

CITY OF NORTH SALT LAKE
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
ANCHOR LOCATION: CITY HALL
10 EAST CENTER STREET, NORTH SALT LAKE
MARCH 14, 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 via Zoom
Commissioner Katherine Maus via Zoom
Commissioner Irene Stone
Commissioner Brandon Tucker
Commissioner William Ward

STAFF PRESENT: Ken Leetham, City Manager; Sherrie Pace, Community Development Director; Mackenzie Johnson, Planner.

OTHERS PRESENT: Brian Horrocks, Lisa Baskin, Alisa Van Langeveld, Sherrelyn Larsen, Lare Finklea, Tammy Finklea, Shane Huntsman, Debra Holdaway, Jennifer Butte, Kathryn Westerman, Sarah Sorensen, Christina Isan, Cam Hawkins, Austin Hawkins, Caleb Falch, Linda Tolman, Clyde Tolman, Bridger Dopp, Pam Corry, Craig Corry, Ashley Cannon, Susan Bendiz, Elaine Galloway, Neil Galloway, Carlos Pena Foentes, Jenalyn M., Jaycee Brown, Erik Cheney, , Rachel Beall, Benton Beall, Mary Gay Jones, Melissa (Missy) White, Paul Barron, Dee Lalliss, Barry Bryson, Shawna Bagslow, Bill Salisbury, Dee Salisbury, Matt Dennis, Brooke Dennis, Lucene Hougaard, Charlene Gibbs, Shane Gibbs, Kerry Gibbs, Lorin Lewis, Krissy Lewis, Robb Beall, Mark Melville, Chris Jones, Kelly Jones, Alex Salina, Jill Dyson, Adam Dyson, Laura Chandler, Jason Jensen, Felicia Jensen, Tammy Clayton, Lawrence Knight, Joan Hewitson, Forrest Cordova, Collette Twitchell, Dean Twitchell, Lisa Midgley, Mariah Nesbit, Michael Larsen, Zachary Nesbit, Louise Kearl, Lyle Nelson, Daniel Shaffer, David Hansen, Mara Hansen, Thorald Wardle, Conrad Jacobson, Mark Lee, JaNae Rawlings, Kelsey Helm, Brooke Muir, Scot Mathews, Bryan Lin, Tori Curtis, Camille Thorpe, Jake Salgado, Nicole Mathews, Jon Kramer, Larry Clark, Sherry Brooks, Douglas Jackson, Bryce Johnson, Rita Auva'a, Ephraim Burke, Charlotte Maxwell, Sineli Tupou, Luisa Tupou, Chris Jones, Mackenzie Townsend, David Finkley, Jennalynn Meldrum, Michelle Fairbanks, residents; Torrey Copfer, Woods Cross; Alisha Copfer, Davis Journal; Jesse Curtis & Brian Carlisle, JCI, Inc. Via Zoom: Karen Albrand, Adam Ginny, Glorious84054, L Jacobson, Marianne Leavitt, Peter Strohmeyer, Ruth Ann Wardle, Schanz family, Shawn Johnson, Sherry Bronson, Amy Duke, Brandy Stubbs, Johnson, Chase, L, Brittney, James Johnson, Aubrey Hansen, Alex Helm, Sarah Sorensen (was in person but left early and logged in on zoom), Wayne, Trisha B.

1. PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no public comments.

2. PUBLIC HEARING: CONSIDERATION OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE TOWNE PLAZA P-DISTRICT GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN LOCATED AT 120 EAST CENTER AND 140 EAST CENTER TO THE LOFTS AT NORTH LAKE GENERAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN TO INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS:
- A. ADDITION OF 1.5 ACRES OF PROPERTY LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 166 EAST CENTER STREET AND 76 SOUTH ORCHARD DRIVE TO BE REZONED FROM COMMERCIAL SHOPPING (CS) TO A PLANNED DISTRICT (P);
 - B. AMENDMENT TO THE APPROVED LAND USE PLAN CONSISTING OF TWO COMMERCIAL OFFICE BUILDINGS AND REQUESTING APPROVAL OF 3 MIXED USE BUILDINGS CONTAINING APPROXIMATELY 13,100 SQUARE FEET OF COMMERCIAL RETAIL SPACE AND APPROXIMATELY 280 RESIDENTIAL APARTMENTS ON 3.125 ACRES

Chair Larson explained that this was the part of the development review process where residents could provide input. The process included the right for an individual to make an application for development which staff would review. The Planning Commission would then review the application and how it pertained to City code to make a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council could then approve or deny the application.

