

The Planning Commission met on Thursday, July 2, 2020, at 6:30 p.m. for a meeting held electronically in accordance with Executive Order 2020-5 Suspending the Enforcement of Provisions of Utah Code 52-4-202 and 52-4-207 due to Infectious Disease COVID-19 Novel Coronavirus issued by Gary Herbert on March 18, 2020.

Present: Phil Markham, Chair  
Scot Woodbury, Vice Chair  
Travis Nay  
Maren Patterson  
Sue Wilson  
Ned Hacker  
Lisa Milkavich  
Jared Hall, Planning Division Manager  
Susan Nixon, Associate Planner  
Zac Smallwood, Associate Planner  
Briant Farnsworth, Deputy City Attorney

The Staff Review meeting was held from 6:00 p.m. 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 Department Office.

Scot Woodbury opened the meeting and welcomed those present. He reviewed the public meeting rules and procedures. He said the commission would like Item #4 – Vertical Bridge Development, LLC to be moved to Item #8 and Item #8 – Fashion Place West Small Area Plan will be moved to Item #4.

Phil Markham made a motion to switch Item #4 with Item #8. The motion was seconded by Travis Nay. A voice vote was made, motion passed 7-0.

Mr. Markham said that he is typically the Chair of these meetings. He and Mr. Woodbury came to an agreement during the last meeting to allow each of them to alternate, whenever possible, in chairing the meetings.

#### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were no minutes to approve.

#### CONFLICT OF INTEREST

There were no conflicts of interest.

#### APPROVAL OF FINDINGS OF FACT

Sue Wilson made a motion to approve the Findings of Fact for a Conditional Use Permit to allow vehicle sales at the property located at 139 West 4500 South Unit #22 for Sehroz Rayne dba Car Deal, LLC; for a Conditional Use Permit for a Quick Quack carwash building at 5565 South 900 East; and a Conditional Use Permit for Youthlinc, LLC to construct a new building for the operation of an afterschool youth community center at 346 East 4500 South. Seconded by Phil Markham. A voice vote was made, motion passed 7-0.

FASHION PLACE WEST SMALL AREA PLAN – 200-300 West Winchester Street (generally) – Project #20-001

Zac Smallwood introduced Mark Morris with VODA Landscape and Planning.

Mr. Morris noted that Annaliese Eichelberg was also online for this presentation. Mr. Morris said during the past few months, they had to adjust their approach to public outreach due to COVID-19, but they received good results from an online public survey. Ms. Eichelberg said the online survey was done in lieu of the second public open house that they were unable to hold. The survey consisted of 18 different questions and was distributed through Facebook and Instagram. They received 155 responses.

When people were asked what words they would use to describe the attributes of the neighborhood, the most common responses were busy, traffic, congested, convenient, and central. That tells them that although traffic is not ideal, this is a popular area and redevelopment of this area is valuable. The survey results showed the following:

- The most common destination when visiting this neighborhood is shopping.
- The biggest challenge facing this neighborhood is traffic.
- Using a car and walking are the most common types of transportation to get to and from the Trax Station.
- Lighting, fixing sidewalks, and crosswalks are the top public improvements people would like to see made in this neighborhood.
- Cottage Cluster and Accessory Dwelling Units are the most desired types of housing for this neighborhood.
- The biggest housing issues in the neighborhood are affordability and construction.

Ms. Eichelberg said the two biggest components of this plan are working with design guidelines and connectivity issues.

Mr. Morris said the most significant pieces of the project are the Utah Transit Authority (UTA) Trax Platform at the end of Winchester Street and Fashion Place Mall and developing connectivity between them. State Street and I-215 are difficult barriers to overcome when it comes to connectivity. They have met with staff from UTA and the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) to talk over the possibilities of improving vehicular connectivity in the neighborhood.

They looked at bicycle connectivity and ways it can be improved to make it a more active piece of transportation, especially for those who are going a short distance. The Porter Rockwell Trail extension is on the long range plan for the Wasatch Front Regional Council. That will be a significant connection as the trail runs from Draper through Sandy parallel to the rail corridor. The dead end point of the trail connection is on Winchester Street and the Trax platform. That trail connection will be a significant connection for this neighborhood and the City.

Public Transit is easily accessible in this neighborhood. Just about every rail line runs through the Fashion Place West Trax Station. They are working with UTA to offer bus service from the Trax Station to Fashion Place Mall.

Pedestrian connectivity is an area that could use a lot of improvement. There are sidewalks that

go from the Trax Station to the mall, but they are not great quality or very safe. The bridges over I-215 on Cottonwood Street and the Winchester Bridge over I-215 will eventually be replaced which will be a good time to replace the sidewalks. Another area that could be improved is State Street and Creek Drive. Installing a pedestrian hybrid beacon or full traffic signal at that intersection would improve connectivity from that neighborhood to the mall.

Mr. Morris said some of the design guidelines the City should focus on are placemaking strategies, streets, parking, and pedestrian connections in order to get a more walkable neighborhood. Mr. Morris said this plan could be implemented in three phases: Short Term (0-5 years), Medium Term (5-10 years) and Long Term (10+ years). During the next steps, the group will complete the plan and recommendation, have a final meeting with staff, and present a finalized draft plan to the City Council and Planning Commission.

Mr. Nay asked Mr. Morris if he received any feedback from the neighborhood to the north regarding the walkability of the sidewalks in that neighborhood. It doesn't seem like that neighborhood has much of a sidewalk network. Mr. Morris replied neither the north nor south neighborhoods have a very good sidewalk network. They have made note of that in the plan, but they are primarily focused on the outward facing pedestrian networks such as Winchester Street, State Street, and Cottonwood Street.

Ms. Milkavich asked what is considered a wider sidewalk. Mr. Morris replied for a street such as Winchester Street, an eight-foot sidewalk would be appropriate. Wider sidewalks could be used in busier areas.

Mr. Markham asked Mr. Morris if he got the sense that Fashion Place Mall wanted to make some changes to the walkability to their site. They control that completely and that's not something that would need approval from UDOT or the City. Mr. Morris replied they did sense that. The walk along Winchester Street isn't great and once you get to the mall property, you have to walk through a parking lot. The new mall owners are looking at how to redevelop their properties.

Mr. Hacker asked if there was a desire to get more open space in this neighborhood. Mr. Morris replied they did talk about ways the open space can be approved. They also spoke with the Parks and Recreation Department about converting a water detention basin into a walking trail or park. He thinks it is important to include small plaza spaces in urban-type developments.

