

CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
ANCHOR LOCATION: CITY HALL  
10 EAST CENTER STREET, NORTH SALT LAKE  
FEBRUARY 28, 2023

**FINAL**

Commission Chair BreAnna Larson called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

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

STAFF PRESENT: Sherrie Pace, Community Development Director; Mackenzie Johnson, Planner; Ali Avery, Long Range Planner.

OTHERS PRESENT: Dale VanWagoner, Wright Development Group; Dee Lalliss, Jon Marsh, residents; Brian Carlisle, Jesse Curtis, Russell Platt, JCI Inc.

1. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

2. WORK SESSION: TOWN CENTER FORM-BASED CODE SECTION 7 (PARKING)

Ali Avery reported on Section 7 Parking of the drafted Town Center Form-Based Code. Staff had reviewed current parking requirements in the existing code and the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) transportation/parking manual. The drafted requirements were reduced by 50% in the Core subdistrict and to 65% in the remaining subdistricts. She showed a table with parking requirements by use and said the uses were general as the purpose of the Form-Based Code was a focus on the appearance of the building and less on the use. Applicants would be required to meet the parking standard in the event of new development, improvements to the existing parking facilities, or a change of use in the building that would require a change in parking by 10% or more. Any existing structure that was destroyed would require the parking to be rebuilt in compliance with the new code. In the Core subdistrict, the parking maximum would be equal to the parking minimum. In the other subdistricts, the maximum was 15% over the minimum parking requirement which was shown in the table as well. Parking for those with disabilities was excluded from the maximum parking requirement.

Ms. Avery shared that the parking requirements for single family residential would remain the same as the existing code. She said single family was only permitted in the Edge subdistrict. For multifamily, the parking requirement would be based on bedroom count, similar to how parking is calculated for multifamily developments zoned as a Planned District. The Craft Industry category was calculated based off the area used by the public.

Ali Avery then spoke about the drafted code for shared parking calculations between uses. She explained the proposed parking credits for residential uses and that they were based on providing certain amenities such as bike lockers or transit passes, as well as reductions in the number of stalls for senior or affordable housing. Any reduction would be subject to a deed restriction in perpetuity. Ms. Avery said that there would be an electric vehicle parking requirement. This included Level 1 charging which is a standard outlet that provides an 8-12 hour recharge and Level 2 charging which is a faster charge at about 4-6 hours. The multifamily residential parking requirement was one Level 1 access for each required covered parking space or at least one Level 2 electric vehicle charging station providing two charging spaces for every 20 parking spaces. For non-residential parking requirements, there would be at least one Level Two vehicle charging station providing two charging spaces for every 20 parking spaces. For developments requiring less than twenty spaces, no electric vehicle parking was required.

Commissioner Jorgensen thanked staff and was in agreement with the concept of not over or under parking. He mentioned the plan for the parking maximum to be equal to the parking minimum in the Core subdistrict only and not in the other subdistricts and how, if there was not adequate parking, the problem would spill into the other subdistricts. Commissioner Jorgensen questioned if the proposed parking requirement would be sufficient, especially in the Core subdistrict. Ali Avery replied that the Town Center Master Plan recommendation was to reduce all the Town Center parking to 65%. She said the Core was intended to be denser which meant parking solutions would need to be more creative. Residential uses were also restricted and only retail would be allowed on the ground floor in the Core subdistrict, the enhanced bus route would be on Highway 89 with a station in the Core. There would be on street parking on Center Street and Hatch Park for overflow. She mentioned that the existing code is over-parked, in general, and that the reduction to 65% could even function okay city-wide, making the 50% reduction less severe.

Commissioner Jorgensen spoke on the parking issues in the newly annexed area and felt it was better to be overparked than under. Ali Avery said the drafted code could be revised so that the parking maximum would be 15% above the parking minimum in all of the subdistricts, not just the Core.

Commissioner Holbrook asked about the parking count reduction and how staff came to suggest these percentages. Ali Avery replied that Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) assisted in the creation of the drafted Form-Based Code and provided a parking study of locations in the City, and surrounding areas, which showed actual usage at about 65% of the existing code

requirements. This suggestion was also made in an effort to increase the intensity to provide more building/use and less parking in the Core with a goal of making the area more walkable and less auto-dependent.

Chair Larson asked about the craft industry parking requirement and the mechanism to park according to use. Ali Avery replied that it would be the associated public use such as one parking space per four seats for a coffee roaster with an associated coffee shop, for example.

