

SALT LAKE CITY HISTORIC LANDMARK COMMISSION
Meeting Minutes
451 South State Street, Room 326
July 6, 2017

A roll is kept of all who attended the Historic Landmark Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:30:44 PM](#). Audio recordings of the Historic Landmark Commission meetings are retained in the Planning Office for an indefinite period of time.

Present for the Historic Landmark Commission meeting were: Chairperson Charles Shepherd, Vice Chairperson Kenton Peters; Commissioners Stanley Adams, Thomas Brennan, Sheleigh Harding, Robert Hyde and Paul Svendsen. Commissioners Rachel Quist and David Richardson were excused.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Nick Norris, Planning Director; Michaela Oktay, Planning Manager; Carl Leith, Senior Planner; Michael Maloy, Senior Planner; Lex Traughber, Senior Planner; Anthony Riederer, Principal Planner; Amy Thompson, Principal Planner; Michelle Poland, Administrative Secretary and Paul Nielson, Senior City Attorney.

FIELD TRIP NOTES:

No field trip was held for this meeting.

APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 1, 2017, MINUTES. [5:34:24 PM](#)

MOTION [5:34:31 PM](#)

Commissioner Brennan moved to approve the minutes from the June 1, 2017, meeting. Commissioner Adams seconded the motion. Commissioners Peters, Adams, Brennan, Hyde and Svendsen voted “aye”. The motion passed unanimously.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR OR VICE CHAIR [5:35:11 PM](#)

Chairperson Shepherd stated he had nothing to report.

Vice Chairperson Peters stated he had nothing to report.

DIRECTOR’S REPORT [5:35:19 PM](#)

Mr. Nick Norris, Planning Director, stated he had nothing to report.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD [5:35:26 PM](#)

Chairperson Shepherd opened the Public Comment Period.

Ms. Polly Hart stated she was opposed to the Warm Springs Park project as it was very inappropriate and would overwhelm the historic building. She stated she was hopeful the City would hold out for something better.

Ms. Cindy Cromer stated her comments were regarding land use and preservation that

the Commission would not hear about otherwise. She stated there was an appeal filed by a member of the Commission and this was not the first time a member of a Commission had filed an appeal regarding a decision by the City. She reviewed the previous appeal and the result of that appeal.

Ms. Jennifer Dailey-Provost stated she would like to see better utilization of the Warm Spring Plunge than what was currently proposed. She stated it did not respect the historical nature of the building and the site would be better used for a community center to benefit the health of the people in the area.

Ms. Sylvia Nibley reviewed the history of the Warm Springs building and stated the scale and dominance of the proposed building would destroy the historical character, would privatize the park area, and the community use of the plunge building would be lost to commercial interests in a way that would be irreversible. She asked the Commission to deny the current proposal and allow for further options for the property to be reviewed to better serve the area and preserve the historic building.

Ms. Emilee Sharp reviewed the neighborhood petition requesting the Historic Landmark Commission consider new proposals to restore the historic building while maintaining community use of the site. She stated the neighborhood was in favor of keeping the historic building and using it as a community center not an apartment complex.

Ms. Erlinda Davis reviewed the importance of the Warm Springs Plunge building and stated the proposed apartments would not benefit the area.

Mr. Phil Dogas stated he was willing to help preserve the building by repairing the roof stopping the deterioration of the interior of the building. He stated the current development was a square peg trying to fit in a round hole, at the very least zoning would have to be changed. Mr. Dogas stated his desire was to refurbish the building to its original purpose with a fully connected park without an apartment complex splitting the park in two. He stated the Warm Springs Alliance best met the guidelines of the Historic Commission and the community should not settle for less as there were people willing to help preserve the building.

Chairperson Shepherd closed the Public Comment Period.