#### WRECK DEMOLITION – 4195 South 500 West #77 & #78 – Project #20-066

Jared Hall reviewed the location and request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow the operation of a demolition contracting business at the property located at 4195 South 500 West #77 and #78. The property is located in the Manufacturing General (M-G) Zone. A Conditional Use Permit is required for contracting businesses in the M-G Zone. There are two overhead doors in the front of the property and one in the back. There is nothing but a restroom and open shop space inside the building. The applicant will need to restripe the parking for the building and will only be required to have three or four parking spaces. The area in front of one of the overhead doors could be striped to provide an ADA compliant, van-accessible parking space. The applicant will be required to keep the front of the building clear in case emergency services need access to the building. Staff is recommending approval of the Conditional Use Permit.

Mr. Woodbury noted that the applicant was not online for the meeting. Even though the applicant is not present, they will be required to comply with all seven of the conditions of approval if the

Planning Commission approves this Conditional Use Permit.

The meeting was open for public comment. No comments were given and the public comment was closed.

A motion was made by Ned Hacker to approve a Conditional Use Permit to allow the operation of a demolition contractor business on the property located at 4195 South 500 West Unit #77 and #78, subject to the following conditions:

1. The project shall meet all applicable Building and Fire Code requirements.
2. The applicant shall obtain Murray City building permits for any construction, including electrical for the installation of equipment.
3. The applicant shall maintain clear access in front of the building and an adequate fire land for emergency access to the building at all times.
4. No refueling is permitted on-site.
5. No business-related parking or storage of vehicles is allowed along 500 West.
6. The applicant shall provide for the re-striping of the parking spaces adjacent to Unit #77 and #78, including one (1) ADA compliant, van-accessible space as outlined in the staff report.
7. The applicant shall obtain a Murray City Business License for operations at this location.

Seconded by Lisa Milkavich.

Call vote recorded by Mr. Hall.

  A   Ned Hacker  
  A   Lisa Milkavich  
  A   Travis Nay  
  A   Sue Wilson  
  A   Maren Patterson  
  A   Scot Woodbury  
  A   Phil Markham

Motion passed 7-0.

WATERSCAPE LANDSCAPING – 5909 & 5915 South Stratler Street – Project #20-068

Michael Stout was online to represent this request. Jared Hall reviewed the location and request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow the operation of a landscape contractor business on the properties located at 5909 and 5915 South Stratler Street. One of the properties is improved with a building on it. The other property is less improved and is used for storage. These properties are located in the M-G Zone and contracting businesses are required to receive approval for a Conditional Use Permit. The applicant intends to use the property as-is with some improvements

to the exterior of the building. The interior of the building has a small reception area, an office and a restroom. The rest of the interior of the building is open space. The parking area in the front can be striped to accommodate four cars or three spaces with handicap accessible parking. There is additional parking on the side of the building. There is some landscaping that needs to be done and an access needs to be added to the property located at 5915 South. The applicant is proposing to put up a fence to help secure the site. Per the City Engineer, if a project exceeds \$5,000 in cost, the City requires the installation or repair of improvement that exists. If the improvements to this site exceed \$5,000 the City will require the applicant to install the sidewalk that was never installed. Staff is recommending approval of the Conditional Use Permit.

Michael Stout, 200 North Redwood Road, North Salt Lake, said he has seen the conditions of approval and is fine with them. He plans on putting in the sidewalk because he likes the idea of formalizing that entrance.

The meeting was open for public comment. No comments were given and the public comment was closed.

A motion was made by Lisa Milkavich to approve a Conditional Use Permit to allow the operation of a landscaping contractor business on the properties addressed 5909 South and 5915 South Stratler Street, subject to the following conditions:

1. If project costs exceed \$5,000.00, missing sidewalk and park strip improvements shall be installed along the frontage of 5915 South Stratler Street.
2. The applicant shall work with city staff to provide the required 10' landscaping along the frontage of Stratler Street for both lots to meet the requirements of Section 17.68 as outlined in the staff report.
3. The 35' access on the south lot shall be improved to meet city engineering standards in conjunction with any required public improvements.
4. The applicant shall provide a minimum of three (3) striped parking spaces in the front parking area adjacent to the building, including an ADA compliant, van-accessible space.
5. The applicant shall comply with requirements of the Murray Fire Department and maintain open access for emergency vehicles.
6. Refueling of equipment is not permitted on-site without an approved fueling station.
7. The applicant shall obtain a Murray City Business License prior to beginning business operations at this location.

Seconded by Phil Markham.

Call vote recorded by Mr. Hall.

  A   Ned Hacker  
  A   Lisa Milkavich  
  A   Travis Nay

A   Sue Wilson  
  A   Maren Patterson  
  A   Scot Woodbury  
  A   Phil Markham

Motion passed 7-0.

7-ELEVEN (ANDERSON WAHLEN & ASSOCIATES) – 5584 South Van Winkle Expressway – Project #20-070

Jake Tate was online to represent this request. Zac Smallwood reviewed the location and request for a Conditional Use Permit for a new gasoline service station at the property located at approximately 5568 South Van Winkle Expressway. During the June 18, 2020 Planning Commission meeting, the Commission approved a subdivision amendment to create a new lot for this 7-Eleven. The property is located in the Commercial Development (C-D) Zone which allows gasoline stations and convenience stores with a Conditional Use Permit. 7-Eleven intends to operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week and will have three to four employees on site during their busiest time.

The landscaping plan that was submitted by the applicant is missing one tree and one five gallon shrub. Setbacks in the C-D Zone are 20 feet. The landscaping represents about 10 feet of that setback and the applicant has proposed approximately 119 feet from the main building to the property line. The applicants have proposed a dumpster enclosure which will meet city standards.

One of the issues that has come up is lighting and light spillover from this property. Mr. Smallwood does not anticipate any light spillover from this project.

The building will be constructed out of brick façade. The applicants are proposing a building that is approximately 18 feet high which is significantly lower than the 35 feet of height they are allowed. The shopping center where this 7-Eleven will be located has approximately 717 parking spaces. This project will require about 12 parking spaces. Access to the 7-Eleven will be provided off of Van Winkle with one right-in and one right-out. There are two accesses onto 5600 South. One access is located behind the shopping center and another one next to Extra Space Storage. Staff is recommending approval of the Conditional Use Permit.