Commissioner Maus spoke on the diversity of uses that could fall under craft industry and the need to calculate parking based on the varying number of employees. Ali Avery responded that this had been difficult to calculate and suggested that the drafted code could be amended so it was more like the requirements of standard city code which required some manufacturing/warehouse uses to provide parking based on the number of employees on highest shift, in addition to calculating parking separately for the public space or retail area.

Sherrie Pace said that staff would research the craft industry use and parking needs further.

Commissioner Stone asked about the parking credits and if they would be determined on a case by case basis. Ali Avery replied that the development would come before the Planning Commission for site plan review. Staff could amend the draft to provide an opportunity for the Planning Commission to allow for more flexibility.

Commissioner Tucker suggested that any residential parking credits be subject to Planning Commission approval. He was in favor of applying the 15% maximum above the minimum parking requirement in all of the subdistricts.

Commissioner Jorgensen mentioned the on street parking credit and how instances where on street parking would not be allowed, such as a bike lane or snow event, would be addressed. Ali Avery responded that the street section of the draft code had cross sections which allowed for on-street parking on some roads. She said that on street parking would be striped and designated in the areas where it was approved, but that parking wouldn't be located within a bike lane.

Commissioner Holbrook requested information about how the parking was calculated for the City Center townhome/commercial development across from City Hall. He asked if the development seemed under or over parked. Sherrie Pace responded that the parking there was per the existing code as the City Center development was started prior to the start of the Form-Based Code. She said the development was not completed yet so was unable to provide an answer on the parking.

Commissioner Maus commented that as an electric vehicle owner, she felt that the requirement for two Level 2 parking spaces per 20 spaces was too few.

Ali Avery clarified the requested changes from the Planning Commission to Section 7 Parking included the maximum parking requirement in all subdistricts was 15% over the minimum parking requirement.

Chair Larson suggested taking a straw poll regarding that change.

Commissioner Holbrook did not think there should be a maximum over the minimum. He felt a developer could put as many parking stalls as they felt necessary.

Commissioner Stone said she wanted the requirement to be based on research and data. Commissioner Tucker was in agreement with Commissioner Stone.

Ali Avery commented that the Form-Based Code started from a template provided by WFRC which was based on similar codes in other cities, such as South Salt Lake.

Chair Larson was in favor of the maximum and minimum requirements being the same.

Commissioner Ward agreed with Commissioner Holbrook to avoid specifying a maximum number of stalls but was agreeable to 15% in all districts.

Commissioner Maus advocated for a maximum, as over-parking could be an issue, but was in favor of increasing the maximum to 15% in all subdistricts.

Commissioner Jorgensen was in favor of finding a way to accommodate a developer that may have a legitimate reason for more parking such as for a restaurant, etc. He did not want them to be held back by overly prescriptive legislation. But, he could be supportive of applying the 15% maximum in all subdistricts with more flexibility.

Ali Avery said the other changes to Section 7 included a rework of the craft industry parking requirement including determining parking spaces for employees based on highest shift for warehouse space as well as more flexibility for the Planning Commission on determining parking credits.

Ali Avery asked about utilizing parking credits in the commercial areas. The Commission felt that the parking credits would be difficult to manage for commercial uses.

Commissioner Jorgensen asked for further education and any data that may be useful. Commissioner Stone was also interested in the data that supporting the drafted parking code such as one stall per one-bedroom unit. She elaborated that a one bedroom unit could potentially have two cars.

3. PUBLIC HEARING: CONSIDERATION OF A PROPOSED CODE AMENDMENT REDUCING THE MINIMUM LOT SIZE FROM 10,000 SQUARE FEET TO 7,000 SQUARE FEET FOR TWO FAMILY DWELLINGS IN THE R1-7 AND RM-7 ZONES

Sherrie Pace explained that the proposed code amendment was presented and recommended for approval at the February 15, 2023 Planning Commission meeting. Staff discovered a clerical error in the notification which only noted the changes proposed to the CH zone and did not include the proposed changes to the R1-7 and RM-7 zones. The public hearing has been readvertised to correct this error. She said this amendment would change the minimum lot size for single family dwellings and two family dwellings (duplexes) to 7,000 square feet in the R1-7 and RM-7 zones. The previous County zoning required a minimum lot size of 9,000 square feet for both single family and two family dwellings. The current City code required a minimum lot size of 7,000 square feet for single family and an additional 3,000 square feet for a two family dwelling but did not have the same requirement for Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) which were essentially a two family dwelling with one unit being owner occupied. This proposed amendment would make those regulations equitable and provide additional opportunities in these two zones for affordable housing within the City.