[5:49:31 PM](#)

New Rear Addition, Side Porch and Garage to Single Family Residence at approximately 638 6th Avenue - A request by Thom Jakab, on behalf of owner James Williamson, for approval of a two story addition with basement to the rear of the existing house, the reconstruction of a new porch to match the original and a new garage. The house is a contributing building in the Avenues Historic District, is on a corner lot and the addition will face J Street. The subject property is zoned SR-1A (Special Development Pattern Residential District) and is located in City Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. This proposal is being referred to the Historic Landmark Commission for decision because it is a substantial addition

to this residence, and special exception approval is required for proposals exceeding the SR-1A zone standards. (Staff contact: Carl Leith at (801) 535-7758 or carl.leith@slcgov.com)

- a. **Proposed Addition and Porch** - The proposed addition and garage are situated to the rear and porch along the north and east sides of this original dwelling, and on this corner lot they face onto J Street. Case number: **PLNHLC2015-00586**
- b. **Special Exception** – Special Exception approval is sought for the proposed porch that would project into the corner side yard by 1'-2 ½", an accessory building positioned within 2'-9 ¼" from an adjacent residential building, cooling equipment placed 1' from the property line within the inside yard area, grade changes which may exceed 4 feet and proposed lot coverage of 54%. Case number: **PLNHLC2015-00587**

Mr. Carl Leith, Senior Planner, gave an overview of the proposal as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff was recommending that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the petition as presented.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- Why a Special Exception was being requested for the garage.
 - The garage could not meet the setback requirement therefore, a Special Exception was necessary.
- The location of the mechanical equipment on the property.

Mr. Thom Jakab, and Ms. Judy Williamson, applicants reviewed how the proposal met the design guidelines and enhanced the historic design of the structure. He reviewed the materials for the proposal, massing and how it related to the existing structure.

The Commission and Applicants reviewed the following:

- If there was another location where the air conditioners could be placed to lessen the noise impact for the neighbors.
- How the home to the west matched up to the footprint of the proposed addition.
- The materials and stone proposed for the addition.
- The Commission encouraged the Applicant to work with the State Historic Society to secure the tax credits for the historic section of the home.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:13:34 PM](#)

Chairperson Shepherd opened the Public Hearing

Chairperson Shepherd read the following comment:

- Mr. Jim Gardner – I would like to thank the Commission for the process and for getting us to this point.

Chairperson Shepherd closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission discussed and stated the following:

- The proposal was exemplary and they looked forward to seeing the finished product.
- The Special Exceptions were reasonable and the design was unique for the lot.

MOTION [6:16:02 PM](#)

Commissioner Brennan stated regarding PLNHLC2015-00586, New Rear Addition, Porch and Rear Garage and PLNHLC2017-00587, Special Exception Approvals, based on the information in the Staff Report, the information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the application, with the condition listed in the Staff Report. Commissioner Adams seconded the motion. Commissioners Peters, Adams, Brennan, Harding, Hyde and Svendsen voted “aye”. The motion passed unanimously.

[6:18:05 PM](#)

Commissioner Svendsen reviewed his past involvement with the home at 970 East 2nd Avenue and stated he no longer was involved with the redevelopment.

The Commission agreed there was no conflict of interest.

[6:19:08 PM](#)

Single Family New Construction at approximately 970 E 2nd Avenue - Dallas Davis, the architect and the owner of the property, is requesting New Construction approval from the Historic Landmark Commission for the design of a single family dwelling in the Avenues Local Historic District. The proposed development requires approval from the Historic Landmark Commission for new construction in an historic district. The subject property is zoned SR1-A (Special Development Pattern Residential District) and is located in City Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff contact: Amy Thompson at (801)535-7281 or amy.thompson@slcgov.com) Case number: PLNHLC2017-00339.

Ms. Amy Thompson, Principal Planner, gave an overview of the proposal as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff was recommending that the Historic Landmark Commission approve the petition as presented.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- If the proposed windows were appropriate for the structure.

Mr. Dallas Davis, reviewed the history of the proposal and how it fit with the guidelines and standards. He reviewed the design and proposed windows for the structure.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:27:38 PM](#)

Chairperson Shepherd opened the Public Hearing, seeing no one wished to speak; Chairperson Shepherd closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission discussed and stated the following:

- The proposal met the area in regard to scale and appearance.

- The proposal was clear and easy to understand.

MOTION [6:29:40 PM](#)

Commissioner Peters stated based on the analysis and findings listed in the Staff Report, the information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, he moved that the Historic Landmark Commission approve petition PLNHLC2017-00330, a request for a certificate of appropriateness for New Construction of a single family dwelling at approximately 970 E. 2nd Avenue. Commissioner Svendsen seconded the motion. Commissioners Peters, Adams, Brennan, Harding, Hyde and Svendsen voted “aye”. The motion passed unanimously.