Mr. Hacker said the northeast corner of the plan shows a monument sign but there is also a monument sign currently on the property. He asked if that was going to be a new sign or a reconstruction of the existing sign. Mr. Smallwood said the sign is going to be moved from its current location.

Ms. Milkavich asked if the Wal-Mart pick-up building was going to be removed. Mr. Smallwood replied it was not going to be removed as far as he is aware. Ms. Milkavich said she received a lot of comments about proximity of gas stations to each other. She verified that the City did not have an ordinance that stated how far apart gas stations have to be from each other. Mr. Smallwood replied there was not. This is private property and the City cannot prohibit someone from constructing something that is allowed in a zone. Ms. Milkavich said she also received some comments from citizens that are concerned about traffic in the area. Mr. Smallwood said this property is right next to Murray City's boundary and Van Winkle Expressway is a UDOT road that the City does not have control over. The City received a request for a wall to be installed, but that is not something the City can request.

Jake Tate, 2010 North Redwood Road, Salt Lake City, said he is excited to revitalize this area. They plan on replacing all of the existing parking lot lights in the complex with LED fixtures so they will match the lighting that is going to be used for the 7-Eleven. He verified that the Wal-Mart pick-up building is staying. He said he has read all the conditions of approval and will be able to meet them.

Mr. Tate said there will be additional traffic, however, this is an ideal location for the project because of all the extra space this property has.

Mr. Woodbury said the Planning Commission had received and reviewed emails from Marnye Haymond (June 22, 2020), Jennifer Caldwell (June 20, 2020), Robson Akio Oshiro (June 24, 2020), and Gayle Matsumiya (June 26, 2020) before this meeting.

The meeting was open for public comment.

The following comments were read into the record.

Lawrence T Morgan – 1542 East Barcon Road, Holladay City

*"I live at 1542 East Barcon Road, one of the neighborhood property owners less than 500 feet from the proposed site.*

*The reason for my concern is noise, both visible and sound, not to mention an extreme rise in danger:*

*1: Danger from the fact of historically deadly accidents on that corner less than 50 feet away from the 50 MPH intersection. Cars have careened or been ejected far into that property more than once right where the proposed gas pumps are. My wife has lived at this location for 53 years and has seen cars crash and fly into the pond by the bank. The neighbor on the Northeast corner of 56th and Van Winkle has had their cinder block wall and fence mowed down, crashing into their RV, as well as just landing next to their front steps numerous times. A gas station that close to the road is asking for disaster.*

*2: Danger from traffic exiting the property flipping U-turns on a red light adding to the already reckless members of VASA gym doing the same thing.*

*3: Visible noise from the super bright gas pump lights that will be on 24/7 disturbing everyone for a long way off.*

*4: Increased sound from cars squealing out and slamming brakes to stop abruptly at all hours of the night.*

*But above all the obvious other reasons is this simple premise: We already have a complete gas station/C-store and restaurant/ice cream parlor less than a block away, so this project is unneeded.*

*Again, this proposal doesn't even make independent sense from the standpoint of customer flow. The 7-Eleven less than one mile away both south and west took out their gas pumps because of a lack of business. Also, there are plenty of gas stations not more than a mile away already still open, but the Shell station across from Holiday Oil Chevron closed completely for lack of business*

*and the Chevron on 9th and 56th is barely holding on. So why does 7-Eleven want to open a gas station that isn't needed by any stretch of the imagination?"*

Jennifer Caldwell – 5534 South Edgewood Drive, Holliday City

*"After researching more I do not want 7-Eleven near my home at all. I do not want to deal with gas fumes, lights, and increased traffic noise. I'm already stressed enough dealing with the parking lot night lights and bright annoying ugly chunky signs from Walmart/Extra Storage/VASA.*

*I do not want to look at 7-Eleven every day. Right across from my backyard. No thank you. Here are two pictures and you'll see why I'm dead against having 7-Eleven there. How would you all feel if you have 7-Eleven built right in front of your house or back of your house? The proposed area is right across from my backyard.*

*Please reject the plan to build 7-Eleven and gas station right there. I would support a local garden center there with limited hours instead of 7-Eleven. Please? If it happens to you all, how would you all feel? Frustrated, angry, stressed, sick (fumes), maybe a lawsuit? Thank you for your time to read my email and check out the pictures."*

Takenori and Mila Komatsu

*"We live on the east side of Edgewood Drive. We are writing to express our strong opposition to the development of the 7-Eleven with gas pump and oppose the City Council's approval of the conditional use permit due to the below reasons:*

*The conditional use permit specifies that the following conditions must be met, specifically for A and B:*

*A. That the proposed use of the particular location is necessary or desirable to provide a service or facility which will contribute to the general well-being of the community and the neighborhood.*

*The 7-Eleven is not a necessary or desirable business for the residents in this community. There are already three 7-Elevens within a one mile radius of the proposed location: 1) 900 East and 5600 South, 2) 900 East and 5900 South, 3) 6400 South and Van Winkle.*

*There are also five convenience store/gas stations within the same one mile radius of the proposed location: 1) Phillips 66: 1300 East and 5600 South, 2) Chevron: 900 East 5600 South, 3) Sinclair: 900 East 5400 South, 4) Chevron: 130 East Vine Street, 5) Chevron: Highland Drive and Van Winkle*

*In short, there are a total of eight convenience stores, five of which offer gas pump service to the local community.*

*B. That such use will not, under the circumstances of the particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity, or injurious to property or improvements in the vicinity.*

*Development of a 24/7 gas station is detrimental to the health, safety and welfare of the residents that live in the adjoining neighborhoods due to the below reasons:*

*1) Increased light pollution: The existing development has already contributed to light pollution because of the parking lights that are on all night and shine into residents' homes which affects*

*the ability to have a restful sleep.*

*2) Increased noise and traffic incidents: We already experience frequent speeding on Van Winkle and noise due to the existing traffic. The 24/7 gas station has the potential to attract patrons that would negatively contribute to noise and traffic disturbances in the area. We have already seen the aftermath of multiple accidents that have occurred near the intersection of 5600 South and Van Winkle.*

*3) Increased potential of loitering and criminal activity: If there is a 24/7 convenience store/gas station, there is the potential to attract more unwanted congregation and loitering near residential areas. We already experience loitering and reckless behavior in the empty parking lot currently. We often hear groups of individuals revving their engines and driving donuts/figure 8s in the parking lot at night. You can see evidence of this activity by the tire marks left behind.*

