

**SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
In Room 326 of the City & County Building
451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah
Wednesday, March 24, 2010**

Present for the Planning Commission meeting were Chair Babs De Lay and Vice Chair Frank Algarin; and Commissioners Tim Chambless, Angela Dean, Michael Fife, Michael Gallegos, Susie McHugh, Matthew Wirthlin, and Kathleen Hill. Commissioner Mary Woodhead was excused.

There field trip prior to the meeting was cancelled. A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at 5:45 p.m. Audio recordings of the Planning Commission meetings are retained in the Planning Office for an indefinite period of time. Planning staff members present at the meeting were: Wilford Sommerkorn, Planning Director, Joel Paterson Programs Manager; Casey Stewart, Principal Planner; Michael Maloy, Principal Planner; Paul Nielson, City Attorney; and Tami Hansen, Senior Secretary.

Field Trip Notes (Taken by Joel Paterson)

Planning Commissioners visited the Stanley F. Taylor house located at 1812 South West Temple. It was noted that the addition to the rear of the home was removed as approved, which was required to renovate the original home.

The use of the building was for an accessible space for the residents at the project, the final plan for a use was not yet know. The applicant was required to apply for Landmark status and the Historic Landmark Commission (HLC) recommended the building not be listed as a Landmark site.

If the site was not landmarked, an existing Planning Commission condition required that any changes to the exterior of the structure must meet HLC guidelines.

Approval of Minutes from Wednesday, March 10, 2010

Commissioner McHugh made a motion to approve the March 10, 2010 minutes as written. Commissioner Wirthlin seconded the motion. Commissioners voted, "Aye". The motion passed unanimously.

Report of the Chair and Vice Chair

Chair De Lay stated she was asked to be on the City's Energy Advisory Committee by Vicki Bennett, Sustainability Director. She noted Mayor Becker was there and she would keep the Commission posted on that.

Report of the Director

Mr. Sommerkorn stated the City Council passed the temporary zoning regulations for the Yalecrest and Westmoreland neighborhoods, in order to look at the potential for declaring those areas in the overlay preservation zone. The council also received a briefing on the historic preservation plan, and the Historic Landmark Commission met, and made a recommendation for prioritizing potential future designation of

historic districts, which would come before the Planning Commission and then forwarded with a recommendation on to the City Council.

Public Hearings

Commissioner Gallegos stated he was a former Housing Commissioner with the City Housing authority, but he had not been on the board for three years, and inquired if the Planning Commissioners felt he needed to recues himself.

Commissioner McHugh felt his position was helpful and he did not need to recues himself.

Commissioner Chambless agreed.

PLNPCM2009-01048: 1812 South West Temple Street Designation—a request by Bill Nighswonger, Salt Lake City Housing Authority, for designation of the Stanley F. Taylor home located at approximately 1812 South West Temple Street, as a landmark site on the Salt Lake City Register of Cultural Resources. The petition is a request to amend the Salt Lake City Zoning Map and apply the Historic Preservation Overlay zone to the subject property. The site is zoned RMF-45 Moderate/ High Density Multi-Family Residential District and is located in City Council District 5, represented by Council Member Jill Remington-Love.

Chair De Lay recognized Michael Maloy as staff representative.

Mr. Maloy stated the Commission originally reviewed this multi-faceted project in September 2008. He stated one of the conditions of the development of this site, after receiving strong sentiments from the community council and member of the administration was that the existing Stanley F. Taylor home should be renovated for reuse. He stated the Planning Commission made that a conditional of approval and it was agreed upon by the City Council. He stated the Landmark site status was only for the building itself.

Mr. Maloy stated the site was under construction for senior residential housing, he noted he had not seen the proposed site plan on how the Salt Lake City Housing Authority would reuse the building, but it would include some type of office space for a Property Manager, and then spaces for the residences plus a common space.

He stated whether or not the application for a landmark site was approved, the applicant was required to follow the applicable residential design guidelines in the historic district publication. He stated the Historic Landmark Commission (HLC) reviewed this petition in January 2010 and determined, based on input from staff and other resources, that the property did not rise to the level of the City's landmark status. There were three basic criteria, which was included in the staff report, which former staff member Robin Zeigler reviewed and did not feel it met approval. The HLC also agreed it did not meet the criteria and they recommended that the Planning Commission not approve this petition, with the understanding that the applicant would still have to follow the historic design guidelines and the building would still be preserved, or reused.

Mr. Bill Nighswonger (Housing Authority) introduced Tom Perry, the builder for this project. He passed out preliminary drawings to the Commission, which would be submitted for building permits. He stated the goal was to get the house back to the original look. There were limitations as far as there could only be 6.4 people on one floor and 5.6 people on the other floor, so primarily the residence would use the first floor as a common area to visit. He stated this house would be considered low income housing and would

be available for 99 years. He stated a lot of seismic upgrades would need to be done; the roof would need to be replaced.

