

Minutes of the Planning Commission meeting held on Thursday, May 21, 2015, at 6:30 p.m. in the Murray City Municipal Council Chambers, 5025 South State Street, Murray, Utah.

Present: Phil Markham, Chair
Scot Woodbury
Gary Dansie
Travis Nay
Tim Taylor
Buck Swaney
Jared Hall, Community and Economic Development Manager
Ray Christensen, Senior Planner
G. L. Critchfield, Deputy City Attorney
Citizens

Excused: Karen Daniels

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

Phil Markham opened the meeting and welcomed those present. He reviewed the public meeting rules and procedures.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were no minutes for approval.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Mr. Nay declared a conflict of interest with Delynn Barney. Mr. Nay stated that he was involved in the preliminary decision that brought it before the Planning Commission and will abstain from voting.

APPROVAL OF FINDINGS OF FACT

Mr. Woodbury made a motion to approve the Findings of Fact for Security National Corporate Park, Spectrum Wireless, Parra Underground, Madrona, Macy's/Fashion Place North Expansion, Recovery Ways Brunswick Living, Iron Horse Concrete & Construction and Murray Crossing. Seconded by Mr. Taylor.

A voice vote was made. Motion passed, 6-0

DELYNN BARNEY – 4902 South Box Elder Street – Project #15-47- Public Hearing

Delynn Barney was the applicant present to represent this request. Jared Hall reviewed the location and request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a carport addition in the front yard area and a new workshop/shed in the rear yard for the property addressed 4902 S. Box Elder Street. Municipal Code Section

17.170.050 outlines the process for review of applications located within the Murray City Center District (MCCD). New construction within the MCCD requires the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness by the Planning Commission after the project receives review and recommendation from the Design Review Committee.

A public hearing is required prior to issuance or denial of the Certificate of Appropriateness. This single-family residence is non-conforming to the current design and development standards of the Murray City Center District (MCCD). Municipal Code Ordinance 17.52 allows for the expansion of non-conforming uses or structures with the approval by the appeal authority. Approval for the proposed expansion and new accessory structure was granted by the Board of Adjustment on August 13, 2012. The single-family dwelling existed prior to the adoption of the M-C-C-D Zoning District and is non-conforming to those development standards. Approval was granted for the construction of a two hundred and twenty (220) square foot attached carport located in front of the existing carport and the construction of a two hundred and eighty (280) square foot detached workshop/storage building located in the rear yard. The submitted plans indicate that the proposed carport would be two hundred (200) square feet and the proposed accessory structure would be the approved two hundred and eighty (280) square feet.

The applicant also proposes to construct an interior sidewalk in order to provide access from the residence to the proposed and existing rear yard accessory structures. According to a site visit, there are currently four (4) accessory structures located in the rear yard area. The applicant proposed to remove two structures located towards the south side of the property in order to construct the proposed two hundred and eighty (280) square foot accessory structure. The rear yard area is also being used as an area for miscellaneous outdoor storage. The applicant has indicated that in conjunction with construction of the new accessory structure, the rear yard area will be cleared of the miscellaneous materials. The existing residence was constructed in 1965 with wood framing and the exterior façade is comprised of light blue siding. The applicant proposes to construct the carport and the rear yard accessory structure with wood framing and for the exterior façade to consist of light blue LP Smartside siding in order to match the existing residence. The M-C-C-D Design Guidelines recommend traditional building materials (wood, masonry, steel, stone, etc.) and the usage of muted colors. Auxiliary buildings should also be designed to complement the architecture and materials of surrounding structures. Staff has determined that the submitted plans, building materials, and colors used for the proposed structures are consistent with the purpose and intent of the design guidelines. Parking for this property is provided by a single-car driveway which provides tandem parking for multiple vehicles as common for single-family residential properties. The proposed carport will have a setback of ten (10) feet from the back of sidewalk and will be located adjacent to the south property line. Unlike a single-family zoning district, the M-C-C-D does not require a minimum side yard setback which allows the carport to be constructed adjacent to the south property line. The proposed rear yard accessory structure will be setback five feet six inches (5'6") from the south property line and will have a maximum height no greater than the residence. According to the submitted plans, the proposed structures comply with the minimum setback and height requirements of the M-C-C-D Zoning District. Existing landscaping complies with the minimum requirements for residential landscaping.

