

**CITY OF SOUTH JORDAN
ELECTRONIC
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
May 9, 2023**

Present: Commissioner Michele Hollist, Commissioner Nathan Gedge, Commissioner Steven Catmull, Commissioner Trevor Darby, Commissioner Laurel Bevans, Deputy City Engineer Jeremy Nielson, Assistant City Attorney Greg Simonsen, City Planner Greg Schindler, Deputy City Recorder Cindy Valdez, Senior IS Tech Phill Brown, GIS Coordinator Matt Jarman, Meeting Transcriptionist Diana Baun, Planner Damir Drozdek

Others: Philip Haderlie, Bennion Gardner, Judy Ward, David Nickel, Rhonda Williams, Corey Jenson, Brian Adams, Vijaya

Absent: Commissioner Aaron Starks

6:30 P.M.
REGULAR MEETING

A. WELCOME AND ROLL CALL – *Chair Michele Hollist*

Commissioner Michele Hollist welcomed everyone to the Electronic Planning Commission Meeting and excused Commissioner Aaron Starks who was unable to attend.

B. MOTION TO APPROVE AGENDA

Commissioner Bevans motioned to approve tonight's agenda as published. Chair Hollist seconded the motion; vote was unanimous in favor. Commissioner Starks was absent from the vote.

C. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

C.1. April 25, 2023 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Commissioner Darby motioned to approve the April 25, 2023 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes as published. Chair Hollist seconded the motion; vote was unanimous in favor. Commissioner Starks was absent from the vote.

D. STAFF BUSINESS - *None*

E. COMMENTS FROM PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS

Chair Michele Hollist gave a brief review of the last City Council study session and meeting from May 2, 2023, and she will send a more in depth review to her fellow commission members in the near future.

Commissioner Nathan Gedge will not be at the June 13 Planning Commission meeting.

The commission discussed that Commissioner Steve Catmull will cover the next City Council Meeting on May 23, then Commissioner Gedge will cover the June 6 meeting.

F. SUMMARY ACTION - None

G. ACTION - None

H. ADMINISTRATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS

H.1. FULLMER LEGACY CENTER SITE PLAN AND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT

Address: 10960 S. Park Rd

File No.: PLSPR202300014, PLCUP202300015

Applicant: Philip Haderlie, VCBO Architecture

Planner Damir Drozdek reviewed background information from the Staff Report.

Chair Michele Hollist asked if the parking agreement had been worked out yet.

City Planner Greg Schindler said it has been signed by the city and is going to the county council next week.

Chair Hollist asked about landscaping requirements in terms of live ground coverage in this zone.

Planner Drozdek said it wasn't specific to this zone, but any areas not used for recreational or training activities can only have up to 20% covered in turf. Since this is being used as a recreational area, they are allowed to have over 20% coverage.

Chair Hollist asked specifically about a personal residence, and what the requirements are.

Planner Drozdek responded that both residential and commercial are required to have at least 50% coverage with live foliage/materials.

Chair Hollist asked if the turf on this property will be live grass or artificial.

Planner Drozdek responded it will be live.

Commissioner Nathan Gedge asked if the permit will stay exclusive to boxing and training activities, or if it will include any recreation activity to include live entertainment.

Planner Drozdek said it isn't tied specifically to a boxing gym and referenced the Staff Report where it states the code and explains the reasoning for choosing the options they did.

Commissioner Steve Catmull noted there was a similar question in the past, and he believes the answer was that it gets reevaluated when a business permit is issued. If someone were to come in with a completely different use, whether it's the new owner or the same owner, it would be reviewed.

Planner Drozdek agreed and gave a few examples of what might require a different permit.

Planner Schindler noted that there will already be a boxing arena with seats, and they plan to sell tickets for that. Based on the stated uses, if the commission wants it to stay exclusively for boxing they would need to state that as a condition.

Commissioner Laurel Bevans asked if there is any anticipation of large events going on at the boxing center, and if that is factored into the parking agreement already.

Planner Drozdek said the agreement doesn't go into detail about coordinating with the nearby areas, but the applicant has had discussions with the city and county to coordinate between events so they are not occurring at the same time.

Chair Hollist noted that at the Architectural Review Committee meeting it was shared that this arena could seat 500 when fully set up.