**Chair Larson opened the public hearing at 7:08 p.m.**

Dee Lalliss spoke on the craft industry subdistrict parking requirement and suggested calculating the maximum number of employees and or customers. He was in favor of reducing the requirement from 10,000 square feet to 7,000 square feet in the newly annexed area to be equitable. Mr. Lalliss said that there needed to be a parking review for those lots less than 10,000 square feet that would now be eligible to become a duplex.

Mackenzie Johnson commented that there were certain requirements per building code to convert a single family home into a duplex. Those changes would require a building permit and the need to have two parking stalls per unit, one of which must be covered.

Jon Marsh said he lived in the recently annexed area and was in support of the lot size reduction.

**Chair Larson closed the public hearing at 7:14 p.m.**

**Commissioner Ward moved that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council the proposed text amendments to Title 10, Chapter as presented with the following findings:**

- 1) **The proposed amendment is in accord with the comprehensive general plan, goals and policies of the City.**

- 2) **Changed or changing conditions make the proposed amendment reasonably necessary to carry out the "purposes" stated in this title.**
- 3) **The proposed ordinance will provide an equitable opportunity for the creation of additional affordable housing in the R1-7 and RM-7 zones in accordance with the City's Moderate Income Plan.**

**Commissioner Jorgensen seconded the motion. The motion was approved by Commissioners Holbrook, Jorgensen, Larson, Maus, Stone, Tucker, and Ward.**

4. CONSIDERATION OF SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR WDG NSL FLEX BUILDING AT 723 WEST 1100 NORTH, DALE VANWAGONER, WRIGHT DEVELOPMENT GROUP, APPLICANT

Mackenzie Johnson reported that the property located at 723 West 1100 North was vacant, 2.474 acres in size, and zoned Manufacturing Distribution (MD). The property received subdivision approval in 2022 and this site plan would not be developed until the subdivision plat was recorded. She shared that the subdivider was diligently working with staff to get the plat recorded as soon as possible. She showed the location of the property and said it was also recently rezoned from General Commercial (CG) to MD due to the property being located in the direct flight path of the Skypark Airport runway. Development, construction, and use of the property are subject to the approval of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). The applicant had obtained multiple letters from the FAA which identified that the proposed structure and site improvements would have no adverse effect on the utilization of the airspace.

The applicant requested exceptions to the street tree ordinance and the requirement that parking islands be landscaped with trees in an effort to comply with the FAA regulations regarding the height of structures and other elements in proximity to the active runway. The proposed landscape plan showed the property being well landscaped with diverse vegetation and 33% vegetation in the park strip along 1100 North.

Mackenzie Johnson said the applicant had proposed to create two driveways on the property. City code 10-6-2 allowed properties with frontages greater than 200 feet up to two driveways. These driveways could not be wider than 40 feet, must be a minimum of 8 feet from the nearest side property line, and separated by a minimum of twice the width of the widest driveway. The site plan proposed two driveways that were each 40 feet wide. Both driveways were more than eight feet away from the nearest side property line in addition to being spaced more than 80 feet apart.

The proposed building met all required setbacks and lot coverage regulations. The building would have six bay doors facing 1100 North. City code 10-6-16 required adequate screening of trucks by a six foot high masonry wall that matched the architecture of the structure and any lighting from the loading spaces must be deflected away from adjacent residential areas. The

Development Review Committee (DRC) has identified that the property was not adjacent to any residential and the six foot wall would not be necessary for screening at this location. Additionally, the FAA may not allow a six foot wall in front of the building.

The building would have 32,000 square feet of warehouse and 5,000 square feet of office space. The parking requirement based on land use and square footage would be 52 total stalls with 3 required ADA stalls. The applicant proposed 50 stalls, 2 of which were ADA compliant. City code allowed the Commission to determine the minimum required parking upon advice from the Community Development Director. The DRC and the Community Development Director supported approving the site plan with the 50 parking stalls due to the FAA's permitted land use which required low occupancy of the structure. By reducing the required parking to 50 stalls, only 2 stalls would be required to be ADA compliant.

The proposed building met the building design standards for massing, articulation, parapet variation, primary building entrance, and materials. The DRC recommended approval of the site plan with the condition for the completion of all engineering and planner redlines prior to review by the City Council.

