

The Planning Commission met on Thursday, February 18, 2021, at 6:30 p.m. for a meeting held electronically in accordance with Utah Code 52-4-207(4), due to infectious disease COVID-19 Novel Coronavirus. The Planning Commission Chair determined that conducting a meeting with an anchor location presented substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location because physical distancing measures may be difficult to maintain in the Murray City Council Chambers.

The public was able to view the meeting via the live stream at www.murraycitylive.com or <https://www.facebook.com/Murraycityutah/>. Anyone who wanted to make a comment on an agenda item at the meeting registered at: <https://tinyurl.com/pc021821> or submitted comments via email at planningcommission@murray.utah.gov.

Present: Maren Patterson, Chair
Ned Hacker, Vice Chair
Travis Nay
Sue Wilson
Lisa Milkavich
Jeremy Lowry
Jake Pehrson
Melinda Greenwood, Community & Economic Development Director
Jared Hall, Planning Division Manager
Zac Smallwood, Associate Planner
Briant Farnsworth, Deputy City Attorney
Citizens

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.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ned Hacker moved to approve the minutes of January 21, 2021 and February 4, 2021 and Lisa Milkavich seconded. A voice vote was made, motion passed 7-0.

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 Conditional Use Permits for Master Muffler EMC Sign, Wynwood Parking Lot Temporary and Sato Accessory Dwelling Unit. Seconded by Travis Nay. A voice vote was made, motion passed 7-0.

RUTH MEYERS - 352 Eat Hillside Drive - #21-014

Ruth Myers was present to represent this request. Zachary Smallwood reviewed the location and request for approval of the subject property located in the Hillside Heights neighborhood south and east of Hillcrest Junior High School. The proposal is for an Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) to be located within the basement of the existing dwelling with a separate entrance on

the west side of the property, in the rear yard area. The property is in the R-1-8 zone where ADU's are allowed. Mr. Smallwood showed the site plans and explained the details of the square footage and showed the main level and basement level footprint. Staff is recommending the Planning Commission approve the application for ADU subject to the 13 conditions.

Ms. Patterson asked if the applicant, Ruth Myers 352 East Hillside Drive, Murray, has read all the conditions of approval. Ms. Myers responded that she is able to comply.

Ms. Patterson opened the meeting for public comment.

The following public comments were emailed and read into the record:

Jamee Christensen - 336 E Saunders Street

This email in my response to the conditional use permit request to construct/operate an ADU at the property addressed at 352 East Hillside Drive. I am against the approval of this ADU permit. We are surrounded by development of low-income housing, high-density housing, and multi-use development projects. Gone are the days of affordable single-family unit subdivisions in Murray. Most single-family housing in construction today is upwards of \$750,000 - \$1 million minimum. By allowing this property owner to construct/operate an ADU, the property will most likely never be turned back into a single-family home. I fear for the degradation of our subdivision by setting a precedence of converting our homes into more rentals. It is bad enough that owners are renting out their entire homes, which are often unkempt, lack structural upgrades, create parking issues with increased number of residents, and lack owner accountability for the occupants of their dwelling. I do not want to add to these existing conditions with approval of this permit. The original builders of our subdivision intended for families to purchase their own property at an affordable price and create a safe neighborhood with homeowners investing in, and improving their property, as a long-term commitment. I believe the intent of this owner is not for the betterment of our neighborhood, but for personal profit and gain. I request that you help us maintain the integrity of our neighborhood and not approve this ADU permit to go forward. Thank you for allowing me to express my concerns in this matter.

Mr. Smallwood stated that one of the conditions is to be owner occupied and it is the right of property owners to rent their own property. As an ADU the property owner is on-site and can address concerns as they come up. Travis Nay brought up House Bill 82 which allows for internal accessory dwelling units across the entire state. It does specify to be owner occupied and restricts cities from placing a limit on the size and number of bedrooms and limits the parking to 1 space per ADU.

Ms. Patterson closed the public comment portion for this agenda item.

Lisa Milkavich made a motion and that the planning commission approve a Conditional Use Permit to allow for an Accessory Dwelling Unit at 352 E Hillside Drive, subject to the following conditions:

1. The project shall comply with all applicable building and fire code standards.
2. Interconnected smoke detectors and CO sensors shall be provided throughout the

house.