*While we support meaningful development of the site, we do not support a convenience store/gas station which, as outlined above, we already have enough light pollution, noise and traffic issues, and loitering activity. Please do not add more to this neighborhood"*

Takenori and Mila Komatsu

*"Thank you Mr. Smallwood for our phone call yesterday 7/1/2020 and for providing more clarity into this process. This email serves as a follow up to our conversation.*

*We had the opportunity to review the 2017 Murray City General Plan and the vision that the City hopes to accomplish for the short and long term. There were a couple lines in particular that struck us: A well-planned city creates a more desirable place to live and a more sustainable city - financially, socially, and environmentally. (1.2 Why Plan)*

*The proposed site is located near a Future Neighborhood Node identified in the Plan with the goal of "diversification and recrafting in a pedestrian-oriented manner" and "serve to create a vibrant village setting within easy access of surrounding nearby neighborhoods/residential areas." (Initiative #5: A City Geared Toward Multi-Modality).*

*Although our neighborhood is across Van Winkle in Holladay, and the proposed site is at the edge of Murray, it does not mean that the surrounding areas are any less important in the wider context. With this in mind, we would like to provide some recommendations for conditions to the Planning Commission to consider:*

*1. Request applicant to move the location of the pump dispensers and storage tanks to the interior of the lot, between Extra Space Storage and the 7-Eleven building, to further mitigate residents' exposure to noxious fumes emitted from the gas station pumps and vents.*

*2. Request applicant to ensure that lighting is, in addition to downward facing, is also dark sky compliant. Although Murray does not have specific lighting ordinance in place, since changes to lighting are anticipated on the entire property, this would be the opportune time for change. It would be beneficial to the communities nearby and further mitigate light noise from entering our homes.*

*3. Request that additional green scape is created along Van Winkle to mitigate noise pollution and light noise and improve the view from the residents' backyards.*

*As the planning commission and the authority in land use, and with the growing body of research showing the harm gas stations pose to the nearest residents, we ask that the Planning Commission seriously consider the above conditions. We also turn to the Planning Commission and ask you to imagine being in the same position as the residents. Would you also be compelled to put safeguards in place for your families and community?"*

Gretchen Ratzlaff

*"I live in the neighborhood adjacent to the proposed 7-Eleven at 5586 South Van Winkle. We walk out our back fence gate into the VASA Gym parking lot. It is my feeling that it is completely unnecessary to build a 7-Eleven at this proposed site and am vehemently opposed to it. First, the Sunburst located a very short distance from 7-Eleven provides gas and grocery sundries. It is well maintained and opened all hours. Second, there is a 7-Eleven located nearby just past the Cottonwood Veterinary Urgent Care."*

Emily Krzysik

*"I am a citizen of Holladay in the neighborhood just East of the planned 7-Eleven gas station on Van Winkle. This is NOT in favor of the area. Not only will it negatively impact locally owned businesses in the area it will impact the residents in the surrounding neighborhoods."*

*I live in a home that is near the intersection of 5600 South and Van Winkle. I see frightening car crashes at this intersection almost monthly, to the degree of severe injuries and even cars coming through the fences of people bordering Van Winkle toward their homes and families. The hasty plan of putting in such a large gas station at this intersection will impact negatively the traffic in the area, safety of homes and home owners, as well as the children walking to and from the four schools within a short distance of this intersection.*

*The idea of having a convenience store like 7-Eleven at this intersection scares me for the safety of my family with additional people drawn to the area possibly effecting the safety of our neighborhood.*

*The roads are not prepared for this introduction, the neighbors are not excited, rather much the opposite, and the businesses will be impacted that make this community our home. I would hate to see local businesses and residents suffer for the idea of convenience.*

*I oppose this gas station being built and will commit to avoiding it. It truly makes me rethink living in the area that we do."*

Takenori and Mila Komatsu

*"First of all, we'd like to say thank you to Mr. Hall for taking the time to speak with us on 6/29/2020 and listening to our concerns regarding the 7-Eleven proposal. We're writing a follow up to the phone call and hope that these concerns will express to the City Council members our neighborhoods' sincere worry for our families' health, wellbeing, and quality of life. Below outlines additional comments regarding our opposition to the 7-Eleven and the harm that it poses to the residents located within 500 feet of the proposed location.*

*1. Health Impact: The attached PDF shows a map of the homes located on the east side of Van Winkle that are within 500 feet of the gasoline dispensing pumps and tank locations. There are numerous studies which show the negative impact on health related to gas station fumes. Gasoline contains toxic compounds, such as benzene, which are released during refueling and from the underground storage tank vents. These compounds are known to have detrimental*

*effects on human health and will leach into the homes of nearby residents impacting indoor air quality. According to the World Health Organization, it was determined that there is no safe level for benzene. There have also been recent incidents in Utah connected to gas stations which have leaked and have released gasoline fuel and vapors into the ground and air, spreading to the surrounding communities. We can only imagine the hardship those families endured and the immense negative impact on their quality of life, not to mention the unknown repercussions exposure to the fumes has caused on their health in the long term.*

*2. Economic Impact: The gas station can lower the value of the nearby homes and make it difficult for home owners to sell and buyers to purchase the homes. Federal Housing Administration (FHA) insured mortgages are not available for properties located within 300 feet of tanks capable of storing 1,000 gallons or more of gasoline or other flammable-explosive materials.*

*3. Zoning provision updates: Murray City does not have existing rules that creates a safe zone separation between gas stations and residential zones. We would like the City Council to consider the existing zoning provisions to create a safe zone buffer of 500 feet between residential zones and new gas stations. There are other municipalities that have adopted similar regulations to prevent new gas station construction within 500 feet of residential zones: Santa Rosa County, FL: Santa Rosa Land Development Code (LDC) at 7.01.14.D.3.c and San Antonio Healthy Neighborhoods Alliance.*

*Again, we support meaningful development of the site, however, do not support a convenience store/gas station so close to our homes.”*

Mr. Smallwood noted that Ms. Komatsu provided references in her email.

The public comment portion was closed.

Mr. Tate said this commercial property has been around for decades and they are trying to utilize a use that has been around for a long time. Because they are not adding an additional driveway on to Van Winkle or 5600 South, it will actually mitigate and reduces the impacts of the additional traffic that 7-Eleven generates. There will be more people coming to this location to utilize the facilities. Van Winkle is a very noisy road with a high volume of traffic. The fuel center will not add much more noise. Mr. Tate said that none of the 7-Eleven's in the area have fuel. He added that there is nothing in Murray City's ordinances that limits the amount of convenience stores in an area.

