



**Minutes of the
Millcreek Planning Commission
July 20, 2022
6:30 p.m.
Regular Meeting**

The Planning Commission of Millcreek, Utah, met in a regular public meeting on Wednesday, July 20, 2022 at City Hall, located at 3330 S. 1300 E., Millcreek, UT 84106. The meeting was conducted electronically and live streamed via the City's website with an option for online public comment.

PRESENT:

Commissioners

Shawn LaMar, Chair
Victoria Reid, Vice Chair (excused)
Aryel Cianflone (electronic, left early)
Scott Claerhout (electronic, left early)
David Hulsberg
Christian Larsen
Nils Per Lofgren
Skye Sieber (electronic)
Ian Wright

City Staff

John Brems, City Attorney
Elyse Sullivan, City Recorder
Francis Lilly, Planning & Zoning Director
Kurt Hansen, Facilities Manager
Brad Sanderson, Current Planning Manager
Fred Lutze, Planning Engineer (electronic)
Katie Larsen, Planner
Jake Green, Planning Engineer (electronic)
Jennifer Smith, Planning Engineer (electronic)

Attendees: Mayor Jeff Silvestrini, Josh Gibbons (electronic), Bob Earl, John & Joan Bramble, Haiying Wang, Yanwan Xiu, Kambouris, Dean Collinwood, Marc & Melissa Western, Melanie Clark, Rob Ricks, Linda Greemat, Deanna Foxley, Sharlene Linford, J. Heppler, Lance Howell, Nate McBride, McCall Judd, Tom Hang, Adam Turville, Sarah Bennett, John Knoblock, Mary Kimball, Lorin Moser, Stephen Stoker, Wayne Johnson

REGULAR MEETING – 6:30 p.m.

TIME COMMENCED: 6:33 p.m.

Chair LaMar called the meeting to order and read a statement describing the duties of the Planning Commission.

1. Commission Business

1.1 New Commissioners Oaths of Office - David Hulsberg, Christian Larsen, and Nils Per Lofgren

Elyse Sullivan administered the oath of office to the new commissioners.

2. Public Hearings

2.1 Consideration of SD-22-004, Request to Amend the Forest Hills Subdivision by Reconfiguring Lots 27, 28, and 29 Location: 3825 S. Arroyo Road Applicant: Rob Ricks Planner: Katie Larsen

Brad Sanderson noted a change to the staff report. He said property was conveyed to lot 26 in the staff report, but it was conveyed to property to the south of the private access. He said planners deal with layers on any property such as parcels, zoning, land use, subdivisions, political districts, infrastructure, transportation, and imagery. There were 29 original lots in the East Forest Hills Subdivision. Three lots were being amended to range in size between 12,000-15,000 square feet. The property was currently vacant, but the applicant was seeking to build three single family dwellings which would be accessed from a private right-of-way connecting to Arroyo Road. Certain deeds were recorded around 1981 attempting to reconfigure lots 27, 28, and 29 as well as the property to the south. The reconfiguration did not amend the subdivision per state statute. Pursuant to Millcreek code section 19.76.080, the applicant sought a variance to: 1) reduce the required 50-foot front yard setback as measured from the center of a private right-of-way (ROW), 2) reduce the minimum lot size to less than a half-acre for lots accessed via the private ROW and, 3) develop on a private road less than 42 feet wide. The variance was granted, however, there were certain requirements imposed by the Land Use Hearing Officer:

1. Lot sizes shall not be reduced below the current R-1-10 Zoning
2. The setback from private right of way shall be a minimum 30 feet from edge of right of way.
3. The private right of way which accesses the Property may not be less than 25 feet wide (and must be widened in certain areas as set forth in paragraph 6 below).
4. Unless otherwise approved by the City Fire Marshall, "No Parking" signage shall be installed at the turn-around near the end of the private right of way and along the portion of the right of way between the Property and Arroyo Road.
5. The use of private right of way shall be limited to the current two adjacent users and the three residential lots located on the Property. This limitation shall be stated on the recorded plat amendment.
6. The portion of the private right of way located on the Property shall be sufficiently widened to accommodate improvements including, but not limited to, travel lanes in both directions, on-street parking and sidewalk on one side, s may be recommended and approved by the City Engineer.
7. The Applicant shall make a good faith effort to work with neighboring property owners on either side of the portion of private right of way that connects to Arroyo Road to eliminant and/or reduce the width of as many drive accesses into the private drive as possible.
8. The Applicant shall make the necessary improvement with the Arroyo Road right of way to the properly connect the private and public improvements, as may be required by the City Engineer.
9. The Applicant must meet all other applicable City requirements including land use, engineering, construction, and building permits.