3. The property owner shall obtain a building permit for any proposed remodeling or construction on the site.
4. Separately controlled heating shall be provided for each area, such as base board heating, a dual zone furnace, etc.
5. Access from the ADU to a circuit breaker panel shall be provided.
6. Appropriate egress windows and window wells shall be provided.
7. Inspections by the Murray City Building Division will be required prior to occupancy of the ADU and will include general inspection of the items outlined in the Staff Report.
8. The proposed ADU shall comply with all applicable standards outlined in Chapter 17.78 of the Murray City Land Use Ordinance.
9. The ADU shall be occupied by no more than two (2) related or unrelated adults and their children.
10. The property owner shall provide an additional two (2) off street parking spaces as required by Section 17.78.040(l) of the Murray City Land Use Ordinance for a total of four (4) off street spaces.
11. The property owner shall complete and record with the Salt Lake County Recorder's Office, the Accessory Dwelling Unit – Owner Occupancy Affidavit (Provided by Community & Economic Development). A copy of the recorded document shall be provided to the Murray City Community and Economic Development Department prior to occupancy of the ADU.
12. The property owners shall obtain a Residential Rental Business License from Murray City prior to allowing occupancy of the ADU. Rental of the ADU must meet the requirements of the Murray City Land Use Ordinance.
13. Temporary Rentals are not allowed; neither the Primary nor Accessory Dwelling Unit may be used for temporary rentals such as an AirB&B or VRBO.

Seconded by Jake Pehrson.

Call vote recorded by Mr. Smallwood.

 A Maren Patterson
 A Lisa Milkavich
 A Travis Nay
 A Sue Wilson
 A Ned Hacker
 A Jeremy Lowry
 A Jake Pehrson

Motion passed 7-0.

THE VINE - 184 East Vine Street - #20-110

Zachary Smallwood reviewed the location and request for approval of a Design Review to allow a mixed-use building at 184 East Vine Street. Applicant, Joe Johnsen of Sync Development was present. The subject property is located east of State Street along the south side of Vine Street. The property is within the Murray City Center District (MCCD) Zone. This zone is designed to be the heart of Murray City as its core city center. The zoning allows for increased heights and densities.

Mr. Smallwood showed the site plans and explained they have added an emergency pull-out which was one of the conditions. He explained the parking details and the requirements for 140 minimum spaces and maximum of 181. He stated there is an allowance to reduce 1 parking space for every 5 bike spaces. Ground floor commercial is required in MCCD zone along the frontage. The second floor houses the bike parking. He showed all the materials on the elevations displaying each material being used. There are public improvements along Vine Street and Arlington Avenue with landscaping, trees and plantings and will include a 7' sidewalk. He showed the location and monument inspiration, the proposed street trees and shrubs. Staff is recommending the Planning Commission approve the application for design review subject to conditions.

Mr. Pehrson asked if there is a requirement for signage directing people to park in the back of the building. Mr. Smallwood stated there isn't a city requirement. Ms. Milkavich stated she supports efforts to reduce car trips but is confident that the majority of people who commute via bike or public transportation still own cars and will need parking options at their place of residence.

Mr. Pehrson brought up several concerns about traffic and parking issues stating he disagrees with the traffic study disputing it will reduce traffic by putting more people on that road. Mr. Smallwood clarified the study takes into account the time it takes to get through the light. Mr. Hall added the traffic study projects the upcoming development. Ms. Patterson pointed out the packet clarifies some of these questions. Mr. Smallwood stated that Trae Stokes, City Engineer has reviewed the traffic study. Mr. Nay commented that he is confident with the City Engineer's review of the study. Ms. Milkavich wanted the record to show that she lives in this neighborhood and is concerned about the increased traffic. She has come to realize that herself, and possibly the general public, assume that a 'traffic study' produces a definitive answer to whether a project will 'work' or not. The longer she serves on the committee the clearer it becomes that the 'traffic study' never results in denying a project. Rather the purpose of the study is to determine what, if any, changes need to occur in traffic patterns to produce the best outcomes. It is unrealistic as a community to think we can stop growth all together but, we hope to direct it toward the best possible outcomes. For better or worse, traffic is an area in which she has to rely on the experts.

