

Minutes of the Planning Commission meeting held on Thursday, September 21, 2017, at 6:30 p.m. in the Murray City Municipal Council Chambers, 5025 South State Street, Murray, Utah.

Present: Buck Swaney, Chair
Maren Patterson
Travis Nay
Sue Wilson
Scot Woodbury
Lisa Milkavich
Tim Tingey, Administrative & Development Services Director
Jared Hall, Community & Economic Development Supervisor
Jim McNulty, Development Services Manager
Mark Boren, Zoning Officer/Assistant Planner
Susan Nixon, Associate Planner
Briant Farnsworth, Senior City Attorney
Citizens

Excused: Phil Markham, Vice Chair

The Staff Review meeting was held from 6:00 to 6:30 p.m. The Planning Commission members briefly reviewed the applications on the agenda. An audio recording is available at the Murray City Community and Economic Development Division Office.

Buck Swaney opened the meeting and welcomed those present. He reviewed the public meeting rules and procedures.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Woodbury made a motion to approve the minutes from the September 7, 2017 Planning Commission meeting. Seconded by Ms. Wilson.

A voice vote was made, motion passes 6-0.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

There were no conflicts of interest.

APPROVAL OF FINDINGS OF FACT

Mr. Woodbury made a motion to approve the Findings of Fact for K 9 Lifeline, LLC, and a Certificate of Appropriateness for the Murray City Fire Department. Mr. Nay seconded the motion.

A voice vote was made, motion passes 6-0.

REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF MURRAY CITY – Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition of Structures - 15,17,19 West 5th Avenue, 22 East 5th Avenue, 21 West 4th Avenue, 28, 32, 36 East 4th Avenue, 4904 & 4918 South Poplar Street - Project #17-123 – Public Hearing

Jared Hall reviewed the location and request for Certificate of Appropriateness for the Demolition of structures located in the MCCD zone. Mr. Hall stated all demolitions within the MCCD zone require COA. These buildings are not on the list of historically significant structures. The building located at 4918 South Poplar Street is on the Historic Register and it was documented by Mary Ann Kirk of the History Advisory Board indicating they have had a

chance to take photographs and conduct a survey. Mr. Hall review the location of each property and stated 4918 and 4904 South Poplar Street, 36, 32 and 28 East 4th Avenue, 22 East 5th Avenue all have residential dwellings but are currently vacant. 19 West 5th Avenue is a commercial use with an automotive shop, 15 West 5th Avenue is a home, 17 West 5th Avenue is a vacant dwelling, 21 West 4th Avenue is a vacant shop. All the properties are owned by the Murray City Redevelopment Agency. The purpose of the demolitions is to make way for the new developments plan for the downtown area. Staff does assert that these proposed demolitions are in support of the goals of the General Plan to create the Civic Center in the downtown area. Based on the information presented in this report, application materials submitted and the site review, staff recommends approval of Certificates of Appropriateness allowing for the demolition of structures located 15,17,19 West 5th Avenue, 22 East 5th Avenue, 21 West 4th Avenue, 28, 32, 36 East 4th Avenue, 4904 & 4918 South Poplar Street subject to conditions.

Mr. Nay asked if the lot line between 19 West and 15 West actually bisects both buildings. Mr. Hall stated yes, they do bisect both buildings and are listed as two separate parcels.

Tim Tingey, Executive Director of the Redevelopment Agency, 5025 South State Street, stated he has reviewed the conditions and will be able to comply. Mr. Tingey addressed the future plans for the downtown area and stated the City received direction from both the Redevelopment Agency Board and City Council to facilitate redevelopment of this area. It has been a redevelopment area for three or four decades now with the hope that this area will be rehabilitated. He stated that city staff received direction from the City Council over a year ago to consider this area for possible public facilities to include rights-of-way, open space elements, relocation of the Fire Station and the possibility of a new city hall. The city will receive public input on this in the future. The City has concerns with these buildings remaining vacant for a long period of time, as there have already had some issues with arson in other vacant buildings.

The public hearing was opened for public comment.

DeLynn Barney, 4902 South Box Elder Street, stated he lives in Murray near the redevelopment area. Mr. Barney stated that he and his family moved to Murray in the 1960's and has lived in this house since. Mr. Barney stated he strongly objects to the demolition of his neighborhood, residential properties and commercial business that remain. Mr. Barney recalled some of the buildings and businesses he visited as a child when he first moved to Murray and stated that this was and continues to be a walkable neighborhood. Mr. Barney encouraged the preservation and protection of some of the homes and businesses in the neighborhood.