Sanderson showed the Commission the original plat, Alta survey, and the proposed plat amendment. The private lane was originally 24.75 feet wide but was widened to 25 feet in 1981 with an easement and would widen to 30 feet in front of the proposed lots. He described how the proposed access, drainage, and improvements would meet code. He said the property had CC&Rs, but CC&Rs were private and recorded but the city does not enforce them as

they differ from ordinances. They were a civil matter with private property owners. Staff recommended approval of the application.

Chair LaMar asked if the sidewalk improvement would extend west to Arroyo Road. Sanderson said no, it would only be in front of the three lots. Chair LaMar asked about the Alta survey. Sanderson said the survey reflected the deeds and was recently done.

Applicant - Rob Ricks and Melanie Clark said the deeds that were recorded in 1981 accomplished the lot reconfiguration. The county recognized the individual parcels for property taxes. Clark said they were seeking buildable lots for development.

Chair LaMar opened the public hearing.

Dean Collinwood, on behalf of a neighboring property owner - Kambouris, appreciated the private CC&Rs mentioned. He said any person wanting to build on any of the 29 lots was required to submit plans for approval to the neighborhood committee who enforced the CC&Rs. The committee had the right to approve the external visage and setbacks, and they did not allow the subdivision of any lots. He brought up figure 4 (from the staff report) as the official recorded plat and asked about the other three proposed buildable configured lots. He said figure 6 showed four lots, the three proposed lots and the easement access lot. He asked about staff finding number 5, that no new lots would be created as a result of the proposal. He noted the building plans could be passed through him to the CC&R committee.

Joan Bramble, 3821 S. Arroyo Road, noted that lot 29 was not absorbed into her lot, lot 26. She felt the city had a responsibility to not put the neighborhood in an adversarial position approving items that went against the CC&Rs. There was neighborhood concern about additional traffic and safety. The proposed buildable lots were reduced in size. The neighborhood would support two lots and did not feel the property was suited for three.

Marc Western, 3840 Arroyo Rd., said there were two blind curves on Arroyo Road. He did not feel the proposed parking would be adequate with on-street parking.

Chair LaMar read an emailed comment from Haiying Wang, 1815 E. 3900 S., *"I am concerned, they are building the houses behind my back yard and making the fence, will it block my back way?"*

Melanie Clark said the 1946 plat identified lots 27, 28, and 29 and no documentation acknowledged lot 29 as not being a lot. The private road was not a lot because it was not buildable. She said the proposed lot sizes were consistent with surrounding lots. Sanderson said there were 29 lots being reconfigured into 29 lots, no additional lots were being proposed. The west portion of lot 29 was absorbed in the Kambouris property. He said the property deeds could be corrected. Since there were no additional lots being added, staff did not feel a traffic study was warranted. The lane already existed, so the blind corner was not something to accommodate. The lane was widened in front of the lots to accommodate on-street parking. The proposed lot sizes in the R-1-10 zone exceeded the minimum lot size of 10,000 square feet. The Land Use Hearing Officer granted the variance for the lot size for a private lane being less than a half-acre. If the code required fencing on the private lane, it

would be addressed. The access road would exist in the form of an easement and would be absorbed in the proposed lot 101.

Stephen Stoker, representing the neighboring property owner – Brambles, said the original subdivision was 28 buildable lots and a driveway. Lot 29 was not buildable. The deeds that were recorded in 1981 with parcel tax id numbers did not have any effect on the subdivision.

Melissa Western, 3840 Arroyo Road, said a fair due process was important and lot 29 was not buildable. She said the city advocated for the builder and not all taxpayers.

Chair LaMar closed the public hearing.

