

**WEST VALLEY CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES**

September 26, 2007

The meeting was called to order at 4:05 p.m. by Chairman Harold Woodruff at 3600 Constitution Boulevard, West Valley City, Utah

WEST VALLEY CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS

Harold Woodruff, Brent Fuller, Jack Matheson, Phil Conder, Mary Jayne Davis and Jason Jones

ABSENT: Terri Mills and Dale Clayton

WEST VALLEY CITY PLANNING DIVISION STAFF

John Janson, Steve Lehman, Steve Pastorik, and Lori Cannon

WEST VALLEY ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF:

Nicole Cottle, Asst. City Attorney

AUDIENCE

Approximately 30 people were in the audience.

SUBDIVISION APPLICATIONS:

PUD-2-2007

The Towns at Highbury Commons – Final Plat

Ivory Homes

RM Zone

102 Units

10.2 Acres

10 U/A

Mr. Steve Lehman presented the application.

BACKGROUND

Darin Haskell, representing Ivory Homes, is requesting final approval for The Townhomes at Highbury Commons. The subject property is known as Lot 1 of the Highbury Commons at Lake Park Subdivision which will be amended as part of this application.

STAFF/AGENCY COMMENTS:

Public Works Department:

- Authorization required of ditch/water users for any abandonment, relocation, piping or any other modifications to existing ditches or irrigation structures.
- Contact Salt Lake County Auditor's Office for approval of street names and subdivision names.
- Street improvements shall be installed in accordance with plan and profiles approved by the Engineering Division.
- Revisions to plat required.
- Flood control issues to be coordinate with Public Works.
- Any proposed on-street parking to be coordinated with Public Works.

Utility Companies:

- Standard Utility Easements required.

Granger Hunter Improvement District:

- Project is subject to all GHID requirements and design standards.

Fire Department:

- Proposed fire hydrant locations need to be shown on subdivision plat.
- Project shall meet all provisions of Fire Code relating to this type of development.
- Fire access will need to be reviewed.

Building Division:

- Follow recommendations outlined in the soils report.

ISSUES:

- The Townhomes at Highbury Commons is a residential community consisting of 102 units on 10.2 acres. This equates to an overall density of 10 units per acre. The development will consist of 4, 5 and 6-plex units.
- The site has been designed with the majority of buildings fronting the Daybury Drive and Highbury Parkway. This type of building orientation has been applied to all of the residential housing thus far approved in the Lake Park area. The project is located immediately to the east of the Kohls shopping center and south of the recently approved Arbor Square town home development.
- Ivory Homes has done a considerable amount of time designing the architecture to be unique and aesthetically pleasing. The building elevations have a great deal of movement in both the exterior façade and roof line. This is a positive element in the overall design of this project, as more than half of the units front a dedicated right-of-way.
- Buildings will consist of 100% masonry products. Brick and stucco will comprise the majority of exterior materials. Other masonry products may be used as accents where determined appropriate. The developer has determined that 3 color schemes will be used throughout the development.

- All residential units will have a two car garage for parking. Additional parking spaces have been provided for guest parking throughout the development. The overall parking has been calculated at 4.2 spaces per unit. This calculation is based on the garage, space in front of the garage and guest spaces. Ivory Homes is also considering the option to have on-street parking along Daybury Drive. After discussing the matter with Public Works, the right-of-way width can accommodate on-street parking, but permanent parking at this location would be discouraged.
- There are four unit types with varying square footages. Proposed residential units are intended to be 1272, 1379, 1605 and 1768 square feet. All units will have a courtyard and/or a covered porch. The courtyard areas are fairly large and will provide residents a sense of outdoor living. Ivory intends to construct basements for these units as well. According to a soils report, ground water was encountered depths ranging from 7.5 to 10 feet below existing grades. As existing grades will be elevated from what they are now, ground water impacts should not be a concern.
- The developer is proposing a minimum front setback of 18-20 feet. However, because these buildings have so much undulation, portions of the same building will be 40 feet from the right-of-way. Setbacks from the private alleys would be 19-20 feet. The building setback along 3100 South will be a minimum of 20 feet.
- The project site contains approximately 46.7 percent of open space. During the preliminary review, the Planning Commission approved the open space proposal based on Ivory's commitment to include certain amenities in this project. Ivory has submitted plans showing a combination the following:
 - * Sports Court
 - * Tot Lot
 - * BBQ Areas
 - * Covered Pavilion
 - * Picnic Tables
 - * Circular Walking Path
- Staff believes that these amenities along with what Zion's is proposing by way of the trail system, waterways and urban fishery, will provide ample recreational and outdoor opportunities for residents living in this community.
- That said however, there are a few concerns with regards to the amenities that staff would like to address. These are stated in the following:

1. The proposed pavilion near the sports court should be doubled in size.
 2. A covered sitting area should be installed near the tot lot.
 3. The picnic table area in the center round should be covered.
 4. Benches at various locations should be added along the circular walking path and other locations throughout the development.
 5. Sidewalks should extend from the main path to each of the proposed recreational spaces.
- During the rezone hearing, a development agreement was required. One condition of the rezone stated that the developer would install a masonry wall adjacent to the commercial development to the west. Ivory Homes has submitted photos of a pre-cast concrete wall. The developer will be extending this wall along the 3100 South right-of-way as well.
 - Staff has evaluated this project in regards to the multiple family design standards. This project meets the standards outlined in the ordinance governing architecture, color and variation. The developer will be provided a copy of these standards to make sure that all areas have been addressed. In addition, the proposed development has been reviewed and approved by Zions Securities.
 - Access to the site will be gained from Daybury Drive and Highbury Parkway. These roadways are presently being constructed and are public rights-of-way. Internal access will be via private drive and alleys. All alley locations will need to be reviewed and approved by the City Fire Department.
 - During the preliminary review, a concern was expressed regarding a potential traffic conflict at the northwest corner of the development. The preliminary plat illustrated that an access point would be provided out to Highbury Parkway. However, after further evaluating this point of access, both Ivory Homes and the owner's of the Shoppes at Lake Park felt that truck traffic and residential use would be problematic. As a result of these discussions, Ivory Homes has agreed to eliminate this point of access. In doing so, and to ensure adequate fire protection, a form of turf-block will be used at the east ends of Beckton Court and Brentford Court.
 - The developer will be required to install various improvements along 3100 South. The cross section will contain a 5-foot parkstrip and 5-foot sidewalk along with a 10-foot landscaped buffer behind the sidewalk. The pre-cast

masonry wall previously mentioned will be located behind the landscaped area.

