

**City of Taylorsville
Planning Commission Meeting
Minutes
Tuesday – February 24, 2009 – 6.00 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

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

PUBLIC: Bill Perry, Bob Perry, Gary Taylor

WELCOME: **Commissioner Overson** welcomed those present, explained the process to be followed this evening and opened the meeting at 6:00 p.m.

SPECIAL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
ZONE CHANGE

- | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. 3Z09 <u>City of Taylorsville – 2099 West 4700 South</u> - Recommendation to the City Council for a zone change amendment to a zoning condition to allow buildings to be located 10' from the north property line. (Dan Udall/City Planner) |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

1.1 **Mr. Udall** presented this item. The City of Taylorsville is the applicant in regards to this application and is requesting a zone change amendment to a zoning condition on property located at 2099 West 4700 South. The City is proposing to amend a zoning condition on the subject property to allow buildings to be 10' from the north property line only. Perry Homes is proposing to build a garage 10' from the north property line on Site Plan B. The reason for the proposed zoning amendment is to allow this to occur. The remaining buildings will be allowed to remain at a minimum of 25' from the west, east and south property lines. The applicant has stated that they prefer site Plan B because on Site Plan A, the carport structure and the garage building obscures or blocks the view of the open space corridor structure and the garage building obscures or blocks the view of the open space corridor from 4700 South along the east side of Building B. Therefore, on Site 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 the zoning conditions on the subject property include the following: That the unit density can be a maximum of 24 units per acre; that only seniors 55 and older are allowed to live in the residential project; and that all buildings need to be at least 25' from the property lines.

Findings of Fact:

1. That the proposed amendment to the R-M/zc zone is compatible with the proposed general plan designation which is "high density residential".
2. That the proposed zoning amendment condition should be compatible with the surrounding property.

Based on the above stated findings of fact, Staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to allow for a zoning condition amendment to allow buildings to be located 10' from the north property line only, because of the following reasons:

1. That the proposed R-M/zc zone is compatible with the proposed "high density residential" general plan designation.
2. That the proposed R-M/zc zone and the zoning amendment allowing buildings to be 10' from the north property line is compatible with the site and the surrounding land uses.

1.2 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** City of Taylorsville.

1.3 **DISCUSSION:** Commissioner Overson said that the site plan the Commission is looking at, is actually from two weeks ago and Mr. Udall said that was correct. [18:04:47](#) Commissioner Bolton said there is three north property lines shown for this property and wanted to know how they could distinguish only the middle one. He wanted to know if the zoning condition could include an exhibit or is it one contiguous parcel? Mr. Udall said that was the case. Commissioner Bolton said that the Commission would then distinguish it in the zoning condition by just saying the north property line. Mr. Meldrum recommended it be identified as the north property line immediately north of Building B. Commissioner Bolton questioned that since the zoning condition goes with the property and not necessarily the applicant. Mr. Meldrum then said that perhaps the dimension of that line should be included on the proposed exhibit, to which Commissioner Bolton agreed.

1.4 **SPEAKING:** No came forward.

1.5 **DISCUSSION:** Commissioner Overson reminded Commissioners that when the motion is formed, it is a recommendation to send to the City Council, whether positive or negative.

1.6 **MOTION:** Commissioner Bolton – I will make a motion that we send a positive recommendation to the City Council for Application 3Z09 for the rezone with the zoning condition that buildings may be allowed 10' closer to the north property line as noted on Exhibit A.

SECOND: Commissioner Murray

Commissioner Overson restated the motion – we have a motion by Commissioner Bolton and a second by Commissioner Murray to send a positive recommendation to the City Council regarding File #3Z09, based what we have heard this evening from Staff, including Exhibit A.