Chair LaMar asked city legal counsel about the CC&Rs. John Brems said the city was not bound by private covenants. Statutorily, land use regulations required a certain statutory process, and these covenants did not follow that process. He cited code and a land use ombudsman's opinion that supported the city's position. He said there may be a violation of the CC&Rs with this application approval, but the city was not involved. He wondered if the CC&R restriction was on buildable lots or just lots. Commissioner Larsen said he was satisfied with the lot size, parking and safety, and consolidation of the lane into a lot. He asked for clarification on buildable lots. Commissioner Cianflone was not concerned with CC&Rs since it was not within the Commission's purview. She asked how figure 4 turned into figure 5.

Commissioner Lofgren said the buildable lot factor for lot 29 did not matter. Commissioner Wright asked about the lot absorption by the southern lot. Sanderson said the deed created that. Code allows for lot reconfiguration under zoning regulations. Lilly said these are difficult situations. A duty of the city is to process applications in a manner compliant with the law. Any advocacy is following the law as administrators. A property owner does have a right to amend a subdivision as long as it complies with code. Chair LaMar noted that figures 4 and 5 were essentially the same. Commissioner Cianflone sympathized with the public for expressing concern when the Commission had to approve the subdivision since it complied with code. Commissioner Hulsberg asked if the easement would be modified to accommodate city code. Sanderson said no because it was recently widened to 25 feet as agreed upon by the two property owners to meet code. Chair LaMar said the Commission did not have the tools to referee a legal fight because they were bound by code. Commissioner Larsen asked about the statutory difference between buildable and not buildable lots. Brems could not find a distinguishment in Millcreek code.

Commissioner Larsen, regarding application SD-22-004, request to amend the Forest Hills Subdivision by reconfiguring Lots 27, 28, and 29 at 3825 S. Arroyo Road, moved that the Planning Commission approve the preliminary subdivision amendment as presented. Commissioner Hulsberg seconded. Chair LaMar called for the vote. Commissioner LaMar voted yes, Commissioner Cianflone voted no, Commissioner Claerhout voted yes, Commissioner Hulsberg voted yes, Commissioner Larsen voted yes, Commissioner Lofgren voted yes, Commissioner Sieber voted yes, and Commissioner Wright voted yes. The motion passed.

Commissioner Claerhout left the meeting.

2.2 Consideration of SD-22-010, Request for Two Flag Lots and a Subdivision Plat Amendment Location: 1643-1647 E. Woodland Avenue Applicant: Lauren Ricks Planner: Katie Larsen

Katie Larsen said the applicant was requesting a preliminary plat approval for a 2-lot subdivision subject to the flag lot policy. The lot was rezoned from R-1-8 to R-1-6 on December 9, 2019, subject to a development agreement. The intent of the rezone was so the lot could qualify for the area requirements under the flag lot policy for the R-1-6 zone. The development agreement required the removal of the existing home on the north portion of the property before the plat was approved by the city and recorded, but the agreement expired due to lack of action. All flag lots must be 1.5 times the area of the minimum base lot requirement. The proposed subdivision had a base lot area of 7,652 square feet with a flag lot area of 9,692 square feet. The subject property was located on a partial public road/private right-of-way that leads into the adjacent school property and parking lot. Staff has verified that access to this lot has been legally established, unit addresses are specified in the license agreement. She showed the Commission the proposed site plan. She recommended that the proposed flag lot subdivision SD-22-010 be granted preliminary plat approval with the following staff conditions:

1. The design of the site and buildings shall comply with all applicable development standards of the Millcreek Zoning Code and any site development standards required by the Millcreek Engineer and Building Official, and Unified Fire Authority.
2. Must meet all requirements in the adopted Flag Lot Policy.
3. Prior to receiving final plat approval, the applicant shall certify that existing utility services have the capacity to accommodate additional demand induced by the development, or that the services will be upgraded to meet the additional demand.
5. Any modifications to these approved plans must be approved by the Planning Department, in writing, prior to the changes being implemented in the field.
6. The proposed subdivision plat must complete a final technical review that includes an engineering review to ensure that the final plat complies with all conditions of approval of the preliminary plat and to ensure that the final plat complies with the design standards, codes, and ordinances and with engineering/surveying requirements, including any bonding for possible future improvements.
7. All applicable zoning, building, health, fire and safety requirements must be met prior to receiving final approval of a building permit.
8. Subject to development agreement.
9. All items of the staff report.