- Once the project is complete, the site will be turned over to a professional management company. Staff has expressed concern about past projects being turned over to an uneducated association or projects that are turned over to the association without all development items being completed. The development agreement addresses this issue and will involve the developer, HOA, and staff before the project is transferred.

Applicant:
Darin Haskell
9303 S. 3070 W.

Discussion: Mr. Darin Haskell assured additional perimeter drains will be placed. He stated they will be placing basements unlike other developments in the area. Mr. Haskell indicated he was in agreement to all staff recommendations.

Commissioner Matheson asked what the price of the units may be. Mr. Haskell replied the smaller townhomes will start at \$170,000.00 and it will go up from that price.

There being no further discussion regarding this application, Chairman Woodruff called for a motion.

Motion: Commissioner Fuller moved to grant final plat approval for the Townhomes at Highbury Commons subject to the following conditions:

1. That the developer resolve all staff and agency concerns.
2. That the Planned Unit Development be subject to the multiple family design standards outlined in the City ordinance.
3. That the applicant follow recommendations outlined in the soils report.
4. That the landscape plan provided to staff be made part of the project. Said landscaping plan shall provide measures to ensure water conservation techniques will be used in accordance with City ordinances.
5. That the proposed development comply with all provisions of the West Valley City Fire Department. This shall include access into and through the project.

6. That the developer resolve any issues regarding irrigation ditches and irrigation water that may be in use.
7. That compliance be made with Granger Hunter Improvement District, i.e., water line extensions, connections, water rights and fire protection.
8. That the subdivision name and street names be approved by the Salt Lake County Auditor's Office.
9. That proposed building setbacks be in accordance with the site plan reviewed as part of this application. Slight modifications can be made to this plan if needed in order to accommodate utilities or other infrastructure. Modifications that deviate substantially from the approved site plan shall be reviewed by the Planning Commission.
10. That specialty lighting be provided throughout the entire development. A lighting plan has been submitted and will be kept on file in the Planning Division.
11. That building elevations, colors and materials, be in accordance with those illustrated during the March 28, 2007 Planning Commission hearing. The developer shall also provide a brick wainscot in all alley locations as well. Modifications to these selections can be made with approval from the Planning Commission.
12. That the south and west boundaries of the development be fenced in accordance with provisions of the development agreement. Ivory Homes will use a pre-cast masonry wall to fulfill this requirement.
13. Site amenities proposed for this project have been illustrated on the landscaping plan. The following additions shall also apply:
 - a. The proposed pavilion near the sports court should be doubled in size.
 - b. A covered sitting area shall be installed near the tot lot.
 - c. The picnic table area between Beckton and Brentford Courts shall be covered.
 - d. Benches at various locations shall be added along the circular walking path and other appropriate locations throughout the development.
 - e. Sidewalks should extend from the main path to each of the proposed recreational spaces.

14. That any on-street parking on Daybury Drive be coordinated with the City Engineering Division. Parking along this roadway is not intended to be permanent but for visitor parking.
15. That each garage be sufficient enough in size to accommodate the garbage can. In addition, the developer will need to coordinate garbage collection independent of City services.
16. That an HOA be established as noted in the development agreement.

Commissioner Matheson seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:

Commissioner Clayton	Absent
Commissioner Conder	Yes
Commissioner Davis	Yes
Commissioner Fuller	Yes
Commissioner Jones	Yes
Commissioner Matheson	Yes
Commissioner Mills	Absent
Chairman Woodruff	Yes

Unanimous – PUD-2-2007 – Approved

S-18-2007
Ridgeline Estates Subdivision
4595 West 3100 South
R-1-8 Zone
5 Lots

Mr. Steve Lehman presented the application.

BACKGROUND

Mr. Steven Bleazard is requesting preliminary and final plat approval for the Ridgeline Estates Subdivision. The subject property is located at 4595 West 3100 South and is zoned R-1-8. Residential housing is located on the east, south and west of the subdivision.

STAFF/AGENCY CONCERNS:

Fire Department:

- Fire hydrants to be installed in accordance with the Uniform Fire Code.

Granger Hunter Improvement District:

- Project will need an availability letter for water, sewer and fire protection.
 - Subject to design and review inspections.

Utility Agencies:

- Subject to all standard easement locations.

Public Works:

- Authorization required of ditch/water users for any abandonment, relocation, piping or any other modifications to existing ditches or irrigation structures.
 - Will allow a 5-foot off-set from Lake Meadow Drive.
 - Coordinate storm water drainage with Public Works.
 - Follow recommendations outlined in the soils report.

Building Inspections:

- Follow recommendations outlined in the soils report.

ISSUES:

- The developer is proposing a minor subdivision consisting of 5 lots on approximately 1.46 acres. Lot sizes range from 8,031 square feet to 15,298 square feet. An existing dwelling is presently located on the property on what is shown as lot 5. It is staff's understanding that this dwelling will be removed as part of the new subdivision construction.
- The subdivision is considered an infill development because of its relationship with existing residential uses. As this property is the last

vacant parcel in this area, it is faced with a challenging access issue. On the north side of 3100 South is a street known as Lake Meadow Drive. In order to comply with Public Works requirements, the new street accessing this subdivision needs to align or be off-set a maximum distance of 5 feet. The required alignment with Lake Meadow Drive will make for a unique shape to lot 1.

- During the study session, a suggestion was made that the elongated portion of lot 1 could be landscaped in such a way to minimize maintenance of this area. As staff explained in the study session, this area could be planted similar to the front yard, a garden could be planted in this area, or the area could be xeriscaped.
- Access to all lots will be from 3100 South. Existing improvements are in place along this street. Curb cuts and other utility installations will need to be coordinated with the appropriate agencies and with the City Engineering Division. If damage has occurred to the existing improvements, or if damage results from new construction, the developer will be responsible to replace those accordingly.
- The applicant has inquired about the possibility of accessing lot 5 from the cul-de-sac. Although this could be construed as a flag lot, staff would suggest that the standard requirements for such lots be waived (except the 20-foot width requirement) as access from the cul-de-sac is more desirable than from 3100 South. If the developer chooses to provide access from the cul-de-sac, staff will require that the dwelling front 3100 South.
- As with all new subdivision development, there is a concern with the potential for ground water impacts. According to a soils report dated August 24, 2007, ground water was encountered at approximately 9 feet below the existing grade. Full basements will be allowed in the subdivision without any problems.