Commissioner Murray asked to make a clarification asking if it would be possible to stipulate that it would only be allowed in the area that it is proposed, so that future development cannot encroach all the way around the perimeter of the development. Mr. Meldrum said that was the intent of the motion. Commissioner Overson said that was correct and said it will be identified according to the site map included in the Staff Report. Commissioner Jensen clarified that it is 10' from the property line and not 10' closer. Commissioner Overson said that it was 10' from the north property line. Commissioner Jensen advised that the wording in the motion was that it be allowed 10' closer to the north property and just wanted to clarify that issue.

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

CONDITIONAL USE

2. 2C09 William Perry (Perry Investments, LLC) – 2099 W 4700 S – 186 Unit Senior Housing Community (The Silver Crest) (Dan Udall – City Planner)

[18:10:16](#)

2.1 Mr. Udall presented this item. The Applicant (Perry Homes) is requesting 186 senior housing units on property located at 2099 West 4700 South. The applicant again has submitted two proposed site plans (A and B). The applicant made changes to the proposed site plans that the Planning Commission had concerns with at the February 10, 2009 Planning Commission public hearing.

- **Site Plans A and B.** On site plan A, the applicant is proposing a garage building and a carport structure on the south side of the driveway aisle on the north side of the property (the north side of building B). On site plan B, the applicant is proposing a garage building 10' from the north property line (the north side of building B). On site plan A, no building or structure is located within 25' of the property lien. The above situation is the only difference between site plan A and B. Site plan A meets City Ordinance and the zoning conditions that were placed on the property. The applicant has submitted a zone change application to amend the zoning condition to allow a garage to be 10' from the north property line only. If the zone change is approved, then site plan B can be approved by the City. Staff has added a proposed condition that if the zoning condition is amended, then site plan A would be void.
- **Access on 4700 South.** The applicant is providing a pork chop to allow only right in and right out access on 4700 South which must be approved by the City Engineer.
- **2200 West driveway access.** The applicant is showing a straight driveway access on 2200 West, with which Staff is okay.
- **Vinyl fence.** The existing fence along the rear property line of the single family home located south of the proposed project and adjacent to 2200 West has a fence that is 6' high along the entire rear yard property

line which extends to the southwest property line of the subject property. Typically the proposed vinyl fence adjacent to the driveway entrance is step down to 2 ½' high from the major street and extending 25' back. This situation allows motorists to have a clear view of the major street to view on-coming traffic. The City cannot force the property owner to the south to remove part of the existing fence to meet this requirement. Therefore, the proposed condition for the vinyl fence to be step down to 2 ½' high adjacent to 2200 West has been removed. The applicant will be proposing a 6' high vinyl fence along the entire southern property line. The proposed condition for the vinyl fence to step down 2 ½' high the driveway adjacent to 4700 South will remain.