Access to this property is provided from Box Elder Street. Based on the information presented in this report, applications materials submitted and the site review, staff recommends approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a carport in the front yard area and an accessory structure in the rear yard for the property addressed 4902 S. Box Elder Street subject to conditions.

Mr. Woodbury clarified that the shed and the workshop will look like the garage. Mr. Hall concurred. He stated the in the rear yard there will be a detached garage, which will have a roll up door on the front.

Delynn Barney, 4902 Box Elder Street, stated he wants to clean up the property and put in something more permanent. Mr. Barney indicated that he has reviewed the staff recommendations and will comply.

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

Mr. Woodbury made a motion to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness to construct a carport addition in the front yard area and a new workshop/shed in the rear yard for the property addressed 4902 S. Box Elder Street subject to conditions:

1. The project shall meet all applicable building code standards. The applicant or contractor shall obtain a Murray City Building Permit prior to the commencement of construction of the proposed structures.
2. The project shall meet all current fire codes.
3. The building design, materials, and colors shall be consistent with the M-C-C-D Design Guidelines and with compliance to this and all other Murray City approvals.
4. The two temporary accessory structures located on the south end of the rear yard shall be removed prior to the construction of the proposed accessory structure.

Seconded by Mr. Taylor.

Call vote recorded by Ray Christensen

A_____ Tim Taylor

A_____ Scot Woodbury

A_____ Phil Markham

A_____ Buck Swaney

A_____ Gary Dansie

Motion passed, 5-0. Travis Nay abstained for voting.

WHITE PINE DENTAL – 597 West 5300 South – Project #15-54

Chris Baker was the applicant present to represent this request. Ray Christensen reviewed the location and request for a Conditional Use Permit for an electronic message sign to be located at the corner area of the property addressed 597 West 5300 South. Municipal Code Ordinance 17.48.200 allows Electronic Message Centers within the C-D-C zoning district subject to Conditional Use Permit approval. The applicant proposes to construct a new detached on premise sign with a portion of that sign being an electronic message center. The proposed total sign area is 76 sq. ft. and with about 38 square feet within the electronic message center which complies with code. The plans submitted show a sign with an overall height of twenty three feet (23') from grade and a clearance of fifteen feet (15') from grade to the bottom of the sign which complies with code. The total proposed sign area of 76 sq. ft. complies with the sign area standard of the ordinance. The applicant will need to provide new plans for relocation of the sign. The exact placement of the sign will need to comply with setback requirements and clearance from utility easements and utilities. The applicant was calling blue stakes to have the utilities marked on the site so the exact placement of the sign can be determined. The applicant will also need to clear the recorded utility easements on the site. The proposed sign is required to maintain a minimum setback from all property lines of two feet (2'). That setback is measured to the nearest point of the sign. Access to this property is from Allendale Drive. Based on the information presented in this report, application materials submitted and the site review, staff recommends the commission grant approval for the electronic message center for the property addressed 597 West 5300 South subject to conditions.

Mr. Markham asked if an additional condition to 1, 2 and 3 would be the time frame. Mr. Christensen stated that the time frame is in the ordinance, however if Mr. Markham wanted to add it as a condition that is fine.

Chris Barker, 880 North 100 East, stated that they have contacted Blue Stakes and they are scheduled to come out. Mr. Barker indicated that he has reviewed the staff recommendations and will comply.

The meeting was opened for public comment.

Terrell Hughes, 5351 South Hamlin Street, stated he is probably the only resident in the area that this is going to affect. Mr. Hughes stated he does have an issue with the flashing lights, and that he was glad to hear that the sign will turn off at 10:00pm., he would like it turned off by 9:00pm. Mr. Hughes stated that the flashing lights have health effects; it causes his wife grief and him seizures. Mr. Hughes suggested that a smaller sign would work just as well in that area.