Applicant:
Steve Bleazard
2615 West Perschon Circle

Concerned:
Dave Davis
4553 West 3100 South

Discussion: Commissioner Conder asked if the front area is considered frontage and would landscaping be required. Steve Lehman answered yes, the front area would be considered frontage, and landscaping would be required. Chairman Woodruff asked if a fence would be placed in front. Steve said he hoped a fence would not be placed, and this question will be addressed later.

Mr. Steve Bleazard assured he is in agreement with staff's recommendations. He will not allow a six-foot fence. Commissioner Jones asked about the people who are interested in lot #1. Mr. Bleazard said they want to build a new home. Mr. Jones asked if there would be an HOA who may restrict fencing. Mr. Bleazard indicated he does not want a six-foot fence. He wants the area to be open with a view and not closed off.

Mr. Dave Davis wanted to know about drainage for basements. He asked how tall the homes would be, concerned that they might tower above the existing homes in the area. Mr. Davis asked what the schedule would be for the fence in front of the home on 3100 S. He wondered what the home exteriors would look like.

Mr. Bleazard indicated the homes will meet the City's design standards. Most will be multi-level units at approximately 1,800 sq. ft. He said they are creating daylight basements due to the configuration. A catch basin will be at the existing grade with a slight berm around the back. Mr. Bleazard stated there is currently a six-foot chainlink fence. He will probably leave the area by lot #1 open for landscaping and to allow visual access for drivers in and out. The City's fencing requirements do not allow fencing over four-feet in the front. Steve Lehman asked if another type of fence is between lot #1 and the adjacent property. Mr. Davis said his lot is surrounded with red block columns. There is 210 feet of block and he would like it continued. Mr. Bleazard assured he will not be disrupting the existing block fence or any other existing fencing. Steve Lehman indicated the City will assure water goes out to 3100 S. as it is a dedicated right-of-way. The City's Public Works Department may require minimal detention, but most likely there will not be a problem with water runoff from one lot to the other.

Commissioner Jones asked if the front would be considered frontage with the 60/40 rule. Steve answered yes, it would be applied and should be landscaped.

There being no further discussion regarding this application, Chairman Woodruff called for a motion.

Motion: Commissioner Matheson moved for approval of the Ridgeline Estates Subdivision subject to the following conditions:

1. That compliance be made with Granger Hunter Improvement District regarding water line extensions, sewer connections and fire protection.
2. That the subdivision name and interior street names be approved by Salt Lake County.

3. That recommendations outlined in the soils report be followed.
4. That any concerns regarding any existing irrigation systems be addressed with the Public Works Department. This requirement shall also include all matters regarding storm drain connections and easements.
5. That the developer resolve all staff and agency concerns.

Commissioner Conder seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:

Commissioner Clayton	Absent
Commissioner Conder	Yes
Commissioner Davis	Yes
Commissioner Fuller	Yes
Commissioner Jones	Yes
Commissioner Matheson	Yes
Commissioner Mills	Absent
Chairman Woodruff	Yes

Unanimous – S-18-2007 – Approved

S-19-2007
Dustin Christensen Subdivision
3279 South 3450 West
R-1-6 Zone
2 Lots

Mr. Steve Lehman presented the application.

BACKGROUND

Dustin Christensen is requesting preliminary and final plat approval for a minor subdivision in the R-1-6 zone. The proposed subdivision will divide a deep parcel into two lots. There is an existing dwelling on what will become lot 1 of the subdivision.

STAFF/AGENCY CONCERNS:

Fire Department:

- Fire hydrant to be within 250 feet of the new dwelling.

Granger Hunter Improvement District:

- Project will need to run availability for water, sewer and fire protection.
- Subject to design and review inspections.

Utility Agencies:

- Subject to all standard easement locations.

Public Works:

- Authorization required of ditch/water users for any abandonment, relocation, piping or any other modifications to existing ditches or irrigation structures.
- Will need to replace or repair existing improvements that may be damaged.
- Will need to coordinate curb cut locations with Public Works.
- Revisions to the plat required.
- Will need to coordinate subdivision name with County Auditor's Office.
- Dedication of 3450 West required.
- Soils report will be required.

Building Inspections:

- Follow recommendations outlined in the soils report.

ISSUES:

- The developer is proposing a new subdivision on the corner of 3450 West Tess Avenue. The proposed subdivision will create an additional building lot from an

existing parcel. This property is not part of a formal plat, and will be located adjacent to an LDS seminary building to the south and residential housing to the east.

- There is an existing dwelling that will remain on lot 1. It appears from the plat that all setbacks with the exception of the north side meet City setback standards. The dwelling on the north side is rather close to Tess Avenue which was created when this road was installed as a dedicated street to provide access to the Rosewood Subdivision to the east. The lot with the existing dwelling will be approximately 6,215 square feet, while the new lot will be approximately 6,156 square feet.
- All frontage and area requirements of the R-1-6 zone will be met as part of this application. Staff does have one concern regarding the depth of the new lot. The new lot will front Tess Avenue and will be approximately 74 feet in depth. Given the front and rear yard setback requirements, a custom designed home will need to be placed here in order to meet square footage requirements and setbacks. Staff has expressed this concern to the applicant and was informed that this should not be a problem.
- Access to the new lot will be gained from Tess Avenue. All public improvements are existing including curb, gutter, and sidewalk. The applicant and/or builder will need to coordinate access to the new lot with the City Engineering Division. The applicant and/or builder will be responsible to replace or repair existing improvements that may be damaged or may become damaged as a result of construction along the frontage of the new lot. The applicant will be dedicating right-of-way along 3450 West as well.
- The applicant and/or builder will need to provide a soils report to address any ground water impacts. Given the high water elevation for the Ivy Park development to the southeast, a soils report will be needed to ensure that the proper basement elevation will be used.

Applicant:
Dustin Christensen
5278 S. Pinemont Dr., #A-210

There being no discussion regarding this application, Chairman Woodruff called for a motion.

Motion: Commissioner Conder moved for approval of the Dustin Christensen Subdivision subject to a resolution of staff and agency comments.

Commissioner Davis seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:

Commissioner Clayton	Absent
Commissioner Conder	Yes
Commissioner Davis	Yes
Commissioner Fuller	Yes
Commissioner Jones	Yes
Commissioner Matheson	Yes
Commissioner Mills	Absent
Chairman Woodruff	Yes

Unanimous – S-19-2007 – Approved

S-20-2007
Burrola Subdivision
5325 West 4100 South
R-1-8 Zone
2 Lots

Mr. Steve Lehman presented the application.