Mr. Lowry mentioned that there are 130 units but only 120 stalls and would want to encourage the developer to make some adjustments to provide 1 stall per unit. Ms. Wilson reiterated the need for 1-2 stalls per unit. Mr. Smallwood clarified they can ask for more parking because this is a design review. Mr. Hall added that they can make a condition of approval as long as your trying to mitigate a serious impact in a reasonable way. Ms. Milkavich commented on how we are trying to make the downtown area more walkable. Mr. Hall noted that this is an urban area and there are going to be a lot of changes over the next few years and Murray is a major transit city adding there will be a State Street Bus Rapid Transit line coming in the near future. He

described the unique sections of the city with east and west suburban area's from the 60s and 70s and we have the ability to add pockets of urban villages to make it more interesting and more traditional without really impacting them because we have a great core of the city to do the more urban things that need to be done not just for Murray's sake but to play a role in the region. Mr. Lowry said he appreciated the forward-thinking mentality but reiterated the need for a stall for each unit. Ms. Wilson added that the Engineering Department also expressed their opinion for additional parking.

Joe Johnsen of Sync Development was present and wanted to strongly emphasize the MCCD zone and the redevelopment of State Street. He stated the Murray Fire Department was adamant about making a sidewalk that took patrons and residents through their property onto Arlington. He stated the way of life is changing; people are working more from home and they want to walk to parks and stores. He stated they have spent hundreds of hours to get this project right and so to have the maximum parking would require a whole new design. He mentioned they would want to speak to the engineers before addressing the traffic study. Mr. Hall commented the table may have an error. Mr. Hacker defined level of service D as low and C as higher in the traffic study and that Trae Stokes is making a recommendation to conduct a level 2 traffic impact study. Mr. Pehrson clarified left turns and through traffic are F's according to the table in the study.

Ms. Patterson asked if the applicant, Joe Johnsen, developer, has read all the conditions and able to comply. Mr. Johnsen affirmed.

Ms. Patterson opened the meeting for public comment.

The following public comments were emailed and read into the record:

Peter Hoffman and Joyce Crocker – 223 East Vine Street

Here are some concerns we have with this development. 1. Will public parking be allowed on Vine street at this property, if so it raises a concern with the amount of traffic already on Vine Street. And should not be allowed 2. With 130 new residential units this will add more traffic to an already busy intersection at Vine and Attwood, developers should be responsible for the cost of a traffic light at this intersection if development approved. Thank You, Peter Hoffman Joyce Crocker 223 East Vine ST.

Jaimie M. Petersen - 246 Elm Street

Considering that vine street is only a two lane road and that an elementary school, day care and the Murray boys club are also on vine street I believe the traffic generated by such a large complex would increase the traffic on vine to a very unsafe level. I also am concerned about the impact of the schools in the neighborhood, a complex of this size could bring several hundred children into the schools in the area, are they capable of adding the high number of students that a complex of this size might bring? I'm very much against a complex of this size being built in this neighborhood and I'm very disappointed the Murray City Council would even consider approving this project.