The Commission took a five minute break. [6:30:33 PM](#)

The Commission reconvened. [6:36:00 PM](#)

[6:38:59 PM](#)

Bishop Place Demolition Request - Don Armstrong is request approval for the demolition of nine (9) contributing structures located at the approximate addresses listed below in the Capitol Hill Local Historic District. The subject properties are located within Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold (Staff Contact: Anthony Riederer at (801)535-7625 or Anthony.riederer@slcgov.com)

- Demolition of a Historic Structure at approximately 241 W Bishop Place** - City surveys indicate that the building in question is a contributing property within the Capitol Hill Historic District. Case number: PLNHLC2017-00014
- Demolition of a Historic Structure at approximately 245 W Bishop Place** - City surveys indicate that the building in question is a contributing property within the Capitol Hill Historic District. Case number: PLNHLC2017-00015
- Demolition of a Historic Structure at approximately 249 W Bishop Place** - City surveys indicate that the building in question is a contributing property within the Capitol Hill Historic District. Case number: PLNHLC2017-00021
- Demolition of a Historic Structure at approximately 259 W Bishop Place** - City surveys indicate that the building in question is a contributing property within the Capitol Hill Historic District. Case number: PLNHLC2017-00023
- Demolition of a Historic Structure at approximately 265 W Bishop Place** - City surveys indicate that the building in question is a contributing property within the Capitol Hill Historic District. Case number: PLNHLC2017-00028
- Demolition of a Historic Structure at approximately 432 North 300 West** - City surveys indicate that the building in question is a contributing property within the Capitol Hill Historic District. Case number: PLNHLC2017-00031
- Demolition of a Historic Structure at approximately 262 W Bishop Place** City surveys indicate that the building in question is a contributing property within the Capitol Hill Historic District. PLNHLC2017-00027
- Demolition of a Historic Structure at approximately 258 W Bishop Place** - City surveys indicate that the building in question is a contributing property within the Capitol Hill Historic District. Case number: PLNHLC2017-00022

- i. **Demolition of a Historic Structure at approximately 248 W Bishop Place City surveys indicate that the building in question is a contributing property within the Capitol Hill Historic District. Case number: Case number: PLNHLC2017-00018**

The Commission discussed the way the hearing would be run and the appeal regarding the demolition process.

Commissioner Svendsen read the language regarding the appeal of the Zoning Administrator's interpretation and asked if the appeal created a stay of the petitions as they arose from the basis of the appeal.

The Commission and Staff reviewed and stated the following:

- The appeal process and how it affected the current petitions.
- Mr. Nielson stated the Administrative Interpretation was issued in general as to how the Planning Department viewed and applied the ordinance.
- Commissioner Svendsen stated the Administrative Interpretation was issued in regard to Bishop Place therefore, it was directly related.
- The way the Bishop Place petition was handled and how the appeal affected the further review of the Bishop Place petition.
- Whether or not the appeal was cause for a stay on the Bishop Place petitions and the Zoning Administrator's role in the process.

MOTION [6:48:43 PM](#) and restated at [7:10:39 PM](#)

Commission Svendsen moved that the Historic Landmark Commission continue the hearing until the appeal had been heard and addressed by the Appeal Hearing Officer. Commissioner Adams seconded the motion.

The Commission discussed the following:

- The ordinance needed to be fixed before the Bishop Place hearing was held.
- The ordinance was confusing and the appeal was trying to clarify the process.
- Why the appeal was an issue at this meeting and what harm would come to the Bishop Place applicant if the petition was stayed.
- The ordinance and how it regulated stays of petitions.

Commissioners Adams and Svendsen voted "aye". Commissioners Brennan, Harding, Hyde and Peters voted "nay". The motion failed 4-2.

[7:11:15 PM](#)

Commissioner Svendsen recused himself as he was the appellant for the appeal.

The Commission agreed Commissioner Svendsen could stay in the room and listen to the discussion.

[7:12:04 PM](#)

Mr. Anthony Riederer, Principal Planner, gave an overview of the proposal as outlined in

the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff was recommending that the Historic Landmark Commission deny the petitions as presented.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The proposed reuse plan for the property.