BACKGROUND

Mr. Richard Burrola is requesting preliminary and final subdivision approval for a two lot subdivision in the R-1-8 Zone. The subject property is bordered on the east, south and west by existing single family housing. A frontage variance was granted by the West Valley City Board of Adjustment in November 2002, allowing the property to develop as a flag lot subdivision.

STAFF/AGENCY CONCERNS:

Fire Department:

- Fire hydrant to be located in accordance with the Uniform Fire Code.

Granger Hunter Improvement District:

- Project will need to run availability for water, sewer and fire protection.
- Subject to design and review inspections.

Utility Agencies:

- Subject to all standard easement locations.

Public Works:

- Authorization required of ditch/water users for any abandonment, relocation, piping or any other modifications to existing ditches or irrigation structures.
- Revisions to plat are required.
- Public improvements have been installed along 4100 South. The developer will be responsible to replace or repair any existing damage, or damage that may result from new construction.
- Soils report may be required.

ISSUES:

- The developer is proposing a flag lot subdivision consisting of 2 lots. In order to subdivide this property, the applicant was in need of a frontage variance from the Board of Adjustment. A variance was granted by the Board in November 2002, which allowed the frontage on lot 1 to be 68 feet where 80 feet is required. All other provisions of the R-1-8 zone will be met as part of this application.
- Access to the subdivision will be gained from 4100 South. Dedication and improvements along the frontage of this property were made at the time the City completed its road project a number of years ago. In regards to the existing improvements, the developer will be responsible to replace or repair any existing damage, or damage that may result from new construction. An access easement will need to be added to the plat allowing access for both lots 1 and 2.
- As with all new subdivision development, there is a concern with the potential of ground water impacts. The applicant has requested that the soils report for the Pheasant Park Subdivision to the east and south be allowed to establish the basement depth of the new dwelling. A review of this report indicates that ground water was not encountered in this area of the subdivision. This request will be evaluated by the City Engineering Division.

- The developer will need to meet requirements of the Fire Department. A fire hydrant will need to be located within 250 of the back dwelling. As the depth of the new lot is less than 150 feet from 4100 South, a turnaround will not be required.
- The proposed subdivision is located east of properties zoned agriculture. City ordinance requires that a 6-foot chain link fence be installed along this boundary. However, if an existing chain link fence exists and is in good condition, the applicant would not need to install a new fence.

Applicant:
Richard Burrola
8056 S. Demrest Rd.

Concerned:
Paul Nichals
5329 W. 4100 S.

Discussion: Commissioner Matheson asked if the property had it been surveyed. Mr. Burrola replied yes. Commissioner Matheson noted three-feet will be taken from the neighbor's property, and he wondered if this has caused problems. Mr. Burrola answered that they will be able to make the road work and it should not be detrimental. He mentioned trees have established the fence line and they will need to be removed to establish the driveway. Mr. Burrola assured he would accommodate Mr. Nichals in any way. Commissioner Woodruff asked if the drive would need to be paved. Steve Lehman replied yes. Commissioner Davis inquired if the driveway could be placed without removing trees. Mr. Burrola explained one tree is already dead, and they plan to keep the trees in the back of the property. He described the green home they plan to build in the rear.

Mr. Paul Nichals told the Commission that there are two trees that must be removed. He said he has been after the applicant to remove the trees for years. Mr. Nichals indicated he did not know if the well on the property would still be operational.

There being no further discussion regarding this application, Chairman Woodruff called for a motion.

Motion: Commissioner Jones moved for approval of the Burrola Subdivision subject to a resolution of staff and agency concerns.

Commissioner Fuller seconded the motion.

Roll call vote:

Commissioner Clayton	Absent
Commissioner Conder	Yes
Commissioner Davis	Yes
Commissioner Fuller	Yes
Commissioner Jones	Yes
Commissioner Matheson	Yes
Commissioner Mills	Absent
Chairman Woodruff	Yes

Unanimous – S-20-2007 – Approved

CONDITIONAL USE APPLICATION:

C-31-2007

**Family Support Center
4478 South Hawarden Drive
Crisis Nursery and Counseling Center
R-1-8 Zone (0.63 acres)**

Mr. Steve Pastorik presented the application.

This application was continued during the public hearing on September 12th. The motion for continuance was to allow the Planning Commission to consider the information presented at the public hearing and to allow all of the interested parties' time to submit additional information addressing outstanding issues. The motion for continuance also included the condition that no additional public input will be heard regarding this application during the public hearing on September 26th and that the hearing would be for a decision only.

Bonnie Peters with the Family Support Center has requested a conditional use for a crisis nursery and counseling center on a 0.63 acre parcel at 4478 South Hawarden Drive. The subject property includes a home and is designated as low density residential, which allows 3 to 4 units/acre, in the West Valley City General Plan. Surrounding uses include single family homes to the north, east and south and a church to the west.

On August 21, 2007, the City Council approved an amendment to the zoning ordinance that added a definition for crisis nursery and counseling center and added crisis nursery and counseling center to the list of conditional uses in the R-1 Zones. The definition

approved for crisis nursery and counseling center is: “a home on at least ½ acre of property licensed by the State as a residential support program to provide temporary, short-term child care for up to 72 hours for the primary purpose of child abuse prevention which may include counseling as an accessory use.”

Proposed Use

The following bulleted list describes the 3 functions the Family Support Center is requesting for this facility.

Crisis Nursery

- The ratio of children to adults is 4/1 at all times.
- The average number of children coming and going in one day's time is 8 – 13.
- Overall, the maximum number of children is 16; however, having that many children is rare.
- 4 adults are providing care at any one time.
- There are never more than 8 children overnight.
- Parents must set an appointment to drop off their children.
- The maximum age of children allowed at the crisis nursery is 11.

Counseling

- Individual and family counseling is provided by 2 part-time clinicians.
- Counseling hours are Monday - Friday, 10:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.
- Counseling appointments are previously scheduled; there are no unscheduled drop-in services.
- A counseling session is 50 minutes with 10 minutes for the clinician to do charting.

Classes

- Parent Education classes are offered quarterly for 10 weeks in each session. Classes are held on Tuesdays and Thursdays.
- Classes are 1 ½ hours in length. 1 class will be held from 10:30 - 12:00 noon and one from 6:00 - 7:30 p.m. (1 daytime class and 1 evening class will be held each week.)
- The maximum attendance per class is 10.
- The facility may also provide Anger Management classes on an evening when parenting classes are not being held. This is an 8 week course; 1 ½ hours per week.