Brent Barnett – Murray Resident

Dear Planning Commission: Thanks for all your work for our city. Here are some thoughts on the Vine Street project: 1) A HORRIBLE IDEA Of course the architects have worked hard to create these drawings. Nonetheless, as a citizen, one has to say that this project is a horrible idea for this neighborhood. Most good planners can see this. Height. The height of this proposed structure is just ridiculous. If built, it would tower over the residences on the street, leaving them in shadow much of the year. Buffer / Transition Zone. There is absolutely no buffer or transition zone as would be expected with good zoning practice. There are hundreds of sites in the city for such a project. There is no reason it should be allowed to intrude in a neighborhood of single-story residences. 2) INSENSITIVE ZONING The proposal demonstrates does seem to show how insensitive the city has been with its zoning. For years the city has been completely insensitive to any desires of this important neighborhood. If this project is allowed, it will further demonstrate how insensitive the city is to the actual desires of their citizens. 3) ZONING MUST PROTECT NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER The number one rule of zoning is to protect the character of neighborhoods. The city has shown no ability to understand the importance of neighborhood character in zoning decisions. Murray is a great city and we deserve to have the expertise of experienced planners. The mayor needs to hire the best expertise to make decisions. The zoning on this lot completely violates the rules of good zoning. 4) EFFECTIVE NEIGHBORHOOD INPUT This project is another embarrassment for Murray. It again highlights the city's lack of understanding of the importance of neighborhood and citizen input. This is another in a series of failures, a pattern of allowing our neighborhoods to be negatively impacted by misguided zoning. We need leadership who can demonstrate understanding good zoning and good planning. It is about time that the neighborhood spoke up. The residents of this neighborhood have every reason to be angry with Blair Camp. And why shouldn't they be angry? The mayor has taken no initiative at all to work with the neighborhood. a) No Personal Involvement It would be only logical that an effective mayor would make an effort to work personally with the citizens in the neighborhood to find good solutions for the area. Yet this has not happened. b) No Qualified Planning Experts One would also expect that the mayor could have easily brought in a qualified planning expert to work with the neighborhood. This has not happened. c) No Work With City Council Representative It seems that an effective mayor could have also at any time worked with the city council representative in the neighborhood to find solutions for the property that would work for the neighborhood. Again, this was ignored. 5) NEIGHBORHOOD POWER Finally, let us acknowledge that the will of this neighborhood has been repeatedly ignored. It seems that unless the residents of the neighborhood organize and meet regularly as a neighborhood they will continue to get stomped on and ignored as they have been for many years.

Amy Thomas – Murray Resident

I am not challenging whether development is needed, but rather how it should proceed, and under what spatial and design constraints. Just a casual look through the "Murray Citizens" Facebook group, of over 5.6K members at this time, you will see a very large and consistent opposition to many of the new proposed development plans. Despite the very clear need for more homes in this area, why is there so much opposition to new developments? Why does the opposition often span across demographics and age groups? Many neighborhoods are feeling as if they are victims of development with no way to improve or even influence what is happening. As I've talked to others in the community, it has become extremely clear that the public is seeing the planning commission and process as a barrier, rather than as a public tool. Community discussions indicate that we need buildings that reflect the history, character, and identity of their surroundings: somewhere, not anywhere. Right now, we have beautiful

neighborhoods with a lot of charm, whose character and uniqueness is being eroded by development. They're creating: Anywhere-ville' and mass-produced boxes, with no attempt at place making, landscaping, lay-out or provision for local character and local needs. Buildings which efface or deface the character of a street or townscape rather than harmonizing with it or adding to it. Such buildings by their absence of a façade, their non-alignment, their alienating materials, their height and scale offend most of us, most of the time. Neighborhoods that make you ill. In general people dislike ways of building that increase anxiety, depression, ill-health, and alienation, whether in residents or in those who live nearby. The problem is that the current planning process tends to lock people into confrontational views without enabling a constructive dialogue about what's best for the future. Those opposing development are good and normal people, acting rationally, or comprehensibly, rather than pantomime villains. This opens a new question: what types of development and development process are most likely to manage their concerns and help them mitigate risk to their financial self-interest, or emotional wellbeing? Start with the question 'What is the spirit of a place?' What is considered to be beautiful and important? What do we (the residents) care about? Ask 'what can development bring to the site and the community to enhance it. How will we benefit? 2. Give us certainty about the look and feel of the places, streets and homes that will be built. 3. Increase the sense of genuine agency. Engage as early as possible. Ensure that we feel as if we have meaningfully fed into the overall design and development process. 4. Give us confidence that necessary infrastructure and services will accompany new development so that meaningful places are built, not just housing estates. 5. Give us confidence that local landscape and biodiversity will be preserved or enhanced. Right now, we don't have any of these feelings about the Vine proposal. One of the most charming streets in Murray full of beautiful and unique 19th century homes, is being defaced. buildings maximize their value by conforming to their surroundings. All we ask is that you preserve the charm, uniqueness, and appeal of this neighborhood by altering the design to conform with its surroundings. As our representatives, we ask that you please take these comments into serious consideration.