- **Pedestrian connectivity.** The applicant has shown three locations where there is pedestrian connectivity between the three building entrances. Pedestrian connections have been created with the parking lot striping and handicapped ramps. Two additional crosswalk connections have been created to connect with the sitting garden area on the northwest side of the project and one crosswalk connection with the community garden, picnic table and horse shoe area on the southeast side of the project.
- **Ditch.** Staff is okay with the ditch situation and realizes that the applicant cannot build a masonry wall along the south property line because of the located of that ditch.
- **Sidewalk extending from 4700 South to sidewalk adjacent to Building C.** The applicant is proposing to extend a sidewalk from 4700 South to a sidewalk in the vicinity of Building C. The applicant has removed the integral sidewalk along the driveway access adjacent to 4700 South, which staff agrees with.
- **Sidewalks and vehicle overhang on sidewalks.** The sidewalks adjacent to the main buildings and the parking stalls are proposed to be 6' wide, except the sidewalk is a miss print on Site Plan B. Staff is okay with the 6' side sidewalks. Staff is also okay without the applicant providing wheel stops on the open parking spaces and under the carport parking stalls. The concrete wheel stops are a tripping hazard and they are not aesthetically pleasing to the community. Most of the other sidewalks proposed on the development including the pedestrian crosswalk connections in the parking lot (except for one 6' wide pedestrian crosswalk connection) are 4' wide. It would be difficult for two people to walk side by side on a 4' wide sidewalk.
- **Open space corridor east of Building B.** Staff supports the amount of open space proposed east of Building B. However, the applicant did remove the carports that were located on the west side of the community amenities located on the southeast side of the proposed project (horseshoe pit, picnic shelter and community garden). Removing this carport (over 8 parking stalls) will allow this area to be more open to the residents and allow this area to be safer and open.
- **Trees adjacent to Golden Living Center.** The applicant is proposing trees along the east side of the property, which Staff supports.
- **Perimeter sidewalk.** The applicant has proposed a perimeter sidewalk to be located on the east side of most of Building C. A sidewalk is also being connected to the Golden Living Center located east of the project. No other perimeter sidewalks are proposed on the property. This sidewalk along the east side of Building C does not continue to the existing sidewalk on 4700 South or to the sidewalk that extends from 4700 South to the residential project.
- **Dumpsters.** The dumpsters that serve Buildings A and B are in the same location that were originally proposed, except the north dumpster has been moved to the south to allow for a passenger loading zone for Building C. [18:15:36](#)
- **Passenger loading zone or drop off areas.** The applicant has proposed three drop off areas or passenger loading areas. One passenger loading area is proposed for each building. Each loading area is designed differently. The crosshatched loading areas are 8' wide. There are proposed planter boxes in the vicinity of Buildings B and C. City Staff is okay with the design of the drop off or passenger loading areas. The Building Department has stated that they are okay with the design of the drop off areas.
- **Parking.** The applicant has proposed eight additional parallel parking stalls on the south side of the property or south of Building A. The stalls are 9' x 24' in size. The applicant is removing some of the landscape buffer that was originally proposed on the south side of the property and installing the parallel parking stalls in that place. Some of the original parking stalls were removed so the applicant can propose improvements that the Planning Commission desired. The applicant is now proposing 267 parking stalls on Site Plan B and 266 parking stalls on Site Plan A. This parking stall count is 43 to 44 more parking stalls than what is required for the site.
- **Monument signs removed from clear view triangle.** Both the monument signs proposed on 4700 South and 2200 West have been removed out of the clear view triangles. The proposed monument sign on 4700 South has moved to the east and the proposed monument sign on 2200 West has been moved to the north.
- **Sidewalks adjacent to garages.** The applicant has proposed sidewalks with handicapped ramps adjacent to the garage buildings (the garage buildings closest to the main buildings). The applicant has also shown additional handicapped ramps attached to the 6' wide sidewalks that are periodically located by the main buildings and in the vicinity of the open space amenities.

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.

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. That City Staff approves the final conditional review.
4. 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 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.
7. That lighting, fencing, additions, colors, building materials, etc., match or complement the overall design of the project.
8. That no outside storage is allowed.
9. That the project receives storm drain approval from the city Engineering department and pays all applicable storm drain fees.
10. That the building elevations are approved as submitted to the Planning Commission. That the material board is approved as submitted.
11. 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.
12. That the applicant receives a building permit for the monument signs.
13. That any mechanical equipment on the roof of the building is screened or positioned so that it is not visible from ground level.
14. That any mechanical equipment on the roof of the building is screened or positioned so that it is not visible from ground level.
15. That the amenities including the fencing are approved as shown on the cut sheets.
16. **[Changed by Motion]** That the vinyl fencing steps down to a maximum of 2 ½' high 25 feet from 4700 South **and a safe clear view triangle be maintained and approved by the City Engineer at both intersections on 4700 South and also 2200 West.**
17. That the design of the pork chop is approved by the City Engineer.
18. That site plan A is void if the zone change amendment and site plan B are approved to allow the garage building to be 10' from the north property line.