Attachments

The Planning Commission allowed additional written input up until September 19th. Staff received the following documents on or before September 19th and these documents are included in the staff report in the order of when they were received:

- E-mail from Charles Parsons, a neighbor of the Family Support Center facility in Salt Lake City

- Letter from Elaine Monsen, spokesperson for the neighborhood surrounding the subject property
- E-mail from Nicole Gregory, a West Valley resident living on Hawarden Drive
- Letter from Robert McConnell, attorney for the Family Support Center

Obviously from the testimony received on September 12th and from these latest documents, there are major differences of opinion on this application. While the Family Support Center is agreeable to some of the conditions, such as parking restrictions, suggested by the neighbors, they are not agreeable to conditions that would prohibit counseling and classes or that further limit the number of children that could be cared for.

Comments from Legal Staff

Planning staff reviewed the letter from Robert McConnell with legal staff. The following indented text is comments from the legal staff concerning this letter.

The applicant, through a letter received September 19, 2007 from its legal representative Robert McConnell, discussed several issues. The applicant did not feel obligated to discuss the wide variety of issues raised at the hearing because it “would require an exhaustive effort that would be both difficult and unwarranted given the absence of factual support for many of the comments” The applicant does address the following:

First, with regard to traffic issues, the applicant assumes the accuracy of staff’s traffic estimates and then states that “an increased daily traffic count does not, in and of itself constitute a detrimental effect particularly given the wider streets in this particular neighborhood and the Crisis Nursery’s relative proximity to a major collector street.” The applicant then submits that any detrimental effect should be evaluated in the context of other permitted and conditional uses.

By simply authorizing a nursery for 8 children, traffic counts will increase. The applicant desires to basically layer three types of uses upon one another which would result in traffic that is substantially greater than that of a single family home and is greater than the other permitted and conditional uses allowed in the zone.

Staff believes that the counts put forth in the applicant’s letter suggest the highest potential trips per day for other uses in the zone while comparing those to numbers staff has presented for the applicant’s use which are admittedly not the highest potential trip numbers for the application. The comparison the applicant makes is therefore disingenuous. In addition, staff submits that a substantial increase in trips per day to this location will have a detrimental effect on the surrounding uses. However, staff also submits that this can be mitigated by applying a reasonable condition limiting the layering of uses at this location.

Second, the applicant submits that it would leave the existing garage and utilize the driveway and street for additional parking. Staff agrees.

Third, the applicant suggests that counseling and classes are allowed in the zone. This is true; however, they are not allowed to be layered with other uses. Again, the applicant is suggesting that we should allow layering of various uses at this location. Staff believes this would result in an incompatible use at this location.

Comments from Planning Staff

Planning staff prepared a staff report for the zone text change that was approved by the City Council. The following indented text is an updated portion of that report that helps describe why staff is recommending the conditions in the attached table.

As a means of comparison for neighborhood impacts, staff compared a day care as a home occupation to the proposed crisis nursery and counseling center. The home occupation requirements were put in place to maintain the residential character of neighborhoods. The definitions of home occupation and home child care are included below for reference:

"Home Occupation" means any lawful use conducted within a dwelling and carried on by persons residing in the dwelling unit, which use is clearly incidental and secondary to the use of the dwelling and does not change the residential character. The home occupation typically allows the home to be used for receiving mail and maintaining a business telephone.

"Home Child Care" means care for children who are non-family members in an occupied dwelling by the resident of that dwelling at least twice a week for more than three children, but fewer than seven children. The total number of children being cared for shall include children under the age of six years residing in the dwelling, who are under the supervision of the provider during the period of time the child care is provided. This definition shall not apply to care being provided strictly to family members. When a caregiver cares for only one child under age two, the group size, at any given time, shall not exceed six, except that one additional school age child may be cared for before and after school hours and on school holidays and during vacation periods; or when a caregiver cares for children who are all two years of age or older, the group's size shall not exceed six, except that two additional children of six years of age or older may be cared for before and after school hours and on school holidays and during vacations.

The proposed use is different from a home occupation in the following ways:

- The persons caring for the children and providing counseling do not reside at the home. Up to six employees (house parents and counselors) would be at the home.
- For home day cares with one child under 2, a maximum of 7 children can be cared for. For home days cares with two children under 2, a maximum of 6 children can be cared for. The proposed use would have up to 16 children aged 0 to 11 during the day and 8 at night.
- Home occupations are only allowed between the hours of 6 AM and 10 PM. The proposed use provides care overnight. Staff asked the applicant if there are hour limitations for when children can be dropped off. Here is the response: “We encourage children to be dropped off during the hours of 7:30 AM-8 PM as this is what is best for them regarding their meal times, bedtimes, etc. However, in an emergency situation where a parent has to go to a hospital, etc. we will let parents drop off at other times.”
- A minor home occupation allows up to 2 customers per hour. The proposed maximum class size is 10 individuals. For counseling sessions, they are generally individual sessions but family therapy would be engaged in at times. This would be for the entire family, ranging in size from 2-10 individuals.

In summary, the proposed use would include more off-street parking to accommodate patrons and employees than a home occupation and more traffic than a home occupation with children being dropped off throughout the day and persons attending counseling sessions and classes.

Questions from the Planning Commission

Two questions asked during the study session were: will the crisis nursery meet building occupancy requirements and will the crisis nursery create traffic congestion or a traffic safety problem. Staff talked with Erik Brondum, the City’s traffic engineer, about the traffic question. His opinion is that, while the use would certainly increase traffic on the street, the additional traffic would not create a road capacity or safety problem. Staff has requested more detailed floor plan information from the Family Support Center to answer the occupancy question. Staff hopes to have the occupancy question answered before the public hearing on the 26th.

Recommended Staff Conditions

Also attached to this report is an 11” x 17” table that includes the conditions of approval proposed by the neighborhood, the conditions of approval proposed by staff, a description as to whether the conditions of approval proposed by staff are acceptable to the applicant, and the reasons for the conditions of approval proposed by staff.

The proposed staff conditions are intended to address: commitments made by the Family Support Center, ordinance requirements, and ways to make the proposed facility compatible with “the character of the site, adjacent properties, surrounding

neighborhoods, and other existing and proposed development” (Section 7-7-105 (3), Conditional Use Standards and Criteria).

Discussion: Commissioner Woodruff reminded that this application is on this agenda for a decision only, and no public input would be received. Steve Pastorik informed that he received four additional documents. Two were e-mails; one was a letter from the spokesperson for the neighbor and one was a letter from legal council for the Family Support Center. Steve said he created a table for the Planning Commission to review listing conditions proposed by the neighborhood; conditions proposed by staff; and reasons for the conditions which staff proposed.