Kathleen Stanford, 487 East Vine Street, stated she hopes the City does not have too many demolitions after this because she has concerns that a lot of our resources are going into the landfill and hopes to work things out.

The public comment portion was closed.

Mr. Woodbury asked about the future development plans for this area and potential demolitions in the City. Mr. Tingey stated the future demolition requests are 4800 South down to Vine Street and State Street to the Trax, but are limited only to the properties that the Redevelopment Agency owns. The City is only looking at acquiring three other properties which are in currently under negotiations. The city is not planning on acquiring additional

properties now.

Ms. Wilson asked which structures the City is planning to retain. Mr. Tingey answered the Murray Mansion, Murray Chapel, and Townsend Home are owned by the City and will be retained.

Ms. Milkavich asked if the City owns other historic buildings that are not a part of this discussion. Mr. Tingey answered yes, the City owns the Murray Theatre and the City is requesting state funding to refurbish it along with a few other historic buildings within Murray City.

Mr. Woodbury thanked Mr. Tingey for elaborating on the future demolition plans in the City and explained that it is important to know the wider scope of applications so the City can progress but also retain the past.

Mr. Woodbury made a motion to grant approval of Certificates of Appropriateness allowing for the demolition of structures located at 15,17,19 West 5th Avenue, 22 East 5th Avenue, 21 West 4th Avenue, 28, 32, 36 East 4th Avenue, 4904 & 4918 South Poplar Street subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicants shall obtain demolition permits from the Murray City Building Division, meeting all the requirements thereof.
2. The applicants shall assure that utility billing is disconnected and service terminated for the property prior to demolition.
3. The applicant shall repair any concrete sidewalk, curb and gutter, and/or roadway that is damaged as a result of planned demolition work.
4. The applicant shall obtain a Murray City Land Disturbance Permit if any contiguous parcels form an area greater than one acre.

Seconded by Ms. Patterson.

Call vote recorded by Mr. Hall.

 A Scot Woodbury
 A Maren Patterson
 A Sue Wilson
 A Travis Nay
 A Lisa Milkavich
 A Buck Swaney

Motion passed 6-0.

WESTECH INDUSTRIAL ELECTRICAL – 4568 South 200 West - Project #17-136

Larry Christensen was the applicant present to represent this request. Mark Boren reviewed the location and request for Conditional Use Permit approval to conduct an electrical contracting business at the property addressed 4568 South 200 West located in the M-G zone. The building is a 2,340 square feet office and 5,000 square foot warehouse facility. The property also includes a residential home to the east. The property has one van accessible

ADA parking stall, and a total of 19 parking stalls which meets all requirements. The warehouse will be used mostly for inventory and equipment storage. The residential dwelling in the front is fenced in and the warehouse is located behind. Mr. Boren reviewed some of the conditions of approval and stated that any racking over 5 feet 9 inches requires a building permit from the City. The Fire Department recommends the removal of the two-above ground fuel storage tanks. A restriction of operation hours will be limited due to the proximity of the apartment complex located directly south of this property. Additional landscaping will be required to be installed on the south and west sides of the property. Based on the information presented in this report, application materials submitted and the site review, staff recommends approval of a Conditional Use Permit for the electrical contracting business subject to conditions.

Mr. Woodbury asked if the dumpster located on the property is permanent. Mr. Boren stated the dumpster is permanent and will be located behind the building, the entire property is fenced with a gate that is closed and locked nightly, it is screened and will not be visible from the street.

Larry Christensen, Westech Electric, living at 5056 Lucky Clover Lane, stated he has reviewed the conditions and will be able to comply. Mr. Christensen stated that the usual hours of operation are 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. and generally not operating on weekends. The fuel tanks are ready to be removed. Mr. Christensen asked what type of approved landscaping can be installed, as he will be working with the owner to install it. Mr. Swaney stated that the landscaping details can be worked out with staff after the meeting. Mr. Christensen stated he is working with HOJ Engineering on the rack designs to determine the load weight and anchoring points.

The meeting was opened for public comment. There were no comments and the public comment portion was closed.

Ms. Milkavich asked if the landscaping installation is the responsibility of the property owner or business owner. Mr. Boren stated, typically staff will work with both property owner and business owner, either can fulfil the requirements. Mr. Swaney stated in the past it has been either way, or whoever is willing to fulfill the landscaping requirements.