Mr. Tate said as far as fumes go, 7-Eleven will comply with all local, state and federal regulations that monitor and chart the transmission of any type of fume. The topography of this site flows to the northwest towards the shopping center. If there is any type of venting of gasses, they will flow away from the residences on the east side of Van Winkle Expressway. The major sources of benzene release are car exhaust and cigarette smoking. The gas storage tanks are regulated by the Department of Environmental Quality and they do have to obtain permits for them. The main release source is when tankers fill the underground storage facility. Technology has advanced and now the tankers have a drop tube that goes into the tank. He explained how 7-Eleven maintains fueling system compliance. There is a monitoring system that continually detects any leaks in the tanks, piping, piping connections and tank fill.

Mr. Tate said he had never heard of the FHA loan issue. He researched that and found it was a valid concern, but it would only affect a fraction of home sales in the neighborhood.

Mr. Smallwood said one of the concerns he heard was regarding the potential of increased people and loitering in the area. There will be additional people in the area during business hours. With and active business there, the loitering that is currently going on will decrease and become less of an issue. Mr. Smallwood believes this business could increase the desirability of the area. The business will need to meet all applicable federal, state, and local health regulations.

A discussion took place regarding the FHA loan issue. Mr. Hall clarified that FHA could not insure a loan if a property was within 300 feet of a gas tank. Ms. Milkavich asked how many homes are within 300 feet of the gas tanks. Mr. Tate replied there were six. Mr. Markham said this is not a regulation that falls with Murray City. He feels the Commission needs to look at what they can reasonably impose based on the application at this time.

Mr. Nay said the applicant is addressing visual mitigation and improving the walkability of the site. He feels this is a great project for this location.

A motion was made by Maren Patterson to approve a Conditional Use Permit to allow the construction of a new 7-Eleven gas station and convenience store at the property addressed approximately 5668 South Van Winkle Expressway, subject to the following conditions:

1. The project shall meet all requirements of the City Engineer, including but not limited to the following:
  - a. Meet City storm drainage requirements, on-site detention/retention is required.
  - b. Implement Low Impact Development (LID) practices where applicable.
  - c. Install a snout type treatment in the junction box upstream of the proposed detention system.
  - d. Develop a site stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) and implement prior to site work.
  - e. Obtain a City Excavation Permit for work in the 5600 South right-of-way.
  - f. Obtain a Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) Excavation Permit for work on Van Winkle Expressway right-of-way.
2. The project shall include complete stamped and signed plans, calcs & a soils report at time of building permit submittal.
3. The project shall meet all requirements of the Murray City Fire Department, including but not limited to the following:
  - a. Observe all IFC 2018 guidelines for construction.
  - b. An underground tank permit and inspection prior to cover-up.
4. The project shall meet all requirements of the Cottonwood Improvement District.
5. The project will need to add an additional tree and 5-gallon shrub to meet the standards of Section 17.68 Landscape Requirements in the Land Use Ordinance.
6. The project shall meet all the applicable standards of Section 17.72 of the Murray City Land Use Ordinance including:

- a. Dispensing devices at automotive service stations shall be located not less than ten feet (10') from any building which is less than one hour fire resistive construction. Such dispensing devices shall also be located so that the nozzle, when hose is fully extended, shall not reach within five feet (5') of any building opening;
  - b. Dispensing units shall be at least twenty feet (20') from all fixed sources of ignition;
  - c. All dispensing devices shall be protected against physical damage from vehicles by mounting on a concrete island a minimum of six inches (6") in height. Alternate methods of providing equivalent protection may be permitted when approved by the chief;
  - d. Apparatus dispensing class I and class II liquids into the fuel tanks of motor vehicles of the public shall not be located at a bulk plant unless separated by a fence or similar barrier from the area in which bulk operations are conducted;
  - e. Dispensing devices shall be secured to the island in an approved manner other than piping and conduit.
7. A Certificate of Occupancy shall not be issued until the amended subdivision plat is recorded with the Salt Lake County Recorder's Office.
  8. Obtain permits for any new attached or detached signs for the business.
  9. Obtain a Murray City Business License prior to beginning operations at this location.

Seconded by Sue Wilson.

Call vote recorded by Mr. Smallwood.

  A   Ned Hacker  
  A   Lisa Milkavich  
  A   Travis Nay  
  A   Sue Wilson  
  A   Maren Patterson  
  A   Scot Woodbury  
  A   Phil Markham

Motion passed 7-0.

VERTICAL BRIDGE DEVELOPMENT LLC – 1044 West Potomac – Project #20-061

Brad Taggart and Caleb Cox were online to represent this request. Jared Hall reviewed the location and request for a Conditional Use Permit for a New Cellular Lattice Tower at 1044 West Potomac Drive. This property is in the Agricultural (A-1) Zone. The A-1 Zone does not allow any type of cellular antenna structures except for lattice towers, which is why the application is for a lattice tower. Lattice towers can be up to 150 feet tall in the A-1 Zone and the applicant is wanting to put up at 100-foot lattice tower. The site would consist of a gravel road coming off of Bullion Street onto the property and a 1,600 sq.ft., 40' X 40', area that would be walled in with an eight (8) foot masonry wall for their equipment and the base of the tower. The site includes a couple of areas where equipment shelters can be placed in the future.

This property has residential zones on three sides. City Code allows a lattice tower to be located closer than 330 feet to a residential zone if the Planning Commission finds that the lattice tower's land height, relative to other utility structures in the area, is not egregious. There are other towers in the area that are between 135 and 140 feet.

Mr. Hall said staff has received some comments about mitigating the impacts of the cell tower by providing some greenspace in the power corridor. Staff is not recommending that because it would be a lot of grass that would need to be watered or mowed and it would be difficult to plant trees in that corridor. Co-location is something that is required and has been planned for on the site. Staff is recommending approval of the Conditional Use Permit.

Ms. Milkavich asked about the overhead communication lines on Bullion Street. Mr. Hall replied there are some overhead lines on Bullion Street that may need to be raised with installation of the road.

Brad Taggart, 8823 South Redwood Road, said his priority is to provide good cellular service to the residents of this area. There is a large amount of coverage and better signal density that is needed in this area. Mr. Cox and Mr. Taggart acknowledged they had reviewed the conditions and are able to meet them. Mr. Cox said this land is owned by Utah Power and Light and they are somewhat held to what they will allow.