Sherrie Pace reported on the steps required for a Planned (P) District rezone which included an application for a General Development Plan (concept) and P District rezone, staff review of the application and General Development Plan, public hearing and Planning Commission review/recommendation and City Council review of the General Development Plan. Followed by City Council approval of the General Development Plan would be the development agreement/site plan application with staff review followed by Planning Commission review of the site plan and zone change recommendation. The City Council could then review the development agreement, site plan, and zone change and approve or deny.

Sherrie Pace showed a zoning map of the area which included the existing Towne Plaza P District, with already constructed townhomes and two vacant commercial lots, and the proposed addition which included 1.5 acres of adjacent land presently zoned Commercial Shopping (CS). The Development Review Committee (DRC) reviewed the proposed amendment to the General Development Plan and found it to be generally consistent with the City's General Plan and Town Center Master Plan and recommended it for review by the Planning Commission. She then showed an aerial map outlining the locations of the proposed Buildings A, B, and C. The map also showed the existing Atlas Academy Preschool and the building containing Janet's Sunshine

Café which would remain. Ms. Pace showed the Town Center Master Plan map with the designated land use for the area being mixed use.

Sherrie Pace reported on what was already entitled on the property zoned as the Towne Plaza P District. On June 16, 2015, the City Council entered into a development agreement with David Curtis and National Commercial Properties for the Towne Plaza project located at 130 East Center Street. The General Development Plan for the project contained 52 townhomes and two commercial office/retail buildings with 8,300 square feet of retail and 30,300 square feet of office space. The townhomes have been constructed. She showed renderings of the two commercial buildings approved to be built at 120 East and 140 East Center Street. This included the east office building with approximately 20,000 square feet of office space and the west building with 8,300 square feet of commercial retail on the main floor and 8,300 square feet of office space on the second story.

Ms. Pace said that the Towne Plaza commercial lots were transferred to Jesse Curtis with JCI Inc. and The Lofts North Lake LLC for completion of the project. The development agreement runs with the land and the new property owners would assume the responsibility of fulfilling the terms of the agreement. The new developer requested 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 concept plan was reviewed at the February 28, 2023 Planning Commission meeting to determine if the project was ready to schedule the public hearing. Based upon comments received at that meeting the plan was revised to include commercial in all three buildings and the height of Building 3 being lowered by one story on the side adjacent to Orchard Drive. This reduced the total unit count to approximately 275-280 units dependent upon final building design.

The proposed amendment included the two commercial lots (120 East and 140 East Center Street) and a proposal to add 1.5 acres directly east and adjacent to the project. The proposed amendment would significantly change the nature of the project from two office buildings (two stories) to a project with three mixed use buildings (six stories). All three buildings would have residential apartments and some ground floor retail. Two of the buildings contained podium parking on the main or basement level. The developer is requesting up to 280 dwelling units (studio, one bedroom, and two bedroom) with 412 parking stalls, and 13,100 square feet of retail space.

The proposed design principles from the drafted Town Center Core Subdistrict includes 65% transparency (glass) on the ground story and 25% transparency for the upper stories, the principal entrance be located on the front façade, one entrance every 75 feet of horizontal building width, 90% front property line coverage, maximum five foot front setbacks, and rear yard parking.

Sherrie Pace showed a rendering of the proposed Buildings A-C with the existing environment and neighboring buildings. The total project would be 3.125 acres with 280 dwelling units and 13,100 square feet of retail space. She explained that a public hearing was required for the zone change to a P District for the property presently zoned as Commercial Shopping (CS) and for the amendment to the General Development Plan. Per the drafted Town Center Form-Based Code, the buildings would be in the Core Subdistrict and the building types would be considered “storefront” which required retail on the main floor.

