission forwards a positive recommendation to the City Council on File #1Z09 to change the zoning from C-1/zc to R-M, with the condition added that it be designated for senior housing only.**

SECOND: Commissioner Bolton

Commissioner Overson restated the motion to send a positive recommendation to the City Council regarding File #1Z09, changing the zone from C-2/zc to R-M and that this be for senior housing only.

VOTE					
Commissioner	Vote	Commissioner	Vote	Commissioner	Vote
Murray	AYE	Bolton	AYE	Overson	AYE
Fink	AYE	Jensen	AYE	Fazzini	Alternate
Holman	AYE	Staley	AYE	Vote passes unanimously.	

At this point, Commissioner Fazzini asked to be excused from participating in discussion of the following item due to possible conflict of interest and left the room.

CONDITIONAL USE

7. 2C09 **William Perry (Perry Construction, Inc.) – 2209 W 4700 S** – 186 Unit Senior Housing Community (The Silver Crest) (Dan Udall – City Planner)

19:13:51

7.1 **Mr. Udall** presented this item. The applicant is requesting 186 senior housing units and has submitted two site plan proposals, referred to as Plan A and Plan B. There are three zoning conditions on the property: (1) is that a maximum of 24 residential units are allowed per acre, (2) that the land use is limited to a senior housing community (for people 55 years of age and older), and (3) that the building setbacks be at least 25' from the property lines. A total of three buildings with three-stories is being proposed. Building A is proposed to have 59 units, Building B 47 units and Building C 80 units for a total of 23.9 residential units per acre. The applicant has stated that this project will be affiliated with the Golden Living Center residential health care facility located to the east.

- Site Plans – One of the zoning conditions is that all buildings are required to be at least 25' from property lines. On Plan B, the applicant is proposing a garage building 10' from the north property line (the north side of Building B). On Plan A, no building or structure is located within 25' of the property line. The above situation is the only difference between Plan A and Plan B. The applicant has stated they prefer Plan B because on Plan A, the carport structure and some of the garages obscure or block the view of the open space corridor along the east side of Building B. Therefore, on Plan B, the applicant is eliminating the carport and proposing the garage 10' from the north property line to allow a view into the open space corridor east of Building B.
- Currently Plan A meets City ordinances. Staff is recommending approval of either site plan but prefers Plan B. If Plan B is approved, the applicant would need to go through the zone change process again to amend the zoning condition so garages can be less than 25' from the property line. In Staff's opinion, the best solution would be to approve Plan B contingent on City Council approval of the amended zoning condition. The Planning Commission also has the option to just approve Plan A. If the Planning Commission approves the preliminary conditional use permit for Plan B, the applicant can go through the civil engineering or technical review stage with the City Engineer in conjunction with the proposed zone change in order to amend the zoning conditions. This situation would not allow down the applicant in order to construct the project. If the Planning Commission approves Plan B and the City Council does not approve the zone change to amend the building setbacks, Plan A would also need to be approved. Thus, the Planning Commission must determine which of the two proposed site plans is most appropriate. Both site plans could be approved pending City Council action on Plan B. If approving both site plan options, the Planning Commission should include a condition that whichever one is not used would then be void.

Findings of Fact:

1. That the senior housing community is a conditional use in the R-M/zc zone.
2. That the applicant is proposing 23.9 units per acre.
3. That the senior housing community serves only the population of 55 years of age and older.
4. That the use should not adversely affect the surrounding area.
5. That site plan "B" does not meet the zoning conditions of the R-M/zc zone that is associated with the site. A Planning Commission preliminary conditional use approval of site plan "B" can be granted contingent on a zone change with amended zoning conditions approved by the City Council.
6. That site plan "A" meets all zoning regulations of the site.