Commissioner Maus asked about the number of required ADA parking stalls. Mackenzie Johnson said that she believed code required 3 ADA stalls for every 51-100 stalls and 2 stalls for parking areas with 50 stalls or less. Those numbers could be verified with code.

Commissioner Holbrook questioned how occupancy was determined including if the space was leased. Mackenzie Johnson replied that business types and land uses that required a lower occupancy were permissible by the FAA standards. She clarified that the property owner was aware of the restrictions and requirements per the FAA for any use of the building. The property owner or potential occupant would need to work with the FAA directly to ensure compliance with the FAA standards.

**Commissioner Holbrook moved that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council of the site plan for the WDG NSL Flex Building located at 723 West 1100 North with the following condition:**

- 1) Completion of all engineering and planner redlines prior to review by the City Council.**

**Commissioner Tucker seconded the motion. The motion was approved by Commissioners Holbrook, Jorgensen, Larson, Maus, Stone, Tucker, and Ward.**

5. CONSIDERATION OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE TOWNE PLAZA GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE LOFTS AT NORTH LAKE ON LOTS 153 AND 154 OF TOWNE PLAZA TOWNHOMES PHASE 3 SUBDIVISION AT

APPROXIMATELY 130 EAST CENTER STREET AND INCLUSION OF  
ADDITIONAL 1.5 ACRES AT APPROXIMATELY 166 EAST CENTER STREET,  
JESSE CURTIS, JCI INC, APPLICANT

Sherrie Pace explained that during 2022, the developer for the two office buildings in the Towne Plaza development had proposed changing the use to from office and retail to multifamily housing in taller structures. The subject property includes two commercial lots at 120 East and 140 East as well as an additional 1.5 acre property east of the project. She clarified that these lots will be part of the Form-Based Code in the Core and Center & Orchard subdistricts.

The City Council entered into a development agreement for the Towne Plaza project located at 130 East Center Street in 2015. The general development plan for the project included 52 townhomes and 2 commercial office/retail buildings. The construction of the townhomes has since been completed. The remaining commercial property has been transferred to Jesse Curtis, JCI Inc. and Lofts North Lake LLC for completion of the project. The development agreement runs with the land and the new LLC assumed the responsibility of fulfilling the terms of the agreement. The new developer is requesting an amendment to the development agreement, including the general development plan, and changing the project name for the remainder of the project to The Lofts at North Lake.

The proposed amendment includes rezoning the 1.5 acre piece of land at approximately 166 East Center Street from Commercial Shopping (CS) to be incorporated in the Towne Plaza P-District. The proposal is to build a development with 3 multi-story buildings consisting of 287 dwelling units, 412 parking stalls, and 7,900 square feet of retail space. The dwelling units would be studio, one bedroom, and two bedroom apartments.

Sherrie Pace reported that the developer requested financial assistance from the City's Redevelopment Agency (RDA) to facilitate the creation of affordable housing units. The City collects tax increment from properties located within RDA boundaries for reinvestment in the area to encourage redevelopment. She explained tax increment, how the RDA worked, and affordable housing based upon the Area Median Income (AMI). She noted that no decision has been made on the requested RDA investment.

Sherrie Pace showed the site plan and the location of the parking structure, buildings, and amenities. She then presented the proposed architecture including renderings and explained that upon review by the DRC the applicant was asked to improve the appearance of the back side of the buildings to be pleasing from any side. The renderings also included the proposed height of the buildings compared to existing adjacent buildings.

Commissioner Stone commented that according to the plan, Atlas Academy and the Sunshine Café buildings would remain and that they were attached to the structure slated to be demolished

for the new building. Sherrie Pace replied affirmatively and elaborated that there were ways to safely remove building sections that shared walls.

Commissioner Holbrook said that the proposed layout seemed awkward and asked if any attempt had been made to purchase the adjoining properties including the Atlas Academy property. Sherrie Pace responded that the developer tried to purchase all of the properties but were unable to do so. She said this was something for the Planning Commission to consider when rezoning.

Sherrie Pace then recommended the Planning Commission determine if the subject parcels at 166 East Center Street should be included in the future Core subdistrict of the drafted Form-Based Code, instead of remaining in the Center & Orchard subdistrict. She explained that the maximum height in the Core was five and a half stories and stacked flats or mixed use buildings would only allow residential on the second story or higher with the ground floor as a retail use.

Commissioner Holbrook asked about the RDA funds and if they could only be used for residential. Sherrie Pace said the City received a portion of the tax increment and 10% must be used to support affordable housing while 85% could be used for property acquisition, infrastructure, etc. She said some of the RDA funds were already obligated to other projects in the redevelopment area.