David Butterfield (Applicant – Chair and President of the Fullmer Legacy Foundation) – said the core of this location will be boxing, specifically youth boxing, but they anticipate that will extend to other kinds of noncontact boxing for the elderly and those who want the health and wellness benefits without risk of injury. They have also talked with the Dean at Utah State University about similar take-off youth programs, since they are so close in proximity and both places having a similar target audience and desired outcome. They do plan on having boxing events with youth from various areas coming to compete in regional and statewide tournaments, and they recognize they will need to work with the other owners to ensure adequate parking.

Chair Hollist opened the public hearing for comments.

Phil Haderlie (Applicant) – is the architect on this project and is available to answer any questions the commission or public might have.

Chair Hollist closed the comment portion of the hearing.

Commissioner Gedge discussed the wording on the permit and shared concerns about possible noise issues with activity outside. However, he believes that the wording in the Staff Report, if read verbatim, addresses his concerns.

Commissioner Gedge motioned to approve File No. PLSPR202300014, Site Plan application, and File No. PLCUP202300015, Conditional Use Permit application, to allow for boxing events and training activities within the building with the following conditions:

- **That the access and parking agreements are executed and recorded prior to building occupancy by the city, county and foundation.**

Chair Hollist seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor.

Commissioner Starks was absent from the vote.

I. LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS

I.1. SJC TOWNHOMES @ REDWOOD REZONE, REZONE FROM A-5 AND R2.5 TO R-M-PD ZONE

Address: 11147 S. Redwood Rd

File No.: PLZBA201900236

Applicant: Brian Adams, Civil Science Inc.

Planner Damir Drozdek reviewed background information from the Staff Report.

Chair Michele Hollist asked if the 39 foot height on the structures is higher than the normal limit.

Planner Drozdek responded that the residential height limit is normally 35 feet, and this would be in excess. There will be a development agreement for this project, and that will be a part of the agreement to allow for the additional height. He believes the townhomes to the north of the project are about the same height at around 40 feet.

Chair Hollist asked for the reasoning behind the height.

Planner Drozdek said he believes the main floor will be just the garage, with the first floor having the kitchen and main living area, and the second floor probably having the bedrooms.

Chair Hollist asked for the identity of the owner of the half acre lot, and if their plans are known at this time for the property.

City Planner Greg Schindler believes the plan is for a single family home, which will not be a part of this project.

Chair Hollist asked to clarify that there is not a development agreement with the city yet, and that they have chosen to move ahead with the rezone before that agreement is in place.

Planner Drozdek noted there is a draft agreement that has been completed, it will be sent to the applicant to review and possibly agree to the terms. The main points of that agreement are in the Staff Report. If the zone change is approved and this moves on to City Council, the council will have the option to approve, deny or change that agreement.

Commissioner Nathan Gedge noted that tonight is just addressing the rezone, and that the planning commission is only a recommending body to the city council. It has been mentioned by the public that this has been seen by the council multiple times, however that is not the case. He asked what happens next if this is approved by the council.

Planner Drozdek believes these will be for-sale units, so there will be a preliminary subdivision plat coming back to the commission.

Commissioner Trevor Darby asked regarding the roads being privately owned and maintained, and if that is the most common approach now for a project like this or if they are usually deeded over to the city.

Planner Drozdek said it's pretty common for this size of project.

Commissioner Laurel Bevans is only seeing one set of elevations, and asked if both commercial buildings are mirror images of each other.

Planner Drozdek said the south elevation shows overhead doors, but the parking is to the south. In the next site plan, this should be fixed as the elevations being shared are only for the north elevation currently.

Chair Hollist asked for the density of the townhomes just north of this project.

Planner Schindler was unsure, as their density was tied to the single family houses on Beckstead, but since the city council doesn't approve projects over 8 units per acre, he believes it is probably below that.

Chair Hollist invited the applicant up to speak.

Brian Adams (Applicant) is with Civil Science and had nothing to add at this time.

Commissioner Bevans asked if they are planning for rooftop decks on these buildings.

Mr. Adams believes that some of them will have those decks.

Chair Hollist asked which direction those decks are facing.

Mr. Adams was unaware of their direction.

Chair Hollist opened the public hearing for comments.

Judy Ward (Resident) – I live directly behind the project and I have a few concerns. Thank you Damir for addressing an email I sent (Attachment A) as it answered a lot of my questions, as I know your time is very valuable. The transportation piece was my number one concern, and I am really nervous about the parking on Beckstead happening. My adult children rent and/or own townhomes and what's happening lately with this is they are renting the individual rooms out, and each individual comes with a car. One of her daughter's concerns when she lived in Riverton was that she had to be home at a certain time or she would be blocks away from her rented room

in the townhome; that is a real concern, where those people are going to park. The problem was she could not park in the driveway because the people renting the garage spaces wanted to be left free in and out access, and didn't want to have to find her to move her car when they wanted to get in or out. As an idea with this, maybe we would not have an access on to Beckstead, which might be able to solve the parking issue along Beckstead Lane, or at least maybe a no parking side on the east side with all the trees. Also, where my location is, I am a little concerned about the storm drainage and want to make sure that is taken care off because I am literally downhill from this development. My father-in-law just had an issue in Taylorsville where his basement got flooded during a construction project that wasn't planned accordingly.