Mr. Udall outlined some observations he felt were issues, one being that along 4700 South there is a local street that is 135 feet from center line to the entrance on 4700 South. The City Engineer feels that would create conflicts with left hand turns going into 2080 West and also into the apartment complex along 4700 South. [19:16:12](#) The City Engineer has recommended a pork chop be placed on 4700 South to only allow right in/right out turns on 4700 South. Along 2200 West, the City Engineer has recommended a full access. Also, staff recommends that a park strip with planting materials similar to those on the west side of the driveway entrance, be located between the sidewalk and the access to 4700 South. The applicant is proposing three different amenity areas, one is a sitting garden located on the northwest side and entry garden feature between Building "B" and "C", and a community garden with picnic shelter, horse shoe pit on the southeast side of the property. One other issue he discussed as a staff concern is that the garages and carports that are located around the periphery of the buildings that motorists will not be able to see the buildings very well and will obscure/block the view to the buildings. The applicant has stated that he needs those structures to accommodate the seniors that will be living in the community. **Mr. Udall** continued on by explaining that [19:21:45](#) Site plan A meets city ordinances but Site Plan B does not (minimum of 25' from the property line). The Planning Commission has the option to approve Plan A and B but on B the applicant would have to submit an application to the City to amend the setback requirement from 25' to 10' from the property line. Staff prefers Site Plan B, as does the applicant.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends or prefers the Planning Commission approves Site Plan "B" contingent that a zone change application is submitted to amend the zoning conditions. Staff also recommends approval of Site Plan "A". Based on the stated findings of fact, Staff recommends approval of preliminary conditional use application 2C09 with the following conditions.

1. Receive approval from and remain compliant with all applicable reviewing agencies.
2. That the use is reviewed upon substantiated and unresolved complaint.
3. **[Changed by Motion]** That ~~City Staff~~ **the Planning Commission** approves the final conditional review.
4. That a pork chop is installed on the driveway aisle adjacent to 4700 South to allow right-in and right-out turns only. That a conditional use amendment application is submitted to the City when the driveway access on 4700 South is proposed to be changed or widened.
5. That a planting plan including trees, shrubs and flowers be provided delineating planting locations and species. That all deciduous trees on site should be 2" caliper and any evergreen trees are a minimum of 6' high. That the park strips on 2200 West and 4700 South are reclaimed with landscaping or grass. That the landscaping on the site is maintained.
6. That a 5' wide parkstrip is provided between the sidewalk and the driveway access that extends south of 4700 South. That the landscaping in the parkstrip is compatible to the parkstrip landscaping on the west side of the driveway aisle. That the sidewalk extends to the sidewalk in the vicinity of Building C.
7. That any lighting should be designed to be oriented from shining upon any adjacent residences. That the lighting fixtures are approved as shown on the cut sheets.
8. That lighting, fencing, additions, colors, building materials, etc., match or complement the overall design of the project.
9. That no outside storage is allowed.
10. That the project receives storm drain approval from the City Engineering Department and pays all applicable storm drain fees.
11. That the building elevations are approved as submitted to the Planning Commission. That the material board is approved as submitted.
12. That a wall or solid fence compatible with the architecture of the buildings screens the dumpsters. That a solid gate screens the front of all dumpsters.
13. That the applicant receives a building permit for the monument signs.
14. That any mechanical equipment at ground level is screened by landscaping.
15. That any mechanical equipment on the roof of the building be screened or positioned so that it is not visible from ground level.
16. That the amenities including the fencing are approved as shown on the cut sheets.
17. That the vinyl fencing steps down to a maximum of 2 ½' high 25 feet from 2200 West and 4700 South.