The applicant was not present for comment.

Chair LaMar opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair LaMar closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Cianflone moved to approve the preliminary subdivision application, file number SD-22-010, per the proposed plans as presented. Commissioner Wright seconded. Chair LaMar called for the vote. Commissioner LaMar voted yes, Commissioner Cianflone voted yes, Commissioner Hulsberg voted yes, Commissioner Larsen voted yes,

Commissioner Lofgren voted yes, Commissioner Sieber voted yes, and Commissioner Wright voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

2.3 Consideration of CU-22-008, Request for a Conditional Use Permit to Accommodate an 89-Unit Multifamily Development Location: 1395 E. Miller Avenue Applicant: PEG Development Planner: Francis Lilly

Francis Lilly noted that the Commission had seen projects on the site several times. The site would front Miller Avenue and Highland Drive. The first phase of the project was approved in approximately 2015, though it was always the developer's intent to do a second phase of the development. In 2020, the proposed second phase had 99 units. The current proposal had 89 units. There would be no new commercial, but it would have a convertible ground floor space for future commercial. Lilly highlighted a private irrigation line on the property. The developer would need to work with the Lower Millcreek Irrigation Company. The project would add 89 dwellings to the existing 44, totaling 17 studios, 58 one-bedroom, 52 two-bedroom, and 6 three-bedroom units. The existing phase had 17,568 square feet of commercial office space. The property was located in the Neighborhood Subdistrict of the City Center Overlay Zone (CCOZ), so no commercial was required, though ground floor transparency must be 40%. He showed the Commission the proposed site plan and building elevations and highlighted how the project met code.

Lilly said in CCOZ, there is a height transition zone that is 75 feet back from the existing right-of-way from Highland Drive. Most of the building is 70-75 feet in height, depending on the grade. A portion of the building along Highland Drive is 50 feet tall due to the height transition requirement. The project proposed about 32% of open space. There would be a 9-foot street dedication on Miller Avenue and street trees would be required to meet code. The applicant was proposing 230 parking stalls excluding ADA. The baseline in CCOZ required 291 stalls before accounting for shared parking and a reduction. The city commissioned a parking study from Hales Engineering to evaluate shared parking opportunities and recommended a reduction within the scope allowed by ordinance.

Josh Gibbons, Hales Engineering, highlighted the parking study. Millcreek code required 291 parking stalls. The property uses would be office and multi-family housing which has different times of use. When accounting for time of day uses, Millcreek code required 241 stalls. Hales compared this project with six others in the area and took the 85 percentile of demand rates, which came to a demand of 1.27 stalls per unit. Hales took that demand and added a five percent buffer to account for surges of demand and concluded that 230 stalls would be sufficient to meet the demand (17% reduction). Chair LaMar asked about a standard timeframe for business operating hours. Gibbons said there was not an industry standard.

Lilly said the Millcreek Community Council recommended approval of the application on a 7-2 vote. Some had expressed concern about the parking reduction, open space, and architecture, but appreciated the reduction in dwellings from the previous proposal. He then reviewed the staff findings and recommendation from the staff report, which was that the commission grant preliminary approval for the conditional use permit subject to the following conditions:

1. Development's guest parking stalls within development will be available for shared parking during business hours operating hours.