Mr. Nay made a motion to grant Conditional Use Permit approval of the electrical contracting business located at 4568 South 200 West subject to the following conditions:

1. The project shall meet all applicable building and fire code standards.
2. Building permits shall be obtained for any remodeling, tenant improvements, or racking for inventory or equipment storage greater than 5 feet 9 inches in height.
3. All above ground fuel storage tanks shall be removed from the site.
4. The hours of operation are limited to no earlier than 7a.m. and no later than 9p.m.
5. Additional drought tolerant plant material shall be installed in the landscaped areas of the south and west sides of the property.
6. The applicant shall obtain a Murray City Business License before commencing business operations at this location.

Seconded by Ms. Milkavich.

Call vote recorded by Mr. Hall.

 A Travis Nay
 A Lisa Milkavich
 A Sue Wilson
 A Maren Patterson
 A Scot Woodbury
 A Buck Swaney

Motion passed 6-0.

FIXNOU, LLP - 150 West 4800 South #6 - Project #17-136

Dave Gantulga was the applicant present to represent this request. Jim McNulty reviewed the location and request for a Conditional Use Permit to operate a restoration contractor business at the property addressed 150 West 4800 South, and proposes to move to this location to have a larger space to operate from. The unit is comprised of a warehouse, office and restroom that are approximately 2,400 total square feet. The site has about 75 parking spaces in total and an ADA parking space will need to be added to be in compliance. Parking for the use is calculated to need four parking spaces including the ADA parking space, which also needs to be restriped. The dumpster which is visible from the street must be enclosed with a fenced. Landscaping meets requirements, no changes are needed. Mr. McNulty commented that this is one applicant needing to upgrade the area, but the entire property needs to be upgraded. Mr. McNulty suggested that the owner should be involved in the property upgrades which would include the dumpster enclosure requirements and that City staff will work with him. Based on the information presented in this report, application materials submitted and the site review, Staff recommends approval of a Conditional Use Permit for a restoration contractor business located at 150 West 4800 South #6 subject to conditions.

Mr. Nay asked if the business would be allowed to store any type of damaged goods or debris inside the warehouse. Mr. McNulty stated he is not aware of any ordinance that would prevent him from storing any type of debris related to his business in the unit and referred to the applicant for additional information.

Dave Gantulga, Fixnou, LLC, 4141 South 500 West, stated he has reviewed the conditions and will be able to comply. Mr. Gantulga added that the demolition is done on site and a dumpster is usually rented and dropped at the job site, then picked up by the dumpster company and hauled away, rarely would any trash be brought into the unit. Mr. Gantulga had concerns about enclosing the dumpster on the property.

The meeting was opened for public comment. There were no comments and the public comment portion was closed.

Ms. Wilson made a motion to approve a Conditional Use Permit for a restoration contractor business located at 150 West 4800 South #6 subject to the following conditions:

1. The project shall meet all applicable building and fire code standards.

2. Building permits shall be obtained for any construction.
3. The business shall be inspected by the Central Valley Water Reclamation Facility and comply with all Murray City Water & Sewer requirements along with those of Central Valley.
4. The parking in front of the unit shall be restriped to provide a van accessible ADA parking stall which complies with the standards for disabled person parking stalls as outlined in Section 17.72.070 of the Murray City Land Use Ordinance.
5. The trash container shall be screened as required by Section 17.76.170 of the Murray City Land Use Ordinance.
6. The applicant shall obtain a Murray City Business License for this location.

Seconded by Mr. Nay.

Call vote recorded by Mr. Hall.

 A Sue Wilson
 A Travis Nay
 A Lisa Milkavich
 A Maren Patterson
 A Scot Woodbury
 A Buck Swaney

Motion passed 6-0.

VILLAGE GARDEN SUBDIVISION – Lot #13 & 14 - 4572 & 4578 South Box Elder Street - Project #17-133

Jim McNulty reviewed the location and request for approval for the proposed lot line adjustment between two properties located in the Village Gardens Subdivision addressed 4572 & 4578 South Box Elder Street in the R-1-6 zone. The R-1-6 zone requires a minimum lot size of 6,000 square feet. Mr. McNulty stated the properties are narrow and deep and if split, parcel one would become 6,200 square feet and parcel two would be 23,431 square feet, both meeting code requirements. Parcel two would become “L” shape and acquire the detached structure in its lot. If approved, it is important that the applicant follow up with the title company and have the titles changed on both properties as well as changing them with the County. Based on the information presented in this report, application materials submitted and the site review, staff recommends approval of the proposed lot line adjustment for the properties addressed 4572 & 4578 South Box Elder Street subject to conditions.