Mr. Barker addressed the concerns of Mr. Hughes stating that he is willing to work on the time frame, one of the good things about the electronic message centers with technology they can dim them down. When it gets dark the message center gets toned down to where it is only 10% of its capability and it's still readable for traffic. Mr. Barker stated that he is willing to work with the neighbors in the area and get it toned down at night.

No additional comments were made and the public comment portion of the meeting was closed.

Mr. Markham asked staff if the technical data on the sign does meet our sign standards for illumination and the sign will have the capability of monitoring the light conditions outside and adjust accordingly, or is it strictly on a timer. Mr. Hall stated that it does and they measure the brightness of the diodes and they can dim those. Mr. Baker stated that he can put a light sensor if needed on it.

Mr. Woodbury stated that the sign ordinance stated that all electronic message centers must have an automatic dimmer to reduce sign intensity after dark. According to the ordinance it can't be up to the person managing the sign, and it needs to have the automatic dimmer.

Mr. Taylor made a motion to approve a Conditional Use Permit for an electronic message sign to be located at the corner area of the property addressed 597 West 5300 South, subject to conditions:

1. The applicant will need to locate the utility easements and utilities on the site for sign clearance and contact Blue Stakes to locate the utility lines at the site for clearance for location of the sign.
2. The applicant shall work with City Staff for approval of the final location of the sign with obtaining a sign permit for clearance from utility easements, utilities and setbacks from property lines and driveways.
3. Comply with Murray City Power Department requirements including clearance from any existing power lines to meet the National Electrical Safety Code plus 25%

Seconded by Mr. Woodbury.

Call vote recorded by Ray Christensen

A____ Tim Taylor
A____ Scot Woodbury
A____ Phil Markham
A____ Buck Swaney
A____ Travis Nay
A____ Gary Dansie

Motion passed, 6-0.

NO LIMIT POWDER COATING & HYDRO-DIPPING – 5215 South Greenpine Drive – Project #15-57

Mike Martinez was the applicant present to represent this request. Ray Christensen reviewed the location and request for a Conditional Use Permit approval for a metal

restoration/powder coating & hydro-dipping business for the property addressed 5215 South Greenpine Drive. The Pine Hill Industrial Office Park is located in a G-O zone, but was originally developed as a P (Planned Zone) and the existing industrial uses are nonconforming to the general office zone. Tim Tingey, Administrative Services Director, has made a policy determination to allow industrial uses based on the M-G-C (manufacturing zone) ordinance. If a use requires a Conditional Use in the M-G-C zone, it will require a Conditional Use Permit in the Pine Hill Industrial Park. The Municipal Code Ordinance 17.152.030 allows the manufacturing Land Use #3497 (metal restoration & coating) in the M-G-C zoning district subject to Conditional Use Permit approval. The building contains other lease spaces which are adjoining this unit. The business owner said he is the only person conducting the business with no employees. The unit contains 1,362 gross sq. ft. with 650 sq. ft. in office space and 713 sq. ft. in shop area. Four parking stalls are required based on the office/shop square footage ordinance requirement. Municipal Code Section 17.72.070 requires that there is one parking space for every 250 square feet of net floor area for an office, and one space for every 750 square feet for manufacturing use. The plan shows there are four or more parking stalls on site for this business use. The property is landscaped in compliance to the landscaping regulations at the time the building was constructed. Access to the property is from Greenpine Drive. Based on the information presented in this report, application materials submitted and the site review, staff recommends the Commission grant conditional use permit approval at the property addressed 5215 S. Greenpine Drive subject to conditions.

Mike Martinez, 4002 South 3515 West, West Valley, stated that the powder coating and hydro coating is more of a hobby type business for him. Mr. Martinez stated that he mostly does automobile and motorcycle parts right now he specializes in wheels. Mr. Martinez stated that he will not have any employees. Mr. Martinez indicated that he has reviewed the staff recommendations and will comply.