Chair De Lay inquired why they wanted to apply the preservation overlay zone to this property.

Mr. Nighswonger stated it was a requirement to take this petition through the zoning process, but the intention was to save the house and keep it as original as possible.

Commissioner Gallegos inquired if there were any other common areas planned, besides what was inside the house.

Mr. Nighswonger stated at the east end of the large building would be a lot of common area space including a kitchen.

Commissioner Wirthlin inquired if the applicant had issues with the Commission following staff's recommendation and denying this petition.

Mr. Nighswonger stated he did not disagree with the Planning staff's recommendation, going through this process was required and would make the house an attractive feature, which would help the marketing; however, the historic registry of this house would not add any value to the property, probably more restrictions than anything.

Commissioner Chambless inquired if it was really cost effective to maintain the skeletal structure of this house, rather than simply having it as an addition to what was underway right now. He inquired if the outside space could have been better used as an extension of the structure.

Mr. Nighswonger stated there was no question the project could use a little more landscaped area, and it was actually very costly to restore this house.

Public Hearing

Chair De Lay opened the public hearing portion of this petition.

The following person spoke in **support** of the petition: **Cindy Cromer** (816 East 100 South) stated the people that would be living in this housing project would remember houses of this era from their childhood. This was good business because the applicant wanted to make a project for a senior community look older, not like modern architecture. She stated not much was protecting this structure, what wound up protecting it was taking it through a planned development process, and the Commission attached conditions to the approval, but it was because it was such a large development. If this had not been a large development there would have been no protection for this property and there were a few precious incentives for people to do historic preservation on structures in this situation, that were not yet nationally or even city registered, and did not get tax incentives.

Chair De Lay closed the public hearing.

Motion

Commissioner Algarin made a motion regarding Petition PLNHLC2009-01048, based on the findings of staff; the Planning Commission forwards a negative recommendation to the City Council.

Commissioner Wirthlin seconded the motion.

Commissioners Chambless, Fife, Dean, Gallegos, Hill, McHugh, Wirthlin, and Algarin voted, “Aye”. The motion passed unanimously.

PLNPCM2009-01423 Civic Campus; Central Community Master Plan Amendment—a request by Salt Lake City Mayor Ralph Becker to adopt a civic campus plan as part of the Central Community Master Plan in preparation for the new public safety building and emergency operations center building and other possible mixed uses. The subject area is located approximately between 400 South and 500 South and 50 East and 350 East (former Barnes Bank building and adjacent lots to the south). The subject property is located in Council District 4, represented by Luke Garrott.

Chair De Lay recognized Casey Stewart as staff representative.

Mr. Stewart stated last year the public majority voted to approve funds for a public safety and emergency operations center. Throughout that process the administration reviewed a few different sites based on criteria to decide where this should be located. Mayor Becker selected site number 9, the Barnes Bank Block. He stated while researching this project he found a map from 1943 for a proposed Civic Center in this location.

Mr. Stewart stated he proposed some text amendments to certain sections of the master plan, which could be found in the staff report. He stated the intent was to essentially speak to the establishment of a civic campus, and allowing government facilities near the central business downtown district. He stated one change he would insert into the proposal which was not in the staff report, was a word change on page 4, under the INSLU-4.1, which stated *Encourage the concentration of federal, state and local government office facilities, courts, and cultural facilities in, **or near**, the Central Business District with convenient access to light rail in order to provide easy availability to the greatest number of people.*

Mr. Stewart stated this site was not in the Central Business District, but it was close to it, as well as a transit station. He stated staff felt this site complied with the intent to concentrate these uses downtown, while allowing the maximum number of citizens to access this site by methods of car, rail, or bus.

Commissioner McHugh stated in the title of the petition it stated, 400 South and 500 South; Main Street and 400 East—yet in the first paragraph it stated *the area bounded roughly by 50 East and 350 East, between 400 South and 500 South*. She inquired which was correct, she though only half of the block would be included, but the title suggested otherwise.

Mr. Stewart stated the title should be changed to 350 East.

Commissioner Chambless inquired where Mr. Stewart found the 1943 proposed map.

Mr. Stewart stated in was in the Planning Division offices in a library of past plans.

Commissioner Chambless stated there was an open house held regarding this issue and it was not well attended, which usually meant the public was not irate about a proposal.

Mr. Stewart stated two people came to ask questions and offer some input.

Commissioner Dean inquired what Mr. Stewart envisioned as a *cultural facility* in this district.

Mr. Stewart stated the intent was to allow for concerts, farmer's markets, and other types of gatherings of that size to take place in this area in connection to the Library block. He stated cultural facility indicated a use rather than a building type.