Margaret Horton - Murray Resident

I listened to the broadcasts of the meeting tonight and I have a concern about the Vine project. I am concerned about the increase in traffic this development will cause. It is already such a busy intersection near State Street. I wonder about people actually visiting the retail sites at the bottom of the building- I personally wouldn't want to deal with parking in that area. Will it REALLY decrease traffic? Will it be pedestrian friendly? Is there a reason why there are so many units? Also, the height of the building seems tall for that area and while it may match the hotel down the street, it may take away from the charm of the older homes in that area. I guess it's too late for zoning plans, but I am deeply concerned about the traffic increase.

Janice Strobel – 4912 Wasatch, Murray Resident

Asked commissioners to go to Page 53, Section 3, Letter D in the packet states this project does not jeopardize the health safety or welfare of the public. Question, without talking to the public how is this determined? Letter E the project is in harmony with the purpose of the MCCD zone and adheres to the principals of the design guidelines. A big problem with this statement is that due to MCCD zone being majorly altered in November 2019 the city currently has no design guideline in place that follows the current zoning. The proposed revised guidelines have yet to go before the City Council and given that the currently outdated approved design guidelines do not match MCCD zoning I ask that the Council delay a vote on this design review until these statements can be accurate. I do feel that it is very sad that this meeting is the only opportunity

where the public has a chance to participate in design review decisions regarding their community. At this stage in the game the public comments appear to be an afterthought. The City has already worked through issues with the applicant that came up after the review by the DRC and City departments. A development such as this has the potential to drastically change the surrounding neighborhood which is where I live and yet we as citizens have had no opportunity to be involved in the process. I ask that there be consideration of how the public can be involved in developments that can change our community prior to the last moment. Recognizing that this development is one of the mixed use applications that were received prior to the moratorium does allow it to continue per the current zoning but delaying a vote on this allows the applicant to work further with the city to adapt their development to better compliment the direction the city is looking to go regarding mixed use rather than it being one of the last built with the problematic pre-moratorium mixed use zoning. So overall in the mixed-use developments that have already been built throughout Murray practically all commercial retail spaces are empty, so I ask how effective are additional mixed-use developments for our community. Tonight, I ask the commission to delay their vote and take time to review the public comments and the concerns that have been stated by you the commission that were made tonight. I ask the applicant to work with the City staff and please know we are barely able to be involved with this and create a structure more in harmony with downtown and the historic surroundings.

The public comments portion was closed.

Mr. Smallwood addressed the current design guidelines which are on the books at this time. The zone was written with public comment involved when the zone was adopted, though private development people are allowed to build on their own property. The property owners have the right to develop their property subject to the zoning regulations. Zoning is where the public can contribute to future projects because that's what dictates projects. He added that all the retail spaces around that area are occupied.

Ms. Greenwood added that in 2019 the city made a conscious effort to proactively restore private property rights with the code change that was brought forward and recommended to the Planning Commission which was not without controversy. A recommendation was forwarded to the City Council which was different than what was initially proposed. In November of 2019, the City Council adopted changes and did decide to keep the design review committee in place which was in response to many of the public comments that came in at that time. The Council felt they found the right balance between the commission and the public. The process was intentionally restoring private property rights that had been so restricted and that we consider design a private property right. It's difficult to regulate that or write code for that. The Design Review Committee is a group of Murray residents and is a citizen body that has an expertise in architecture and landscape architecture. She added that the moratorium is irrelevant to this project.

Joe Johnsen stated when they purchased the property they discussed the project with planning staff and looked at the MCCD zone. He stated there is commercial to the west, duplexes to the east that are being redeveloped, and the post office to the rear and the Ken Price Ball Park and Pickle ball courts are adjacent and there is the Home 2 Suites across the street. He stated they have jumped through many hoops to make this work and feel this is a project that would make everyone proud.

Travis Nay added this is a vibrant neighborhood in a transition zone. They could have

requested a 10-story building, but they asked for a 7-story building which pays respect to the neighborhood. It is 2021 where architecture styles have changed and evolved, and he commended the developer for making an aesthetically designed building more so than other projects in the valley. Ms. Patterson mentioned the empty commercial spaces affirming we are in a pandemic; it has been a struggle to open and or find tenants that can open and the city should look to the future and not current times. Mr. Lowry, Mr. Nay and Ms. Patterson agreed that losing 10 spots due to bicycle parking even though it is codified seemed concerning, and they would prefer it as an addition rather than reduction of vehicle spaces.