Mr. Markham asked the applicants if they have considered or if it is possible to co-locate on the existing lattice tower in the satellite compound that is directly east of this location. Mr. Taggart replied it has been considered. They have been hired by the carrier and the tower builder to do this project. The carrier will always look at co-locating before building a new tower because it is much cheaper and easier. They are confident that the carrier looked at that location and determined it was not sufficient for their coverage needs.

Mr. Woodbury said the Planning Commission received and reviewed a substantial number of emails from residents before the meeting. Those emails were from Brett Cushing which included an article from the Appraisal Journal from the summer of 2005 about the impact of cell towers (June 22, 2020), Bill and Pam Cotter which included pictures (June 24, 2020), Dale and Jann Cox (June 26, 2020), Dave Nicponski (June 23, 2020), Elizabeth Larsen (June 26, 2020), Joel and Anne Kjar (June 24, 2020), Kelly Lundeborg which included pictures (June 23, 2020), Brad Christensen (June 25, 2020), Kent and Terrie Plott (June 25, 2020), and Nick Jensen (June 23, 2020).

The meeting was open for public comment.

The following comments were read into the record.

Justin and Bobbi Breeze

*"We wanted to voice our opinion about a 5G tower that may be going up in our neighborhood on Bullion St. We do not want a 5G tower in our neighborhood. These towers emit high levels of radiation. There are already other lines ran in that same area that emit radiation and we fear that adding more will affect the health of ourselves, our young children, and neighbors."*

Linda Geigle – 5558 South Walden Wood Drive, Murray City

*"NO, NO, NO, I want to go on record OPPOSING the Conditional Use Permit to Vertical Bridge*

*Development, LLC for the construction of a lattice tower for cellular communications to be located on the property at 1044 West Potomac Drive. Thank you for your careful consideration in this matter."*

Glo Merrill

*"I have lived in Murray for 35 years and it is time to have grass under the power lines near Bullion St. Rocky Mountain added a cell tower that looks like a tree, and other locations have grass, or area for families or children a play area. Could be soccer, tennis, or basketball. Thank you for all you do to make Murray City a great place!"*

Kevin and Jean Duffy

*"We have recently been made aware of the proposal for a 100 foot tower for cellular phone service to be built at approximately 1000 West on Bullion Street. We reside at 890 West Bullion Street and have lived here for over 36 years. We are strongly opposed to this proposal as we do not want this eye sore in our neighborhood. This will not only detract from the appearance of our neighborhood but will also lessen our property values. Additionally, we are concerned that other cell service providers will seek to put their cell towers in our neighborhood as well. We recommend that you consider placing the tower in one of Murray's industrial or business areas where it will not affect our city's residents. Thank you for your consideration"*

Brent Ludlow

*"There are a lot of studies showing that the radio magnetic signals coming off of 5G Tower can be harmful to the health and welfare of the citizens in our community. I think before we unleashed this on the people it needs to be studied more fully, the road were going down with this is not going to be an easy one to turn around from. I know the power company owns that property but they're in our city limits and we can put restrictions on what they can do. If we can put restrictions on how many dogs people can have we can surely put restrictions on what dangers a company can expose our citizens to.*

*This is not going to be the first 5G Tower they're going to want to put up in our city, it is the first one I know of, and once they put the first one up we have no recourse against them putting up more.*

*I'd like to urge you to postpone your decision until you've had time to look at all the studies that are being done on it, the problems we're seeing in China with 5G Networks and also now in Switzerland." Mr. Ludlow included a link to an article from Health Impact News about Swiss Citizens protesting 5G Implementation.*

Rochelle White

*"Please insist that Rocky Mountain Power, or the company that currently owns the power lines/towers, maintain, improve and beautify their existing right away that runs through Murray City and our neighborhood. It is only right that if we have to live with the eyesore of power lines and towers, that the area is improved in order for our neighborhood to maintain its beauty and orderliness. I do not believe it is asking too much to insist they do this for our neighborhood and the citizens of Murray! We have lived with these eyesores long enough to not expect mutual respect from this utility."*

Janis and Lee Rowser

*"We were informed that a 100-foot cell tower is to be erected in the middle of our beautiful Walden Hills neighborhood. We have lived in this area since 1995. We take pride in our subdivision, and*

*this would not enhance the beauty or the safety of our area. Please reconsider by using this property for families to enjoy as promised over 35 years ago - tennis courts, soccer field, Pickle ball courts - anything but a cell tower. This is not the year, nor the place, to have to fight this battle. We take pride in Murray and appreciate your reconsideration.*

*While we have your attention, how long has it been since you've driven along 700 West between 5300-5900 South? Many of these fixed-income resident's homes could use a face lift to help beautify the west side of our city (similar to the homes along Vine Street by Murray Park and Parkside Elementary School). How about organizing a service project of fresh paint, yard work, or rebuilding to make this a more desirable street. I take pride in my property and want to keep this a safe and great place to live. We appreciate your public service and know that you will do your part to keep this a great place to live, as well."*

Greg and Rebecca Woolston – 5535 South Walden Meadows Drive, Murray City

*"We are contacting you about the open field that Rocky Mountain power maintains near 53<sup>rd</sup> south. We live just down the street on Walden Meadows Drive. We bought our home three years ago and it had been a rental for years before that and the yard wasn't very well maintained. We have had to spend a lot of effort trying to get the voles out of the yard. We know that the open field has created a rodent problem and it's been frustrating to deal with.*

*While we don't love the idea of a cell tower so close to our house, we think it would be worth it if it meant the field would be maintained better. We use several different bikes and strollers across the field and the weeds do a lot of damage to the tires. I think nearly anything would be an improvement to the area, even gravel would be better than the weeds. Thanks for your consideration."*

Erik Varney – 1042 West Aaron Park Circle, Murray City

*"Thank you again for taking my call again earlier today and discussing the proposed new cell site build on the current Rocky Mountain Power easement for the high tension power lines that is proposed to be located at 1044 West Potomac Drive.*

*As we discussed, here are some of the core concerns I have for another cell site with a lattice tower structure that would be located just over a very short distance of 784 feet from the current cell site on the US Satellite owned property almost due east of the proposed site.*

*Here are some of the key points to this site proposal that I am calling into question due to my background in cellular technology for the last 20+ years, as well as some detailed knowledge of cell site placement and design:*

*1. Why does there need to be a new cell site structure built less than 800 feet from an existing site that currently has two open deployment sites for cell infrastructure that was proposed for this site?*