Katherine Sadler, 127 West 5900 South, stated she has reviewed the conditions and will be able to comply.

Ms. Wilson recommended to the applicant, that if this is approved to go immediately to the title company and have the parcel # separated and plat lines recorded. Ms. Sadler stated the title company is aware of the proposal and both properties have already been sold contingent on this approval tonight. Ms. Sadler stated she appreciated the suggestion and will make the change.

The meeting was opened for public comment. No comments were made and the public comment portion was closed.

Mr. Woodbury made a motion to approve the proposed lot line adjustment for the properties addressed 4572 & 4578 South Box Elder Street subject to the following conditions:

1. The project shall comply with all Murray City lot line adjustment requirements which includes the following:
 - (a) The notice of approval of the property line adjustment shall be completed and recorded prior to the execution of the lot line adjustment;
 - (b) The lot line adjustment shall be completed by either plat or deed following the recordation of the notice of approval.
2. A copy of all recorded documents associated with this application shall be provided to the Murray City Community Development Division

Seconded by Ms. Milkavich.

Call vote recorded by Mr. Hall.

 A Scot Woodbury
 A Lisa Milkavich
 A Travis Nay
 A Sue Wilson
 A Maren Patterson
 A Buck Swaney

Motion passed 6-0.

LORRAINE O'DRISCOLL - 99 West Wilson Avenue - Project #17-135

Lorraine O'Driscoll was the applicant present to represent this request. Jared Hall reviewed the location and request for a Zone Map Amendment from M-G, Manufacturing General to R-1-8, Single-Family Residential for a portion (approximately 1,500 sq.ft.) of the property addressed 99 West Wilson Avenue. Mr. Hall stated that previously, the properties were owned by a family trust and has since then been sold and now has two separate owners. One property has a single-family home and the other a commercial business located on them. A survey that was done found that the property line runs down the middle of a commercial building on one of the properties and the corner of the residential dwelling. The solution was to adjust the property line to go around the building and dwelling separating them onto separate properties, this was already done administratively. The request for zone change is only for a small portion of the property that bows out around the dwelling and is currently zoned M-G, and proposed to be re-zoned R-1-8 to match the main lot.

Based on the information presented in this report, application materials submitted and the site review, staff recommends approval to the City Council for the request to amend the Zoning Map from M-G to R-1-8 on a portion of the property located at 99 West Wilson Avenue subject to conditions.

Mr. Nay stated there is a small out building (playhouse) that also has a property line through it and asked if this property line will move. Mr. Hall stated it is a play house and the property

owner will address this issue tonight.

Lorraine O'Driscoll, 126 East Oak Ridge Drive, stated she has reviewed the conditions and will be able to comply. Ms. O'Driscoll stated the playhouse has been removed.

The meeting was opened for public comment. No comments were made and the public comment portion was closed.

Ms. Wilson made a motion to forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council for the request to amend the Zoning Map from M-G to R-1-8 on a portion of the property located at 99 West Wilson Avenue.

Seconded by Mr. Woodbury.

Call vote recorded by Mr. Hall.

 A Sue Wilson
 A Scot Woodbury
 A Maren Patterson
 A Travis Nay
 A Lisa Milkavich
 A Buck Swaney

Motion passed 6-0.

LAND USE TEXT AMENDMENT – Title 17.170 – Requirements for Nonresidential Uses on ground floors in the MCCD Zone - Project #17-130

Kipling Shepard was the applicant present to represent this request. Jared Hall reviewed the request to amend the text of Section 17.170.080(B) of the Murray City Land Use Ordinance which prohibits residential development on the ground floor in multi-family residential projects within the MCCD zone. The applicant is proposing to develop in the MCCD zone and has requested to add language to Land Use #1130 (Multiple Family Dwelling, Residential not permitted on Ground Floor) and Land Use #1150 (Apartment High-Rise, Residential not permitted on Ground Floor) to allow 15% of the ground floor to be potentially used for non-residential uses that are related to the residential use above such as, a leasing office, exercise room or lobby entrance.