2. Prior to receiving final approval, applicant shall bond for all required improvements, including curb, gutter, sidewalk, street trees and required irrigation, required setback landscaping, streetlights, and any other improvement required by the City.
3. Applicant shall make best efforts to incorporate travel demand management strategies for the project, including but not limited to subsidizing the cost of transit passes for commercial and residential uses, providing safe, secure, and convenient bicycle storage beyond what is required by Millcreek code.
4. The applicant will ensure that every residential unit has at least one dedicated parking space.
5. Applicant shall provide service availability letters from all utility providers prior to receiving final conditional use approval.
6. Applicant shall verify with Millcreek Engineering staff through appropriate studies as required by the City's Geological Hazards ordinance that the soils are suitable for development prior to receiving final conditional use approval.
7. Applicant shall install dark-sky compliant lighting, and submit a lighting and photometric plan, including for signage, for review by planning staff prior to receiving final conditional use approval.
8. Applicant shall comply with the materials palette presented in the application and CCOZ package.
9. The applicant shall obtain preliminary plan approval from the Fire Marshal prior to receiving final conditional use approval.
10. Prior to receiving a certificate of occupancy, applicant shall apply an anti-graffiti material or coating on the north, west, and south building facades, and on any fencing the applicant installs on the project.
11. The design of the site and building shall comply with all applicable development standards, including but not limited to the City's Recreational Facility and Open Space Standards, Medium and High-Density Residential Development Standards, the Millcreek Urban Forestry Standards, and any site development standard required by the City Engineer and Fire Marshal.
12. Prior to receiving final conditional use approval, the applicant shall certify that existing utility services have the capacity to accommodate additional demand induced by the development, or that the services will be upgraded to meet the additional demand.
13. Prior to receiving final conditional use approval, the applicant shall obtain written approval from the Lower Millcreek Irrigation Company.
14. Signs and accessory structures will require separate building permits and staff review for zoning/land use compliance.
15. No light source (light bulb, fluorescent tube, or other direct source of light used to illuminate a parking area) shall be visible beyond the property line including the alley (ROW) of any off-street parking area as required by Section 19.80.030 of the zoning ordinance.
16. Any modifications to these approved plans must be approved by the Planning Department, in writing, prior to the changes being implemented in the field.
17. Landscaping shall be installed in compliance with Chapter 19.77 Water Efficient Landscape Design and Development Standards and as required by the City Center overlay Zone. Any revisions to the landscape plan package shall be reviewed and approved in writing by the director or designee prior to commencement of construction. Re-certification of compliance with the requirements of the landscaping ordinance shall be provided by the qualified professionals who prepared and submitted the plan revisions.
18. The applicant will comply with all requirements established through the technical review process prior to receiving final conditional use approval.
19. All items of the staff report, and discussions located in the meeting minutes.

Applicant - Nate McBride and McCall Judd, PEG, said PEG was founded in 2003 and had developed more than 95 projects. They have a project history on Brickcreek from 2016 to

present. The project was revisited and updated after the pandemic. The architect showed the Commission updated building renderings.

Commissioner Wright asked about fewer windows on Miller Avenue. The applicant's architect said the south facing façade created a pattern of lines and there were no windows to accommodate the bedrooms, having a place for bed placement. Commissioner Wright asked that more windows be considered.

Lilly said in response to a comment he received online, he noted the city was aware of irrigation in the area and the developer would be required to modernize the line that crossed their property. The developer had to work with the irrigation company.

Wayne Johnson, Millcreek Community Council, said the council liked the proposal. The open space between phases I and II felt like a slot canyon. He reiterated the importance of dealing with the irrigation water on the property. There were ongoing irrigation issues to the west of the property. The dissenting votes came from irrigation issues and parking.

Chair LaMar opened the public hearing.

Chair LaMar read an emailed comment received from Lynda Bagley-Gibson. *"I object to this project sending irrigation water thru or house at 3074 Richmond Street if that is what they are planning to do. the irrigation water has caused flooding to our property and other property's on Elgin Ave. since they closed the north and south bound ditches. This was also mentioned at the Millcreek Community Council meeting."*

Fred Lutze said nothing the project did would add water to the irrigation system, it was completely separate.

Chair LaMar closed the public hearing.

Chair LaMar asked if there was a way to ensure there was not a crossover of times for parking with commercial that had later hours. Lilly said he would talk with the PEG team on lease restrictions. Judd said the commercial was on floor 1 of Brickcreek Phase I, so there would not be any restaurants, just office space. Commissioner Hulsberg asked about landscaping requirements on Highland Drive. Lilly said there was not enough frontage to require a street tree, but he would review it. He requested the Commission add a condition in their motion to add a street tree on Highland Drive. Commissioner Sieber asked about stormwater management. Lutze said there would be a large vault on site that would release the stormwater at a restricted rate into the city's system. Chair LaMar thought the project complied with CCOZ.