2.6 **DISCUSSION: 18:16:55 Commissioner Bolton** stated in reference to the vinyl fence along 2200 West, that apparently the Commission can't require them to step it down because it is existing, but asked if it didn't interfere with the view triangle? **Mr. Udall** advised that it would interfere with it somewhat. **Commissioner Bolton** said then that basically it is all right for them to leave it there, which essentially means the Commission is approving an unsafe intersection, which he personally would not be comfortable with doing. **Mr. Udall** said the problem is that the fence is owned by the existing property owners to the south on 2200 West. **Commissioner Bolton** said that then the intersection must be designed to insure it is in a safe location. **Mr. Udall** said that was an option. **Commissioner Overson** asked if it is approved as presented would that not be an issue with engineering? **Mr. Udall** said that it would be and they would have to review it. **Commissioner Bolton** commented that it would be part of the City Engineering review, which would in turn alter the site plan. This condition is saying that the Commission is okay with them not bringing the fence down but the fence is causing the unsafe intersection and leave it up to the City Engineer. **Commissioner Murray** asked for clarification on the extent of the existing fence that is in question. **Mr. Udall** then displayed the aerial map to explain the fence. He said that the fence goes all the way to the northwest

side of the property. **Mr. Meldrum** added that there are multiple fences that run along the south property line of this project and not all of them are the same. **18:19:46 Commissioner Murray** wanted to know if there were lines dashed in on the plan which suggested what the viewing angles are? **Mr. Meldrum** said on the north side of the drive approach that was correct but not the south side. **Commissioner Bolton** suggested looking at the view triangle that is shown, there is one shown on the north side where they have relocated the monument sign but it is not shown on the south side of the intersection. That may become a problem if it ends up on the south side of the power poles. It is a safety concern with which he is not comfortable.

2.7 **APPLICANT ADDRESS: 18:21:05 Mr. Bill Perry (L. H. Perry Investments).** **Mr. Perry** said that they had tried the best they could to listen to the tapes and work with Staff and make the site plan adjustments requested. The suggestions received from the Commission were very helpful, especially the installation of loading zones which he felt would be a very nice addition to the site plan. The restructuring of some of the crosswalks as well as the loading zones did require the necessity of trying to add a few additional parking spaces which were lost. Therefore, on the south side of the property there are about eight parallel parking stalls, to be used by visitors. They are significantly larger than the Code requires because of the concern about the senior citizen's ability to back in and out. They are about 4' larger than normal. In terms of the fence, they did look at that issue. It is about 5' of interference from where the existing home owner's fence is to where it would require the neighbor losing about 5' of their fence in order to get that 45° angle. He suggested trying to slightly angle the driveway a little bit further north a matter of a few feet which would probably eliminate that issue. In response to the Planning Commission recommendation heard during the last meeting, the turn was straightened out, however, that still leaves about a 5' issue. He felt the site plan spoke for itself and said he would be glad to answer any questions.