Ms. Milkavich wanted to discuss whether the fencing is required as it blocks the flow of walkability and asked about Arlington traffic. Mr. Smallwood explained the fence is there for privacy for the dwellings close to the property. Mr. Hall stated the Arlington traffic was "A" level of service in the traffic study.

Ms. Patterson added that she really appreciates the forward thinking with this project, the loading zone for drop off and grub hub adding they have created a project specific to this zone. This is a project that we have been waiting for in an empty lot, it is an asset and benefits the area.

Mr. Nay made a motion that the planning commission grant Design Review Approval to allow for a mixed-use building at 184 East Vine Street, subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall meet Murray City Engineering requirements including the following:
 - a) Meet City storm drainage requirements, on-site retention of the 80th percentile storm and detention is required. Implement Low Impact Development (LID) practices.
 - b) Meet City right-of-way and utility standards for all off-site improvements.
 - c) Dedicate right-of-way and Install MCCD street improvements (sidewalk & park strip) along the Vine Street and Arlington Avenue frontages.
 - d) Relocate utility cabinet at northwest property corner to avoid conflict with sidewalk or adjust sidewalk and drive approach to avoid the cabinet.
 - e) Coordinate power pole conflicts and relocations with Murray City Power.
 - f) The parking access should be setback from the sidewalk to allow adequate line of sight for pedestrian and vehicular cross traffic.
 - g) On-street parking needs to be avoided near the drive accesses to allow adequate line of sight for vehicular access onto Vine Street.
 - h) Avoid using the public right-of-way for construction staging, dumpster service, delivery vehicles and moving trucks. Vine Street will not accommodate much on-street parking.
 - i) Provide a UDOT level II Traffic Impact Study and implement recommendations.
 - j) Develop a site SWPPP and obtain a Land Disturbance Permit prior to beginning any site work.
 - k) Obtain a City Excavation Permit for work in the City right-of-way.
2. The applicant shall meet all Murray City Fire Department requirements including the

following:

- a) The Fire Department agreed on the ability to provide an access pullout on the northwest corner on Vine that would be around 12 feet wide.
 - b) The Fire lane shall be signed and marked as "Fire Lane only No parking".
 - c) The park strip nearest to the sidewalk on the fire lane portion, shall be cement or an 80,000lbs road base approved material.
3. The applicant shall meet all Murray City Power Department requirements including the following:
 - a) This site requires a line relocation. Continue working on a new easement and contract with the Power Department to relocate the lines.
 4. The applicant shall with the Murray City Water Division to ensure all water disconnects are made.
 5. The applicant shall meet all Murray City Wastewater Division requirements including the following:
 - a) Sewer line on the Utility Plan will need some changes for final approval by the division.
 - b) There is a shared lateral for 5000-5006 Jones Court that runs down the east side footprint of the new building. This will have to be kept in service during construction.
 6. The applicant shall meet all the standards of Section 17.170 (Murray City Center District) of the Murray City Land Use Ordinance.
 7. The applicant shall obtain sign permits for any proposed signage.
 8. The applicant shall ensure that any commercial tenants obtain a Murray City Business License prior to the operation of any business.

Seconded by Ned Hacker.

Call vote recorded by Mr. Smallwood.

 A Maren Patterson
 A Lisa Milkavich
 A Travis Nay
 A Sue Wilson
 A Ned Hacker
 A Jeremy Lowry
 A Jake Pehrson

Motion passed 7-0.

WOODWARD INDUSTRIAL PARK 3RD AMENDMENT – 248 & 232 West 4860 South – Project #21-013

Clint Tolman was present to represent this request. Jared Hall reviewed the location and

request for approval of a subdivision amendment to consolidate Lots 1 and 2. Staff recommends approval of the subdivision amendment.

Ms. Patterson asked if the applicant is present and to introduce themselves. Clint Tolman introduced himself and stated his address as 197 W 4860 S, Murray. He indicated he has reviewed the staff recommendations and will comply.

Ms. Patterson opened the meeting for public comment. None were given.

The public comment portion was closed.