*2. This proposed area is significantly terrain blocked from the current available cell site which is located almost due east of the subject proposal area, as it sits approximately 63 feet higher than the proposed site. This would force the tower to not be able to provide significant coverage improvement to more than 35% of the available service area that the proposed site would provide service to versus the higher elevation site that currently exists. Even if the top of the 100' proposed tower was used, the two available locations on the current site would have full radius coverage of the area and would be at least 28' - 38' higher. All additional elevation on a cell site makes a*

*significant difference in "downtilt requirements" for optimal RF signal propagation. (see current topographical image of area of possible coverage area and terrain blocking due to current topography and structures.*

*3. The current proposed cell structure at the bottom of the site is not built to accommodate current build requirements of other Tier one cell carriers, such as AT&T and Verizon Wireless. Some deficiencies in this current plan are that the size of the enclosure would have to be increased to accommodate other cell equipment enclosures, as well as availability for redundant power connections and backup generators on site.*

*4. Another statement that was made was that the existing cell site could not support the technological requirements that this carrier needs for this site. The carriers currently operating from this site are already operating the latest and highest capacity LTE 4G/5G (LTE Advanced) wireless network that is providing faster speeds than are currently offered by this proposed carrier. There is power and fiber backhaul availability with more than enough capacity at the current site.*

*5. Latticed tower design is unsightly and obtrusive, and entirely unnecessary in an existing residential area. An alternative tower design could be used that is not as unsightly or large for the deployment requirements of a tower that will only be 100' tall.*

*These are a few of the key concerns I have with this proposal. I am more than happy to provide further feedback or detail that you would like to further discuss. Thank you for your time in reading through these points and concerns." Mr. Varney included pictures of a map and cell tower.*

Anne Hunter – 1056 West Ropcke Drive, Murray City

*"Recently I received notice that approval is being sought to construct a lattice tower for cellular communications at approximately 950 W. and Bullion Street (incorrectly listed as 1044 Potomac on the document mailed to my home).*

*I live near this location and am opposed to the construction of a tower in close proximity to residential neighborhoods. There are already tall towers further to the east, and adding more takes away from the desirable, suburban atmosphere I want for our neighborhood. Landscaping that would eliminate the unsightly, tinder-dry weeds that pose a fire hazard on the subject property would help beautify our community and be a better choice for this blighted area."*

Tom Allen – 5546 Hollow Springs Drive, Murray City

*"I heard about a cell tower going in at 1044 West Potomac Drive but as I look at the Notice for Public Meeting the drawings show it on Bullion Street. The agenda for the July 2 Planning Commission Meeting also lists the Potomac Drive address for the conditional use permit. This is confusing for those who might be concerned and the consideration of the conditional use permit should be rescheduled with the correct information in the Notice. In addition, the "Subject Property" box in the photo on the first page of the Notice is pointing to the wrong property.*

*If the conditional use permit is eventually approved it should provide for improvements such as landscaping and/or grass to improve the area in this neighborhood. This would include the area of the power line corridor that traverses Walden Hills neighborhood."*

David Strong – 5793 South Walden Glen Drive, Murray City

*"This letter is in reference to the cell tower being planned near Bullion Street and the Walden Hills*

*subdivision. It has come to my attention there are plans to put in a 100ft cell tower. I live near this area and drive by it on a regular basis. This area with the power lines is already very unattractive and has many safety concerns given the lack of maintenance and landscaping. I am not against having the tower, if it is done with the idea of making the area look better, rather than just adding another structure that continues to take away from the area. I would like to see landscaping around the tower and the tower disguised to fit into that landscaping. This landscaping should include a non-transparent fence with grass and trees around the outside of the fence. At a minimum I would expect the landscaping to be similar to what currently exists just north on Bullion for the US Satellite Corporation, with grass, trees, and a stone fence. Please consider requiring landscaping and continued maintenance from the parties involved in installing the tower. Your consideration in the matter is greatly appreciated."*

Ali Lyddall – 869 Walden Hills Drive, Murray City

*"I'm writing to express my concern over the proposed installation of a 5G cell phone tower in our neighborhood. I believe that the health effects of such a tower are not yet known and that its presence will detract from the home values in the area. The ground owned by Rocky Mountain Power is already an eyesore - home to tons of rodents that tunnel into backyards, "goat head" weeds that pop hundreds of bike tires, and overgrown weeds which are a fire hazard in the summer and which also get into the coats of pets.*

*I hope you will not approve this tower and that you will require Rocky Mountain Power to step up their care of this area. Further along to the South, the same strip was made into Willow Pond Park and to the North it is Germania Park. It would be nice if the same improvements could be made on the stretch I see every day between 5400 South and Willow Pond Park."*

Jess and Judy McArthur

*"Jess and Judy McArthur definitely want a vote yes on Rocky Mt Power providing grass and maintaining it under the power lines. This would be a great asset to Murray and provide soccer fields or other recreation facilities. That area is an eyesore. In the early 90's Murray City Council voted no on having grass under the power lines. That was a big mistake. Rocky Mt Power provides grass in other cities under the Power Lines."*

Randy and Carol Hall

*"As homeowners in the Walden Hills neighborhood, would like to see grass under the power lines and the easement maintained by Rocky Mountain Power."*

Andrea Wyatt

*"I know it has been wondered if the proposed tower to be built next to the US Satellites property could use the current lattice tower that is to the east, up the hill, on the US Satellites property, with the idea that the old tower could be upgraded or rebuilt.*

*If this is a consideration, has it been discussed how to handle the wildlife that currently live on the US Satellite tower? There are both barn owls and red-tailed hawks that live on that tower.*

*It would be difficult to replace the tower and maintain the owl and hawk nests. I am not opposed to the building of a new tower in the proposed location and feel it fits the area and would not detract from the neighborhood or the current surroundings."*

Brody Lee

*"There are a lot of studies that showing that the radio magnetic signals coming off of 5G Tower*

*can be harmful to the health and welfare of the citizens in our community. I think before we unleashed this on the people it needs to be studied more fully, the road were going down with this is not going to be an easy one to turn around from. I know the power company owns that property but they're in our city limits and we can put restrictions on what they can do. If we can put restrictions on how many dogs people can have we can surely put restrictions on what dangers a company can expose our citizens to.*

*This is not going to be the first 5G Tower they're going to want to put up in our city, it is the first one I know of, and once they put the first one up we have no recourse against them putting up more.*

*I'd like to urge you to POSTPONE your decision until you've had time to look at all the studies that are being done on it, the problems we're seeing in China with 5G Networks and also now in Switzerland"*