- **Commissioner Bolton** addressed the site triangle saying that even in the previous generation of the roadway it was shifted to the south but that 5' is 5' and he did not feel comfortable with this type of fix and could not waiver on the safety issue involved. **Mr. Perry** said that the road could be slightly tweaked and end up being an angle situation again to the north rather than angled to the south as it was previously.
- **Commissioner Overson** said that with regard to that she felt that the Engineering Staff would catch that and suggest to the applicant a way that they could make that a safe intersection, possibly by working with the home owner involved regarding the fence. She felt this doesn't work well right now and needs to be looked at.
- **Commissioner Jensen** agreed and supported approaching the home owner to see if they are amenable to putting in a shorter fence for that 5' length. With regard to the wheel stops, he wanted to know if the sidewalks and pavement would be on the same level. **Mr. Perry** said no, that the sidewalks would be raised higher. **Commissioner Jensen** felt that was more of a tripping hazard than would be the wheel stops. **Mr. Perry** said that they have looked hard at that issue and contacted several other centers for their opinions with this regard and the unanimous feedback was that wheel stops end up being a tripping hazard and not as visible as the curb itself. He said they were not adamantly opposed to installing those but did get negative feedback that it would be a tripping hazard for senior citizens. The other thing was a uniform feeling that over time the wheel stops would get beat up and end up very ugly, which makes it a aesthetic issue as well as safety. Their thought was if the Commission continues to feel strongly about that, that maybe they would look at the option of painting the line that the folks from the Golden Living Center suggested in the last meeting on February 10th. However, the same feedback group commented that too would be an eyesore. **Commissioner Jensen** wondered if that could be taken care of by having the sidewalk and pavement on the same level – flat. **Mr. Perry** expressed that probably would not work because of storm drain run off issues, which requires an actual curb in place to route the flow of run off.
- **Commissioner Fink** thanked Mr. Perry for his willingness to include the Commission's suggestions on their revised site plan. He said on the corner where the picnic area is located it does appear to be boxed in with garages and on the other side to the north it is open carports. He wanted to know if that could be flipped so that picnic area would be more open. **Mr. Perry** did not feel that posed a great deal of difference to them one way or the other. **Commissioner Fink** said he agreed with Commissioner Murray who felt that needed to be opened up to make it more enjoyable for those utilizing it. **Mr. Bob Perry** commented that originally the thinking was to keep the garage buildings away from the living buildings as much as was possible so that the view of the buildings was not obstructed. **Mr. Bill Perry** added that one thing they did do there was to the west there were previously carports planned, which were eliminated in an effort to give more openness to the site. He expressed that it did not matter to them where the garages were placed but that the recommendation for the present placement came from their architect in looking at it from an aesthetic standpoint.

- **Commissioner Bolton** [20:30:30](#) commented that whatever decision is made, clear direction should be given to the applicant. There are some things which remain unclear with regard to Plan A or Plan B, or both. If it is tabled, direction is even more important. The Commission wants to move this forward but also wants to make sure it is right.
- **Commissioner Murray** expressed that he felt the applicant had made efforts to add more landscaping. The Commission has eliminated the six carports and now Building C is under-parked. He wanted to know if the parking stalls which were lost in this endeavor could be moved along the south side. **Mr. Bill Perry** said that because of the distance from the housing area, they could not make this into carport parking, therefore that would not help them. [18:41:30](#)

2.8 **SPEAKING: Gary Taylor (Golden Living Center).** **Mr. Taylor** said that this will be a gorgeous project because the quality is superior and the size of the apartments is senior-friendly. He felt the applicant has gone several extra miles to accommodate the Commission and Staff's concerns and supported approval of the project.

2.9 There being no further discussion or comment, **Commissioner Overson** asked for a motion.

2.10 **Commissioner Bolton** - [18:45:39](#) I move for approval of File # 2C09 for the 186 unit senior housing community with 18 staff conditions, with slight modification to #16 to read: That the vinyl fencing be stepped down to a maximum of 2 ½' high, 25 feet from 4700 South and that a safe clear view triangle be maintained and approved by the City Engineer at both intersections of 2200 West and 4700 South.

SECOND: Commissioner Holman

Mr. Meldrum said that before the Discussion, in the previous meeting the applicant had requested approval of Site Plans A and B so that if for some reason they were denied their request at the City Council level, that they would still be able to come back with Option A and move forward with their site plan. He advised that he did not hear that in the motion. **Commissioner Overson** said that she looked through the Staff recommendations and that #18 doesn't cover that because it says that Site Plan A would void, so the Commission needs to modify or add a condition that both Site Plans be approved.

Commissioner Bolton - [18:47:06](#) I would like to modify the motion to state that both Site Plan A and B be recommended for approval and be subject to the same 18 staff conditions. **Commissioner Overson** - Can we just add that into condition #18 to say that Site Plan A and B are approved **Mr. Meldrum** said that he did not think that could be included because it is just a recommendation. **Commissioner Bolton** said that was correct, the Commission could not make approval a condition, so the motion is approve both Site Plan A and B subject to the same 18 conditions.