Mr. Hacker made a motion to approve the Woodward Industrial Park 3rd Subdivision Amendment plat at 248 & 232 West 4860 South, subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall meet all Murray City subdivision amendment requirements for the consolidation of lots.
2. The applicant shall work with Murray City Water to address the three (3) water services to the property.
3. All Murray City Power Department power easements are to remain in place.
4. The project shall follow International Fire Code (IFC) regulations for fire access and for hydrant locations.
5. The applicant shall prepare an Amended Subdivision Plat which complies with all requirements of Title 16, Murray City Subdivision Ordinance.
6. The applicant shall meet all applicable regulations of Section 17.146 of the Murray Land Use Ordinance.

Seconded by Mr. Lowry.

Call vote recorded by Mr. Hall.

 A Maren Patterson
 A Lisa Milkavich
 A Travis Nay
 A Sue Wilson
 A Ned Hacker
 A Jeremy Lowry
 A Jake Pehrson

Motion passed 7-0.

CROWN POINTE PUD AMENDMENT – 5686 South Crown Point Drive, 404 East 5600 South, 5757 South McMillan Circle - Project #21-017

Muriel Espil was present to represent this request of an adjustment of property lines and consolidation of parcels amending Lot #20 of the Crown Pointe PUD Subdivision. Jared Hall reviewed the location and request for approval for boundary line adjustment. Both properties are located within a recorded subdivision plat. The property addressed at 5686 South Crown Point Drive, 404 East 5600 South, 5757 South McMillan Circle. The zoning is R-M-15. Originally when

the subdivision was put in place the boundary was established with a fence and later a pool was installed on a remnant parcel that was not part of Lot 20 or part of the subdivision. Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the adjustment of property lines subject to the 4 conditions.

Applicant Muriel Espil, 5686 S Crown Pointe Drive, stated she has lived there for 19 years and the pool was there when she moved in and she found out last May that section was not part of her property. The property has not changed since she moved in. Ms. Patterson asked if she has read all the conditions and will comply and she affirmed.

Ms. Patterson opened the meeting up to public comment.

The following public comments were emailed and read into the record:

Lenore Lillywhite – 430 E Crown Pointe Drive

I would like to give my support to the proposed adjustments for Muriel's property, which will be discussed February 18th. We lived in the subdivision before the homes were built on that west side, and all the original buyers on that side extended their property lines with their own fences because the property behind them was not occupied and I assume they wanted larger back yards--as I recall, at the time, the large piece of property had an older yellow house which was empty, and there was no one to tell them not to. Muriel is a later owner, the house already had a pool on it. I don't know if, on buying the property, she was even told that the original owners had done that. She tried to get this property line problem fixed years ago. I hope you will go ahead and allow for the adjustment on her property.

The public comments portion was closed.

Ms. Wilson made a motion that the Planning Commission approve the consolidation of parcels amending Lot #20 of the Crown Pointe PUD Subdivision located at 5686 S Crown Point Drive, 404 East 5600 South, 5757 South McMillan Circle, subject to the following conditions:

1. The project shall meet the Murray City Engineering requirements including the following conditions:
 - a. Meet City subdivision amendment requirements for boundary line adjustment.
 - b. Provide standard PUE's on the lot.
2. The Murray City Power Department recommends approval and any power easements are to remain in place.
3. The applicant shall prepare an Amended Subdivision Plat which complies with all requirements of Title 16, Murray City Subdivision Ordinance.
4. The applicant shall meet all applicable regulations of Section 17.146 of the Murray Land Use Ordinance.

Seconded by Ned Hacker.

Call vote recorded by Ms. Nixon.

A Maren Patterson

 A Lisa Milkavich

 A Travis Nay

 A Sue Wilson

 A Ned Hacker

 A Jeremy Lowry

 A Jake Pehrson

Motion passed 7-0.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Hall stated that it will be a very busy spring. Item 8 and 9 which was Hamlet development was withdrawn from this agenda. The developer Mike Brodsky is working with Dale Cox to put together a neighborhood meeting. Ms. Greenwood mentioned that RC Willey property represented by Boyer Company as well as the Howland property at 5300 South and State Street have withdrawn their applications, so we will be working to find some solutions for mixed use options in those areas.

Sue Wilson made a motion to adjourn. Motion seconded by Lisa Milkavich. A voice vote was made, motion passed 7-0.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:58 p.m.



Jared Hall, Planning Division Manager