7.6 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** **Bill Perry and Bob Perry from Perry Investments** [19:25:19](#) **Mr. Bill Perry** said that they appreciated the cooperation of the planning staff and the members of the surrounding neighborhoods with regard to this endeavor. He felt that the initial negative concerns from the neighbors have softened. The access off of 4700 South was a big issue to them and UDOT wanted this entrance to line up with 2080 West across the street and have it a full access entrance. Perry Investments felt that as close as that would be to the intersection of 2200 West and 4700 South, would be dangerous, especially for senior citizen drivers. They explained this reasoning to UDOT and they have finally agreed to have the entrance where proposed, with right in/right out turns only. Another issue of note was that the City Council expressed concerns about the initial design related to the scarcity of open

space dispersed throughout the project. Initially, all of the open space was in the southeast corner of the project. The Council asked Perry Investments to find a way to increase building height but allow for dispersment of open space areas throughout the property. That created a situation where there is significant open space north of Building "A", a lot on the east side Building "B" (a trail system with gardens), along with the open space south of Building "C". In addition to that, one of the other comments received from the neighbors living to the south of this, had to do with the proximity of the garages. Initially the garages were for the most part set along the south property line and were very close to what found have been the south fence. There was concern from the neighbors there that they would become a "no man's land" behind those garages, as a collection point for garbage, etc. To change that, the garages have been oriented to the sides of the buildings, however, staff feels that obscures some of the views of the buildings. **Mr. Perry** said that they have tried to situate those garages so that they are laying in between or middle areas of the building so that at least when driving in, there is a view of the architecture rather than an initial view of a garage. That allows on the south side of the property the possibility to create a 20' wide park strip down most of the south boundary, which is anticipated to be a planting area for nice trees and perhaps a trail system there. He said that he would be glad to answer any questions from Commissioners. [19:29:31](#)

- **Commissioner Murray** said that he applauded the use for this location and for working so well with the neighbors. He commended the applicants on the quality of workmanship being portrayed and felt this is a great opportunity to create a model project. His only concern was the lack of connectivity from one building to the next and felt that would be a great opportunity for a cohesive neighborhood feel. **Mr. Bill Perry** explained the connectivity between Building A to B and **Commissioner Murray** suggested a clearly marked pedestrian path needs to be made, which goes around the buildings, across roadways and on to the Golden Living Center or out to 2200 West or 4700 South. **Mr. Perry** had no objection to that suggestion and added that it is already in the plans to connect the walking path in this development with the one at the Golden Living Center. **Commissioner Murray** said that there is a nice green outdoor space that is created near Building "B", with an opportunity to connect it to Building "C", given the orientation and shape of the buildings, and yet at the center of that there is a large concentration of parking garage and parking spaces where there could otherwise be a greater density of green scape, being that is the center of the development. He asked if Mr. Perry had considered pulling more green space and reducing the parking area, which seems to overwhelm that particular location. In other words, take the landscape surrounding Building "B" and square it off on the top right corner, just have an internal circulation loop around there. He felt there are great amenities, the largest area is located behind a garage in the corner of the project and wondered about the safety issue for tenants there. **Mr. Perry** addressed the parking perspective saying that one of the challenges that any multi-family project has is getting the parking balance right. There is always the question of how many parking spaces per unit should be provided. In this case, there had been discussion about going down as low as 1.25 spaces per unit, having started out at about 1.5 spaces per unit. A typical upscale multi-family project done under Perry Investments, have ratios of about 1.75 spaces per unit. When the ratios are moved lower, people end up parking illegally. Although they could have reduced parking, their concern was that although less parking would be cheaper they did not want to get into a situation where people are at some times forced to either try and park along 2200 West or 4700 South. The ratio for this development is 1.44 spaces per unit. [19:39:13](#) **Commissioner Murray** suggested reducing the number of parking stalls in order to secure more green space and **Mr. Bill Perry** said that he had no problem with that. **Commissioner Murray** also suggested installing a walking path around the building which is clearly marked as such and **Mr. Bill Perry** expressed no problem with that and continued on to say that they intended to connect a path between this project and the Golden Living Center to the east. [19:37:45](#)
- **Commissioner Overson** [19:39:25](#) asked what their plan was with regard to the irrigation ditch along 2200 West. [19:39:57](#) **Mr. Bill Perry** explained the agreement they have with the neighbors regarding piping of the ditch, which includes moving the ditch to be entirely on Perry's property, that Perry would agree to fence the neighbor's property, that Perry would install three weir structures along the south end of the neighbor's property that would allow them to regulate the water flow and also that Perry would pipe the ditch. The Ditch company has also agreed to those terms. **Commissioner Overson** expressed that there did not seem to be enough accessible parking stalls provided and **Mr. Bob Perry** advised that there were 11 handicap stalls proposed, which met the ADA code. **Commissioner Overson** then said she applauded the use of open space between this project and the Golden Living Center and **Mr. Bill Perry** added that their intent was to put in additional trees there to make it even better. She asked about the width of the proposed sidewalks to assure that overhanging cars overhanging do not conflict with pedestrian flow and **Mr. Bob Perry** advised that the sidewalks adjacent to parking stalls are 6' wide. **Commissioner Overson** wondered if they had proposed an adequate number of dumpsters for a project this large and **Mr. Bill Perry** said that the amount was typical for their other similar projects and that they would assure that the locations are easily accessible for servicing and that the correct hours for servicing those dumpsters are kept. [19:44:16](#) **Commissioner Overson** [19:45:17](#) then asked about the pad on the corner where there are existing structures seems to be higher than this project and wanted to know if there were plans to infill that level it off. **Mr. Bill Perry** said