Mr. Bruce Baird, attorney, asked the Commission to review the petition with the current process in the ordinance and not what was being suggested by the appeal. He reviewed the standards that, in his opinion, the proposal did and did not meet. Mr. Baird reviewed the history of the property, the current structural issues with each building and how each building did or did not contribute to the area. He stated age did not justify keeping the buildings and was not grounds for determining historical status.

The Commission and Applicants discussed the following:

- What the RDA grant money had been used for.
- The conditions of the RDA grant.
- The year the buildings were acquired and if it was done all at once or one building at a time.
- The history of the property and why it was not renovated.
- Why buildings were not repaired when walls collapsed.
- The engineers and contractors, with historic experience, that reviewed the property.

PUBLIC HEARING [8:08:09 PM](#)

Chairperson Shepherd opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petitions: Mr. David Sheer, Mr. Griffin Jenkins, Mr. Kirk Huffaker, Ms. Cindy Cromer and Ms. Polly Hart.

The following comments were made:

- Would like the historic documentation collected prior to the demolition of the buildings.
- Would like the brick bungalow duplex and the structure on 300 West to be restored as their structural condition was not as deteriorated as the others.
- Would like the Commission to review the information submitted at the previous meeting and not permit the demolition of 265 Bishop Place or 432 North 300 West.
- The home at 432 North 300 West was the largest full-fledged craftsman style home in Capitol Hill.
- The neighboring structures on 300 West were older than the home at 432 North 300 West.
- Bishop Place was one of the last remaining family courts in Salt Lake City.
- Each house was distinctive and unique which made them individually important to the makeup of the area.
- If Bishop Place didn't deserve protection then none of the other areas deserved protection.

- Bishop Place was its own streetscape and part of an ensemble.
- The homes were inhabited until 2011 and then stripped to what remains today.
- The buildings are in the current condition because of willful neglect and the lack of proper permitting.
- The properties were not diligently boarded and secured as neighbors have to call on them routinely.
- The ordinance was in place to preserve special places in their context.
- The integrity of the original architecture was evident.
- The effect of the proposal was on the streetscape of Bishop Place and should not be removed in the context of discussing what streetscapes are affected.
- Neighborhoods were best experienced on foot from the street.
- There are programs that help developers repair and make economical choices for these types of projects.
- The Applicant was trying to meet the conditions of the RDA loan by developing the property.
- It was important for the Commission to define what constituted the streetscape for the subject buildings with the exception of 432 North 300 West.
- People would rehab these homes and it was economically feasible.
- A landscaping plan was not an effective reuse plan.
- The building at 432 North 300 West was inappropriately zoned and should be reviewed to make it more viable.
- This was a buyer beware issue and the applicant was not being punished because the buildings could not be torn down.
- The buildings were not garbage and were unique.
- The issue was not about money but how the buildings meet the standards for demolition.
- No one was entitled to make a profit on every single investment they made nor was anyone entitled to skirt the rules because they made an investment that was not appropriate with their goals.
- Structural integrity was not historic integrity and these buildings were unique.
- The base zoning was appropriate for the restoration of the buildings.
- The reuse was within the standards.
- These buildings have suffered neglect at the hands of the owner.
- If the owner was not going to remodel the buildings he should not have purchased them.

Chairperson Shepherd closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Baird stated they were happy to have the buildings available for historic documentation before demolition. Mr. Baird stated the issue with rezoning 432 North 300 West to commercial was that it changed the earthquake requirements and the structure requirements could not be economically met. He stated the reason the small courts had been changed was because things evolve and one cannot make someone keep a building that was economically unfeasible to maintain. Mr. Baird stated it was a paradox to say that the buildings were unique because they were different. He stated not everything historic was able to be preserved under the ordinance and they have shown the standards

were met. Mr. Baird stated the majority of the damage was done before the current owner owned the property and that even if the property was free it would not make sense to restore the buildings. He stated the structural integrity was an issue with the buildings and it was not a matter of if the buildings would be demolished but when. He stated the statue indicated landscaping was a permitted use, the code needed major work, structural integrity did not equal historic integrity but structural integrity was an element of historic preservation. Mr. Baird stated not all historic things matter and private property owners had the right to develop their property.