David Nickel (Resident) – I live pretty close to where she lives too. I am really surprised, it says that this has been before the city council three times and the citizens know nothing about it; it sounds like it is already a done deal. Aren't we usually receiving this letter when you are in the planning time. It sounds like you aren't really going to listen to anything we say, if the city council has already approved it. I have some concern too about Beckstead. I am glad that has been extended all the way through, but I think with this it will just be a parking lot for the overflow of what they are going to build there. I would suggest too that maybe one side should be non-parking, just as it is at Wyngate, because Wyngate has the same problems on the east/west next to them with 30-40 cars parked out there every night; they have made it so you can't park on both sides. I am a little concerned about things that are approved without proper parking. I don't know if this facility has parking for visitors, is that part of the plan? Down by the car wash there is a business there, and evidently they were given their spot and they have no room for parking, so they park over in the church parking lot. I think parking is really a problem with these things, so do we even get in touch with the city council, as it has already been approved before we really had a chance to say anything about it. We even have people with RVs that leave those RVs there for the whole winter, so there is not much room there for all of these things at this time.

Rhonda Williams (Resident) - As is Judy, I am directly across Beckstead. Beckstead is 25 miles per hour, but do any of you want to guess how fast people go on that street; it's not 25, and we don't have the police presence that we should there, even though it's just down the street from the police station. They have been clocked at 60-65 mph going down that street, so my concern is the speed and the parking as well. I am concerned, as David is, that this sounds like it was already in the works before we were notified, so these apartments or townhomes are going to be in the middle of three residential areas. Putting those ugly things on top, like they did on Redwood Road, is just an eyesore as they are ugly. Everyone comments, asking who lives in those awful apartments, and it is just not structurally the same as the rest of the neighborhood. Honestly, I have thought about moving because of this. The through street from Redwood Road into Beckstead is going to be awful, we already have too much traffic on Beckstead because people cut through there to get to either 11400 South or 10600 South; the traffic is horrible there. Something needs to happen so there is not that easy access to that road. If you are going to do retail on one side and townhomes, I don't understand why it wasn't recommended residential homes instead of townhomes; I'm sure money has a lot to do with this, but I am disappointed that anybody would say it's okay to put townhomes there. I can see them along Redwood Road, but I can't see them in the middle of a residential area. If they are going to do retail and the homes, then there needs to be some kind of a division so the people on Redwood Road cannot go

through there to get to Beckstead because that is really an issue. The parking, like Judy and David mentioned, is really a problem and it makes you want to move because of the atmosphere you are creating by allowing that to happen.

Vijaya (Resident) I am just north of the townhomes. More than a concern, I want more information on this concept plan. I want to know exactly what is coming out there, is that going to cause any issues in future. There is an adjacent road and I see cars driving there during the week with a few accidents where they just crashed into the wall of the building and premises, so I want to know if there is going to be some kind of divider that comes between my property and the road. I wanted to find out what exactly will be between the road and my property.

Planner Schindler shared that his lot is the second lot in from Beckstead on the north side at the commission's request.

Vijaya – I have no concerns, I just wanted to get an answer to my question.

Bennion Gardner (Resident) – I just had two comments. I think it's great we are getting more housing in our community, which is desperately needed. I have a house which I am glad about as anyone who doesn't own a house and hasn't bought one in the last year will have a tough thing trying to get one. I have siblings who are younger than me who haven't gotten to the point where they were able to buy a house yet, and I am not sure if they're ever going to be able to. Adding more housing is great, we need that in the community. The other point that I wanted to make, that I think addresses some of the concerns we've heard is that when I looked at the site plan I saw very little design for pedestrians, for anything but cars. There is a little bit of a sidewalk, but really not much. In fact, it looks very unsafe. There is no sidewalk coming from Redwood Road into all these homes, you are going to add several homes which is good but not everyone in these homes is going to be driving a car. Some of them will want to get out on foot. I know Redwood Road is not the greatest for pedestrian access, but I wish there was a little more thought and more added to the design to keep pedestrians safe and separate from cars, able to access the homes that are there. Going along with that, with concerns over speeding on Beckstead with traffic and parking, perhaps that is a road that could use a road diet and benefit from a protected bike lane on one side. That again would provide people with options for transportation that did not involve cars, and also eliminate some of those parking issues. Narrowing the road would also slow cars down.

