

CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
AUGUST 11, 2020

FINAL

This meeting was held electronically via 3CX. The host site was located at 10 East Center Street in North Salt Lake.

Commission Chair Ted Knowlton called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and Stephen Garn led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

PRESENT: Commission Chair Ted Knowlton
Commissioner Stephen Garn
Commissioner Kent Kirkham
Commissioner William Ward
Commissioner Brandon Tucker
Commissioner BreAnna Larson
Commissioner Alisa Van Langeveld

STAFF PRESENT: Sherrie Llewelyn, Community Development Director; Ali Avery, Long Range Planner; Andrea Bradford, Minutes Secretary.

OTHERS PRESENT: Stan Porter, Debra Lines, Camille Thorpe, Allan Sandoval, Christen Lane, residents; Todd Meyers, Maverik; Taylor Spendlove, Brighton Utah.

1. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Residents Camille Thorpe and Debra Lines made several comments related to the Brighton Development on the agenda. Chair Knowlton suggested that these comments be added below to the public hearing for that item.

2. PUBLIC HEARING: CONSIDERATION OF REQUEST TO REZONE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 71 NORTH HWY 89 FROM COMMERCIAL HIGHWAY (CH) TO PLANNED DISTRICT (P) FOR THE PURPOSE OF DEVELOPMENT AS NSL CITY CENTER, PHASE 2, BRIGHTON UTAH, APPLICANT

Sherrie Llewelyn reported that Brighton Utah had acquired the rights to purchase the property located at 71 North Highway 89. This site currently contains the Chaparral Fire Protection building, which would be replaced with 29 townhome units. Brighton has requested amending the general development plan and rezoning the property from CH to a P District. She then showed a site plan and highlighted where the previously approved units would be relocated and the proposed landscaping.

On June 12, 2018, the Planning Commission recommended approval of the NSL City Center General Development Plan. The City Council approved this plan on June 19, 2018. This plan included the commercial office building, which has been built across from City Hall, and 56 for sale townhome units on 3.65 acres. The proposed amended plan would include an additional 1.55 acres for a site total of 5.2 acres. An additional nine units would front Highway 89 north of the existing units. The setbacks, sidewalk improvements and park strip would match the existing units. An additional 20 feet of right of way will be dedicated along Highway 89 for future expansion of the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT). A pedestrian pathway and landscaping will be provided between the buildings with 21 feet in width to accommodate landscaping on either side. The proposal for the current walkway is four feet and staff recommends this width be increased to five feet.

Sherrie Llewelyn said staff requested the applicant adhere to the new draft subdivision ordinance and maintain a 15 foot property boundary from all units to provide adequate space for private rear yards, pedestrian circulation, and visual aesthetic separation. She explained that of the new units there would be 29 new units and the 6 relocated units from phase 1 with 27 of those units to have full length driveways. An additional 13 guest parking spaces would also be added to the site and each unit would have a garage. The total parking for the revised plan for phase 1 would include 115 parking spaces for 3.96 spaces per unit.

Improvements to the landscaping are estimated at 0.5 acres or 18,000 square feet of new landscaping in this phase. The total landscaping would be approximately 27% for the whole project. A central lawn area may potentially include a fenced dog area or other amenity. The proposed architecture would have the same dark brick, stucco, metal accents, and modern architectural style as the buildings that had already been constructed.

Sherrie Llewelyn explained that the Planning Commission would hold a public hearing on the rezone and make a recommendation on the general development plan amendment. Once the general development plan amendment was approved by the City Council, staff would finalize the preliminary plat and bring the final plat and amendment development agreement to the Planning Commission for approval. The Development Review Committee (DRC) recommended approval of the amended general development plan with the following conditions to be included in the amended development agreement: an updated lighting plan, including any additional street lights along Hwy 89 per the standard and specification manual, programming details for the common area including appropriate amenities, all previous conditions and design standards within the development agreement shall be required for the new phase, and subject to approval of the final rezone and amendment of the development agreement.

Taylor Spendlove, Brighton Utah, commented that originally Chaparral Fire was not interested in selling their property. UDOT required Brighton to provide an access easement to the Chaparral Fire property. Therefore the two accesses on that property are required to be abandoned by UDOT as they were restricting access onto Highway 89. The owners of that property have since

found that their tenants would like to move. The existing parking stalls are shared with the office buildings so the additional stalls will be used for resident parking.