Sherrie Pace reviewed the street façade requirements for compliance with the draft Form-Based Code for the Core subdistrict for mixed use buildings including 65% ground store transparency and 25% for upper stories, principal entrance location on the front façade, number of entrances, 90% front property line coverage, maximum five foot setback, and rear yard parking. The street façade requirements for the stacked flat buildings in the draft Form-Based Code for 25% ground story transparency and 15% for upper stories, the principal entrance location, one entrance for every 100 feet, 90% front property line coverage, maximum five foot front setback, and rear yard parking was also met.

The proposed amendments would apply to the total 3.125 acre property with a total of 287 dwelling units and 412 parking spaces. The proposed parking ratio would be 1.44 spaces per unit. Current City code permits a reduction in parking requirements to a level at 65% of the standards required by ordinance and also allowed the use of shared parking for mixed use developments. As the Form-Based Code had not yet been adopted, the P-District zone and development agreement would be the final determinant for required parking. A parking study was provided and the proposed 412 spaces (not including 27 on street spaces) exceeds the standards. The analysis reviewed the standards required in the draft Form-Based Code to those listed for actual parking demand in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE). The ITE suggested that the parking demand for this type of development would be 279 parking stalls. Hales recommends providing additional stalls for residential (5%) and retail (10%) for a total recommended parking of 295 stalls. The study found that the proposed 412 parking stalls would be sufficient based on the ITE and draft Form-Based Code.

Ms. Pace also said that the parking study noted that 50% of the units would meet the 80% AMI standard (based upon an earlier proposal) and the developer now proposed to place deed restrictions on units in the 50% and 30% AMI levels for 14 and 6 dwelling units respectively. The DRC requested the Planning Commission review the proposed plan and schedule a public hearing on the proposed amendments and rezone of the property at 166 East Center Street. It was requested that the Commission provide feedback on building height, dwelling unit density, and minimum required parking to staff and the developer.

Commissioner Jorgensen spoke on some of the concerns including expanding the P District and removing the area from the Center & Orchard subdistrict as well as impacts to the street and other infrastructure, because that area is intended to be a buffer between the Core subdistrict and the existing single family zones.

Commissioner Tucker commented on the drafted Form-Based Code and his disdain for making exceptions but was in favor of a new building with moderate income housing. He spoke on how to meet the requirements of the subdistricts while maintaining the affordable housing element of the project.

Commissioner Stone asked about the requested six stories and if this was to accommodate the low income housing. Jesse Curtis replied that they wanted a viable project and the requested height and design would allow them to meet the parking requirement. He shared that due to the topography of the land, the six stories would feel smaller in some areas.

Commissioner Holbrook questioned if the slope on buildings B and C would provide daylight to the units on the ground floor. Brian Carlisle, JCI Inc., replied that due to the slope, there would be parking with a portion underground and one or two walk out units on the main level of building B and possibly building C.

Commissioner Holbrook commented that he would prefer retail rather than walk out residential. Jesse Curtis clarified that for building B most of the main floor space was the clubhouse house and other amenities.

Commissioner Maus asked if the main level must be retail per the drafted Form-Based Code. She did not want to give up retail on buildings that fronted Center Street. Sherrie Pace replied that when a building fronted Center Street or Highway 89, residential uses were not permitted on the main floor level.

Commissioner Maus questioned if the affordable units would be the first to be eliminated if the buildings were required to lose units in favor of adding commercial, per the drafted Form-Based Code requirement. Jesse Curtis said some of the request for RDA funds was to meet the level of low income units at 30% or 50% AMI. He said 60-70% of the units would meet the 80% AMI based on market value.

Jesse Curtis also spoke on the need for a buffer between uses and did not request a change to the entire Center & Orchard subdistrict but just the parcels included in the scope of this project. He thought that the redevelopment of the existing rundown buildings would be a benefit to the City.

Commissioner Stone asked if building C would be constructed if the proposed structure was limited in height and could not be five and half stories tall. Jesse Curtis replied that the property acquisition and proposed development on the 1.5 acre property would probably not occur if the height was limited as the current property owner needed a set price for the property. He said they would not have enough units in a three story building.

Chair Larson clarified that the Commission needed to provide feedback on willingness to adjust the Core subdistrict, height/stories, commercial on the ground level, and density.

Commissioner Jorgensen opposed adjusting the Core due to not having a buffer/Edge subdistrict and obstructing the view for existing residents near the property.