The commission discussed allowing those who have already commented to speak again during public comment.

Commissioner Gedge motioned to allow additional citizen comments, if they are specifically related to the rezone and contain new information not previously presented, with a time limit of no more than one minute. Commissioner Darby seconded the motion; vote was unanimous in favor. Commissioner Starks was absent from the vote.

Rhonda Williams (Resident) – I am just concerned about why we are not staying within that 35 foot restriction. I don't understand why they're allowed to go 39 feet.

Chair Hollist closed public comment. She reviewed the issues presented with transportation and parking on Beckstead. She asked Planner Drozdek to respond to those concerns.

Planner Drozdek reviewed the map and information from the Staff Report. City Code requires two parking spaces for a two bedroom unit, for three bedrooms or more code requires 2.5 parking spaces. Based on the site plan presented, the applicant has provided enough parking which does include driveway spaces. There is no guest parking, the six stalls on the side of the project are reserved for commercial uses along Redwood.

Commissioner Trevor Darby asked to review the steps for this project, noting that the development agreement has not been officially approved by the council and will happen at a future meeting where concerned residents can attend and comment during that public hearing. The site plan is not being approved tonight, and many of the comments have been more related to that than the rezone being proposed tonight.

Planner Drozdek said this will be discussed at the first City Council Meeting in June. Those noticed for this hearing were also noticed of the council meeting on the same paperwork.

Assistant City Attorney Greg Simonsen noted his concerns when citizens think decisions have already been made, and that they were removed from the process. In this process, a developer will go to the planning staff, then sometimes attend a work meeting. A work meeting is a place where no decisions are made, and the developer presents what they are hoping to do to get feedback from the council. Those meetings are noticed and placed on the website, and as explained, nothing gets decided at those public meetings. Anyone can go on the city website and review the Staff Report, as it answers many of the questions residents have shared tonight. He discussed the PD Zone and its purpose, which is also explained in the Staff Report. He also discussed the development agreement which is still in the works, noting that he and Planner Drozdek are the ones creating it, but they are not the decision makers. They are merely putting everything on paper, but there will be a lot of input coming in over time on the things contained in there. As soon as there is a proposed development agreement, it will show up in the noticing for the rezone when it goes to the legislative body. This body, the planning commission, only recommends, and the city council is the body that makes the final decision; they have not weighed in on the rezone or development agreement yet. Also, there is no parking allowed on Beckstead Lane. Someone can always come and park illegally, and if that happens they can be issued a ticket, but there are no parking spots designated on Beckstead Lane.

Commissioner Catmull added that residents can call the city with illegal parking issues and they will be addressed.

Commissioner Bevans asked if the spots designated for commercial parking are intended for business hours, and could they potentially be used by residents outside of those hours.

Planner Drozdek said they should be for standard business hours, and he doesn't believe that parking would be enforced after/before business hours.

Chair Hollist agreed that tonight they are only hearing the rezone. There are some references to some general guidelines the development agreement will follow, and it does reference this is

what things will be built towards. She does have concerns with no designated visitor spots, and the reality is that for developments like this, parking is an issue. There are two garage spots, and they technically meet the parking requirement with the driveway spots, but we often see that garages aren't used at all. She addressed the comment about renting individual rooms and asked staff to discuss city ordinances regarding that.

Planner Drozdek responded you can rent out your home to family, and it is defined in city code what is considered "family;" It is people either related by blood, or up to four unrelated individuals. That is the same for a single family home or a townhome type housing option. This project has mostly all three bedroom, and they are a for sale product.

Chair Hollist asked staff to review storm drainage requirements, and to confirm that will be reviewed on the site plan and that the runoff from the property will be the owners' responsibility.

Deputy City Engineer Jeremy Nielson responded that yes, they will be required to submit storm drain calculations to ensure they can accommodate the required runoff. They will also be required to retain the 80th percentile storm.

Chair Hollist asked if the no parking on Beckstead is announced via signage.

Deputy Engineer Nielson said you can currently park on Beckstead Lane, however if it ever became a traffic safety issue it could be marked as no parking in the future. It is a very wide road at 42 feet of asphalt, which has enough width for parking on both sides. If they did allow some parking on that road it would technically slow down traffic from a traffic engineering standpoint.