Commissioner Van Langeveld asked for clarification on the sidewalk lengths. Sherrie Llewelyn clarified that the sidewalks would be seven feet on Highway 89. The pedestrian connection between unit 57 and unit 18 was proposed to be a four foot sidewalk and staff is recommending a five foot sidewalk there.

Commissioner Van Langeveld commented that UDOT had prohibited access to the interior of the development off Highway 89. Taylor Spendlove replied affirmatively and said that UDOT wanted to restrict access to and limit the number of curb cuts on Highway 89 and required the access easement for the project.

Sherrie Llewelyn clarified that the stub streets on the north side would be used for fire access/turnaround. She said UDOT's goal was to reduce the number of accesses on Highway 89 so that the flow of traffic would not be reduced and to redirect traffic to the signal lights.

Chair Knowlton opened the public hearing at 6:57 p.m.

Camille Thorpe, 80 North Main, commented that she was the closest neighbor to Brighton Phases 1 and 2. She spoke on the street lighting and asked if this style of Dark Sky Ordinance approved lighting on the buildings could be continued down Main Street instead of the industrial style. She felt that this style with the lower street lights would help continue the pedestrian friendly appeal and the look for the area.

Ms. Thorpe then spoke on the goal of having a pedestrian friendly area and said that this was difficult with the semi trucks that were using Main Street. She mentioned she had been keeping a traffic log regarding these instances of the trucks using Main Street.

Camille Thorpe asked about the proposed traffic outlets, in addition to Main Street, for the Brighton development on the agenda.

Sherrie Llewelyn addressed the lighting and said similar lighting would be installed along Main Street including poles with a banner arm up to 150 North. She said the long-range plan was to replace all the lighting along Main Street and in the neighborhoods with pedestrian friendly lighting. Mrs. Llewelyn commented that staff was preparing cost estimates on replacing the lighting along Main Street. She said that the traffic log for the trucks using Main Street should be given to the police department so they could watch for and ticket the trucks using Main Street.

Debra Lines asked, via chat, if the street lights were replaced on Main Street if they could be installed along Valley View Drive. She said this street was very dark at night and a target for crime. Sherrie Llewelyn responded that the goal was to have a new residential lighting standard

throughout the City. She said this comment could be shared with the public works department and the City Engineer. She said the City had plans to replace and add new lighting every year as part of the capital facility plan.

Christen Lane commented that one of her concerns was that there were only two access points on the property for the number of units. She asked if the developer had looked into adding another access on the opposite side of Highway 89. Alex Sandoval echoed the same sentiments.

Chair Knowlton closed the public hearing at 7:00 p.m.

Sherrie Llewelyn addressed the comments about a third access and said this would not be required under City ordinance as the two accesses were adequate per the traffic analysis. It was determined that even with a worst case scenario of eight vehicle trips per day per household that there would be only one car every 3-5 minutes on average. She said the City Engineer did not have a concern but this could be reviewed further if the Planning Commission had concerns. Mrs. Llewelyn explained that Main Street would be widened and an additional right of way would be added to Highway 89.

Taylor Spendlove commented that they would love to have a third access point but there were restrictions with UDOT/Highway 89 and an HOA open space to the west. He asked if rezone could be conditioned upon Brighton closing on the property to ensure the current property owner did not lose the zoning if things went awry. Sherrie Llewelyn replied that this was appropriate as the City would sign a revised development agreement with the developer and the zone change would not occur until the agreement was signed.

Christen Lane asked, via chat, about the timeline for development of the project. Taylor Spendlove replied that they would like to start as soon as possible to keep momentum on the sales. He said it would be dependent on the tenant moving to a new location.

Commissioner Van Langeveld asked Allan and Christen if they lived near the property and if they saw traffic issues now. Christen Lane replied that they did live by the property and that there were some traffic issues due to the construction. Allan Sandoval commented that while he was working from home he did notice some visibility issues turning left.

Commissioner Van Langeveld asked if there were currently restrictions on the access points such as right turn only. Sherrie Llewelyn replied that there were not currently any restrictions but said at certain times of the day you may not want to turn right at the Center Street exit due to a train or heavy traffic.

Taylor Spendlove commented that he had an office on the site and saw some of the concern. He said it was not necessarily the traffic from the building but Center Street traffic in general.

Commissioner Van Langeveld said that she did not think the development would dramatically increase the traffic on those streets but did not want to make it difficult for the people living there. Taylor Spendlove replied that they would not be opposed to a right turn only.