Commissioner Maus asked if the project would be developed if the Core was adjusted and allowed for five and a half stories but required retail on the main floor of buildings B and C. Jesse Curtis commented that the Commission had previously had this discussion and had approved no commercial in building B.

Chair Larson asked for feedback on potentially adjusting the Core subdistrict in the drafted Form-Based Code.

Commissioner Maus was open to adjusting the Core subdistrict but was not open to eliminating retail. Commissioner Ward said this was being developed as a P District as the Form-Based Code was not yet adopted and the question should be is this the right development for the land. He had some reservations about the proposed project. Commissioner Tucker did not support adjusting the Core subdistrict for this project. Commissioner Stone was not in favor of how the project was currently being proposed. Commissioner Holbrook appreciated the site layout and parking as a buffer but challenged the developer to reduce the proposed height to four and a half stories with the grade for building C. He was open to expanding the Core subdistrict. Chair Larson was opposed to adjusting the Core subdistrict.

Sherrie Pace asked for feedback on retail on the main floor of building B. Jesse Curtis commented that they would be willing to have commercial space on the main floor of building C facing Orchard.

Chair Larson asked if building C could only be three and half stories and noted that she did not want to eliminate any existing commercial there. Jesse Curtis said it took a decade for the current property owner of the 1.5 acres to lease all of the commercial space in the existing building.

Commissioner Maus questioned expanding the Core and how that would require retail on the main level. Sherrie Pace commented that the Form-Based Code had not been adopted. She said there would be negotiations for the P District. She shared the drafted Form-Based Code as a guiding tool before the negotiated terms within the development agreement for on this property, such as requiring main floor retail.

Commissioner Ward did not want to lose retail and asked for a comparison of the amount of existing commercial to be eliminated versus the amount proposed to be created in the new buildings. He suggested requiring a percentage of retail for the entire project and the developer could determine where it fit best. Jesse Curtis commented that this was something they would be willing to do. He felt they could replace the existing retail in the new buildings.

Jesse Curtis asked about exceptions to the five and a half story requirement for building A and B. He said the proposed structures would technically be six stories above grade on part of the properties due to the topography. The Commission did not have any reservations as this was the intent of the five and a half stories.

Commissioner Jorgensen commented that it was important to finalize the Form-Base Code and General Plan update including feedback from the community and a focus on new issues such as water availability.

**Commissioner Ward moved that the Planning Commission schedule a public hearing tentatively set for March 14<sup>th</sup> subject to the applicant's final proposal to consider the amendment to the Towne Plaza P-District and General Development Plan Amendment for The Lofts at North Lake project based upon the feedback given to the developer related to height, stories, the density and the minimum parking requirements. Commissioner Holbrook seconded the motion. The motion was approved by Commissioners Holbrook, Jorgensen, Larson, Maus, Stone, Tucker and Ward.**

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

Sherrie Pace reported that the Val Verda zoning map was adopted for the annexed area at the February 21<sup>st</sup> City Council meeting. The City Council denied the change for the Blundell property to be zoned RM-7 instead of R1-7. If the property owner had a specific development proposal he could reapply. The CH zone amendments for the height and rear setbacks were also approved during this meeting.

Sherrie Pace said that she had been tasked with re-writing the drafted sections of the Form-Based Code to make the adoption and implementation of the code easier. She felt that the timeline previously discussed for the adoption of the Form-Based Code would not change as a result of those edits by more than 2 weeks.

Mackenzie Johnson elaborated that the most current version of the Form-Based Code needed to be revised to make it easier to implement as a code instead of acting as a guiding tool similar to a General Plan.

Mackenzie Johnson reminded the Commission that they must complete a minimum of 4 hours of annual training, per State statute. She asked that the Commission complete their required trainings prior to April. Commissioners Tucker and Jorgensen had already completed the required training hours.

#### 7. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Planning Commission meeting minutes of February 15, 2023 were reviewed and approved.

**Commissioner Jorgensen moved to approve the minutes as drafted for the February 15, 2023 Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Maus seconded the motion. The motion was approved by Commissioners Holbrook, Jorgensen, Larson, Maus, Stone, Tucker and Ward.**

#### 8. ADJOURN

Commission Chair Larson adjourned the meeting at 9:03 p.m.

*The foregoing was approved by the Planning Commission of the City of North Salt Lake on Tuesday, March 14, 2023 by unanimous vote of all members present.*

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Wendy Page, City Recorder