Staff prepared some information for the meeting with the MCCD and addressed several concerns. The MCCD Design Committee weighed in on this amendment request during the meeting and agreed with Staffs counter-proposal. The applicant's proposal allowed the 15% without a total square footage limit. Without limits to the square footage allowed within the 15% it has the potential to take up a large, uncapped portion of building frontage that the City wishes to be reserved for non-residential development such as commercial development that faces the street and creates the type of development the City wants in the MCCD. With that concern in mind Staff suggested a modified version to be used that states: residential uses are not permitted on the ground floor of multi-story residential buildings with the exception of a leasing office or lobby allowing access to the upper floors. Such uses shall not occupy more than 15% of the ground floor and no more than 1,000 square feet, whichever is less. In summary, this would reduce the allowance for types of uses to only leasing offices and lobbies for entrance to upper floors and to cap the 15% allowance at a maximum of 1,000 square feet. This was presented to the DRC and they agreed with staff based on the

presentations. Staff feels that the suggested text is a good balance that allows street frontage without interfering in the commercial development of the street frontage while still producing a nice lobby and leasing area. We want the residential units to be successful and feel that the allowance will help promote them, as well as be in support of the goals of the General Plan to provide a mix of land uses, support a healthy community comprised of livable neighborhoods and vibrant economic districts.

Based on the information presented in this report, and application materials submitted, Staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council for a text amendment to Section 17.170.110 of the Murray City Land Use Ordinance.

Kipling Shepard, CEO, Wasatch Affordable Ventures, stated he appreciated the efforts made by staff on behalf of his request. Mr. Shepard further stated that they asked for a consideration of more space but not on a frontage of the building. Mr. Shepard additionally proposed to add two allowances, one square footage cap on frontage and one square footage cap in the rear, off the frontage.

Mr. Swaney asked Mr. Shepard if they could have the extra square footage what would they do with it. Mr. Shepard answered that it would be related to the residential use, and provide a presence.

Ms. Milkavich asked how much additional space are they suggesting. Mr. Shepard answered they would like 500 to 1000 square feet more.

Mr. Woodbury asked Mr. Shepard to compare his experiences with other cities to Murray City regarding project allowances. Mr. Shepard stated he does not have a direct comparison but said the requirement for 100% percent commercial on the lower floor has only been encountered one other time and it is in relation to how the frontage appears.

Mr. Hall addressed the request for extra square footage and stated Staff did consider larger amounts which started at 1,500 square feet and went down from there after looking at other projects in neighboring cities. Mr. Hall further stated the square footage is primarily to allow for a leasing office and an area that could be used to access the upper floors and mailboxes which could be achieved without impacting the street frontage. Staff stated they are still more comfortable with the 1,000-square foot limit and does not see a need for it to be greater for the type of projects they see coming. Mr. Hall added that there may be a time in the future when the market may be different and could warrant a change to the square foot limits or uses on the ground floor.

Ms. Patterson asked why would we not include a condition to protect frontage rather than limiting the square footage or uses. Mr. Hall stated that the original request was a simple text amendment and Staff did not include additional changes beyond the proposal because Staff is comfortable with the allowances as they exist in the ordinance. Staff does not feel comfortable at this time recommending additional changes.

Mr. Swaney used the Council Chambers as an example of what approximately 1,000 square feet looks like, and stated that a large building that could have 100 or more residential units in it has a 1,000-square foot residential use area would seem small in comparison especially if it will be used for the leasing office and the elevators and restrooms. Mr. Hall stated that any hallways used to access the lobby, or elevators themselves would not be counted in that

square footage. Mr. Nay asked if a development wanted to have a 20-foot-wide hallway would the city be ok with it. Mr. Hall stated he would have to see the layout in plans to know and added that typically, when we calculate usable space we do not calculate hallway space. Mr. Nay asked if restrooms and elevators are counted in the 1,000 feet totals. Mr. Hall stated they are not calculated in the totals.

Mr. McNulty recalled the slides that were presented earlier as part of the presentation which showed similar uses that had grand lobbies, tall ceilings and leasing areas that measure out at about the same square footage and work well. Mr. McNulty added that these uses are newer to our City development and we want to feel it out before we allow a lot of concessions. The city does not want a lot of changes to the ordinance now.

Ms. Wilson asked if we could revisit the square footage requirements in the future. Mr. Hall stated that nothing now would preclude a possible change in the future.

Mr. Swaney commented that going from zero square feet to 1,000 square feet seems like a large allowance. Mr. McNulty added that it is his understanding that a lot of Multi Family housing projects are happening in the valley, and the uses other than leasing office and lobbies are being required to go in on second, third and fourth floors. In some cases, they are even putting in individual workout areas on each floor.

The meeting was opened for public comment. No comments were made and the public comment portion was closed.

Ms. Patterson commented that she feels staff has done a great job researching this and does not agree with an uncapped 15% allowance on the ground floor but feels that a concession of 1,000 square feet versus 1,500 square feet is a manageable change. Ms. Wilson stated she agreed with Ms. Patterson.