Sherrie Llewelyn said that the City's designated safety committee could review the need for a right turn only at any time. Commissioner Van Langeveld suggested that residents be informed that they could request a review for a right hand only turn by contacting the City.

Commissioner Kirkham asked about the intersection at Hatch Park and Center Street. Sherrie Llewelyn replied that Brighton widened their side of Main Street and the City would widen the other side of Main Street when Hatch Park was rebuilt.

Chair Knowlton asked in regards to the direction the units were facing. He said the west units would face the open space. Taylor Spendlove clarified that west units had the front doors and garages on the same side to accommodate the request for more driveways per the City Council.

Chair Knowlton spoke on reorienting the front of the units to open space while leaving the garage doors facing the alleyways. He said some units may need to be sacrificed to achieve this. Taylor Spendlove replied that this was initially their plan but explained that they wanted to create a walking path by removing the existing fence and sharing the space with the neighboring HOA. He said they wanted to open up the area and remove the fence to avoid an alleyway.

Taylor Spendlove said that plan was what dictated how the area was laid out but other ideas could be explored at preliminary plat.

Chair Knowlton asked about the unit count. Taylor Spendlove replied that as they would be buying out the tenant's lease and purchasing the property the proposed unit count was important. He said they were already down two units due to the need to widen the separation between the buildings.

Sherrie Llewelyn spoke on the separation between the units and that staff had requested a separation of 21 to 25 feet. Taylor Spendlove replied that they were requesting a 20 foot minimum separation. He also clarified that they would be repairing the existing fencing if the deal with the neighboring HOA for sharing the open space was completed.

Taylor Spendlove commented that there were 29 new units and 6 previously approved units in this phase. Sherrie Llewelyn clarified that the total count was 85 units.

Commissioner Van Langeveld asked for clarification on the proposal to extend the Bamberger Trail in this area. Ali Avery replied that it would be part of the Town Center trail circulation. She said that historically the Bamberger Trail ran through North Town Station and staff saw the open

space as an opportunity to make a connection. The plan shows the trail going along the roadway through North Town Station, exiting at 200 North, and then hooking into the historic right of way.

Taylor Spendlove said they specifically requested a public access easement for the trail from the North Town Station HOA and are hoping to secure an agreement with the HOA

Sherrie Llewelyn commented that these units would be for sale and owner occupied units. Taylor Spendlove stated that when the project was approved the CCR's did not allow for more than 25% of the units to be rented and no individual could own more than two units. Sherrie Llewelyn said that this was to prevent one entity from purchasing multiple units and renting them as apartments.

Commissioner Van Langeveld said that the existing property is attractive and the residential will fit in well with the neighborhood. She expressed concern for traffic and access points with no real way to address issues in the future.

Chair Knowlton stated he did not find the layout compelling in relation to the access points, proposed use of the open space, and the orientation of the townhouses. Taylor Spendlove said these items could be reviewed at preliminary plat. He said the open space area was currently neglected and he wanted to open it up to make it more useable and visible.

Sherrie Llewelyn said she saw both sides including the perspective of a unit facing open space or having a little more privacy with a backyard. Taylor Spendlove said there would be fenced in backyards and living space on the second floor above the fence line.

The Commission discussed the two options including approving the layout as presented and the second option would be requesting a revised submission with the northern row of townhouses added to the other three rows, moving the road along the northern property line, and extended the elements facing north and south northward to the park. The internal road would be extended to where the northern row of townhomes are currently and would run along the northern property line. This would eliminate the homes on the end with long entry sidewalks and make units potentially more livable as they would face Highway 89 or open space.

Taylor Spendlove spoke on the proposed changes and said he would like conditional approval to explore and bring back a second option at preliminary plan approval.

Commissioner Larson commented that she would like to see a site plan showing the internal circulation.

Commissioner Tucker said he felt the market would drive the salability of the layout.

Commissioners Van Langeveld and Ward did not have strong feelings either way prior to comparing with the second layout.

Debra Lines commented that some people would want privacy and some would want to face the open space so the proposed layout would appease them both. She said she did not have an issue with this layout.

Commissioner Kirkham asked if the motion should include Brighton's request that the sale of the property be finalized before the zoning was changed. Sherrie Llewelyn replied that the zone change would not take effect until the property owner signed the agreement, which would be Brighton.

Chair Knowlton asked the applicant if he would verbally agree to bring back the second option per the feedback from the Commission. Taylor Spendlove replied that he would be willing to support that but he would like a vote on the amendment to the general development plan today.