Ms. Pace showed renderings of the proposed buildings and said Building A would contain 7,900 square feet of ground floor retail fronting onto Center Street. Building B would have 1,000 square feet of ground floor retail on the corner of 130 East and Center Street. Building C contained 4,200 square feet of ground floor retail fronting Orchard Drive and in line with the commercial shopping center to the east. The building materials proposed are stacked stone, stucco, cement fiber board/hardie board, glass, and black metal awnings. Building C would replace a portion of the existing building between Atlas Academy and the remainder of the strip mall. Each building would be six stories in height with Buildings B and C to contain podium parking on the basement level. Commercial use is proposed for the street level of each building fronting Center Street and Orchard Drive with an emphasis on the corner of 130 East Center Street. Building B would contain amenities with a pool, spa, and clubhouse. Buildings A and C would have pet areas, rooftop amenities such as gathering spaces with seating, gas fireplaces, and BBQ grills. She showed the proposed floor plans of the unit types which included 106 studio/jr units, 96 one bedroom units, and 73 two bedroom units.

Sherrie Pace reiterated that Building A on 0.731 acres would have 7,900 square feet of retail with 25 studio apartments, 15 one bedroom apartments, and 10 two bedroom apartments for a total of 50 units. Building A at 120 East Center would not have a basement, the main floor would be retail, and it would have five stories of residential for a total of six stories. Building A would have a separate two story parking structure with 93 parking stalls. Building B would be on 0.88 acres with 1,000 square feet of retail containing 44 studio units, 40 one bedroom units, 33 two bedroom units for a total of 117 units and 112 parking stalls. Building B located at 140 East Center Street would be six stories including basement parking, some main floor parking with retail and amenities, and four stories of residential. Building C on 1.514 acres would have 4,200 square feet of retail, 37 studio units, 41 one bedroom units, 30 two bedroom units for a total of 108 units and 67 parking stalls on the basement level. Building C would also have a separate two story parking structure with 99 parking stalls as well as a surface parking lot with 44 stalls. Building C would be located at 166 East Center Street with basement parking, main floor retail and residential, and four stories of residential for a total of six stories. The total project contains 3.125 acres with 13,100 square feet of retail, 106 studio units, 96 one bedroom units, 73 two bedroom units, and a total of 412 parking stalls.

Sherrie Pace showed renderings of the three buildings on Center Street including the location of the buildings, parking stalls, and entrance/exit for parking. She explained that six units were

removed from Building C and 4,200 square feet of commercial space was added per feedback from the Planning Commission. The applicant proposes 412 parking spaces for the 275 dwellings units, a ratio of 1.5 spaces per unit. The General Plan recommended a 35% reduction to the current parking code requirements for the Town Center area. She explained that the parking table contained within the staff report which compares the standard parking requirement, the parking reduction recommended by the Town Center Master Plan of 65% of the standard, and the proposed standard within the draft Form Based Code. The standard requirement would be 2.25 stalls per residential unit is 619 stalls and 66 stalls for the retail/commercial uses, totaling 685 stalls. The recommended reduction in the Town Center Master Plan would require 445 stalls. The draft Form-Based Code requirement would be 312 residential parking stalls and 27 retail/commercial stalls totaling 412 spaces. The 27 on street parking spaces were not counted towards required parking counts and were for informational purposes only.

Ms. Pace reported that a parking study has been prepared by Hales Engineering. The analysis reviewed the standards required in code, the draft Form-Based Code, and to those listed for expected actual parking demand as listed in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) manual. The ITE recommendation for parking demand of this type of development would be 279 parking stalls. The Hales report recommends providing additional stalls for residential (5%) and retail (10%) for a total recommended parking of 295 stalls. The study makes a finding that the proposed 412 parking stalls would be sufficient based on the ITE manual and the draft Form-Based Code. The study notes that project success would be dependent upon good parking management strategies for leasing to tenants with one vehicle or less per apartment and as the property is close to transit lines it is expected that a great deal of the residents would utilize transit options. The study also notes that 50% of the units would meet the 80% AMI standard, based upon an initial concept plan. She explained that the scope of the project has changed and that the developer is proposing instead to place deed restrictions on 14 units at the 50% AMI and six units at the 30% AMI levels, as the development is expected to meet the 80% AMI rental rates without deed restriction based upon the developers market rate study.