Commissioner Darby asked about cars on public roads that seem to be abandoned and what the time limit is for moving it.

Deputy Engineer Nielson responded that it has to be moved within 48 hours, and residents can call the city for cars, trailers or RVs parked longer to have them cited and towed. There is actually an online form that can be filled out as well to have those vehicles dealt with.

Chair Hollist asked what type of wall/fencing will be installed between the private homes to the north.

Planner Drozdek believes there is an existing decorative masonry wall, and that is proposed to remain in place to serve as a safety barrier between the road and homes to the north.

Chair Hollist asked about concerns regarding speeds on Beckstead.

Deputy Engineer Nielson said residents are always welcome to contact him. They are trying to slow the speeds down on roads like Beckstead lane, and projects like this that add congestion to the road will slow the speeds. They will also be doing some striping to narrow the lanes a little bit and try to make drivers feel a little less comfortable traveling at faster speeds. A few years ago radar feedback signs were also installed to try and alert drivers to ensure they were checking their speed.

Chair Hollist asked if this road was being considered for a bike lane.

Deputy Engineer Nielson responded not at this time, but with the striped shoulders there would be plenty of width for cyclists.

Chair Hollist asked about the requirements for sidewalks in this type of a development.

Planner Drozdek said they are showing sidewalks on Redwood and Beckstead, those are public improvements. However, since the project will have private drives they don't have to have any sidewalks. There are many developments like this back in Europe that don't have any sidewalks, with pedestrians and cars sharing the same space; there is a specific name for it in Holland.

Chair Hollist noted that with these mixed use developments, one of the selling points is being able to work, live and play in the same area so you would think that pedestrian walkability would be a requirement.

Planner Drozdek agreed and said they could add that to their motion, but he is not sure how many people will be working in those two commercial buildings since they are mostly warehouse.

Chair Hollist agrees with the comments about the need for housing, and noted that her calculations are showing the density for this project at 8.4 units per acre. She asked if that is taking into account the entire area of that parcel, including the businesses.

Planner Drozdek was able to figure out the density of the project to the north, and the entire subdivision, which includes a commercial area to the north of the townhomes, comes out with a density of over 9 units to the acre. The townhome portion itself comes out to over 20 units to the acre.

Commissioner Bevans noted that the site plan does show some sidewalks on the south end of the private road, but that's the only ones inside the project. She asked about the distance between the road and the fence on the north side. She also asked about the lighting requirements on a street like that.

Planner Drozdek assumes that the fence is adjacent to the curb. Regarding lighting, it will be required to submit their lighting plan as part of the site plan process and they will take into account how close the homes are.

Commissioner Darby thanked the public for being here and expressing their concerns. He reassured them this is the first meeting they would have been noticed for, as this is the very first step being taken with the decision whether to rezone or not. There will be opportunities with the next steps for the public to continue to weigh in. He shares many of the residents' concerns about parking and speed on the roads. He doesn't believe the developer, in any case, would have any control over people speeding on the road so it's not on their shoulders, but parking could be an issue and they will ensure they have the appropriate number of parking spaces as stated in the city code.

Assistant Attorney Simonsen shared some language from the development agreement draft in regards to parking, which states the developer will “provide garage, driveway and guest parking stalls for the project as set forth in the concept plan,” and asked about spaces 15-20.

Planner Drozdek said it has been discussed whether to have those intended commercial parking spaces be shared parking between the residents and business. Hours could be limited as mentioned, and that may be able to be built into the agreement.

Chair Hollist asked about a possible restriction on percentage of lot that can be covered in a zone like this.

Planner Drozdek responded that no, the requirements are different for residential areas.

Commissioner Gedge suggested possible traffic mitigation being included in the development agreement, as well as possibly signage or other measures to help slow that down as a direct cut through. Also, they might want to think about including requirements for parking.

Chair Hollist noted there is one official connection by the fields, and there are others nearby. She wouldn't personally cut through a parking lot when there are options for official roads.

Deputy Engineer Nielson noted that the access to the north is a signalized intersection on to Redwood Road. On review, he wasn't overly concerned about the cut through, and this is why they try to have multiple connections, to avoid any one being overly concentrated. In this case, he saw there were enough connections that wouldn't be a strong desire to use that as a cut through. They can always add speed bumps and other things in the future. With the width of the private roads in the project, they will also probably have on-street parking allowed.