3. CONSIDERATION OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR NSL CITY CENTER PHASE 1 (25 EAST CENTER STREET) AND 2 TO INCLUDE AN ADDITIONAL 1.55 ACRES LOCATED AT 71 NORTH HIGHWAY 89 BRIGHTON UTAH, APPLICANT

Sherrie Llewelyn explained that the rezone approval would be at a future meeting.

Commissioner Kirkham moved that the Planning Commission recommends approval to the City Council the proposed amendment to the general development plan for NSL City Center located at 25 East Center Street to include the property located at 71 North Hwy 89 with the following conditions to be included in the amended development agreement:

- 1) Updated lighting plan, including any additional street lights along Hwy 89 per the standard and specification manual;**
- 2) Programming details for common area, including appropriate amenities;**
- 3) All previous conditions and design standards within the development agreement shall be required for the new phase;**
- 4) Subject to approval of the final rezone and amendment of the development agreement.**

Commissioner Van Langeveld seconded the motion. The motion was approved by Commissioners Knowlton, Garn, Kirkham, Ward, Tucker, Larson and Van Langeveld.

4. CONSIDERATION OF CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR DRIVEWAY EXPANSION AT 12 SOUTH 350 EAST, DEBRA LINES, APPLICANT

Ali Avery reported that this application was a conditional use permit for a driveway expansion at 12 South 350 East. She showed an overhead view of the site including the two driveways and explained that this property had frontage on Center Street and 350 East. The driveway on Center Street was 10 feet wide and the driveway on 350 East was 20 feet wide with an RV pad. The homeowner has requested an expansion of the driveway on 350 East of up to 36 feet to accommodate the turning radius for her RV. The driveway on Center Street was previously used for an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) in the basement. The homeowner is not currently renting out the unit and understands that she would need to obtain a Land Use Permit for the ADU if she chose to rent it out in the future.

Ali Avery explained that the City code stated that for a residential lot, not more than one access driveway shall be a maximum of thirty feet wide at the street lot line, or as established by conditional use permit and not to exceed forty feet. Lots with a frontage greater than one hundred feet may provide two access driveways each up to fifteen feet wide for circular driveways and other special type circulation and parking. She said that in this situation the driveway on 350 East would be nonconforming as the two driveways should be a maximum of fifteen feet each. She asked for a determination from the Planning Commission on whether a conditional use permit could be issued.

Ali Avery said that staff was interpreting the code as allowing for up to 30 feet in width combined between the two driveways on lots with frontage greater than 100 feet except as allowed by conditional use permit in which case the total of the two driveways could be up to 40 feet. This would allow an increase in 10 feet in width for the 350 East driveway. Staff is requesting approval for this application and clarification for the interpretation of the code. If necessary staff will provide a code amendment in the future to better clarify this.

The DRC recommends approval of the conditional use permit with the following conditions that the total width of the two driveways on the property combined may not exceed 40 feet and with no negative impacts on traffic safety by the increase in driveway width.

Sherrie Llewelyn commented that staff had to determine if the intent of the ordinance was to allow one driveway per frontage and allowing a corner lot to have two thirty foot driveways or if it was total to the property. She asked for direction from the Planning Commission and a potential code amendment.

Chair Knowlton asked how wide the driveway opening was on the east side. Ali Avery replied that the driveway was 20 feet and with the addition of the RV pad it was approximately 40 feet total.

Debra Lines commented that when she purchased the property it was an eyesore and she put a lot of money into the house. She said accommodating an RV would require her to move the fence line six feet as she could not park it there with the current layout. Ms. Lines also said there was a

row of mailboxes to the side of the proposed curb so no one would be parking there. She said she would like to extend the driveway an additional 16 feet for a total of 34 feet.

Commissioner Ward said he did not have an opinion on the intent of the code in terms of corner lots but he had no problem eliminating part of the island for this property. Commissioners Tucker, Garn and Kirkham were in agreement.

Chair Knowlton commented that the rationale for driveway width standards were to provide neighbors and pedestrians with a view of landscaping instead of concrete but in his view a corner lot could have two access points. He said the language in the code could be reinforced and state that neither frontage may exceed 30 feet. This would allow Ms. Lines to have more space on the 350 East driveway and if hypothetically she closed the Center Street driveway she could not extend the remaining driveway to 40 feet.

Debra Lines clarified that this would mean driveway on 350 East could only be extended 10 more feet.