Commissioner Matheson assured the Commission is not addressing this application as a home occupation, and the rules for a home occupation do not bear on this application. Steve replied this is correct. He said if it was a home occupation, the person running the business must be the same person living at the home. Steve explained he referred to home occupations because those uses should try to make the business fit into a community without someone actually knowing there is a business running out of the neighborhood. It was used as a means of comparison to compare this non-profit business with other home occupations.

Commissioner Conder disclosed that Councilman Coleman called him and they had a non-detailed discussion regarding the purpose of the Planning Commission. Councilman Coleman expressed his feelings to Commissioner Conder regarding this application, but no new information was discussed.

Commissioner Matheson declared that he talked with Councilman Coleman, and Councilman Coleman’s recommendations were that the Commission should go with staff’s recommendations and the City’s Legal Department’s recommendations.

Steve Pastorik informed that the new staff’s conditions have been amended from the original staff conditions. Chairman Woodruff compared the amended conditions and asked if they reflect what is in the staff recommendations. Steve answered yes.

Commissioner Conder asked if there was a layout for the home. He was concerned about the occupancy of the home, the number of bedrooms, and how it might be configured with the separation of ages and sexes. Steve explained there are three bedrooms upstairs for girls and boys and the house parents. There are three rooms in basement that will be used for counseling and a separate play area for the children. Commissioner Matheson asked if the City’s building inspector had reviewed the plans. Steve informed that dimensions were requested and the building inspector reported a limit of 16 people for the home. If it had over 16 people, it would be considered a commercial business, requiring ADA requirements and a sprinkler system. Steve said before the Center obtains a license,

an inspection must be scheduled.

Commissioner Jones acknowledged an 'RB' zone would be a better location for this type of business, but without counseling, the root of the client's problems will not be addressed. He mentioned he would be more in favor of this application if limited counseling could be performed so that it would not incur extra traffic. The intent would be to provide better care for the children. Chairman Woodruff agreed, but not with the limit of ten people per class. Commissioner Jones reminded that the parents can receive counseling at the time they drop their child off without making an extra trip. Chairman Woodruff suggested limiting the counseling to single or family counseling. This would possibly result in a slight amount of traffic, even if two cars per family were used. He commented no group or ten-person class would be held. Commissioner Jones agreed with this suggestion.

Commissioner Davis was concerned about older children and infants sleeping in the same room. She said children who may be compromised emotionally must be protected, especially if their family is in crisis. Steve assured the State requirements would regulate and address the separation of gender and ages.

Commissioner Fuller wondered if the counseling or classes could be held at a different facility. He questioned how the counseling could be monitored to assure the Center is following the requirements. Chairman Woodruff perceived the Center would perform counseling services on an appointment basis. Steve reminded that staff has suggested that eight children be cared for and watched, but there be no counseling. He informed that the Family Support Center at the Midvale location has a contract with the State requiring they provide at least 200 hours of counseling per year. This does not mean this location must have the same requirement. Commissioner Jones asked if the 200 hours include classes and counseling or is it strictly for counseling. Steve stated it was his understanding that the requirement is only for the counseling.

Commissioner Matheson reminded that a home occupation allows two customers per hour. He suggested this could be a valid number for counseling. The home occupation ordinance also does not allow people to attend the business after 10:00 p.m. or before 6:00 a.m. Commissioner Matheson stated there should be no drop offs after 10:00 p.m. Steve commented that daycares and a home with a hair salon are considered home occupations, and may have more than customers in one hour. He noted that staff's issue is that there are home occupations for hair cutting, and home occupations for a daycare business, but it is not allowed to have both at the same time. This application plans to have both the childcare and the counseling at the same time. Commissioner Jones asked if the State contract specifies that the counseling must occur at the same location, or is it open-ended. Steve did not know if the contract specified this. Commissioner Fuller reminded that during the last public hearing, it was mentioned that counseling must occur

at the same location.

Commissioner Conder said this is a crises nursery, not a daycare with sleepovers. If children are not allowed to be dropped off after 10:00 p.m., it negates the purpose of the facility. He thought if law enforcement delivered a child, and there was still room in the nursery, they should be allowed to accept that child after 10:00 p.m. Commissioner Conder agreed that appointments should not be allowed after 10:00 p.m. for parents who need a break. It should be allowed for emergency situations, as he would rather have a child brought to this type of facility rather than taken to the hospital due to an incident. Commissioner Matheson agreed that in an emergency situation, an exception should be allowed. Commissioner Conder said the definition should be “public safety individual” rather than the term “law enforcement”.

There being no further discussion regarding this application, Chairman Woodruff called for a motion.

Motion: Commissioner Conder moved for approval subject to the following conditions:

1. No parking lot shall be placed in the back yard, since parking lots are not compatible with single family residential neighborhoods.
2. No more than 8 children shall be cared for at any one time.
3. All children treated shall be shall be 11 years of age or younger. This should help reduce the amount of traffic so the traffic can be managed to and from the facility.
4. Children shall be dropped off and picked up between 6:00 a.m. and 10:00 p.m. except when accompanied by a public safety official. This will help reduce the impact during nighttime hours to the residents.
5. No classes shall be allowed on-site. This will eliminate the need for a parking lot.
6. Family and individual counseling shall be allowed on this site.
7. The garage shall not be converted to a play area or be reduced in size. This maintains the integrity of the home as a residential home and keeps the neighborhood looking as it is currently.
8. A six-foot solid visual barrier fence shall be installed around the entire back yard. This will help privacy concerns for the facility as well as the neighbors.
9. A four-to-one ratio of children to adults shall be maintained at all times. “Adults” are defined as 18-years of age or older.
10. No additional structures shall be allowed on the property.
11. The building shall not be expanded with the exception of a possible elevator.
12. Any elevator for ADA purposes shall be enclosed and be architecturally

- integrated with the home. The City code requires additions to be architecturally integrated with existing buildings and designs.
13. The only parking areas allowed shall be in the garage, on the driveway and, if any excess, on the street. This will help alleviate some of the safety concerns that the neighbors have regarding vehicles on the street and extra vehicular traffic.
 14. Any dead or barren areas in the front yard, parkstrip and back yard shall be re-landscaped and maintained. This would be in compliance with the City's landscaping code.
 15. Children shall be dropped off at the home by appointment only, except in the case of an emergency where children are accompanied by a public safety official. This helps maintain the business as a business so that there are some operating hours, but the Commission also recognizes there are some emergency situations.
 16. No signs shall be placed on the front or the sides of the home. The house number for the home shall be clearly labeled on the front of the home. The house number on the front of the home will help people to find the home easily and not be lost. There is no need for signage in the back if there is no parking lot in the back of the home. This will also keep the home looking like a home.
 17. The shed attached to the north side of the house shall be removed. The shed does not meet the setback requirements and is unattractive.
 18. The facility shall be licensed by the State as a residential support program. A West Valley City business license is also required.
 19. A building permit shall be obtained for any interior remodeling.

