# **MEMORANDUM**

451 South State Street, Room 406 Salt Lake City, Utah 84111 (801) 535-7757



**TO:** Salt Lake City Planning Commission

**FROM:** Lex Traughber – Principal Planner

**DATE:** August 9, 2006

**SUBJECT:** Issues Only Hearing for Petition 410-06-29,

Capitol View Planned Development/Conditional Use

## **VICINITY MAP:**



### **Proposal Outline**

Cooper Roberts Simonsen Architects, representing the developer, Jeremy Jones, is requesting approval of a Planned Development in the Capitol Hill Historic District consisting of nineteen new single-family residential dwelling units. The subject property is located at approximately 690 N. West Capitol Street and is zoned SR-1A, Special Development Pattern Residential District. The purpose of this district is to, "maintain the unique"

character of older predominantly low-density neighborhoods that display a variety of yards, lot sizes and bulk characteristics." The proposed development is subject to the Salt Lake City Zoning Ordinance and the Design Guidelines for Residential Historic Districts in Salt Lake City, and requires approval from the Historic Landmark Commission as well as the Planning Commission. The purpose of this "Issues Only" hearing is to allow the Planning Commission the opportunity to hear the concerns of the public, as well as collect feedback and input regarding the proposal from Planning Commission members.

The subject property is comprised of several vacant parcels, approximately 2.81 acres in size, located between Victory Road and West Capitol Street. The proposed nineteen single-family residential units consist of ten different housing designs. The homes would be positioned on either side of an extension to Darwin Street that would connect to West Capitol Street, allowing circular traffic flow. The applicant proposes to widen West Capitol Street from Clinton Avenue heading north to the northern end of the project. The increased street width will accommodate an additional travel lane, sidewalk, curb and gutter, and a six to eight foot high retaining wall. Please refer to the attached site plan and elevations for details regarding the subdivision layout, house design and proposed heights, as well as the mix of dwelling units proposed.

In terms of project review, this proposal is subject to review processes by the Planning Commission and the Historic Landmark Commission. In terms of Planning Commission consideration, the applicant has filed an application for a Planned Development. As part of this process, items that will be reviewed by the Planning Commission, include but are not limited to the overall density of the development, overall maximum building coverage, a reduced road width and road radius, and reduced yards/setbacks, and preliminary subdivision. The items that fall under the review of the Historic Landmark Commission include Zoning Ordinance standards for the H-Historic Preservation Overlay District for new construction, as well as compliance with the adopted Design Guidelines for Residential Historic Districts in Salt Lake City. As in the past, the Historic Landmark Commission's review will include, but is not limited to, a study of the materials used for residential construction, the proposed massing, scale, height and design of the residential units, and subdivision layout. The review of this proposal does differ from proposals that the Historic Landmark Commission has seen in the past because it is located in an area that is subject to Ordinance 26 of 2006 – Amending Section 21A.24.080, Salt Lake City Code, Pertaining to SR-1 Special Development Pattern Residential District, and Section 21A.40.050, Salt Lake City Code, Pertaining to General Yard, Bulk and Height Limitations. This Ordinance was adopted by the City Council on June 9, 2006. Under this Ordinance, the issue of building height in the H-Historic Preservation Overlay District falls under the purview of the Historic Landmark Commission. The applicant is requesting building heights that exceed the twenty-three foot (23') height limit allowed under the this Ordinance. The Historic Landmark Commission has the authority to determine if the proposed heights are appropriate for the Historic District.

#### **Process to Date**

Prior to the applicant's submittal of the proposal to the Planning Division, a joint subcommittee meeting was held with members of the Historic Landmark Commission and the Planning Commission on January 1, 2006. The developer and members of the development team, as well as members of Planning Staff were present for this meeting. The developer provided an overview of the project and comments were noted from various individuals in attendance. In general, the review process was discussed, as well as various design items including building height, building materials, building siting, massing, scale, density, single-family versus multifamily development, and roadway design.

On April 5, 2006, the Historic Landmark Commission held an "Issues Only" hearing to discuss this proposal and take public comment. The primary issues that the Historic Landmark Commission considered during this hearing were as follows:

- 1. The height of the proposed dwelling units, particularly those that front West Capitol Street
- 2. The proposed materials and design of the dwelling units
- 3. The width of the proposed garages

Comments received from the public included but were not limited to:

- 1. Building height and retaining wall height along West Capitol Street
- 2. Density
- 3. Traffic impacts
- 4. Impacts on City infrastructure; water and particularly sewer
- 5. Design compatibility
- 6. Construction impacts
- 7. Environmental impacts, particularly on wildlife
- 8. Slope stability

Following this Issues Only Hearing, the applicant provided revised plans to address the issues and concerns noted. On May 17, 2006, the Historic Landmark Commission held a public hearing and denied the applicant's request noting that the proposed development is incompatible in terms of mass, scale and height, citing Historic Preservation Design Guidelines 11.4, 11.5 and 11.7 as not met in the proposed design. These guidelines are as follows:

- 11.4 To construct a new building to reinforce a sense of human scale
- 11.5 To construct a new building to appear similar in scale to the scale that is established in the block
- 11.7 To build to meet heights that appear similar to those found historically in the district.

### **Course of Action**

Realizing that there is development potential on the subject site, Planning Staff wanted to present the proposal to the Planning Commission to begin review of the items that fall under the Planning Commission's purview. These items include but are not limited to:

- 1. Overall density of the development
- 2. Overall maximum building coverage
- 3. Reduced road width and road radius
- 4. Reduced yards/setbacks
- 5. Preliminary subdivision

To assist with the discussion of the five items noted above, Planning Staff has included a map of the surrounding neighborhood showing lot sizes and configuration.

At this time, it is Planning Staff's intent to obtain the feedback of the Planning Commission members regarding the proposal. Following, Planning Staff proposes that the applicant meet with a sub-committee composed of members of the Planning Commission and the Historic Landmark Commission in order to obtain specific information and guidance regarding the proposed plans. After the subcommittee meeting, the applicant would then make revisions and revisit the Planning Commission in a Public Hearing. Planning Staff would produce a detailed staff report analyzing the request and make specific findings and a recommendation for consideration. The applicant would then reapply and go before the Historic Landmark Commission for reconsideration based on revised plans.