Commissioner Larsen, regarding CU-22-008 a request for a conditional use permit to accommodate an 89-unit multifamily development at 1395 E. Miller Avenue, moved that the Planning Commission grant preliminary conditional use approval based on the staff report and all conditions therein. Commissioner Lofgren seconded. Chair LaMar called for the vote. Commissioner LaMar voted yes, Commissioner Cianflone voted yes, Commissioner Hulsberg voted yes, Commissioner Larsen voted yes, Commissioner Lofgren

voted yes, Commissioner Sieber voted yes, and Commissioner Wright voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

Lilly noted he would update the city center development dashboard and send it to the Commission. The Commission took a break from 8:43-8:50pm. Commissioner Cianflone left the meeting.

3. Continued Matters

3.1 Consideration of CU-22-009, Request for a Conditional Use Permit to Construct a New Two-Mile Segment of Bonneville Shoreline Trail Connecting Parleys and Millcreek Canyon Location: Parcels 163-620-0003, 162-540-0005, 162-540-0004, 162-537-6008, and 162-532-7023 Applicant: Trails Utah Planner: Katie Larsen

Katie Larsen said the applicant, Trails Utah, was requesting a conditional use permit to construct a new two-mile segment of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail in the FR-5, Forestry and Recreation Zone located on public land holdings parcels. Impacts of parking and traffic had largely been addressed in recent improvements to the two recognized access points, Grandeur Peak East, and Rattlesnake Gulch trailheads. A traffic study was commissioned at the Grandeur Peal trailhead in 2015 and the findings of the report guided the improvements. Initially, the parking lot had 17 parking spots, the study recommended an additional 23 spots to meet peak demand. The improvements created 49 parking spaces, 9 more than the traffic study required for peak demand. Improvements made to the Rattlesnake Gulch trailhead provided 24 more parking spaces than the previous 15-16 spots. She said while there is seemingly ample parking opportunity, many users still resort to parking on residential streets to access informal trailheads. Trails Utah will be required to formulate a parking contingency plan and take the necessary action to prevent and mitigate negative effects (signage to discourage use, no parking in areas, etc.). Staff requested that the applicant be required to improve trash receptacles at trailheads to prepare for more trail users and add signage to discourage littering and encourage users to pick up after their dogs. Larsen noted that user-made trailheads could be found on Teton and Crestwood Drive, which leads to social trails on the hillside. These access points are often seen as a detriment to residents due to parking and people walking in or near their property. Staff requested that the applicant be required to post wayfinding signage on the established trail to lead people away from using the social trails and add signage near informal access points discouraging access or blocking it off with natural debris. Larsen showed images of the existing terrain and the proposed trail alignment.

Larsen reported that the Mt. Olympus Community Council met on June 22, 2022, and moved 6 votes in favor and 2 opposed for approval of the application if the applicant provided an effective parking contingency plan to mitigate issues of parking on residential streets and takes action to deter the public from using social trails and informal trailheads. The council expressed concerns regarding waste disposal, as other trails in the area have caused similar issues. They recommended the improvement of waste receptacles and the provision of dog waste bags. Staff said the application supported Millcreek's objective to advance the goals of the General Plan, which supported completion of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. She recommended approval of the application subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall block off access to social trails on the hillside by using signage and natural blockades, such as logs and rocks.
2. The applicant is to include wayfinding signage at crossroads of social trails to direct users to the improved trail.

3. The applicant shall place signage at informal trailheads to discourage access. The informal trailheads relating to the extension are found on Teton and Crestwood Drive.
4. If the trail causes increased traffic and parking in residential areas causing issues of access, the contingency plan must include the placement of 'No Parking' signage on at least one side of the road near informal access points.
5. The applicant is to provide improved waste receptacles and signage regarding littering and proper disposal of dog waste at The Grandeur Peak and Rattlesnake Gulch trailheads. The burden is on the applicant to coordinate the servicing of waste.
6. The applicant shall provide a parking contingency plan Millcreek staff agrees on, including Planning and Zoning, the City Attorney and Engineering.

Applicant - John Knoblock, Trails Utah, apologized for the delay at the last Commission meeting. They agreed with the contingency plan presented. He said they were not the land manager for the property. The county owned the property and Grandeur Peak trailhead. The Forest Service owned the Rattlesnake Gulch trailhead. They would work with the county on trail signage and partner to ensure things came together. He said they would inform nearby residents of when construction would take place.

Chair LaMar asked about the waste removal condition. Knoblock said Trails Utah would get the trail built but would work with Salt Lake County to get waste receptacles.

Chair LaMar asked for public comment.