Sherrie Pace said the proposed General Development Plan proposes a widened cross section on Center Street as recommended by the Town Center Master Plan with parallel parking, a park strip area containing stamped concrete/pavers, street trees, planter boxes, street lighting, and ten foot sidewalks adjacent to the buildings to promote pedestrian traffic in the Town Center. The final landscape plan would be submitted with the site plan application if the General Development Plan was approved by the City Council. The landscaping would be required to meet the City's water conservation ordinance which was adopted last year. She then presented renderings and aerial images of each building with views from different locations including Center Street and 130 East, overhead, and perspectives with a relationship to existing buildings.

Chair Larson opened the public hearing at 7:11 p.m.

Mackenzie Johnson read the public comments received via email into the public record. The first email was from Tom Johnson, 623 Ridgetop Circle, who was against additional high density housing in this area. He was concerned about parking and infrastructure. He elaborated on the City's Master Plan which called for a downtown commercial area with restaurants and shopping.

The next email was from Karen Albrand who felt the proposed project was an eyesore and presented more problems than benefits. She asked where the new tenants of the mixed use housing project would shop for groceries as the closest store was 25 minutes away via public transit. Ms. Albrand suggested that if the City wanted to be a walking/public transport community then it should be planned for before approving this project.

The third email was from Ron and Janet Jibson who stated that the City had already built more than their share of apartments in Davis County. They said the proposed area seemed more suited to additional commercial development which was needed. They urged the Commission to recommend a higher percentage of commercial property and limited apartment housing in the proposed area of development.

The fourth email was from Lorin Lewis who opposed the project and said the parking for the existing 52 townhomes was terrible as they parked on a narrow street and made two lane travel impossible. They mentioned overcrowding of schools, lack of grocery and other retail nearby, lack of a library or recreation center, affordable housing driving down property values, and the proposed structures blocking views.

The final email was from Susan Bendig, 232 Eagle Way, who was opposed to amending the plan to allow for additional apartment units. She felt that it would cause headaches with traffic (particularly by the school), water usage, and parking. Ms. Bending said that the City was changing from a lovely residential area to multiple high rise apartments that would detract from the small town feel.

Lawrence Knight, 157 South 300 East, said the parking, especially the underground parking, would not work due there not being enough elevation change on the property. He also said the parking on Building A would be located over the required storm water retention pond. Mr. Knight mentioned that other five story buildings in the City had to meet earthquake requirements and asked if that would be required with this development. He spoke on other similar proposed developments that residents did not approve of.

Sarah Sorensen, 413 East 100 North, commented that the developer had purchased an agreement that they did not want to fulfill. She said this project was not appropriate for what they had proposed due to infrastructure and the neighboring school already being at max capacity. She spoke on how the elementary school would be overwhelmed by additional students, the issues with drop off and pick up, and lack of safe school walking routes. She believed that the community desired commercial space in the area.

Tammy Finklea, 265 East 50 South, asked about the 20 units that were proposed to be affordable housing and asked for the definition of affordable housing and what those units would go for. She then asked what the other apartments would go for including a breakdown of each unit type (one bedroom, two bedroom, etc.). Sherrie Pace replied that there were three levels of affordable housing based on the area median income (AMI) at 80%, 50%, or 30% AMI. Those AMIs are a sliding scale based on household size and income. The figures she shared were based on a one person household size. The developer provided a market analysis which showed that the current market rental rate for a one bedroom apartment in the city was approximately \$1,225 a month (excluding utilities). Affordable housing costs including utilities equated to \$1,407 a month at 80% AMI, \$880 a month at 50% AMI, and \$528 per month at 30% AMI. She noted that the developer has requested assistance from the City's Redevelopment Agency (RDA) to facilitate the creation of the 20 affordable housing units in the form of rent subsidies. The proposal is that 14 units would be restricted to 50% AMI and 6 units at 30% AMI. The remainder of one bedroom units were expected to rent at market rate which qualified as affordable housing at the 80% AMI.

Tammy Finklea, 265 East 50 South, questioned who would want multiple six story buildings in their neighborhood. She felt most people would not want to see those types of buildings from their homes. She proposed this plan be built at the golf course instead. Ms. Finklea urged the Planning Commission and City Council to vote no on this proposed plan.

Bill Salisbury, 142 Mason Lane, urged the Commission not to approve this project. He spoke on issues with water, snow removal, and school safety.