Commissioner Van Langeveld asked if the existing speed limit sign would need to be moved. She also asked about moving the fence to ensure the motorhome would not block the sidewalk. Debra Lines replied that she did not believe the sign would need to be moved. She said the additional driveway and moving her fence back would ensure the RV would not obstruct the sidewalk.

Commissioner Van Langeveld asked if there were issues in having an RV or bus parked on the property indefinitely. Ali Avery replied that it would be acceptable as long as it was parked in the RV parking and not in front of the house.

Chair Knowlton said the basic approach was to interpret the code as written and this code established 30 feet for a standard lot. Sherrie Llewelyn clarified that the code stated 30 feet is the standard unless a conditional use permit was obtained which would allow for an increase to 40 feet. She said the code was a little confusing in regards to two driveways and clarification could be added to allow for 30 feet on the primary frontage and up to 15 feet on the secondary frontage with additional feet to be addressed per a conditional use permit.

Commissioner Ward asked for clarification on the numbers and if the two driveways could not exceed 40 feet if that would give the applicant enough room. Ali Avery replied that this would give the applicant an additional 10 feet on 350 East with two to three feet to the side property line. She clarified that there would need to be three feet to the side property line which could be part of the motion. This may not allow for the full 36 feet which was estimate on Google Earth.

Commissioner Ward suggested that the motion allow for 45 feet. Sherrie Llewelyn commented that it would be better to address just the frontage on 350 East and allow for up to 40 feet maintaining the minimum 3 feet from the property line.

Commissioner Van Langeveld asked if the interpretation for 45 feet was just for this conditional use permit or the interpretation of the code moving forward. Sherrie Llewelyn replied that that would like to bring a code amendment to provide clean language with no questions.

Ali Avery clarified that the amendment would allow corner lots to each have a driveway of 30 feet or up to 40 feet as increased per a conditional use permit. Sherrie Llewelyn commented that it could also be a primary driveway allowance of 30 feet and a secondary driveway with 15 feet.

Commissioner Tucker commented that the way he interpreted the current code was that it was meant to apply per frontage and clarification was needed for the code. He said he did not have a problem with up to 45 feet in frontage on 350 provided they met the 3 foot offset.

Commissioner Ward moved that the Planning Commission approve the conditional use permit for an increased driveway width at 12 South 350 East with the following:

- 1) The total width of the driveway on 350 East not exceed 40 feet provided that it meets the 3 foot offset to the adjacent property.**
- 2) Finding no negative impact on traffic safety by the increase in driveway width.**

Commissioner Tucker seconded the motion. The motion was approved by Commissioners Knowlton, Garn, Kirkham, Ward, Tucker, Larson and Van Langeveld.

5. CONSIDERATION OF A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR A CITY CENTER STREET DRIVEWAY EXPANSION FOR MAVERIK LOCATED AT 24 NORTH REDWOOD ROAD, TODD MEYER, APPLICANT

Ali Avery reported that the site plan for the Maverik located at 24 North Redwood Road was approved by the Planning Commission on February 26, 2019 and was constructed soon after. Since that time, semi trucks have had a difficult time staying within the turning radius of the driveway on Center Street when turning right onto Center Street. There is an existing power pole that has been hit multiple times over the last year, which has caused power outages in the area. The latest incident occurred on July 9th and the Planning Commission approved a driveway relocation and expansion on July 14th. Cat Scales who operates on the east side of the property has denied the request to relocate the driveway so the applicant is now requesting to expand the existing driveway to the west and relocate the power pole. These changes would accommodate a larger turning radius for the semi trucks turning out of the driveway.

City code requires that any driveway in a commercial or industrial area be a maximum of 40 feet in width unless the Planning Commission allows for an increase per a conditional use permit. The approved driveway was 50 feet in width and the proposed expansion will total 60 feet in width to better accommodate the semi truck turning radius. The DRC recommends approval with the finding that the increased width of the driveway provides for improved safety for commercial vehicles and public utilities.

Todd Meyer, Maverik, commented that the previous application from July was nice because the approval was between Maverik and the City but Cat Scales would not allow for the relocation of the access. He said the advantage of this location would be the alignment of the private street to the south but the disadvantage was that Maverik would have to obtain permission from Rocky Mountain Power to relocate the power pole. Mr. Meyer asked that the motion allow them to take this access and expand to the east if Rocky Mountain did not grant approval.