that was not being considered because the pad she referenced had been in-filled. That they would contact their geo-technical engineer and determine through soils analysis what areas will be in need of fill, which they felt would be a minimal amount, if any. The primary desire on this site, because of the fact that it will be a senior living facility is to have it as flat as possible and avoid inclines. The thought is to put the vinyl fence below the raised wall at that location, so they would see a 4' high fence above their wall rather than 6'. **Commissioner Overson** said with regard to the fencing, that the developer has been approved for high density and with high density, the Commission expects higher quality. Therefore, she wanted to know if it would be possible to provide a masonry wall instead of the proposed vinyl. **Mr. Bill Perry** advised that along the south side there is a ditch, which would present a problem for placement of a cement post for a masonry fence anchor, so they would prefer to have the vinyl fencing, with the promise that they would use only the highest quality of vinyl fencing available and assure maintenance is consistently performed. **Commissioner Overson** added that she would like to see connecting sidewalks and clear paths through the driveway in order to assure pedestrian's safety, along with a walkway around the perimeter and more green space in the center of the project. **Mr. Bill Perry** said that they were in agreement with that, have added a significant amount of green space to this proposal since their original plan and would like to have approval tonight. [19:49:21](#)

- **Commissioner Bolton** [19:52:45](#) said that in looking at the buildings and the way they are situated they have a front door presence but it doesn't go to the street which reduces the walk ability aspect. The pedestrian accesses seem to always be going through parking stalls, through parking structures or obscure routes to get to certain areas. As patrons would exit out of the garages, there are trees there but no safe route through the parking area. The building layouts don't seem to flow very well because of having to go through parking areas to get anywhere. It is really dominated by parking surrounding the buildings. He wanted to know if the 1.44 ratio applies to senior centers, where there may not be as many drivers as in regular multi-family projects. **Mr. Bill Perry** said 1.5 ratios work best and felt that to go to one space per unit would not be enough and would not accommodate any guest parking or the possibility of occupants having more than one car. [19:54:51](#) **Commissioner Bolton** conceded that guest parking is a problem in most multi-family projects and a senior community may even need a higher ratio of guest parking. He went on to say that he was just concerned about the buildings being so heavily dominated by parking and suggested densification of parking in certain areas to open up the buildings a little. He was mainly concerned about have open access areas for emergency vehicles close in to the buildings. **Mr. Bill Perry** said that they would not be opposed to eliminating a few parking spots in order to install a painted connectivity trail in those areas to facilitate more of the open type of feel. The other thing that is challenging is that they had considered eliminating some of the parking and the problem they encountered is that Building B ends up being under parked for the number of stalls needed for the residents, which potentially asks an older person to walk further to get to their residence in order to accommodate the aesthetics. He felt the best solution was to leave a few stalls open and paint a path as previously suggested. **Commissioner Bolton** felt that when a person drives into this project it should be so well done and there should be such a sense of arrival that they cannot discern which is the front door and which is the rear. **Mr. Bill Perry** suggested eliminating four stalls at the entrance and leaving