Mary Gay Jones, 18 North Foxhill Road, compared the proposed development to the City Creek development and said this development was not well planned like City Creek. She suggested that the City require more stringent parking requirements. Ms. Jones said this development did not provide open space, a grocery store or other necessities, or other retail such as a movie theater. She felt the development would overwhelm the schools and current public transportation.

Christina Isan, 25 East Center Street, urged that the proposed amendment not be approved and the new developer be held to the existing development agreement that had already been approved. She said the proposed development would significantly change the feel of the area.

Chris Jones, 107 Orchard Drive, said the City had some leverage in the situation to negotiate for something better in this area. He wanted to see more owner occupied condos in this development instead of apartments. Mr. Jones also mentioned issues with parking, height of the buildings, and the need for a traffic study. He suggested requiring the developer to improve the exterior of the adjoining buildings such as the Sunshine Cafe.

Shane Gibbs, 113 Mason Lane, said this development was too large for this area of the City. He said the congestion around the elementary school was already unsafe. Mr. Gibbs suggested

building affordable homes under \$450,000 and providing those residents with a down payment through the new Senate Bill 240 for affordable housing.

JaNae Rawlings, 23 Walker Place, said she lived in the Towne Plaza townhomes which was part of the original project and spoke on the issues there including parking, rental/owner ratio, property management, and quality.

Mara Hansen, 69 South Mason Lane, spoke on issues in the area including parking, traffic, height of the proposed buildings, and safety of school children. She recommended doing away with on street parking on 130 East or at least restricting parking to one side. She suggested designing parking stalls and garages so that large vehicles such as trucks could safely park.

David Hansen, 69 South Mason Lane, was concerned about the school, traffic, snow on 130 East with parking on both sides of the street, and height of the buildings. He also mentioned that the length of the proposed buildings was too long.

Kelly Jones, 107 Osborn Circle, urged against approving the rezone and the proposed development. She felt the six story buildings were too tall and set a negative precedent. Ms. Jones said the resident parking at one car per unit was too low and asked how this would be enforced. She also mentioned issues with the five foot setbacks, street parking, and affordable housing. She suggested improvement of the attached strip mall and condominiums instead of apartments.

Bryce Johnson, 278 East Ellen Lane, was concerned with six story buildings in this area and parking. He recommended providing more green space, space for pets, and opportunities for first time homebuyers.

Caleb Falch, 30 South 130 East, commented that he lives in the Towne Plaza townhomes and the garage in his building was too small. He spoke on other parking issues and the safety of the 130 East.

Zachary Nesbit, 158 East 175 South, said that with the transfer of the property and the request to amend the already approved development, if approved, would set a precedent for other developers. He spoke on the danger of walking/driving around Orchard Elementary. Mr. Nesbitt said six stories was too high and did not fit the area.

Mariah Nesbit, 158 East 175 South, said the developer was required to fulfill their original agreement. She spoke on the dangers of 130 East with no school zone markings, other traffic problems, and how the six story buildings would change the feel of the area to a downtown similar to Salt Lake. Ms. Nesbitt was in favor of affordable housing including the previously suggested idea for subsidized single family homes. She asked that the application be sent back to the developer and the city make them fulfill their promises.

Debra Holdaway, 51 South 130 East, owned Atlas Academy and lives in the City. She said she purchased her property based on the City's Master Plan. Ms. Holdaway mentioned that there was not an easement with Atlas Academy for through traffic. She mentioned other issues including parking, vandalism, and the need for that cross access easement.

Brooke Muir, 1021 Parkway Drive, echoed the concerns about traffic and safety. She suggested a requirement in the City code for green space in future developments and asked for a safe walkway for the traffic circle in this area.

Cameron Hawkins, 75 South Orchard Drive, voiced opposition to the development as he lived across the street. He had concerns with the impact the development would have on the character of the neighborhood, the height of the buildings, parking for commercial, traffic, and pet waste.

Conrad Jacobson, 10 South Oakwood Drive, commented that he served on the Planning Commission for five years and ten years on the City Council. He spoke on the original proposal for townhomes and two office buildings from who they thought was an honest developer. The new developer was offering less than half of the commercial space. Mr. Jacobson said the Planning Commission did not have to approve the rezone to a P District or accept six story apartment buildings.

