

PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT ADMINISTRATIVE ITEM



Planning Division
Department of Community &
Economic Development

PARLEY'S MEETINGHOUSE

Planned Development – PLNSUB2013-00016

Conditional Use – PLNPCM2013-00027

Special Exception – PLNPCM2013-00100

2350 South 2100 East

June 26, 2013

Applicant

Brad Gygi, on behalf of the Church of
Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints

Staff

Lex Traughber, Senior Planner
(801) 535-6184 or
lex.traughber@slc.gov.com

Tax ID & Lot Area

16-22-154-011 (~2.48 Acres)

Current Zone

R-1/7,000 (Single-Family Residential
District)

Master Plan Designation

Sugar House Master Plan –
Very Low Density Residential

Council District

District 7 – Søren Simonsen

Community Council

Sugar House Community Council,
Christopher Thomas - Chair

Current Use:

Church

Applicable Land Use Regulations:

- Chapter 21A.54 – Conditional Uses
- Chapter 21A.55 – Planned Developments
- Chapter 21A.59 – Conditional Building and Site Design Review
- Chapter 21A.24.060 – R-1/7,000 Single-Family Residential District

Attachments:

- A. PC Minutes (March 27, 2013)
- B. Staff Report (March 13, 2013)
- C. Citizen Correspondence (June 26, 2013)
- D. Revised Elevations

Request

This is a request by Brad Gygi, on behalf of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, for Planned Development, Conditional Use, Special Exception, and Conditional Building and Site Design Review for a new LDS meetinghouse. The existing meetinghouse on the subject property will be demolished and a new one built in its place. The Planning Commission has final decision-making authority for this series of applications.

Recommendation

Based on the findings listed in the original staff report dated March 13, 2013, and the findings in this staff report, it is the Planning Staff's opinion that the project generally meets the applicable standards for Conditional Use, Planned Development, Conditional Building and Site Design Review, and Special Exception and therefore recommends the Planning Commission approve the applications subject to the following conditions:

1. Final Planned Development site plan approval is delegated to the Planning Director.
2. Through the Planned Development process, the Planning Commission approves a modification of the R-1/7,000 Zoning District regulations to include parking in the front yard along Parley's Circle as proposed and shown on the site plan attached to this report (Exhibit D).
3. A Special Exception is granted to allow for a building height of approximately thirty-one feet (31') as proposed and shown on the elevation drawings attached to this report (Exhibit D).

Background

This proposal was originally heard by the Planning Commission on March 27, 2013. The minutes (Exhibit A) and the original staff report (Exhibit B) are included with this report for reference. The applicant has considered the Planning Commission's and the public's comments, and has submitted revised building plans (Exhibit D) for consideration. The following is a summary of the proposed revisions:

- East and west entries: The height of the entries has been increased to visually break up the mass of the larger roof behind and increase the feel of the two story height areas to echo the existing building. The detailing was changed slightly, flagstone was substituted for brick around the main entry way to echo the materials of the existing building and give visual prominence to the main entries.
- South entry: The height of this entry was also increased to visually break up the larger roof area and give a two-story feel to that part of the building.
- East and west gables: The smaller gables on the east and west were also raised to increase the two-story feel areas as well as to break up the larger roof mass behind.

Public Notice, Meetings and Comments

Notice of the public hearing for the proposal includes:

- Public hearing notice mailed on June 13, 2013.
- Public hearing notice posted on property on June 17, 2013.
- Public hearing notice posted on City and State websites on June 13, 2013.

Public Comments

Citizen correspondence since the Planning Commission hearing on March 27, 2013, is attached for consideration (Exhibit C).

Analysis and Findings

The applicant has submitted revised building plans in consideration of the comments of the Planning Commission and the community (see Exhibit A – PC Minutes). These concerns and issues include, but are not limited to the following:

- The feel of the larger roof mass of the building;
- The lack of prominence given to the main entries;
- The two-story feel of the existing building vs. primarily one story feel of the originally submitted design; and,
- The general concern of losing the feel / materials of the existing building.