Mr. Woodbury stated he agreed with Ms. Patterson and also agreed that the frontage is more valuable, and having space that extends back behind elevators feels benign and wants the frontage and walkable downtown to succeed and would also like to see an allowance for the 1,500 square feet but understands Staffs reasons.

Ms. Milkavich stated she also agrees with Mr. Woodbury and Ms. Patterson but also respects the limit of 1,000 square feet, as the consequences of allowing additional space is unknown at this time.

Mr. Swaney stated that he is very familiar with Multi-family buildings in a lot of different cities and agrees with the 1,500 square foot threshold because the more people you have inhabiting an area the more important the common areas become.

All Commissioners agreed that no matter the square foot allowance the frontage should be protected.

Mr. Woodbury stated that four Commissioners are not in agreement with Staffs proposal, but the challenge is that we don't want to hold up this amendment and feel that City Council could make a change if they feel it appropriate as well. Ms. Wilson stated she feels the 1,500 hundred square feet is a very appropriate allowance while protecting the commercial frontage is doable.

Mr. Hall stated that a leasing office, elevators and lobby area are amply served thought a 1,000-square foot space. Mr. Nay added that a leasing office should be able to adequately function simply with a front desk and two offices within the 1,000-square foot allowance.

Mr. Woodbury stated that he envisioned a grand lobby where residents could inhabit and socialize. Mr. Hall replied that is not the intent of the lobby, instead residents could socialize in a club room on the second floor. The ground floor is meant for commercial uses foremost but this would be additional area for the leasing office and an entrance from the frontage area.

Mr. Nay asked what the parking requirements are for a development such as this. Mr. Hall stated parking areas are available for people to use with separate entrances and this is an additional access, not the sole access.

Ms. Milkavich asked if the lobby is a communal area, but used for a different purpose than socializing. Mr. Hall stated yes, we are providing a common space that may have some area to sit but the true intent is not to provide pools, exercise rooms or club rooms.

Mr. Woodbury stated that he has been in some other apartment buildings in New York, Chicago and London where you would walk down an uninviting narrow hallway on the ground floor to access the residents on the upper floors without a nice open lobby. Mr. Woodbury further stated he does appreciate the efforts of Staff to make a more open, inviting ground floor leasing office and welcome reception area and feels that the open discussion has been productive.

Mr. McNulty reminded the Commission that this ground floor restriction of 1,000 square feet is for the MCCD zone only. The City is not looking at it to accommodate a certain project, instead to amend the text and set policy for the City. The recommendation to City Council is for approval, disapproval or a change to it, but the City Council will make the final decision on it.

Mr. Tingey stated he supports the proposal that Staff has presented and reminded all that as of now the City does not allow residential amenities on the ground floor in the MCCD. It was purposely put in place by the Council because we don't want the pendulum to shift to this being a multi-family area. We have had a lot of push back over the years to eliminate the lower level commercial, and we are trying to hold the line because this is a mixed-use area. This is an opportunity to allow just a little bit of residential use to facilitate the residents, but this is meant to be fully commercial.

Mr. Woodbury made a motion to forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council for a text amendment to Section 17.170.110 of the Murray City Land Use Ordinance as City as recommended by City Staff.

Seconded by Ms. Patterson.

Call vote recorded by Mr. Hall.

 A Scot Woodbury
 A Maren Patterson
 A Sue Wilson
 A Travis Nay
 A Lisa Milkavich

A Buck Swaney

Motion passed 6-0.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. McNulty stated at this time, he is aware that three Commissioners have signed up for the Fall APA Conference in Park City and hopes the Commissioners will be able to attend the October 5, 2017 Planning Commission Meeting as they are needed for a quorum.

Mr. McNulty mentioned that Mr. Pelch, who is the owner and operator of Exclusive Architectural Products on Riley Lane will be brought back to the Planning Commission for revocation of the Conditional Use Permit. At which time, it will have been approximately 180 days since his Conditional Use Permit was granted and has yet to meet his conditions of approval. The Revocation letter was hand delivered to him on 9/21/2017 as well as delivery through certified mail to inform him. Staff has visited his property, called and worked with him to get the conditions met, but he is not really reacting to the demands of the city to come into compliance.

Mr. McNulty stated that Staff has been working on the Sign code and hopes to have a first draft to present in the next 30 days so we can start moving forward with it.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:54 p.m.

Jared Hall, Supervisor
Community and Economic Development