Brian Horrocks, 100 North Eaglewood Drive, said that he had also served on the Planning Commission and City Council. He said in hindsight more parking should have been added to almost every development. He mentioned how the cost of housing today requires roommates which equals more cars. Mr. Horrocks said he was on the City Council in 2015 when the Towne Plaza development was approved and at that time he asked the developer, Mr. Curtis, if the commercial/office buildings would be built. Dave Curtis promised to locate his own office in the building. Mr. Horrocks said most developments did change but there was a vision for this area and he did not believe this proposal followed in that plan to create a walkable downtown with retail.

Rita Auva'a, 77 South Orchard Drive, was in agreement with those that had spoken before and was in awe of the love the residents had for the City. She asked the Commission to stop the developers from just making money off the City. Ms. Auva'a expressed concern with kids walking across the busy street and the height of the buildings/view.

Bridger Dopp, 55 South Mason Lane, expressed concern with changing the feel of the area, parking, traffic congestion, and a safe walk to school. He spoke on the impact that apartments could have and how they only benefitted the developer/owner. Mr. Dopp said the development of this land was an opportunity to make the community better.

Mackenzie Townsend, 55 South Mason Lane, echoed previous statements regarding parking, the height of the proposed buildings, infrastructure, and the impact on schools. She shared that in the

past, she lived in apartments similar to those being proposed. She expressed gratitude for having a home with a yard and a view in the City. She asked if the proposal would be adding things that would benefit the community or just benefit the developer. Ms. Townsend wanted local businesses to come to the City.

Neil Galloway, 109 South Orchard Drive, said the proposal for the apartment complex was not feasible with the additional traffic and the safety of the school children. He was against the proposed development.

David Finkley, 265 East 50 South, said that most residents wanted a quiet, peaceful place to live with neighbors that cared about the City. He was happy to see the Mayor Brian Horrocks, voice his concern about the project. Mr. Finkley stated that he was opposed to the zone change and felt this was an area for retail and a gathering place for residents.

Missy White, 1019 Foxhill Road, said she understood the need for affordable housing but was concerned about losing the existing commercial, including the already lost bowling alley and the Winegars grocery store. She spoke on overcrowding in schools and additional traffic with more high density housing. She shared opposition to this development and scale of the proposed project.

Rob Beall, 57 South Orchard Drive, asked staff for a rendering showing Building C from the east side of Orchard Drive to the west. He then expressed the same concerns with traffic/congestion, large high density development, the proposed height, parking, and pet waste in his yard.

Charlotte Maxwell, 300 East 81 South, spoke on how the proposed buildings were too tall for this area and suggested allowing the residents to vote on what they wanted for the property. Ms. Maxwell proposed that tiny houses on the property would be a better fit.

JennaLynn Meldrum, 44 South Main Street, said she had lived in multiple apartments in other cities for the last 14 years and asked about garbage collection at the proposed development. She said that her current apartment building, Ridgeview, had garbage pickup at the door and then the waste was mismanaged so it was unpleasant as a resident. She asked if there would be space allotted for u-hauls and storage pods to park when people moved in and out. Ms. Meldrum suggested locations in the parking garages for cars to turnaround.

Matthew Dennis, 66 Mason Lane, said residents did not want high density at any level in this area. He asked for community buildings in this area and things that would benefit residents. He asked if another public hearing would be held if the developer brought forward another proposal. Chair Larson replied that if the developer decided to build the original two office/commercial buildings that there would not be another hearing. If the developer asked for any other accommodations such as a zone change or height allowance, there would be another public hearing.

Michelle Fairbanks, 856 West 3600 South, said this development would be an eyesore. She was opposed to the development and spoke on street parking issues and how this would make the area like downtown Salt Lake.

Tammy Clayton, 524 East Sider Drive, said these buildings did not belong in this area. She spoke on issues with garbage, emergency service access, and a lack of nearby retail such as a grocery store. Ms. Clayton asked that the Commission and the developer listen to the residents.

Forrest Cordova, 73 Kingdon Lane, spoke on the issues of traffic, infrastructure, high density housing, and the feel of the City.

Scot Mathews, 640 Park View Drive, mentioned the original Master Plan with good retail/commercial development. He said the City was now known for high density and used car lots and the community lacked a sense of identity. Mr. Mathews was concerned with future development in the City and the implementation of the Master Plan.