Findings: The analysis based on the standards for Planned Development, Conditional Use, Conditional Building and Site Design Review, and Special Exception as noted in the original staff report dated March 13, 2013 (Exhibit B) are still valid. Planning Staff had recommended approval of the original design based on these standards. The building modifications proposed have little, if any, bearing on the analysis as originally conducted. Planning Staff continues to support the project and the modified design.

Potential Motions

The motion recommended by the Planning Division is located on the cover page of this staff report. The recommendation is based on the above analysis. The following is a potential motion that may be used in case the Planning Commission determines the project should be denied:

Not Consistent with Staff Recommendation: Based on the testimony, plans presented, and the following findings, I move that the Planning Commission deny the Parley's Meetinghouse located at approximately 2350 South 2100 East. The proposal fails to meet the standards for Conditional Use, Planned Development, Conditional Building and Site Design, and Special Exception or some combination thereof. The proposed project therefore, is not compliant with the following standards and is denied:

The Planning Commission will need to make findings based on the above reference standards to deny the proposal.

Exhibit A –
PC Minutes of March 27, 2013

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Room 126 of the City & County Building
451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah
Wednesday, March 27, 2013

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at 5:39:48 PM. Audio recordings of the Planning Commission meetings are retained in the Planning Office for an indefinite period of time.

Present for the Planning Commission meeting were: Chairperson Michael Gallegos; Vice Chair Emily Drown Commissioners Lisa Adams, Bernardo Flores-Sahagun, Marie Taylor and Mary Woodhead. Commissioners Angela Dean, Clark Ruttinger, Michael Fife and Matthew Wirthlin were excused.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Wilford Sommerkorn, Planning Director; Joel Paterson, Planning Manager; Lex Traughber, Senior Planner; Michelle Moeller, Senior Secretary and Paul Neilson, City Attorney.

FIELD TRIP NOTES:

A field trip was held prior to the work session. Planning Commissioners present were: Lisa Adams, Bernardo Flores-Sahagun, Michael Gallegos, Marie Woodhead and Marie Taylor. Staff members in attendance were Joel Paterson and Lex Traughber.

The following locations were visited:

Parley's Meeting House 2350 S 2100 E- The Commission visited the site of the Parley's Meeting house at 2350 S 2100 E and drove through the surrounding neighborhood. The Staff discussed the details of the proposal to demolish the existing building on the lot and the various applications pending. The Commission asked questions about the reasons the applicant wants to demolish the existing meeting house, the new design, site considerations, the proposed building height and the parking.

5:40:08 PM APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE February 27, 2013 and March 13, 2013 MEETINGS

MOTION 5:40:15 PM

Commissioner Woodhead made a motion to approve the February 27, 2013 minutes. Commissioner Taylor seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The Commission did not vote on the March 13, 2013 Meeting minutes due to the lack of members in attendance.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR 5:41:35 PM

Chairperson Gallegos stated he had nothing to report at this time

Vice Chairperson Drown stated she had nothing to report at this time.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR 5:41:44 PM

Mr. Wilford, Sommerkorn, Planning Director, stated a briefing on the Downtown Master Plan was given at the March 13 meeting. He said Staff would like the Planning Commission to initiate the Master Plan petition which would require a motion from the Planning Commission regarding such.

5:42:21 PM

Commissioner Drown made a motion for the Planning Commission to initiate the Downtown Master Plan. Commissioner Woodhead seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Sommerkorn stated that as part of the process an advisory committee was being put together. He asked if the Commission wanted to appoint anyone to the positions.

The Commission and Staff decided the positions would be filled via email. The date for the committee meeting would be April 30, 2013 with the first community workshop on May 9, 2013.

5:44:14 PM

PUBLIC HEARING

PARLEY'S MEETINGHOUSE at approximately 2350 South 2100 East - Bradley Gygi on behalf of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints is proposing to demolish the existing church located at the address listed above and requesting approval to construct a new church that is approximately 31 feet in height (3 feet above the maximum height allowed in the zoning district) on the property. The Applicant is also requesting approval to construct a parking lot within the required front yard setback on Parley's Circle. This project requires Planned Development, Conditional Use, Special Exception, and Conditional Building and Site Design approval from the Planning Commission. The proposed church building and parking lot will be located in similar locations to the existing building and parking lot. The subject property is located in an R-1/7,000 (Single-Family Residential) District and is also located in Council District 7 represented by Søren Simonsen. (Staff contact: Lex Traughber at (801)535-6184 or lex.traughber@slcgov.com file numbers PLNSUB2013-00016, PLNPCM2013-00027 and PLNPCM2013-00100).