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

Mr. Woodbury made a motion to grant Conditional Use Permit approval for a metal restoration/powder coating & hydro-dipping business for the property addressed 5215 South Greenpine Drive subject to conditions:

1. The applicant shall meet all applicable building codes and building department requirements.
2. The project shall meet all current fire codes and fire department requirements.
3. The project shall meet all applicable water and sewer department requirements. This business is subject to wastewater regulations. The applicant will need to provide more information, plan approvals, inspections, and a discharge permit is required.
4. The project requires four parking spaces that are striped to comply with zoning regulations.

5. Trash containers shall be screened as required by Section 17.76.170.

Seconded by Mr. Nay.

Call vote recorded by Ray Christensen

- A ____ Tim Taylor
- A ____ Scot Woodbury
- A ____ Phil Markham
- A ____ Buck Swaney
- A ____ Travis Nay
- A ____ Gary Dansie

Motion passed, 6-0.

PERSONAL ONE 2 ONE FITNESS – 6060 South 300 West #17 – Project #15-61

James Robertson was the applicant present to represent this request. Jared Hall reviewed the location and request for a Conditional Use Permit approval to conduct a personal training business at the property addressed 6060 South 300 Wes, Suite #17. Municipal Code Ordinance 17.152 allows gymnasiums, athletic clubs, or body building studios (LU #7425) within the M-G-C zoning district subject to Conditional Use Permit approval. The applicant proposes to operate a personal training studio at this location which would include cardiovascular and weight training. The unit includes two (2) separate restrooms with a 174 square foot office space and the warehouse space measuring at approximately 2,226 square feet in net floor area. Unlike a larger public or membership gym, this facility would only provide one-on-one personal training with sessions ranging from thirty (30) to sixty (60) minutes in length. The applicant has indicated with a written narrative that there could be a maximum of six (6) people in the studio, with his partner and himself each training no more than two (2) clients at a time. Training would occur Mondays through Fridays between four (4) to seven (7) hours per day with occasional training scheduled on Saturdays. It is the understanding of staff that training would be scheduled by appointment only and that this facility would not be operated as an open gym. Parking for this type of use is calculated at the rate of one (1) space for each person on the highest employment shift, or the maximum amount of persons that could be using facility simultaneously. The applicant has indicated that there could be a maximum of six (6) people using the facility at any given time, and therefore a total of six (6) off-street parking spaces will need to be provided for this use. Based upon a site visit there appears to be five (5) spaces provided for this unit. Currently there are no ADA parking spaces provided for the units in this section of the industrial park. According to Chapter 17.72 of the Murray Land Use Ordinance, one (1) van accessible ADA parking space must be provided for every one (1) to twenty-five (25) total spaces provided. In order to comply with this standard, one (1) van accessible ADA parking space must be provided on site. Due to the requirement to add a van accessible ADA parking space, the total number of spaces provided for this unit will be reduced to four (4) spaces. In order to demonstrate that there is sufficient parking for this business use which requires a minimum of six (6) off-street spaces, the applicant will need to submit a shared parking agreement to Community Development Staff for review and approval.

Without a shared parking agreement to provide additional parking spaces, sufficient parking would not be provided for this business use. The building complies with the minimum setback and height requirements of the M-G-C zoning district. Landscaping was previously approved for this office/warehouse park and is being well maintained along both frontages. Access for this location is provided by access driveways along 300 West and 6100 South Streets. Based on the information presented in this report, application materials submitted and the site review, staff recommends approval of the Conditional Use Permit for Personal One-2-One Fitness Training for the property addressed 6060 South 300 West Suite #17 subject to conditions.

James Robertson, 3938 Barton Creek Drive, stated he is currently only training 1 person at a time, so it's usually just Mr. Robertson and his client. Mr. Robertson indicated that he has reviewed the staff recommendations and will comply.