Lorin Moser, 3258 S. Teton Drive, expressed concern with condition 4. The studies done in 2015 were outdated for the amount of traffic in the area. He said there were more bicyclers using the social trails. He expressed concern with snow removal and residential waste can emptying on the street with on-street parking by hikers/bikers.

Jeff Silvestrini, 3400 S. Crestwood Drive, said as Mayor of Millcreek the city had worked hard with Salt Lake County to preserve the property along Grandeur Peak as open space. The city was interested in the trail for recreation. As a resident, he had seen an increased use in social trails. He did not feel the social trails would stop with the connection of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. The city would work on parking problems as they developed. He was not personally bothered by the street parking. He felt the staff conditions were appropriate. The city would also work with the county on waste receptacles.

Sarah Bennett, Trails Utah Executive Director, expressed gratitude to planning staff. She said the project was important and a long time coming. The trail would be constructed by professional trail builders. Trails Utah would pay close attention to any issues stemming from this trail.

Commissioner Sieber said the city and applicant should have data on existing traffic and then decide at what point it became enough of an issue to take action.

Elyse Sullivan read an emailed comment from Daniel Figuero. *"I have read the latest staff notes which I think relates to this. A very strong concern for residents which causes a lot of discussion amongst us on Teton Dr and what has been voiced frequently to you and the various parties involved in this plan is increased traffic and parking from overflow traffic if*

this goes ahead. Reading the mitigation statements it appears that the current thought is to place no parking signs on one side only on the hillside to allow fire access. If this is the case then it seems that traffic will continue but instead of parking on the hillside will now park in front of the houses on Teton Dr and potentially block drive and house access. Can we suggest in the mitigation wording that no parking lines are also placed in front of the houses or some sort of signage on the house side also to discourage any parking on that side also? Or perhaps the signage on hillside should state no parking on the whole street / either side of street and for residents only?"

Chair LaMar did not feel the trail connection would increase traffic where it was already taking place. He was in favor of the application. He was in favor of waste receptacles but did not want to put the undue burden on Trails Utah.

Commissioner Sieber, in consideration of CU-22-009, request for a conditional use permit to construct a new two-mile segment of Bonneville Shoreline Trail connecting Parleys and Millcreek Canyon, moved that the Planning Commission grant the conditional use permit. Commissioner Wright seconded. Chair LaMar called for the vote. Commissioner LaMar voted yes, Commissioner Hulsberg voted yes, Commissioner Larsen voted yes, Commissioner Lofgren voted yes, Commissioner Sieber voted yes, and Commissioner Wright voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

1. Commission Business Continued

1.2 Approval of June 15, 2022 Meeting Minutes

1.3 Approval of June 29, 2022 Special Meeting Minutes

Commissioner LaMar moved to approve the June 15th and June 29th minutes as provided by staff. Commissioner Larsen seconded. Chair LaMar called for the vote. Commissioner LaMar voted yes, Commissioner Hulsberg voted yes, Commissioner Larsen voted yes, Commissioner Lofgren voted yes, Commissioner Sieber voted yes, and Commissioner Wright voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

1.4 Updates from the Planning and Zoning Director

There was no update.

4. Calendar of Upcoming Meetings

- City Council Mtg., 7/26/22, 7:00 p.m.
- Mt. Olympus Community Council Mtg., 8/1/22, 6:00 p.m.
- Millcreek Community Council Mtg., 8/2/22, 6:30 p.m.
- Canyon Rim Citizens Association Mtg., 8/3/22, 7:00 p.m.
- East Mill Creek Community Council Mtg., 8/4/22, 6:30 p.m.
- City Council Mtg., 8/8/22, 7:00 p.m.
- Planning Commission Mtg., 8/17/22, 5:00 p.m.

ADJOURNED: Commissioner Lofgren moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:19 p.m. Commissioner Hulsberg seconded. Chair LaMar called for the vote. Commissioner LaMar voted yes, Commissioner Hulsberg voted yes, Commissioner Larsen voted yes,

Commissioner Lofgren voted yes, Commissioner Sieber voted yes, and Commissioner Wright voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

APPROVED: _____ Date
Shawn LaMar, Chair

Attest: _____
Elyse Sullivan, City Recorder

DRAFT