

CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
APRIL 26, 2022

FINAL

Commission Chair BreAnna Larson called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and Brandon Tucker led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

PRESENT: Commission Chair BreAnna Larson
Commissioner Ryan Holbrook
Commissioner Ron Jorgensen
Commissioner Katherine Maus
Commissioner Brandon Tucker
Commissioner William Ward

EXCUSED: Commissioner Irene Stone

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Dee Lalliss, resident; Katie Williams, Shane Marshall, Horrocks Engineers & The Langdon Group.

1. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

2. PRESENTATION-PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD, I-15 RECONSTRUCTION EIS,
HORROCKS ENGINEERING & THE LANGDON GROUP

Shane Marshall, Horrocks Engineers, stated that they were representing the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) tonight. He reported that they would cover the purpose of the I-15 environmental impact statement study, what was known so far, and opportunities for feedback. He spoke on the purpose of the study with a focus on Utah's Quality of Life Framework which included better mobility, good health, connected communities, and a strong economy. Mr. Marshall said that mobility included all types of transportation including buses, vehicles, and active transportation. The study area encompassed US-89 in Farmington along I-15 to the 400 South I-80 area in Salt Lake City. Shane Marshall reviewed the study process starting with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) overview and early scoping, to the purpose and needs scoping, to alternatives development, preparation of draft EIS, the release of the draft EIS, preparation of the final EIS, release of the final EIS and recording the decision, and concluding with recommended funding, planning, and construction. He spoke on the current phase which

was the purpose and need. He explained that this included determining what was wrong and what would be fixed.

The first phase of the study was the NEPA overview and early scoping which included the initial coordination with stakeholders. The second and current phase was the purpose and need plus scoping which included filing notice of the intent to begin the NEPA process, public outreach, and a 30 day public comment period, and solidifying the study area and project limits. The third phase of alternatives development included developing screening criteria and preliminary alternatives, public engagement, and outreach with a 30 day comment period. The fourth phase was preparing the draft EIS with ongoing stakeholder engagement. The fifth phase would consist of releasing the draft EIS along with a public hearing and a 45 day public comment period. The sixth phase was the preparation of the final EIS through revision and responses to the public comments on the draft EIS. The final phase was the release of the final EIS with public notification of the final recorded decision. Each phase would include coordination with local government and ongoing stakeholder communication. This study was planned to be completed in 2024 with construction to potentially begin in 2026.

Shane Marshall reported on what was already known which included aging infrastructure, increased travel times, safety, limited connections, and drainage. He said there were 35 bridges along the corridor with 9 that needed replacement, 12 that needed rehabilitation, and all 35 needed to be widened. Mr. Marshall spoke on drainage and said this was a 50 year old facility which meant standing water when it rained. The second concern was travel time and he compared a projection of travel times showing that a trip that took 19 minutes in 2019 would take 66 minutes in 2050. The next issue was interchange needs which included congestion and backing onto I-15 which was a safety issue. Mr. Marshall showed images of the total number of crashes on I-15 both north and southbound Farmington to Salt Lake from 2018 to 2020. He said the fourth aspect of the project was safety with a review of issues such as narrow or substandard shoulders and sharp curves. The final item was limited connections for pedestrians and bikes. He said staff had performed walk audits in different areas including the 500 South dual diverging interchange (DDI). He said there were issues including makeshift sidewalks and difficulty accessing east/west and commuter rail.

Shane Marshall commented on early stakeholder engagement with meetings over the last several months on what was broken and needed to be fixed.

Katie Williams, Horrocks Engineers, reported on stakeholder engagement including a public comment period which would run from April 11th to May 13th. This included feedback on the draft purpose and needs statement, screening criteria, and ways to improve travel through the I-15 corridor. She spoke on the draft purpose and needs statement which addressed the reasons for the study. Ms. Williams then read the current draft purpose and needs statement "To improve safety, replace aging infrastructure, provide better mobility for all travel modes, strengthen the state and local economy, and better connect communities along I-15 from Farmington to Salt

Lake City. The project purpose consists of the following items which are organized by UDOT's Quality of Life Framework categories of Good Health, Connected Communities, Strong Economy, and Better Mobility." She focused on the quality of life, good health, and connected communities goals. This included improving the safety and operations of the I-15 mainline, I-15 interchanges, bicyclist and pedestrian crossings, and the supporting roadway network, being consistent with planned land use, growth objectives, and transportation plans, and enhancing access and connectivity to FrontRunner, connection to transit, regional trails, and across I-15.