Commissioner Bevans shares the concerns regarding no guest parking, but she assured everyone that the city council members listen to these recordings and they will hear all the resident concerns from tonight, as well as the commissioners' concerns. Those will all be taken into account before a decision is made. Most of her concerns are related to the site plan and development, she does not have an issue with recommending a positive recommendation for the rezone.

Commissioner Darby is in the same position.

Commissioner Gedge is fine with the rezone as well, but he does want the height to be discussed.

Commissioner Catmull noted that the zone attempting to be applied allows for this kind of mixed use in a smaller area, that wouldn't be easily done if they tried to split this with something along Redwood Road and then something on the back side of Beckstead like residential homes, and still have the required buffer. He does share the concerns around pedestrians and the access on the private road, as in the future there will be more autonomous cars on the roads and perhaps more pedestrians, so he wants to make sure that is safe and accessible. He also shares the concerns regarding guest parking and proximity to the houses to the north.

Chair Hollist is leaning against this rezone, because they are playing some density games while going for a mixed use zoning. She understands the purpose, but has concerns that this mixed use isn't addressing the walkability, or the parking reality. She is aware they can't require more than the ordinance states, but when they allow this density, especially when it's concentrated on such a small portion of the total acreage, they are probably creating this problem that otherwise wouldn't be there if there were more street parking that would occur with less density. Having seen the site plan and knowing this is just a rezone, but knowing what the intent is to put all those homes in a small portion of the property, she believes she is opposed to the rezone. Her issue is that the actual residences are significantly more dense in the actual building portion, and she anticipates problems with that, no guest parking, and the lack of walkability which is supposed to be one of the primary selling points on a mixed use. She also has concerns with the wall being right up against the private lane, which in theory can work but people need a little bit of buffer and shoulder. She knows on public roads parking is allowed, and that is great for things like special events, but when it is regular it is harder to drive on; she prefers the open feel and having less street parking personally. She knows that's what's done out in Daybreak, but it's one of the things they hear the most complaints about when citizens come to these forums, that while on street parking is allowed, it doesn't appear to be very desirable to many residents.

Commissioner Catmull discussed the recommended language for action, and that whenever they do a rezone it is often just a rezone being approved; however, this rezone has an ordinance number. He asked if there is something different with that.

Planner Schindler noted that they are only recommending approval of that ordinance, not approving it. The ordinance itself is what approves a rezone, and he believes it has been fairly common recently.

Commissioner Catmull asked to confirm that this type of zoning change requires a development agreement to be in place.

Planner Schindler responded that yes, when this is reviewed by the city council there will be a resolution number specifically for the development agreement, and then the ordinance for the rezone will be discussed and either passed or rejected. The planning commission is not making a recommendation on this development agreement, as there is not a completed copy for them to review at this time, as it does not affect the zone change. If the rezone is approved, and comes back with the subdivision and site plan, at that time it will be the planning commission's charge to ensure that what is presented at that meeting is in compliance with the development agreement approved by the city council. The commissioners should definitely share their concerns and anything they'd like added to the development agreement with their council members.

Commissioner Gedge recommended approval of File No. PLZBA201900236, Rezone from A-5 and R2.5 to R-M-PD Zone, with the recommendation to address the following in the creation of the development agreement between the developer and the city:

- **Pedestrian access, including sidewalks; as well as guest parking and overall parking.**
- **Overall density.**
- **Overall height of the residential buildings.**
- **Placement of the drive along the north boundary of the property**

Commissioner Bevans noted that after hearing the other commissioners' thoughts, and reviewing her notes, she doesn't know if many of her concerns can be quickly addressed in the way this is drawn and may affect the way this moves forward. Due to that, she noted she is being swayed in the other direction.

Chair Hollist wanted to point out that they are discussing changing this to a mixed use, which is pretty open. Our city council is very responsible and answers to their public; they are elected officials and will ultimately make that decision.

Chair Hollist seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 3-2, majority in favor with Chair Hollist and Commissioner Bevans issuing no votes. Commissioner Starks was absent from the vote.

Commissioner Catmull spoke to the public and noted that any evidence, whether physical or personal feelings, brought to the public hearing at the council meeting where this is addressed, needs to be as detailed and professional as possible as that is the more persuasive type of evidence.

J. OTHER BUSINESS

City Planner Greg Schindler discussed the agenda for the next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Hollist motioned to adjourn the May 9, 2023 Planning Commission Meeting. Commissioner Gedge seconded the motion; vote was unanimous in favor. Commissioner Starks was absent from the vote.

The May 9, 2023 Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 8:06 p.m.