The Commission discussed and stated the following:

- Agree with the summary matrix and Staff's analysis of each home.
- The testimony of the neighbors supported Staff's opinion.
- Staff's determination regarding the impact to the streetscape was correct as presented in the Staff Report.
- The historic district was established and reviewed in the survey information.
- The Applicant was trying to say there was no historical integrity in the area which was not correct.
- Cannot base the decision on what might happen to the structures in the future.
- The statement that the building would not exist one way or another conflicted with willful neglect.
- Reviewed the seven standards for demolition and physical integrity of each structure.
- It did not make sense to keep the structures because they were currently beyond repair.
- Would support a motion to deny the applications.
- The language for the motion and whether to combine them or do them separate.

MOTION [8:52:24 PM](#)

Commissioner Harding stated regarding PLNHLC2017-00031 432 North 300 West, PLNHLC2017-00028 265 W. Bishop Place, PLNHLC2017-00028 265 W. Bishop Place, PLNHLC2017-00028 265 W. Bishop Place, PLNHLC2017-00027 262 W. Bishop Place, PLNHLC2017-00023 259 W. Bishop Place, PLNHLC2017-00022 258 W. Bishop Place, PLNHLC2017-00021 249 W. Bishop Place, PLNHLC2017-00018 248 W. Bishop Place, PLNHLC2017-00015 245 W. Bishop Place, PLNHLC2017-00014 241 W. Bishop Place, she moved based on the analysis and findings in the Staff Report along with the testimony heard and the discussion that in each application only one of the standards for a Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition has been met and therefore, the Historic Landmark Commission was required to deny the demolition request for each petition. Commissioner Brennan seconded the motion.

Chairperson Shepherd asked for clarification of which standard had been met.

Commissioner Harding amended the motion to state Standard E had been met. Commissioner Brennan seconded the amendment.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following

- If landscaping was an appropriate reuse plan.
- Willful neglect as stated in the ordinance and that the Commission would have to find that all of the standards for willful neglect had been demonstrated.

Commissioners Harding, Peters, Shepherd and Brennan voted “aye”. Commissioner Adams and Hyde voted “nay”. The motion passed 4-2.

The Commission took a five minute break. [9:03:13 PM](#)

The Commission reconvened. [9:08:22 PM](#)

[9:08:26 PM](#)

Amendments to the Local Historic District Demolition Process - A text amendment to amend sections of Title 21A (Zoning) of the Salt Lake City Code and clarify regulations concerning the demolition of historic resources in the H – Historic Preservation Overlay District. Changes proposed are intended to clarify language and to make the demolition process more transparent. The proposed regulation changes will affect section 21A.34.020 of the zoning ordinance. Related provisions of title 21A may also be amended as part of this petition as necessary. The changes would apply citywide. (Staff contact: Lex Traugher at (801)535-6184 or lex.traugher@slcgov.com.) Case number: PLNPCM2009-00014

Mr. Lex Traugher, Senior Planner, gave an overview of the proposal as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff was recommending that the Historic Landmark Commission forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council regarding the petition.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The standards for appropriateness of demolition of a contributing principal building.
 - Under K add the language to state “the request substantially complies with the following standards.”
- Definition of economic hardship should state “the property owner was denied all reasonable benefit, economical, viable use based on the certificate of appropriateness being denied”.
- The definition of an appropriate reuse plan.

PUBLIC HEARING [9:19:58 PM](#)

Chairperson Shepherd opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petitions: Ms. Polly Hart, Mr. Allen Roberts, Ms. Cindy Cromer and Mr. Douglas White.

The following comments were made:

- There was a difference between making the demolition process simpler, not easier and the goal was to not make demolition easier to achieve.

- The ordinance was a hoop not a barrier to demolition as it should be more difficult to demolish historic structures.
- Did not like people buying historic properties simply to demolish them.
- The six standards should remain in the ordinance as they were the only thing standing between buildings remaining or be demolished.
- The merit provision was deleted from the current proposal and should be re-added as sometimes the demolition of a historic structure was justified.
- Special merit existed to allow demolitions when the new project had considerable merit.
- Almost every major historic building in the city was built on the site of a previous historic building.
- Preservation was not the only priority of the city.
- The city needed a special merit provision to allow for growth.
- The Staff Report needed to look at taking some of the subjectivity out of Section L as it pitted the property owner against preservation efforts.
- Under section L, g. needed to be removed.
- Please do not do away with the three person economic hardship panel.
- The Special Merit was not always what it presented itself to be and was a huge risk.
- There are a limited number of people in Salt Lake City that truly have expertise with historic structures and their rehabilitation.
- Remove demolitions from the political process and hire someone who was unbiased to review these petitions.