Katie Williams spoke on the next goals of the purpose and need statement which was a strong economy and better mobility. This included replacing aging infrastructure on I-15, enhancing the economy by reducing travel delays on I-15, improving mobility and operations on the I-15 mainline, I-15 interchanges, the supporting roadway network, transit connections, and bicyclist and pedestrian facilities to help accommodate projected 2050 travel demand. She reiterated that this was the draft plan that they would like public feedback on.

Katie Williams reported on the screening criteria which was used to develop concepts to be evaluated, purpose and need, and environmental impacts and cost. The approved concepts would then be combined into alternatives followed by conducting preliminary engineering and providing the detailed alternatives evaluation in the draft EIS. She said some of the sample screening criteria could be if the alternatives met the safety standards, site distance, operational standards, or the reduction of conflict between motorized and non-motorized modes of transportation. Ms. Williams showed different ways for the public to submit comments including at the project website, via email, by mail or by phone. She explained that the City Council would be submitting comments as a body and encouraged the Planning Commission to also make individual comments.

Katie Williams focused on the schedule and the next steps including alternatives development which would likely occur in the fall. She provided ways for the Commission to stay in touch with the project including email, website, phone, and a Facebook page.

Commissioner Jorgensen asked if the information was collected outside the scoping process including from Wasatch Front Regional Council. Shane Marshall replied that they sat down with community partners regarding the long range plan as they were one of the biggest stakeholders in the project.

Commissioner Jorgensen questioned if the speed limit was a variable that was considered or if it was set by legislative mandate. Shane Marshall responded that the top speed limit was set by the legislature, but other speed limits were set by traffic analysis and was something that could be reviewed. He suggested that Commissioner Jorgensen could submit this as a comment for the study.

Katie Williams said that there had been an uptick in accidents at the sharp curves with the increased speed limit. Shane Marshall commented that those curves were originally made for 55-66 mph and those areas would be straightened out to accommodate the increased speed.

Commissioner Jorgensen asked about the material types for the freeway. He asked if there was a difference in the noise characteristics of concrete versus other materials. Shane Marshall responded UDOT had a standing policy that all urban freeways were concrete. He said that the benefits of asphalt wore out over time so that around the three year mark there was no difference between concrete and asphalt.

Commissioner Tucker spoke on the City's interchange on Center Street and the concern with east/west mobility through that interchange. He said it was not UDOT that controlled this but UP and UTA and asked about coordination with transit authorities for mobility. Shane Marshall commented that one of the biggest challenges was the railroad tracks. He said that they were a partner in this project and there was a focus on the major cross streets including 2600 South/1100 North. Mr. Marshall explained that they had talked to the City about a new interchange and more access not less.

Chair Larson asked how the request for public comment was being publicized. Katie Williams replied that they were meeting with other cities/stakeholders and asking cities, municipalities, schools, etc. to spread the word as well as through official UDOT channels.

3. WORK SESSION: TOWN CENTER FORM-BASED CODE DRAFT CHAPTERS 1, 3, AND 4

Ali Avery reported on the revised Section 1 of the Form-Based Code. The items that remained in this section included adjacency requirements, subdistrict changes would be processed the same as rezoning, the continuation of in-process development, and nonconformance of street façade revisions, roof revisions, or site characteristics. She explained that there would be several smaller Town Center zones, or subdistricts, within a big overlying area that is a Town Center zone. Everything in the Town Center area would be rezoned once the Form-Based Code was approved. In process development could continue with original plans if it was under an approved development agreement or work had begun within one year of code and construction continued diligently. Ms. Avery said that dozens of buildings in the Town Center zone would become nonconforming and that could spur re-development. Existing buildings in the Town Center could be modified as there were triggers in place to require some or total compliance with code depending on the level of redevelopment. This included street façade revisions within the build to area (BTA), a change in doors, a change in 30% of windows, and a change in 30% of the façade. Roof revisions within the BTA, and shape or style change with no added square footage. Changes to site characteristics are also addressed in the Code, including the size of nonconformance over 10%, a change in use of the number of units, gross floor area (GFA),

capacity increases by 50% or more (multi-tenant signs exempt), GFA increased by 50% or more, or abandonment of the use for at least 12 months.

Ms. Avery spoke on general requirements including an interconnected street pattern, access, lots, and definitions. The code section about access was to discourage primary access on Center Street or US 89 and encourage pedestrian/bicycle corridors. Pedestrian/bicycle corridors were to be required on blocks over 500 feet, combined with mid-block crossings, with active transportation corridors in the middle third of the block, a 20 foot minimum right of way (ROW) width for trails, and could be applied toward open space calculations. Requirements for City blocks included blocks fronted with lots on at least two faces, frontage on a street, through-lots were not permitted unless covering 50% or more of a block and both streets were front property lines. Flag lots would be prohibited. She said that the definitions in the Form-Based Code were not used anywhere else in City Code and were specific to this Chapter. If there was any conflict in the Code then the definitions in this Chapter would prevail.