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

Mr. Taylor made a motion to grant Conditional Use Permit approval to conduct a personal training business at the property addressed 6060 South 300 West Suite #17 subject to conditions:

1. The project shall meet all applicable building code standards.
2. The applicant shall provide plans to the Murray Building Division for review and approval of code analysis and an egress plan.
3. The project shall meet all current fire codes.
4. One (1) van accessible ADA parking space shall be provided for this use. The van accessible space shall be striped with an adjacent eight foot (8') wide access aisle and provided with appropriate signage.
5. The applicant shall provide a shared parking agreement to Community Development Staff in order to demonstrate that there is sufficient parking for this use and the adjacent business uses. The submitted parking agreement shall be signed by the property owner and the business owners that will be providing additional parking for this business use.
6. The applicant shall obtain a Murray City Business License prior to the commencement of business operations.

Seconded by Mr. Woodbury.

Call vote recorded by Ray Christensen

A____ Tim Taylor

A____ Scot Woodbury

A____ Phil Markham

A____ Buck Swaney

A_____ Travis Nay

A_____ Gary Dansie

Motion passed, 6-0.

EXTRA SPACE STORAGE – 5572 South Van Winkle Expressway – Project #15-58

Scott Wyckoff was the applicant present to represent this request. Ray Christensen reviewed the location and request for a Conditional Use Permit approval for self-storage units to be located at the property addressed 5572 South Van Winkle Expressway in the Van Winkle Expressway Shopping Center. Municipal Code Ordinance 17.160.030 allows storage units within the C-D-C zoning district subject to Conditional Use Permit approval. The applicant indicated this will be a tenant improvement to the existing lease space to create indoor climate controlled self-storage units which includes a mezzanine level. The total sq. ft. will be 83, 000 total gross sq. ft. with 65,000 net rentable space. This lease space has previously been used by various retail lease uses. The applicant indicated the lease space for the business use will contain 42,196 sq. ft. Murray City zoning code section 17.72 does not define the number of parking stalls that this storage unit type of business requires. Section 17.72.070 gives discretion to the Planning Commission when the specific use is undefined in regards to parking requirements. This storage unit use requires less parking than the retail requirement which is 210 parking stalls. There are a total of 786 parking stalls on the site shared with other business uses. Parking should be adequate for the storage units and retail uses on the site. The building complies with the required setbacks for the C-D-C zone. The landscaping on the site complies with landscaping code at the time the buildings were constructed. Landscaping on the west side of the property has recently been upgraded. Access to the property is from Van Winkle Expressway and 5600 South Street. Based on the information presented in this report, application materials submitted and the site review, staff recommends the Commission grant Conditional Use Permit for self-storage units at the property addressed 5572 South Van Winkle Expressway subject to conditions.

Mr. Markham stated to Mr. Christensen that in the pre application material the Planning Commission was provided it did not mention anything about outside storage or RV vehicles, it only says interior storage space. Mr. Christensen stated that the outside storage was not specifically dealt with and we could continue and put it on another meeting to approve that specifically, if that needs to be done. Mr. Woodbury stated that the public notice stated "approval of self-storage units". Mr. Christensen stated that he was not aware that the RV was new to this property that it was not already on the site.

Scott Wyckoff, 3041 Tolcate Lane, stated the application does not list it but the exhibit has always had the RV parking listed with the attached exhibits. Mr. Wyckoff stated that his intent at the time of applying was to have everything included as one package. Mr. Wyckoff stated that he is going to rent the 42,000 square feet from the landlord, and what we will do is put in a second floor within that and add two elevators so it can be used for storage. Mr. Wyckoff stated the only concern he has is condition number two. He is fine meeting all the fire code requirements. If it is deemed necessary after inspection of the current sprinkler pipes that he can't reuse those, he

is fine replacing them. Mr. Wyckoff would like the flexibility to have that be inspected and determined if some of that is reusable or not.

Mr. Swaney stated that he would like clarification on the parking for the RV storage and what Mr. Wyckoff has envisioned. Mr. Wyckoff stated the parking and the infrastructure is in place, there is curb, the parking spots are all in place, there is an existing fence around a majority of that area. He stated that along 5600 South Street there is a grade separation that goes up dramatically. The entrance area at the top has two access gates that would be key pad entry access controlled. He stated that they would have Knox boxes so the fire department would have access, and turning radiuses to get through the area. Mr. Wyckoff stated that he feels like they have adequate customer parking in the front.