Commissioner Jones seconded the motion.

Discussion: Commissioner Jones asked if the security system for the facility was planned as part of the motion. Steve Pastorik informed the security system will be required by the State and was listed as information only for the City.

Chairman Woodruff said if there is no parking in the back, would the business still create a large impact requiring a fence. Commissioner Conder reminded that the residents have expressed that there would be an impact and he is trying to mitigate that particular issue. He did not believe it was an unreasonable condition. This business will be a different environment and there will probably be a play area making it as child friendly as possible. Commissioner Fuller indicated for the security of the children in the back, it would be safer to have a solid fence. Commissioner Jones stated testimony at the last public hearing indicated Doberman dogs and a registered sex offender are located adjacent to this property. He suggested the fence would make sense.

Commissioner Matheson asked if an 18-year old is defined as an adult. Nicole Cottle said it depends on what statute is looked at. Sometimes an adult is defined as a 16-year old and sometimes, the State law defines an adult as an 18-year old. It can be defined as an 18-year old for this condition. Commissioner Conder suggested an 18-year old should be the minimum age to be considered an adult for this business.

Commissioner Matheson said regarding the elevator, are we trying to make the facility ADA compatible. If so, the restrooms and much of the interior would need to be ADA compatible as well. Steve Pastorik assured the City's Building Inspection Division will need to determine this upon inspections. It is based on the number of occupants, where if there are more than 16 occupants, then at that point, the ADA requirements must be met. With the limitation of eight children and two adults, there would only be ten people in the building overnight. He was not sure if the contract with the State required the facility to be ADA compatible. Staff listed this as a condition so that if ADA requirements are required, they will be done in a way as to not change the character of the home.

Steve asked if there was any thought regarding limiting the number of counseling sessions in the motion. Chairman Woodruff suggested with two counselors, it could be limited to two per hour, one session at a time for one hour per session.

Commissioner Matheson wanted to review the interior building plan. He noted there must be an enclosed play area, since the Center cannot utilize the garage. Steve indicated the motion would eliminate classes in the basement, allowing room for a play area. Chairman Woodruff added that with limiting the children from 16 to 8, the play area does not need to be as large as originally planned.

Commissioner Matheson said the facility needs an additional nursery room, as it does not make sense to have older children staying in the same room as the babies. Commissioner Conder stated there would be additional rooms available in the basement with this motion. Commissioner Jones asked if coordinating the rooms is the Commission's job or would it be addressed with the facilities' licensing process. Nicole assured the use of the bedrooms could be made a condition of approval, but she would ask what detrimental land use effect it mitigates. She said her legal advice is that the Commission cannot coordinate the bedrooms unless the Commission can specify a detrimental effect that it is mitigating; that the Commission has authority over as a land use Board. Chairman Woodruff perceived with three bedrooms and eight children, there would be some flexibility for the adults in charge to determine how to separate the children.

Commissioner Davis asked how many bathrooms are in the house. Steve replied two on the main floor and one in the basement.

Steve clarified the hours of pick-up and drop-off would be between 6:00 a.m. to 10:00

p.m. He asked if it would be the same hours for the counseling sessions. Commissioner Conder suggested the counseling sessions should be held between 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. He re-read item #6 of his motion regarding counseling, stating the counseling sessions that would occur, should only occur between 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. He also clarified the number of sessions, as one per hour per counselor. Commissioner Jones agreed and seconded both amendments of the motion.

Roll call vote:

Commissioner Clayton	Absent
Commissioner Conder	Yes
Commissioner Davis	No
Commissioner Fuller	No
Commissioner Jones	Yes
Commissioner Matheson	No
Commissioner Mills	Absent
Chairman Woodruff	Yes

Split vote – C-31-2007 – Motion did not pass

Discussion: Commissioner Fuller informed that his only problem is regarding the counseling which cannot be monitored. He said if they hold their classes somewhere else, then the counseling could also be held somewhere else. This would eliminate approximately 18 vehicle trips. Commissioner Matheson agreed that the counselors are separate from the people that are there on a daily basis.

Commissioner Davis said this is a neighborhood, and comparisons have been made between this type of center and other home businesses. She agrees that the Center does great work, and the children need help, but the adults could get their help at other locations. This would reduce some of the impacts to the neighborhood, and the neighbors want it to remain a neighborhood. Commissioner Davis suggested limiting everything possible in order to make it remain just a crisis center for children.

Commissioner Matheson indicated he was still bothered with the idea of an elevator. He would like comments from the State informing if this facility needs to be ADA compatible. If it does, the Commission should then look at what must be placed for that requirement. Commissioner Fuller informed if the State mandated the facility to be ADA compatible, they would follow through to make sure everything else is ADA compatible. He questioned if the motion could be amended regarding the ADA requirements. Nicole did not know of the Center's ADA requirements, but said she would be surprised if it did not require some type of ADA access. She did not believe the City's code requires an update to the ADA standards until a certain number of occupants were at the Center, as Steve Pastorik mentioned. Commissioner Fuller asked Commissioner Matheson if it was

the appearance from the outside that was concerning him. Commissioner Matheson said yes, but if the ADA access was located in the backyard, he would not have a problem with it. He wants the home to be maintained as a residential home so that people who don't know about the Center would never think it was anything other than the home. Commissioner Conder reminded that much of the modifications will occur on the inside of the home.