Commissioner Jorgensen asked about the corresponding diagram of a building shown next to the General Requirements. Ali Avery replied that the image detailed the placement of vertical divisions, horizontal divisions, street frontage, and entrance type. She explained that the definitions were for the entire chapter and would be addressed in later Sections.

Ali Avery reported on Section 3: Subdistrict zones which included the following zones in the Town Center area: Core (TC-C), Arts & Park (TC-AP), Center & Orchard (TC-CO), Boulevard (TC-B), North 89 (TC-N89), and Edge (TC-E). This included a map of the Town Center area and the location of these zones. The Core subdistrict would be the center of activity with the most density, tallest buildings, and a connection to the new bus route. The Arts & Parks subdistrict includes Hatch Park, the historic Bamberger train station buildings, and art uses. She explained that the Center & Orchard subdistrict would be mixed use and a transition area to the surrounding neighborhoods east of Orchard Drive. The Boulevard subdistrict was distanced from the neighborhoods, allowing for more height and was located at the southern entrance to the City. The North 89 subdistrict includes height transitions to residential while the Edge subdistrict is mostly residential (duplexes, etc.) to complete the transition from the Town Center to the single-family neighborhoods.

Commissioner Tucker commented that the revisions to the Form-Based Code were more readable and enforceable than the last time the Planning Commission reviewed it.

Commissioner Maus agreed with Commissioner Tucker's comments. She asked if parcels could request to be moved from one subdistrict to another. Ali Avery replied that a parcel could be changed to another subdistrict via the same process as a rezoning. She said the property would have to be adjacent to the subdistrict/zone they were requesting.

Commissioner Maus questioned if a property could petition to be part of the Town Center zone and if they would have to change the zone as well as the subdistrict. Ali Avery responded affirmatively that it was the same process with the same adjacency requirement.

Commissioner Holbrook asked about the differences between the Edge subdistrict and the Center & Orchard subdistrict. Ali Avery replied that the Edge subdistrict would have a lower density. The Center & Orchard subdistrict was more commercial, included a school, and would have taller apartment buildings with future restaurants and businesses. She said the Center & Orchard subdistrict allowed for three-story buildings which was higher than what was allowed in the Edge subdistrict.

Commissioner Holbrook then asked about the differences between the Center & Orchard subdistrict and the Core subdistrict. Ali Avery responded that the Core subdistrict would allow for a five-story building. She explained that the differences would be more apparent in later sections of the Form-Based Code, particularly the area that addressed the building types and what heights were allowed in which subdistrict. The Core subdistrict allowed a different set of building types than the Center & Orchard or the Arts & Park subdistricts.

Commissioner Jorgensen complimented staff on the revisions. He asked about the single-family homes in the Edge subdistrict and what the advantages/disadvantages were for being within the Town Center. Ali Avery said that most of the residential units in the Edge subdistrict were not single-family homes but duplexes, fourplexes, or townhomes. She noted that staff hoped that property owners would see this as an opportunity to increase their property values and would be less concerned about density in the Town Center. The Edge subdistrict would be a buffer to protect neighboring single-family residential property owners from the higher density.

Ali Avery reported on Section 4-Uses with the general requirements that a lot may contain more than one use, each of the uses may function as either a principal use or accessory use on a lot unless otherwise specified, each use shall be located within a permitted Building Type unless otherwise specified, and the uses permitted within the subdistrict may be further limited by the building types permitted. She showed Table 4.1 Uses by Subdistrict for the Commission to review.

Chair Larson asked about the existing drive-through in the proposed Boulevard subdistrict that would no longer be permitted per the Form-Based Code and if it would be eliminated. Ali Avery explained that the existing drive-through was regulated by a development agreement and allowed per that agreement.

Sherrie Pace clarified that there would be no new drive-throughs in the Town Center. She said the future Beans & Brews is governed by a development agreement which is legally binding with the property owners.

Commissioner Jorgensen spoke on the Use Table and said that most of the subdistricts were small so some of the proposed uses, such as a hospital, would not make sense. Ali Avery recommended reviewing the rest of Section 4 and then coming back to Table 4.1.