that area completely open. **Commissioner Bolton** said it was totally up to the developer and his architect how to deal with the entrance and more effective use of green space. He liked the look of the building and felt they were beautiful and with minor adjustments, this could be a very nice project. On garage accessibility – there are nice trees and a landscape median but no pathway. His concern was accessibility for the senior citizens in carrying things from their cars to their homes. He then asked Mr. Perry to explain the reason for the kink in the south access. **Mr. Bill Perry** said that in the first concept it was more extreme and has been modified to what is being presented now. They thought the meander would be more aesthetically pleasing to have the entry monument sign jut out a little more and also wanted to slow traffic down. The traffic calming aspect was the same thought as for the round about. **Commissioner Bolton** suggested that if that remains, the parking stalls at that entrance are too close and may have to be eliminated to create a satisfactory throat to channel traffic properly. **Mr. Bill Perry** said that he understood that but the concept was to look at the projected traffic counts, there will probably be about six per hour, which is considered to be low impact. **Commissioner Bolton** just wanted to make sure the traffic movement would be as safe as possible, therefore, recommended looking at the distances between the parking stalls and the main entrance. [20:02:24](#) **Commissioner Bolton** then asked about the detention area and **Mr. Bill Perry** advised that would be located in the sitting garden at the north entrance and would consist of an underground system which will be shown in the final engineering plans. [20:03:30](#)
- **Commissioner Jensen** [20:03:57](#) agreed with Commissioner Bolton in expressing concern about the sidewalks being right against the parking stalls and with the subsequent overhang of the front ends of the vehicles over the sidewalks. **Mr. Bill Perry** said that the extra width of the sidewalks should compensate for that. **Commissioner Jensen** still recommended some form of wheel stop in order to keep the 6' of sidewalk clear. [20:05:46](#) He also commented on the entrance from 2200 West, saying he would encourage a straight

in entrance to slow down the speed coming off of 2200 West. **Mr. Bill Perry** said that they were not locked in to that particular design which includes the jog and in fact that was a suggestion made by Staff. **Commissioner Jensen** would also like to see some type of identifiable characteristics at the entrances to buildings, along with clearly defined pull off areas. [20:08:39](#) He said that he liked the idea of having three levels on Building B and suggested a third level on Building C also. **Mr. Bill Perry** said that the buildings are all three stories, which was decided during the City Council meeting.

- **Commissioner Staley** [20:09:38](#) agreed with previous comments that there does need to be designated loading zones, especially for emergency vehicles. **Mr. Bill Perry** and **Mr. Bob Perry** explained where the handicap stalls would be located and advised they will look into the loading zone issue.
- **Commissioner Bolton** [20:11:14](#) said one thing that wasn't brought up is possibly pulling the sidewalk at the throat off of the main road and putting in a traditional park strip there instead. **Mr. Bill Perry** said that option has been discussed with Staff and everyone concerned agrees it should be implemented.

7.7 **SPEAKING:**

Mr. Gary Taylor - Golden Living Center. [20:12:07](#) **Mr. Taylor** said that in addition to the Gold Living Center, he owns a similar 144 unit project and suggested painting a white line in front of the stalls to show the drivers when to stop. That solution has worked well with his project and he offered it as a suggestion. He felt this new community will mesh very well with the Golden Living Center and recommended approval.