Mr. Taylor asked Mr. Wyckoff his plans with regards to the loading dock with the building that is adjacent. Mr. Wyckoff stated that is the space for the trampoline business and they do not have any use or purpose for that loading dock at this time that securing the area for the RV parking would keep transient truck parking and other less desirable uses from using that space and area.

Chris Monson, 1887 Ashley Mesa Ln, stated he is representing the shopping center owner. Mr. Monson stated that he could address the dock issue. They have a signed 10 year lease with the trampoline arena and they have no use of the docks in their lease, and no plans to change that. Mr. Monson asked how he could find out what curb and sidewalk repairs would need to be made on 5600 South Street. Mr. Markham stated that would be subject to consultation with the City Engineer and his inspectors.

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

Mr. Swaney stated that this is in the annexation area of Murray and the city's General Plan does not have any clear direction for this particular land use as it's listed in the future land use. It is indicated as commercial retail. He stated this proposed use is a long term investment and once this kind of infrastructure goes, it would fundamentally alter the ability to use the space differently for decades. It takes the site out of flexibility for use or change or redevelopment. Those are a number of issues that perhaps belong primarily to the property owner. Mr. Swaney expressed concern with the outdoor aspect of this which has not been properly noticed. Mr. Swaney stated he would not be comfortable forwarding a recommendation given that the residents around there may or may not have been properly informed, and they may or may not be present to give their opinions about what would be a very significant land use change and is something they would have to look at for decades. Mr. Swaney stated that another concern is with the general plan, which is currently going through the update process, and it is a first opportunity for Murray citizens to be able to look at the site and say we have some questions or desires for it that they can express as citizens for future land use. Mr. Swaney stated that he feels there is a due process that may have not been met here and this is a new and very different land use from what has ever been there.

Mr. Swaney stated in reviewing the staff assessments for items A and B, his opinion is the review should be more rigorous than it is currently and he does not agree with some of the details. He stated that this proposal could be injurious to other properties in the vicinity; and other people around this site might feel that this is not proper because it is surrounded primarily by residential. He questioned whether it would be a desirable facility for the community and needs a more rigorous analysis and outreach to the neighbors.

Mr. Nay concurred with Mr. Swaney's concern regarding the notice issue. He stated that he would prefer to see additional site images before he is comfortable with approval, and that he would like to better understand what security gates and fencing would look like in an area like this and what would be required especially where it is adjacent to residential use.

Mr. Markham stated that from his experience with the corporation he is familiar with several of their projects in Murray City and elsewhere, and they do have a first class presentation of the facility. He stated that he is not particularly concerned with the indoor storage facility. He has serious questions about the outdoor RV storage. It is a very big concern and one he was not aware of until this evening.

Mr. Christensen stated that the written application did not have any wording related to the RV storage and it was not noticed in the notices that went out. Mr. Christensen stated he did not become aware of the RV parking until the staff review meeting. He stated the public notices included the site plan which shows the RV parking. He questioned if there has been adequate notice for that use through the process of sending out mailings, and putting it on another schedule specifically for the RV parking.

Mr. Hall stated that an option would be to table any decision and continue the item to a date specific, but that should be decided by the Planning Commission. He suggested that there may need to be more noticing done, gathering more information, and working with the applicant about what it is going to look like. Mr. Swaney commented that the staff report items A and B may need to be reviewed as well, so that the planning commission can make an informed decision at the next available hearing. The next planning commission meetings are June 4th and June 18th, 2015. If the commission wants to continue this there would need to be a motion to do so.

Mr. Nay asked if that was enough time for proper notice for the June 4th meeting. Mr. Hall stated there is enough time for noticing since it would be a continuation. He stated that the staff can re notice the same neighbors that received notices the first time and include the RV parking as a specific item.

Mr. Taylor asked if the planning commission could ask for clarification as far as visuals and the material and height of the fence. He asked if staff would have time to prepare that. Mr. Hall stated that those things could be provided quickly.