Commissioner Murray [18:47:52](#) asked to entertain another condition to the motion and was given permission to do so by Chairman Overson. **Commissioner Murray** - I feel that we are so close in getting this to be a pedestrian friendly project that in the few spots where the pedestrian access crosses the drive aisles, we could certainly ask them to bound it on one side by landscaping, which would provide an extra measure of safety and draws attention to the fact that there is a crossing of the road rather than just a simple marked path between two parking stalls. He asked that condition be added that each side be bounded with a landscape median on one side as it crosses. **Commissioner Bolton** - I agree with Commissioner Murray on the amendment to the motion but would rather just let Staff work with that instead of making it a hard condition in case something doesn't work out that we are not aware of and it is not going to come back to us. It is going to be up to the discretion of Staff. Not a condition of approval but as a direction to Staff that they put serious effort into that. **Commissioner Murray** was agreeable with that proposal and felt it was at least as important as the view triangle. **Commissioner Overson** (to Commissioner Bolton) – Since you made the motion, you are not including that suggestion in your motion as a condition. **Commissioner Bolton** - That is correct, just instruct Staff to work with the applicant on that issue.

Commissioner Overson restated the motion: The motion is to approve File #2C09, a conditional use permit for a 186 unit senior housing community development. This motion is to approve Site Plan A and Site Plan B according to what we see in our staff report this evening. Conditions 1 through 18 apply, amending Condition #16 to read that the vinyl fence steps down to a maximum of 2 ½' high, 25 feet from 4700 South and a safe clear view triangle be maintained and approved by the City Engineering at both intersections on 4700 South and also 2200 West. And that we strongly advised the applicant to work with Staff to provide a safe crossing with a landscape buffer on at least one side of the crossing.

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

NOTE: At this point, **Commissioner Fazzini** entered Chambers to participate in the remainder of the meeting, having previously declared a potential conflict of interest in participating in discussion of Items 1 and 2.

WORK SESSION

3. Discussion of the Blueprint Jordan River document. (Michael Meldrum/Principal Planner)

Mr. Meldrum introduced this item and the presenter Mr. Gabriel Epperson from Envision Utah and turned the time over to Mr. Epperson for his presentation. **Mr. Epperson** outlined the proposed ideas to implement the vision for this project as being:

- A linear nature preserve stretching over 20 miles of open space and natural parks.
- Regional and neighborhood "River Centers" – commercial uses within the corridor which includes mixed use development and businesses.
- A continuous "blue-green" trail from Utah Lake to the Great Salt Lake, with such uses as lake to lake boating with kayaks, canoes and other non-motor boats, rowing clubs with club house and boat storage facilities.
- Regional trails which would connect residents to the River directly from their neighborhoods.
- Public Transportation – new rail stops near the River represent multiple opportunities for the future of the River and this Region. Transit-oriented developments are natural centers for river-related businesses such as restaurants, recreational shops, rental facilities and visitor centers.
- River Habitat Preservation and Restoration Opportunities - The blueprint recommends a flexible framework for policies that take varying current conditions of the River into account.
- Jordan Valley Water conservancy District has demonstration gardens and facilities with abundant information on how to preserve our mountain-desert metropolitan areas.
- Equestrian trails are intended to accommodate equestrians and their horses but also serve as an alternative path for pedestrians and cyclists on wilderness terrain bikes. Equestrian trails are always unpaved, soft surface trails and therefore, restrict the use of in-line skaters and cyclists on road bikes by design

DISCUSSION: Commissioners were concerned about clean up efforts along the Jordan River and about the time line in place to finish this project. **Mr. Epperson** explained the factoring in place to clean up the river and said the whole project would take between 10 and 20 years to complete. Commissioners and Staff thanked Mr. Epperson for his very informative presentation.