7.8 **DISCUSSION:** [20:15:27](#)

- **Commissioner Fink** suggested that Plan B be approved tonight.
- **Commissioner Murray** [20:15:59](#) said that there are many positive attributes about this project but there is still room to make some concepts stronger and more effective. He wanted to give the applicant time to implement the suggestions given tonight and come back to the Commission for approval. That the differences between the two proposed plans was negligible and could be easily worked out.
- **Commissioner Bolton** [20:16:47](#) offered that the Site Plan B option would require another notice – which would give the applicant time to address comments made this evening and make the process move forward cleaner. [20:17:37](#) He would like to see it come back with a much shorter list of requirements, along with a revised site plan implementing ideas given out this evening by the Commission and Staff. [20:18:11](#)
- **Commissioner Jensen** suggested continuing this time certain to be heard again in two weeks. He felt it was a good project and with a few minor changes it would be even better.
- **Commissioner Overson** asked Mr. Perry if he had been given enough direction from the Commission and **Mr. Perry** said he had, however, that they would like to get underway on construction by summer, so there was some sense of urgency on their part. He wanted to have approval this evening on both Plan A and Plan B. That if Plan A is approved, then even if the City Council does not approve the zone change, they could move forward and work out the details of Planning Commission suggestions with Staff. He continued on to say that this will probably be the only project Perry Investments would do this year and he had every confidence that it would be of the highest quality.
- **Commissioner Overson** asked Mr. McGrath if the Commission approves this tonight would staff be able to work with the applicants and if there are difficulties come back to the Commission, to which **Mr. McGrath** agreed. She went on to say that in the event this is tabled, would two weeks be acceptable per noticing requirements and **Mr. McGrath** said this would not have to be re-noticed but he reminded the applicant that staff would need the drawings two full days ahead of the meeting in order to review them properly. **Commissioner Jensen** added that tonight was a public meeting and the notice to be heard in two weeks being said here would qualify it as being noticed. [20:27:40](#)
- **Mr. Bill Perry** advised that one thing they could not do within two weeks was to obtain color renderings and wondered if black and white would do for this purpose. **Commissioner Overson** said that would be acceptable. [20:29:00](#)

7.9 There being no further discussion or comment, **Commissioner Overson** asked for a motion. [20:30:31](#)

7.10 **MOTION:** Commissioner Murray - 20:31:59 I move that we table File #2C09 for two weeks. I understand what that does to your designers and consultants because I am very familiar with that industry but I also know that most firms have light work loads right now and if they are interested in this, they would certainly be responsive. My Motion is to table this for two weeks.

SECOND: Commissioner Bolton

Commissioner Overson restated the motion to table File 2C09 for two weeks or whatever is appropriate for the applicant in order to revise the site plan according to conversations and discussions heard from the Planning Commission this evening. She also encouraged the applicant to listen to the audio recording of the meeting for any clarification and work with Staff to get an idea of what was discussed this evening. 20:33:03

Commissioner Bolton – Somewhere amongst all this, I don't know if you want it as part of the motion but do we want to discuss the options of Plan A or Plan B? After the motion we may want to discuss that issue.

Commissioner Overson – The motion is to table the application for two weeks.

VOTE					
Commissioner	Vote	Commissioner	Vote	Commissioner	Vote
Murray	AYE	Bolton	AYE	Overson	AYE
Fink	NAY	Jensen	AYE	Fazzini	Alternate
Holman	AYE	Staley	NAY	Vote passes 5 to 2	

Mr. Bill Perry 20:37:12 said that Site Plan B requires a zone change and wanted to know if they could make the appropriate site plan changes and bring both back at the same time. Mr. McGrath said that would be appropriate and staff would advertise the rezone application for two weeks out as well. 20:38:15

CITY COUNCIL MEETING DISCUSSION: A discussion was held during the pre-meeting outlining what occurred during the most recent City Council meetings, with Commissioner Bolton saying that during the February 4, 2009 meeting, the only planning matter was the Jordan River trail system where the City Council voted 4 to 0 to support protection of the river. Mr. McGrath advised that there would be a presentation before the Planning Commission in two weeks regarding "Blueprint Jordan River".

OTHER BUSINESS: None

ADJOURNMENT: By motion of Commissioner Holman the meeting was adjourned at 20:42:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by:

Signed/March 11, 2009

 Jean Gallegos, Admin Asst/Recorder for the
 Planning Commission

Approved in meeting held on March 10, 2009.