Commissioner Conder understands the detrimental effect that classes may have with the Center, and he asked how counseling is defined. If counseling was banned from the facility, what about recommendations that are given to a parent who is dropping off a child. The traffic would be reduced with one on one or family counseling, different than having 16 people attending a class. Commissioner Fuller did not think recommendations on how to help with a child when dropped off would be challenged. Steve Pastorik reminded that staff suggests limiting the number of children being cared for overnight to eight along with the two adults. With counseling not allowed, it is essentially saying there could be no more than ten people. Commissioner Conder asked if that meant there could be six children, two parents, and then two counselors conducting counseling. Steve answered that staff's intent is to have eight children and two adults watching the children. Commissioner Conder reminded that there may not always be eight children. He said if they are not at capacity, could counseling then be allowed. Commissioner Fuller said that situation could change in ten-minutes, and should not be planned on. Chairman Woodruff perceived the residents of this neighborhood will be calling Steve if there are continually many cars at the facility. Commissioner Conder reminded that the Commission can review this if the conditions do not mitigate the situation. Commissioner Jones agreed with the comments regarding limiting traffic. He suggested much of the value of a crisis center is with counseling. Perhaps if the condition could be changed to allow counseling, but within the limits of eight or ten people, it may allay the traffic concerns. Chairman Woodruff reminded that the Building Division would allow up to 16 people.

Commissioner Jones asked if there were any conditions under which counseling would be acceptable. Commissioner Davis believes the children will need counseling as much as the adults. The children should be the ones receiving counseling at the center, not the adults. Steve clarified that the Center's primary purpose for the counseling is for the children, although they do offer family counseling. Commissioner Conder said if the motion was for no counseling, would that mean the children could not be counseled. Commissioner Davis replied no, the children should be counseled while in residence at the Crisis Nursery. She does not believe the adults should come in for counseling in the same way. This would change the face of the neighborhood and surrounding area. She suggested the motion be reworded to say "no adult counseling sessions" allowed at the Center. Commissioner Jones thought parental involvement is helpful. Possibly it could be reworded to allow counseling with a parent and child. If the parent is picking up the

child, it should not create additional detrimental affects by including the parents in the counseling session. Commissioner Davis stated that adults picking up a child and then coming back to attend a class at another time would impact the neighborhood. Commissioner Jones assured he wants to exclude the classes. Commissioner Matheson suggested siblings of the children in crisis may also need counseling. Commissioner Fuller asked if this could occur at a different location. He wondered if the motion could say counseling of children presently at the Center. Commissioner Jones agreed, as long as parents are allowed to attend a child's counseling. Commissioner Conder agreed that family counseling is appropriate. Commissioner Davis also agreed, but did not believe this is the proper location where it should occur. Her initial impression of this application is that it was a place for children in crisis, and there may be some counseling for those children which would take place at the center. Commissioner Conder noted parents will be dropping off children and those parents could possibly use some good advice from the Center. He does not want to restrict a good location that will facilitate good things happening to a family by saying it is not allowed. Commissioner Davis believes any professional at this location could offer good advice when the child is picked up. No additional sessions should be scheduled with adults or siblings at other times for this location. If the words "counseling sessions" are left open ended, it will allow more appointments to be set. Commissioner Conder asked what about the parents sitting down with a counselor for an hour when they come to pick up their child. Commissioner Davis hoped the parents would pick up their child, and then make their way out of the neighborhood so the next person picking up their children could do the same thing. Commissioner Conder understands the dilemma is the definition of counseling. He noted the Crisis Counseling Center has a requirement to perform 200 hours of counseling at their Midvale location. He asked if this location has the same requirement, could it be required that the 200 hours not occur at this facility as a formal counseling session. This would place the burden on the Center to define the counseling if they could not count it at this location. A separate facility could then be offered for additional counseling and classes. Commissioner Davis agreed to this suggestion.

There being no further discussion regarding this application, Chairman Woodruff called for a motion.

Motion: Commissioner Conder moved for approval subject to the following conditions:

1. No parking lot shall be placed in the back yard, since parking lots are not compatible with single family residential neighborhoods.
2. No more than 8 children shall be cared for at any one time.
3. All children treated shall be shall be 11 years of age or younger. This should help reduce the amount of traffic so the traffic can be managed to and from the facility.
4. Children shall be dropped off and picked up between 6:00 a.m. and 10:00

- p.m. except when accompanied by a public safety official. This will help reduce the impact during nighttime hours to the residents.
5. No classes shall be allowed on-site. This will eliminate the need for a parking lot.
 6. No formal counseling sessions shall be allowed at this site.
 7. The garage shall not be converted to a play area or be reduced in size. This maintains the integrity of the home as a residential home and keeps the neighborhood looking as it is currently.
 8. A six-foot solid visual barrier fence shall be installed around the entire back yard. This will help privacy concerns for the facility as well as the neighbors.
 9. A four-to-one ratio of children to adults shall be maintained at all times. "Adults" are defined as 18-years of age or older.
 10. No additional structures shall be allowed on the property.
 11. The building shall not be expanded with the exception of a possible elevator.
 12. Any elevator for ADA purposes shall be enclosed and be architecturally integrated with the home. The City code requires additions to be architecturally integrated with existing buildings and designs.
 13. The only parking areas allowed shall be in the garage, on the driveway and, if any excess, on the street. This will help alleviate some of the safety concerns that the neighbors have regarding vehicles on the street and extra vehicular traffic.
 14. Any dead or barren areas in the front yard, parkstrip and back yard shall be re-landscaped and maintained. This would be in compliance with the City's landscaping code.
 15. Children shall be dropped off at the home by appointment only, except in the case of an emergency where children are accompanied by a public safety official. This helps maintain the business as a business so that there are some operating hours, but the Commission also recognizes there are some emergency situations.
 16. No signs shall be placed on the front or the sides of the home. The house number for the home shall be clearly labeled on the front of the home. The house number on the front of the home will help people to find the home easily and not be lost. There is no need for signage in the back if there is no parking lot in the back of the home. This will also keep the home looking like a home.
 17. The shed attached to the north side of the house shall be removed. The shed does not meet the setback requirements and is unattractive.
 18. The facility shall be licensed by the State as a residential support program. A West Valley City business license is also required.
 19. A building permit shall be obtained for any interior remodeling.

Commissioner Fuller seconded the motion.

Discussion: Commissioner Matheson perceived the elevator issue will take care of itself if the State requires ADA requirements.

Roll call vote:

Commissioner Clayton	Absent
Commissioner Conder	Yes
Commissioner Davis	Yes
Commissioner Fuller	Yes
Commissioner Jones	Yes
Commissioner Matheson	Yes
Commissioner Mills	Absent
Chairman Woodruff	No

Majority – C-31-2007 – Approved

PLANNING COMMISSION BUSINESS

Approval of minutes from July 25, 2007 (Regular Meeting) - **Continued**

Approval of minutes from September 12, 2007 (Regular Meeting) - **Approved**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 5:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lori Cannon, Administrative Assistant