Mr. Nay stated that he would like to see how the grade change is going to look. Mr. Hall stated that he could take some pictures and present that to the planning

commission. Mr. Markham stated if this item is continued, there is plenty of time for each of them to make a site visit.

Scott Wyckoff, stated that he understands the concerns and apologized for the confusion on the application. He stated as previously discussed in the pre planning commission meeting, he has spoken with the fire department about access. He stated it was not his intent to deceive at all with the RV parking. Mr. Wyckoff understands the planning commissioners' needs to have additional information, if that's the direction it goes. Mr. Wyckoff asked if he could separate the interior self-storage request from the RV parking request, so that he could proceed with that, and then have the RV parking portion heard at the next planning commission. He stated that he would be able to provide the information in a timely manner. Mr. Hall asked if Mr. Wyckoff separates them, to please allow staff more time to re notice it as a separate application. Mr. Markham clarified with Mr. Hall that the June 18, 2015 planning commission would work best.

Mr. Swaney asked about separating the interior storage unit approval from the RV parking approval and whether that is desirable or if it would create some risks for the applicants in terms of the possibility that part of their project could get approved and part of it may not. Mr. Markham stated that is a real possibility after the information that was just presented. Mr. Swaney asked Mr. Wyckoff if that would cancel the entire project if in the long run the RV storage was not approved. Mr. Wyckoff responded that the RV storage is a significant piece of their application and project, and he may need to renegotiate and discuss this with the landlord. Mr. Wyckoff would rather have some approval tonight rather than no approval at all at this point in time.

Mr. Woodbury stated he likes the idea of the security gates and being able to go in and no one can follow you into your storage space. He stated the issues at hand is not necessarily the security gate, not the elevators, or the indoor storage, but is more of the surrounding neighbors. He asked if there are lights and asked how bright are the lights going to be. Mr. Woodbury stated he would prefer to separate the approval for the indoor storage and the RV parking. He suggested including the security gate as part of the inside storage and that it is an important part of the inside storage. He stated it is good for people to be able to go in and not have someone follow you into your storage space. Mr. Woodbury asked if there is a way to access the RV parking space securely with the fences.

Mr. Swaney stated he struggles with part of staff analysis and that he would like to see better connection to what the General Plan gives them for direction on future land use. He stated if the intent is over time for this to convert to commercial retail use, he would like to see a better analysis so an informed decision can be made about this project. Mr. Swaney stated that he feels they are flying below the radar with the public not having been properly noticed. Mr. Woodbury stated that the public had the opportunity to come and speak about storage, and he feels the issue is only the RV. The public knows, they received notices that there was going to be a discussion of this property for indoor storage. Mr. Woodbury stated that he doesn't think the indoor storage by any means is flying under the radar. Mr. Swaney explained that he was not indicating that the indoor storage request is flying below the radar, but the whole exterior portion. Mr. Woodbury stated it's important to separate them, the public may

care about the outside but they obviously don't care about the inside because they are not here and they did not receive any comments as staff. Mr. Woodbury stated he sees no reason why the inside is not appropriate. People have had an opportunity to come speak about it and no one has. Mr. Woodbury commented that he liked the idea of having 100% occupancy in the businesses strip mall which has been vacant for some time. Mr. Woodbury has seen a lot of Extra Space Storage facilities around the valley and he thinks they are very nice facilities.

Chris Monson stated they currently have the right to park cars in all of the stalls 24/7 including overnight. Mr. Monson stated that this proposal is no different and they are just putting a gate around it and will give the fire department opportunity to crash through it if they are in a hurry or unlock the gate if they want. Mr. Monson stated they are parking cars there and have been since the beginning, they are really not doing anything different then what they had intended in the beginning. Mr. Monson stated they are bringing a lower parking use for the front of the building. He stated that they have had entertainment uses that are very big parking users and the gym and this is a good complimentary use and will only require 8 parking stalls in front where we have 10 to 15 times that. Mr. Monson stated he is not surprised that people didn't show up regarding outdoor storage of cars in a parking lot because that is what it is, storage of cars. Mr. Monson stated they would be happy to come back to an additional meeting.