Nai Kannell

*"There is a proposal for a 100 foot 5G lattice cell phone tower to be constructed on Rocky Mountain Power property at 952 West and Bullion Street.*

*The Rocky mountain property has been an eye sore from the beginning. If Murray City is in a place of leverage, I would like for Rocky mountain to agree to maintain the property and beautify it to match the standards of our beautiful city.*

*If possible, could Murray convince Rocky mountain to landscape the easement with grass and trees, from 5300 S down to the soccer fields that begin at Willow Pond Park. It would be great if it could go the whole stretch of Murray, but this area is what is affected by the tower."*

Kelly Taeoalii – 5492 South White Springs Drive, Murray City

*"Residents have been waiting for years for the city to do something with the property below the proposed tower. Is it possible to have a contingency for Vertical Bridge to allocate a portion of the "kick back" funds that would go to Rocky Mountain to rather go to Murray City to pay for the upkeep of any green development?"*

The public comment portion was closed.

Mr. Hall said there are parks and trails under the corridor in other parts of the valley. He doesn't think turning this into a park is an impossibility, but he doesn't think they can tie turning this into a park to this development. The development that is being proposed would not preclude the City from using this area as a park in the future however, that is not in the prevue of the Planning Commission or the Planning Department right now. Conditional uses have to be allowed and the City is allowed to impose conditions to reasonably mitigate impacts that are direct results from the request.

There were a lot of comments about radio waves, radio magnetic waves and the harmful effects of 5G. 5G is new, but cellular signals are not. The health effects have been established since the 1990's when cell towers became prevalent. The FCC and Federal Government regulate that.

Mr. Markham asked if the Planning Commission could say that this cell tower is not necessary because there is another one so close with available space on it. Mr. Hall replied that is a valid consideration. The City promotes co-location. One thing that is evaluated when staff looks at

these types of conditional uses is compatibility of the proposed structure for the height and mass. The second consideration is whether co-location of the antenna on another existing structure in the same vicinity is possible without affecting the antenna transmission or reception. Mr. Hall cannot speak to that. The applicants mentioned this is an issue of signal density, not signal coverage for T-Mobile, but Mr. Hall does not know what that means. Mr. Markham said the applicants stated they believed co-location was explored, but he was not satisfied with that explanation.

Ms. Milkavich said she appreciates the information that is provided, but she is concerned when it is the applicant and residents that are providing the information. She wished there was an expert on staff that could verify the information or add to the conversation. Mr. Hall replied as a land use issue, the City has every right and expectation to review the application for things like density, massing, height, distance from residential properties and whether the use is appropriate in the A-1 Zone. When it comes to whether or not they can effectively co-locate on an existing cell tower, the City takes the applicants word on it based on a technical explanation. There was a discussion in the pre-meeting about having the applicant put the co-location information into a report.

Mr. Woodbury said he doesn't feel like he has enough information on the co-location issue to know whether it has been explored or not.

Mr. Nay said there is a new cell tower with one or two carriers on it in Applegate that was just approved to be moved which is well within signal distance of this. He doesn't know if all options relating to co-location have been fully explored.

Mr. Cox said he knows cell towers aren't well liked, but people like their cell phones. A cell tower costs several hundred thousand dollars to build. They are precisely placed and a lot of engineering work goes into them. The distance coverage is one thing. In this case, it is more about the density, meaning there are a lot of users in this residential area. It's not about spreading out as far as they can, it's about offsetting and offloading other towers in the area to offer better density and better network speeds. Cell towers are becoming a necessary utility because people don't have landlines anymore. Mr. Cox stated there is a lot of information online relating to the 5G concerns. The FCC has deemed 5G safe and the engineers that he has spoken with have said these frequencies have been around for 25 years and television stations and the Federal Government have used them. They are being repurposed now for cellular service. A higher antenna is not necessarily better in this situation. Too high of a tower might overshoot the target and too low might interfere with other things. Mr. Cox said he could not say if co-location was looked at as a possibility, but co-locating would cost one tenth of what a new tower would be. Although they are somewhat limited in their lease area, they plan to put in a masonry wall and plant trees on the outside of it. They are happy to work with the City and do what they can to provide this essential service to the community while trying to mitigate the footprint that it does cause.

Mr. Markham said he is not comfortable, at this point, with what they have heard about co-locating on the tower. He needs more time to find out more about this to see if this is truly the only acceptable site or if the other tower is a possibility. The last thing he wants is another tower in that area. However, he realizes this is a utility corridor and that is not going to change. He would like this item extended to the first meeting in August to allow time to gather more data. It would also give staff a chance to reach out to other experts.

Ms. Wilson said she feels like the Commission needs more technical information for this proposal

so they can be comfortable with their decision.

Mr. Nay said this is the next generation of technology. He thinks some of the fears in the community are because they have been given false information through the internet.

Mr. Hacker said there is true technology out there. Some is dangerous, some is not. The residents need to be comfortable understanding that.

Ms. Wilson said she studied frequency waves and radiation before the meeting. She found a report from the American Cancer Society. They say there is insufficient evidence to support an association between radio frequency radiation exposure and tumor formation or cancer. They also say people get more radiation from using their cell phone than from a tower.

Ms. Milkavich asked if staff could provide more information about the health concerns relating to cell phone towers.

Mr. Woodbury said he would like to see all avenues explored for co-location on existing towers. He is not comfortable building another tower without that. Even the applicant said he could not verify that all the options had been looked at. He would like to see a letter stating they have explored co-location and the reasons it could or could not be done. He would also like the applicant to feel more confident about being able to meet the conditions of approval.

A motion was made by Phil Markham that the Planning Commission delay a decision on this item until the August 6, 2020 Planning Commission meeting. At that time, he would like to have information from staff dealing with specifics about co-location attempts or the feasibility of co-location on existing towers.

Seconded by Sue Wilson.

Call vote recorded by Mr. Hall.

  A   Ned Hacker  
  A   Lisa Milkavich  
  A   Travis Nay  
  A   Sue Wilson  
  A   Maren Patterson  
  A   Scot Woodbury  
  A   Phil Markham

Motion passed 7-0.

#### OTHER BUSINESS

Phil Markham made a motion to adjourn. Seconded by Sue Wilson.

A voice vote was made, motion passed 7-0.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

Planning Commission Meeting

July 2, 2020

Page 22

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jared Hall", written over a horizontal line.

Jared Hall, Planning Division Manager