Commissioner Dean inquired why the plan was so specific in terms of address, she stated obviously to capture the east block, but it seemed very directional, when in the 1943 plan the core seemed to be the City & County Building with extensions to the north and south. She inquired if it was wise to create a hard lined edge versus infer that a central district should be created to keep it open to additions in the future when other facilities might be needed therefore creating a necessity to have to revise this boundary again and again.

Mr. Stewart stated currently there were some overlapping areas included in the map to try to help with that flexibility, but as far as the outer boundary he would be open to suggestions on how to soften that up.

Mr. Sommerkorn stated that was a great point and an issue that was discussed amongst staff fairly extensively. He stated the land use plan was very specific, designating portions of blocks for certain types of uses, which came back to the philosophy of how specific or how general this plan should be. He stated this particular plan was a long time in the adoption process, simply because it was getting so specific, following the adoption of this plan by the City Council there was discussion about making plans in the future a little bit more general, and staff agreed with that.

Commissioner Dean stated maybe it was the difference between a zoning district and master plan intent of build out and whether or not there was an overlay of government concentrated facilities as a general larger bubble to try to capture some of the vacant parking lots as potential venues.

Commissioner Chambless inquired if the state would also be utilizing some of this space.

Mr. Stewart stated those discussions were still being had.

Mr. Sommerkorn stated the state adopted some intent language in their budget to continue looking at the possibility of partnering with the City on this emergency operations center.

Commissioner Chambless stated that at the 300 East ingress/egress there was a possibility of restricted access in that area.

Chair De Lay stated that was a Federal and State decision.

Public Hearing

Chair De Lay opened the public hearing portion of the petition.

The following person spoke in *support* of the petition: **Cindy Cromer** (816 East 100 South) handed out the most recent neighborhood plan, adopted in 2005. She stated her comments were in context of what the city had been planning for the East Downtown neighborhood for the last twenty years. She stated when she was on the Planning Commission in the early 1990s, they worked on the East Downtown master plan and decided the depopulation of east downtown was a huge mistake, allowing low rise office buildings and surface parking lots, which drove people out of the city. She stated the Coridini Administration chose to rezone property owned by Hermes, so the City could have a huge traffic-oriented shopping area. The city spent ten years developing the transit corridor zone, which was put in place in late 2005 and despite emphasis on housing in that zone there had not been a single unit of housing as a result to that zone.

Chair De Lay stated there were massive housing units built within a block of this corridor.

Ms. Cromer stated because the land was cheaper and people were willing to develop a block from 400 South. She stated the housing that was promised had not been put into place, including on Library Square.

Chair De Lay inquired if Ms. Cromer was advocating for housing on the civic campus block.

Ms. Cromer stated no, the city kept passing the buck and not doing what it had promised this neighborhood. She stated as someone who had invested in this area it was really debilitating. She inquired where the housing was going to be located.

Chair De Lay stated the city does want to have mixed use on the Barnes Bank block, which would include housing, residential, and the emergency services, but locations were not final right now.

Ms. Cromer stated a mixed use project could be predominately housing with a little bit of retail on the main floor.

Chair De Lay inquired if the Federal Government was going to allow any housing around this civic campus.

Ms. Cromer stated that was why she brought this up, the housing kept being deferred, all the proposed changes to this plan regarded institutional uses, and if the housing component kept being deferred there was not going to be room for it. She stated housing was essential to the downtown area to get people to live and shop downtown so it would thrive.

Commissioner Hill inquired where Ms. Cromer would recommend the housing go.

Ms. Cromer stated the work going on for and around North Temple was fabulous and really had a chance of working. She stated that philosophy was sensitive to the neighborhoods and the types of resources in the area should be applied to the 400 South area as soon as possible. Currently the transit corridor zone appeared to be so ineffective it was its own moratorium.

Commissioner Fife inquired if there were plans to extend the North Temple process to 400 South and State Street.

Mr. Sommerkorn stated the intent was once that zoning designation was put in place; staff would look at it and see if it would work for 400 South. He stated on the north end of the Barnes Bank block it was zoned for mixed use, which implied some residential in this case, but it was a question of whether that would happen or not.

Chair De Lay closed the public hearing.

Motion

Commissioner Fife made a motion regarding Petition PLNPCM2009-01423, a master plan amendment area within 400 South and 500 South Main Street and 350 East; based on the discussion, staff report, and public comment, the Planning Commission transmits a favorable recommendation to the City Council to adopt the proposed Civic Campus Plan and associated text amendments as part of the Central Community Master plan and East Downtown Neighborhood Plan.

Commissioner Chambless seconded the motion.

Commissioners Chambless, Gallegos, Dean, Fife, Hill, McHugh, Wirthlin, and Algarin voted, “Aye”. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 6:33 p.m.

This document, along with the digital recording, constitute the official minutes of the Salt Lake City Planning Commission held on March 24, 2010.

Tami Hansen