Ali Avery reported on the Residential and Lodging Uses which included residential multifamily, residential single family, hotel and inn, residential care, civic uses, and utility and infrastructure. She spoke on the requirements for each residential and lodging use including that multifamily residential were attached, that stacked residential must be five or more units (no fourplexes), and that horizontally attached units must have three or more units (except in the Edge subdistrict). Residential single family would be defined as one unit not mixed or attached to any other unit. The hotel & inn would have rooms accessed from the interior of the building. The residential care would also have rooms accessed from the interior of the building. Civic uses would include assembly, public services, educational facilities, and hospitals. Utility and infrastructure included electric/gas, sewage treatment, water treatment/storage, energy conversion, etc.

Retail and Service Uses would be broken down into neighborhood retail and service less than 8,000 square feet, general retail and service greater than 8,000 square feet, and outdoor sales lots, which are not permitted. This was accompanied by Table 4.2 detailing the uses for Retail and Services: Neighborhood and Table 4.3 Retail and Services: General. Office Uses included those with appointment or meeting times and the sale of goods permitted as an accessory use. The types of uses categorized as Craft Industry include small scale manufacturing, production, assembly, and/or repair, with little to no noxious by-products, a showroom or small retail outlet, may include office and small scale warehouse with limited distribution as an accessory use and a maximum GFA of 10,000 square feet. These included Table 4.4 Office and Table 4.5 Craft Industry.

Ali Avery reported that the next section was Open Space (as a Use) which was not to be confused with open space types detailed in another section. She explained that parking lots were not a permitted form of open space, and that stormwater accommodations were required, with additional regulations regarding the type of structures allowed within open space, and adjacent building frontages. Stormwater accommodations were required to accommodate additional uses such as sports fields, etc., they could not be fenced or impede the use of the land and were low impact design. The allowed structures could be small scale food and beverage services under 200 square feet and all civic facilities (rec center, community center, pavilion, etc.) in public parks were excluded from size restrictions. The adjacent building frontages were buildings adjacent to or within open space with the façade facing the open space to be treated as street facades.

The Accessory Uses included home occupations, parking lots/parking structures, outdoor display of goods, and drive-through facilities. The parking lot/parking structures were prohibited in single-family use, must be within 300 feet of the principal or secondary rear entrance, must have a dedicated pedestrian pathway, commercial vehicle parking lots were prohibited, and the design shall conform to City Code 10-6. The limitations for Outdoor Display of Goods included that

permanent outdoor storage of goods typically not housed or sold indoors was not permitted and it would have to be pertinent to the use in front of which it was located. Drive-through facilities were only permitted in the North 89 subdistrict and all drive-through structures or canopies must be located at the rear of the building.

Ali Avery reported on Prohibited Uses in Table 4.6 Uses Explicitly Prohibited Within the Town Center. She then asked if the Commission had any questions regarding Table 4.1 Uses by Subdistrict.

Commissioner Jorgensen asked if it seemed appropriate to place a hospital in the Core subdistrict based on the size of these subdistricts. Sherrie Pace suggested changing the “Hospital & Clinic” Use Type to “Medical Clinics”.

Commissioner Jorgensen mentioned the uses “Craftsman Industrial” and “Craft Industry” with an affinity for the term “Craft Industry”. Ali Avery replied that it should be “Craft Industry” throughout the Code.

Commissioner Jorgensen mentioned where the outdoor display of goods would be permitted and questioned the consistency. He said the North 89 subdistrict permitted large retail but did not allow for a parking structure. Ali Avery responded that a maximum size for retail may need to be specified as a big box store would most likely not be placed in the Town Center.

Commissioner Holbrook asked if there should be a maximum square footage for retail in these subdistricts.

Ali Avery commented that the parking structures were not allowed in North 89 due to the height and the proximity to the Core Subdistrict.

Commissioner Tucker asked if this would prohibit underground parking. Sherrie Pace clarified that “parking structure” meant a sole standalone structure. She said podium parking was considered part of the building.

Commissioner Tucker suggested further definition of the parking structure to allow for one shared by multiple buildings. Ali Avery replied that the parking structure was allowed in all the subdistricts except North 89 and Edge. She said staff would provide more clarification in the Form-Based Code regarding parking structures, underground parking, etc.

Commissioner Tucker questioned why drive-through retail was being discouraged. Ali Avery responded that the goal was for walkability in the Town Center which meant discouraging the use of vehicles and encouraging people to stay and walk.

Sherrie Pace commented on the goal for walkability in the Town Center and avoiding automobile-centric uses such as gas stations, carwashes, drive-throughs, etc.

Commissioner Ward suggested allowing drive-throughs in the Boulevard subdistrict as it was not a walkable area. Chair Larson commented that in future planning this area may become more walkable.