The Commission, Staff and Mr. Roberts discussed the following:

- Why the Special Merit provision was removed from the ordinance?
 - It was determined that if a Special Merit provision was implemented it would become the sole process developers would chose in order to achieve demolition.
- Some version of Special Merit was needed to allow for growth and a proposal would have to be exceptional to allow for demolition of a historic structure.
- How surveys affected the demolition process.

Chairperson Shepherd closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission and Staff discussed and stated the following:

- The reuse plan and how it was addressed in the proposed ordinance.
 - The landscape plan had been removed from the proposed ordinance as a reuse option.
- If there were two different approvals one for the demolition and one for the site/reuse plan?
- The standards for demolition approval.
- How base zoning affected demolition and how it was applied in the ordinance.
- If the base zoning standard should be part of the economic hardship process.
- The standards and language under willful neglect.

- The Commission had helped developers to streamline proposals and allow development to move forward.
- The Special Merit program and how it applied to demolitions.
 - The Commission would like more information on Special Merit programs and how other cities use the program.
- If an outside unbiased entity should review demolitions or if the three person panel was a better option.

MOTION [10:11:50 PM](#)

Commissioner Brennan stated regarding PLNPCM2009-00014 – Local Historic District Demolition Process Text Amendment, tabled the petition to a future meeting to allow Staff to gather information on the items of question. Commissioner Harding seconded the motion. Commissioners Peters, Harding Adams, Brennan, Hyde and Svendsen voted “aye”. The motion passed unanimously.

[10:13:06 PM](#)

Amendments to the New Construction Standards for Local Historic Districts - A text amendment to amend sections of Title 21A (Zoning) of the Salt Lake City Code and clarify regulations concerning new construction in the H – Historic Preservation Overlay District. Changes proposed are intended to clarify language and to improve the new construction process. The proposed regulation changes will affect section 21A.34.020 of the zoning ordinance. Related provisions of title 21A may also be amended as part of this petition. The changes would apply citywide. (Staff contact: Anthony Riederer at (801) 535-7625 or Anthony.riederer@slcgov.com.) Case number: PLNPCM2016-00905

MOTION [10:13:25 PM](#)

Commissioner Brennan stated regarding PLNPCM2016-00905 - Amendments to the New Construction Standards for Local Historic Districts, he moved to table the petition to the August 3, 2017 meeting. Commissioner Peters seconded the motion. Commissioners Peters, Adams, Brennan, Harding, Hyde and Svendsen voted “aye”. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioners Harding and Adams recused themselves from the meeting. [10:13:48 PM](#)

Work Session [10:14:24 PM](#)

Trolley Square Ventures Rezone Briefing at approximately 603 S 600 East Street - Douglas White, on behalf of Trolley Squares Ventures LLC, has requested a zoning map amendment from RMF-30 Low Density Multi-Family Residential District to R-MU-35 Residential/Mixed Use District at the above listed address. Currently the land is used for parking. The purpose of the request is to develop a 24 unit apartment building that will not exceed 35 feet in height. Although the applicant has requested the property be rezoned to R-MU-35 District, consideration may be given to rezoning the property to another zoning district with similar characteristics. The subject property is located within Council District 4, represented by Derek Kitchen. (Staff contact: Michael Maloy, Senior Planner, at

(801)535-7118 or michael.maloy@slcgov.com). Case number: PLNPCM2017-00373.

Mr. Michael Maloy, Senior Planner, gave an overview of the proposal as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff was requesting comments and suggestions for the proposal.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The reasons to deny the zoning change.
 - The Master Plan called out the parcel to be rezoned to allow for more density on the property.

Mr. Douglas White reviewed the history of the proposal and reasoning for the zoning change.

The meeting adjourned at [10:22:25 PM](#)