Lyle Nelson, 83 South Orchard Drive, said his primary concerns were traffic and parking including emergency and garbage pickup services. He encouraged the Commission to drive by 130 East around school pickup time. He mentioned potential problems with visitor parking and asked the Commission to not approve the proposed development.

Lisa Midgley, 26 South Walker Lane, spoke on the lack of sense of community due to there not being places to shop, eat, or meet with neighbors. She said this development would change the community, traffic, walkability, and the potential for what could be.

Rachel Beall said that this project did not fit in the community. She spoke about the amount of people and cars that this development could bring. She also spoke on the legacy of the Commission and Council and the need to deny this project.

Daniel Shaffer, 189 East 175 South, said that this development was not for the City or Davis County. He spoke on the issues of water and building height.

Chair Larsen closed the public hearing at 8:57 p.m.

Commissioner Holbrook asked if Buildings A and B were already part of a P District and in the Core subdistrict. He asked about the current building height allowed in the Core. Sherrie Pace replied that buildings A & B are in the drafted Form-Based Code Core Subdistrict and the proposed code for the Core was five and a half stories. Commissioner Holbrook then asked if Building C would be considered in the Edge subdistrict and for the allowable height there. Ms. Pace replied that Building C would be in the drafted Center and Orchard subdistrict which would allow for three and a half stories. Commissioner Holbrook asked if a developer could come in and develop the land with 5.5 stories where building A and B are and 3.5 stories where building

C is without a public hearing. Ms. Pace said no because the property was zoned as a P District and Commercial Shopping (CS) and the drafted Form-Based Code had not been adopted. She elaborated that the two office and retail buildings which were already entitled were currently part of a P District and the rezone was for the additional property currently zoned Commercial Shopping (CS).

Chair Larson asked the Commissioners for input on the zone change from CS to P District.

Commissioner Jorgensen reiterated that nothing he heard in the public hearing swayed him for a zone change. He had concerns with the multistory buildings and the lack of retail and was not convinced this was the right development for the property. He was not in favor of advancing the zone change.

Commissioner Stone was not in favor of approving the zone change. Commissioner Tucker commented that he was still against the zone change as well.

Commissioner Ward thanked the public and said they reflected a lot of the same concerns he had. He said the height and scope did not match the character of the neighborhood. He would not be recommending approval. Commissioner Tucker said he was concerned with the height and traffic. He said that the commercial buildings would not impact the traffic the same way as the proposed development would. He stated that this was not the right place for this development.

Commissioner Holbrook said the public opinion influenced his opinion. He had been excited about some aspects of the development including the main floor retail concept and affordable housing promised by the project. He spoke on the need for gathering spaces and restaurants. He said this project did not match what was intended for the City Core.

Chair Larson asked about the next step if the Planning Commission did not recommend the zone change. Sherrie Pace explained that the Commission had several options: vote to deny the zone change and general development plan amendment; table action and direct the developer to make specific changes for future consideration; or craft a motion to recommend approval with amendments to the plan, which could exclude the additional property, recommend fewer stories/residential units, more retail space, or parking, etc.

Commissioner Maus commented that she was grateful for the public comments and was in agreement with the remarks made by the other Planning Commissioners. She had issues with the proposed height as well and would not be in favor of moving forward with a recommendation of approval.

Commissioner Ward moved that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council the denial of the proposed amendment to the Towne Plaza P-District and General Development Plan Amendment for The Lofts at North Lake project. Commissioner

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

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

Sherrie Pace reported that at the City Council meeting on March 7, 2023, the City Council approved the code amendment to the R1-7 and RM-7 zone related to the minimum lot size for two family dwellings (duplexes).

Mackenzie Johnson reminded the Planning Commission of the required training for the fiscal year.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Planning Commission meeting minutes of February 28, 2023 were reviewed and approved.

Commissioner Tucker moved to approve the meeting minutes for the Planning Commission February 28, 2023 meeting as written. Commissioner Stone seconded the motion. The motion was approved by Commissioners Holbrook, Jorgensen, Larson, Maus, Stone, Tucker and Ward.

5. ADJOURN

Commission Chair Larson adjourned the meeting at 9:20 p.m.

The foregoing was approved by the Planning Commission of the City of North Salt Lake on Tuesday, March 28, 2023 by unanimous vote of all members present.


Wendy Page, City Recorder