Ali Avery said that there would be an enhanced bus station there so it would be preferable if walkable uses were located in the area. She explained that there was a possibility that Main Street may be closed at Highway 89 which would allow for plaza space adjacent to the Boulevard subdistrict and a pedestrian-activated signal on Highway 89.

Commissioner Holbrook asked about the property located near City Hall where Main Street and Highway 89 met. Ali Avery replied that it was owned by the City and could be converted to an active plaza/pedestrian space.

Sherrie Pace commented that the City recently acquired that property with the intent to place an entry monument or something similar. She said the Town Center traffic circulation study would address what would happen if that section of the street was closed and how it would impact Center Street, Highway 89, Main Street, and the Town Center. A presentation to the Commission regarding the traffic study would be done in May.

Commissioner Holbrook mentioned Civic Uses with library, museum, and post office. He asked if there was the possibility to encourage collaboration with the post office and a developer to include a post office on the main floor of a bigger development. Sherrie Pace replied that the use (post office) could be provided for, and staff could encourage developers to include it. She also suggested a post office could be part of the community center in Hatch Park or as part of the Town Center.

Commissioner Jorgensen asked about automotive supply in Table 4.3 and requested that salvage yards be listed as a prohibited use and removed from Table 4.3. He spoke on utility and infrastructure and if there should be exclusions such as utility scale high voltage lines, or utility scale solar panels and wind turbines. Ali Avery replied that exclusions could also include cellular towers, and that staff would include a section regarding utilities.

Sherrie Pace commented that there were smaller scale and other options for cellular including panels and would further research this.

Commissioner Holbrook mentioned infrastructure and the requirement for burying utilities. He suggested that this could be its own section in the code. Sherrie Pace responded that underground utilities could be required for new development and in the case of redevelopment with existing overhead lines.

Commissioner Jorgensen mentioned Craft Industry and additional requirements such as no significant fire, explosion, and hazardous chemical release.

Commissioner Jorgensen asked about the non-store retail use. Sherrie Pace clarified that this would be mail-order or online sales.

Commissioner Jorgensen also recommended additional requirements around hazardous materials and manufacturing. He suggested other prohibited uses including pawnshops, thrift shops, rummage, and trailer parks. Sherrie Pace responded by sharing the differences between large-scale thrift shops and smaller shops. She was in favor of a small thrift shop and said that the larger thrift shops, such as those Commissioner Jorgensen may be referring to would be prohibited based on size, not use.

Ali Avery commented that trailer parks would not be permitted by building type. Commissioner Jorgensen asked about tattoo and massage parlors. Sherrie Pace replied that they would be permitted under personal services.

Commissioner Jorgensen asked about portable building sales. Sherrie Pace replied that they would be prohibited due to outdoor storage and display.

Commissioner Jorgensen asked about outdoor display of goods and the proposed limitations. He asked about using part of the parking lot and if that would be prohibited. Sherrie Pace recommended against using the parking area for outdoor display but suggested maybe as a temporary use.

Sherrie Pace recommended adding scooter regulations in the Town Center code.

Commissioner Jorgensen suggested traffic calming for this area as it was off Highway 89 including a traffic light and a lower speed limit.

Commissioner Maus asked for more time to review and asked if there was a deadline for comments. Sherrie Pace replied that items could be addressed until the Form-Based Code was finalized.

Chair Larson made several suggestions on text edits.

Ali Avery said that the goal moving forward was to provide the updated draft in advance including the suggestions made by the Commission.

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

Sherrie Pace reported that the plat amendment which vacated seven on-street parking spaces along Orchard Drive, and the site plans for Buildings 4 and 5 of the Village Station at Eaglewood development were approved. She said Building 5 could not start until construction began on Eaglewood Plaza, the commercial and office building to the north of Building 5. Staff reached out to the developer and found that the delays on Eaglewood Plaza were due to financing and securing a contractor.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Planning Commission meeting minutes of April 12, 2022 were reviewed and approved.

Commissioner Maus moved to approve the minutes from the April 12, 2022 Planning Commission meeting with the staff changes recommended. Commissioner Holbrook seconded the motion. The motion was approved by Commissioners Holbrook, Jorgensen, Larson, Maus, Tucker, and Ward. Commissioner Stone was excused.

6. ADJOURN

Chair Larson adjourned the meeting at 8:08 p.m.

The foregoing was approved by the Planning Commission of the City of North Salt Lake on Tuesday, May 10, 2022 by unanimous vote of all members present.



Wendy Page, City Recorder