Mr. Woodbury asked if there would be additional lighting or security lighting that would be required for the storage vs. what is already there. Mr. Monson stated that there will not be any flashing lights and it is completely shielded from the neighbors in the back.

Mr. Swaney made a motion to grant approval of a Conditional Use Permit for Extra Space Storage to allow the interior self-storage units at the property addressed 5572 South Van Winkle Expressway, exclusive of the RV storage shown on the site plan. Staff subject to the following conditions:

1. The project shall meet all Building and Fire Codes. The applicant shall provide plans stamped and sealed by appropriate design professionals to include code analysis and egress plan.
2. The project shall meet all current fire codes. The project shall be upgraded with new fire sprinkler pipe from the riser area.
3. The project shall meet all engineering department requirements. If building improvements exceed \$5000, curb and gutter and sidewalk repairs will need to be done along the 5600 South property frontage.
4. Trash containers shall be screened as required by Section 17.76.170.
5. The applicant shall obtain a separate sign permit for any proposed signage

Mr. Swaney stated that staff shall re-notice the exterior portion to the public, provide stronger analysis of the application, provide additional information on the grade

changes, fencing and exterior visuals a continuation of that portion of the application approval process to the June 18th, 2015, Planning Commission meeting.

Seconded by Mr. Nay.

Call vote recorded by Ray Christensen

N ____ Tim Taylor

N ____ Scot Woodbury

A ____ Phil Markham

A ____ Buck Swaney

A ____ Travis Nay

A ____ Gary Dansie

Motion passed, 4-2.

CONNIE EVANS SUBDIVISION 1ST AMENDMENT – 5593 – 5597 Avalon Drive – Project #15-60

Kenneth Baum was the applicant present to represent this request. Mr. Christensen reviewed the location and request for a subdivision amendment for a boundary line adjustment to the Connie Evans Subdivision for the properties addressed 5593 and 5597 South Avalon Drive. Municipal Code Ordinance 16.04.050 requires that subdivision plat amendment of property to be approved by Murray City Officials with recommendation from the Planning Commission. The applicants are requesting a subdivision plat amendment for a boundary line adjustment to the Connie Evans Subdivision for the two properties. The same property owners own both lots. Both of the lots comply with the 8,000 sq. ft. minimum area requirement in the R-1-8 zone. There are two existing dwellings located on the property that meet the required setbacks. The properties are landscaped for single family residential uses. Access to the properties are from Avalon Drive and 5600 South Street. Based on the information presented in this report, application materials submitted and the site review, staff recommends the Commission forward a recommendation to the Mayor for approval of the subdivision plat amendment at the property addressed 5593 & 5597 South Avalon Drive subject to conditions.

Dave Meadows, 1568 Fieldcrest Ln, stated he is representing the owners of the two lots. Mr. Meadows stated they are looking to draw the lines at the break in the contours of the properties so that lot number 2 stays on top of the hill, and lot 1 where the primary residence is, and has access from 5600 South on to the lower portion of the same lot. Mr. Meadows stated that the only other issue is there is water shares, Walker Water, and the access point is on the very corner in lot two. Some of the verbiage on that new amendment is to maintain and make sure that it is written that the southern area of that lot always maintains easement to the water and access for lot 1. Mr. Meadows indicated that he has reviewed the staff recommendations and will comply.

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

Mr. Woodbury made a motion that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval to the Mayor for the subdivision plat amendment at the property addressed 5593 & 5597 South Avalon Drive subject to conditions:

1. Meet the City subdivision plat requirements for the recording of the plat at the Salt Lake County Recorder's Office.
2. Show utility easements on all of the lots to meet the subdivision ordinance regulations

Seconded by Mr. Taylor.

Call vote recorded by Ray Christensen

A ____ Tim Taylor
A ____ Scot Woodbury
A ____ Phil Markham
A ____ Buck Swaney
A ____ Travis Nay
A ____ Gary Dansie

Motion passed, 6-0.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Hall mentioned attendance.

Meeting adjourned at 7:51 p.m.

Jared Hall, Manager
Community and Economic Development