4. Discussion of the Jordan River Corridor. (Michael Meldrum/Principal Planner)

Mr. Meldrum presented this item and asked the Commissioners for feedback/ideas. [19:19:25](#)

- **Commissioner Murray** asked what the size of the buffer was along the river and if the type of buffering was stipulated anywhere. **Mr. Meldrum** [19:20:47](#) advised that at present the General Plan calls for a 50' no build area and a 50' corridor preservation area for a total of 100 feet. On Page 16 in the Blueprint Jordan River booklet, they have compared the different widths to the medals of the Olympics (bronze, silver, gold, with 300' being the best in their opinion). Through attendance at the meetings in preparation for that plan, that had the most uses within it – it provided for animal corridors, habitat space, useable recreating space, etc. The 300' was rated the best and 50' to 100' buffering had the least amount of positive impact and the intermediate being the moderate impact.
- **Commissioner Overson** said it seemed to her that there seemed to be many fragments. In looking at what there is available, including some of the larger parcels which have not yet been developed, it made sense that when there are large areas like the piece along 4800 South at the river (Lamoreaux property), where there is easy access and not many homes built in the area would be the places that we would hope to provide recreation areas and preservation areas along the river. In summary, where there are big parcels, it is a great opportunity to keep as much of that green and open and pushed back from the river. **Mr. Meldrum** commented that the Sorensen site is almost 25 acres and the piece of property on 4800 South is about nine acres. It would make a great boat access area to the river and

that the City is in the process of discussing prospects for this site with the Lamoreaux family and Salt Lake County to be purchased under their open space program.

- **Commissioner Murray** said that he felt that like the City General Plan that guides the decisions made in the City and he would like to see an enlarged detailed map which is an aerial type and also delineates parcels, of the portion of the river that goes through Taylorsville. **Commissioner Fazzini** also suggested adding the color elements shown on the General Plan. **Mr. Meldrum** said that Staff would prepare several differing maps to see which one is the most useful to the Commission. **Commissioner Murray** wanted to make sure Envision Utah knows that Taylorsville wants to be a pro-active participant in this project and to ask them for a graphic of just the elements along the river within Taylorsville.
- **Commissioner Fazzini** [19:28:39](#) suggested that as the General Plan is being rewritten, the usage around the river could be incorporated therein, which doesn't have to be 300' for the whole three miles and could be a mixture of varying widths and uses. As the proposal has been worked on, the concept was out there that the same type of elements don't apply to the entire length of the river. **Mr. Meldrum** expressed concern with just putting this in the General Plan as it seems the as certain times the General Plan, being a guide, lacks impetus in some areas and he would rather see it addressed in the Zoning Ordinance Code.
- **Commissioner Overson** said that as development has occurred along the river, it has been very unclear where the wetlands are and specific guidance to the Commission was lacking. She sees this proposal as a good place where everyone is coming together and have the same thing in mind but allowing for flexibility within the differing cities. **Mr. Meldrum** said that Envision Utah is not trying to tell Taylorsville how to develop and what goes where, rather it is general guiding principles that ask how development should occur and to pre-plan for that event. He suggested putting some of the language into the zoning ordinance to help protect and preserve the river. **Commissioner Overson** said that this is the best opportunity to improve the river the City is ever going to have.

CITY COUNCIL MEETING DISCUSSION: **Commissioner Fazzini** was present at the last City Council meeting and briefed the Commission on the outcome thereof.

OTHER BUSINESS: None

ADJOURNMENT: By motion of **Commissioner Holman** the meeting was adjourned at 7:37 p.m. [19:36:46](#)

Respectfully submitted by:

Jean Gallegos/Admin Assistant/Recorder for the
City of Taylorsville Planning Commission

Minutes were approved in meeting held on April 14, 2009