Chair Knowlton clarified that if the applicant was unable to get approval for the relocation of the power pole to the east as shown that they could take the width and shift it to the west. He suggested that this could be a condition in the motion. Todd Meyer said the drawing showed a 10 foot expansion to the west and asked for a motion of approval for Maverik to work with the City on the location of the 60 foot width.

Commissioner Van Langeveld moved that the Planning Commission approve the conditional use permit for a driveway relocation/expansion at Maverik located at 24 North Redwood Road with the following finding:

- 1) **The increased width of the driveway provides for improved safety for commercial vehicles and public utilities.**
- 2) **If the applicant fails to obtain approval from Rocky Mountain Power the driveway may be extended to the east.**

Commissioner Garn seconded the motion.

Chair Knowlton asked if the motion met the needs of the applicant. Todd Meyer replied affirmatively.

The motion was approved by Commissioners Knowlton, Garn, Kirkham, Ward, Tucker, Larson and Van Langeveld.

6. REPORT ON CITY COUNCIL ACTIONS ON ITEMS RECOMMENDED BY PLANNING COMMISSION

Sherrie Llewelyn reported that the August 4th City Council meeting was cancelled. She said the Council has entered into an agreement with Lewis Young Robertson & Burningham to update

the annexation policy and plan. This would bring the policy up to date with State code and help to provide an understanding of potential annexation and the impacts associated. Mrs. Llewelyn explained that there are certain statutory requirements to start the study including public hearings to gather input on both existing and proposed annexation areas. The situation with an annexation for the property located in Salt Lake County into the City requires that the Salt Lake County Council approve a resolution allowing the applicants to apply for annexation. This resolution does not change the City's ability to approve or deny the application.

The first step to studying the annexation policy area requires that it be added to the annexation policy area. If the study findings show it would be a good idea then the applicants could make a formal petition. The annexation plan must be updated first.

Commissioner Van Langeveld asked if the City updated the annexation plan to include that property if that felt like a De facto invitation for the proposal. She said she did not see a benefit to the City in annexing the proposed property. Sherrie Llewelyn replied that the annexation policy and expansion area was not a De facto invitation to annex but would show that the City was willing to consider the potential to annex that property. She said the statute had changed and required an in depth fiscal analysis. This study would provide information to the City Council regarding the tradeoffs, taxes, cost, utilities, current conditions, etc. The other side would be what revenue may be generated such as additional taxes or jobs but would cost a certain amount to maintain. This would provide for agreements to be made with the property owner.

Commissioner Van Langeveld commented that she reviewed the documents from the Salt Lake County meeting and it appeared that the City would be paying for a portion of the study. Sherrie Llewelyn replied that the only part the City would be paying for were Areas A, B and C on the annexation map which included forest service area and the Chevron location. She said the City wanted to analyze those three areas to review the financial implications for annexing any of those areas. She gave the example of the forest service area and said the City would most likely not want this property in the event of a forest fire as they would be responsible for a portion of the cost to fight the fire. Mrs. Llewelyn explained the developer would reimburse the City for the cost of the proposed area D. She explained that the City had a contract that even though they were paying that cost that it was not a guarantee of approval or acceptance of a petition for annexation.

Chair Knowlton asked when the Planning Commission would see an initial outline. Sherrie Llewelyn replied the first public hearing would be in about a month. She explained that this was the initial stage of the annexation.

Commissioner Van Langeveld commented that the resolution appeared that the City wanted and supported the annexation. Sherrie Llewelyn replied that a property owner had the right to petition either border city to annex into that city but said they did have to obtain approval from Salt Lake County.

Chair Knowlton asked if the City should provide an FAQ regarding the annexation in the newsletter.

Sherrie Llewelyn commented that she attended some of the meetings and stated similar sentiments but rumors were still spread. She said the City Council has not expressed a strong opinion either way but were willing to review the annexation.

Sherrie Llewelyn also reported that the final Town Center wayfinding and branding package would be presented to the City Council soon.

7. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Planning Commission meeting minutes of July 14, 2020 were reviewed and approved. **Commissioner Van Langeveld moved that the North Salt Lake Planning Commission minutes of July 14, 2020 be accepted and approved as written with the exception of removing Commissioner William Ward. Commissioner Tucker seconded the motion. The motion was approved by Commissioners Knowlton, Garn, Kirkham, Ward, Tucker, Larson and Van Langeveld.**

8. ADJOURN

Chair Knowlton adjourned the meeting at 8:46 p.m.



Signed for and on behalf of Chair Ted Knowlton, as approved

Chair

Recorder

Secretary