Mr. Lex Traugher, Senior Planner reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated it was Staff's recommendation to approve the petition as presented.

Mr. Bradley Gygi, Architect, reviewed the history of the property and the need for the new structure. He reviewed the design and layout to the proposed building. Mr. Gygi reviewed the architecture and why it was necessary for the use and efficiency of the building.

The Applicant and Commissioners discussed the design of the proposed structure and how it could better address the neighborhood. They discussed the steeple placement, entrance orientation, mechanical elements of the building and parking for the proposal. They discussed how the design was chosen, how the LDS Church generally designs its structures and uses standard plans.

PUBLIC HEARING 6:04:38 PM

Chairperson Gallegos opened the Public Hearing;

Ms. Judy Short, Sugar House Community Council, stated the neighborhood understood the reasons the church needed to be replaced however the church is in a gateway to Sugar House. She stated the proposed structures height was questionable. Ms. Short stated if there is a standard plan for these churches it should fit with the residential area standards, landscaping should be adequate year round keeping the property attractive and noise from the air-conditioning units will be an issue in the area. She stated the proposal needed to be adjusted to fit the area before approval.

The following persons spoke in favor of the petition: Mr. Ron Larkin, Mr. Nate Jones, Mr. James Jardine, Mr. Soren Simonsen and Mr. Carl Empey.

The following comments were made:

- 460 - 550 members attend the church but not all attend each week.
- The design has met the needs in other areas with more attendance.
- Steeple placement is ideal as it is over the chapel in the church, which is the most scared part of the building.
- People that attend the church are in favor of the design.
- Need a building that functions for the needs of the church and its members.
- Proposed building will be attractive and add to the area.
- Design is ideal for the use of the building.
- It will not be the tallest building in the area; the trees and an adjacent home is taller.
- Noise will not be an issue as it is currently not an issue.
- Change in this area has been taking place all around

- Building is not safe and will collapse if an earthquake were to happen and safety is very important

The following persons spoke in opposition of the petition: Mr. Larry Migliaccio, Mr. Scott Kisling, Mr. Soren Simonsen and Mr. Clayton Damion

The following comments were made:

- Design is not ideal for the area.
- Plan should be made to fit with the neighborhood requirements.
- Lower profile of the building would make it more energy efficient.
- Steeple should remain in the center of the building where it currently is.
- Location of the building is in a gateway and proposal does not address the neighborhood on all sides.
- Flat roof would allow for mechanical equipment to be placed on the roof.
- Developer should not determine the design of the structure; the standards and master plan for the area should determine the design.

Commissioners asked who attended the design review meeting for the building and what the ward boundaries for the church were.

Mr. Gygi explained the process of choosing the design of the building. He reviewed the boundaries for the church.

Chairperson Gallegos closed the Public Hearing.

6:28:35 PM

Commissioner Adams reviewed the field trip taken to the site and surrounding area.

Mr. Gygi reviewed the placement of the steeple and its religious purpose. He reviewed how the decision for the design was reached, how it best fit the use of the building and the standards for construction.

Mr. Paul Neilson asked if the steeple over the chapel was a church mandate or just an architectural element.

Mr. Gygi stated in new construction it was a church-wide practice to place the steeple over the chapel because of its sacred nature. He stated historically there are churches that differ from the proposed design however; from 2000 forward it has been a core feature of construction.

The Commission and Applicant reviewed the proposed landscaping and the option to have a flat roof. Mr. Gygi stated there are not many flat roofs in the area however; the Church is working on a flat roof design.

The Commissioners and Applicant discussed the issue of building mass and the options for the design to meet the neighborhood requirements. They discussed the massing of the roof, whether there is a religious purpose for the roof design and if it was an element protected by the First Amendment of the U. S. Constitution. The Commission and the Applicant discussed why the church would not want to address the concerns of the neighborhood and make the building fit the area architecturally and aesthetically.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the wall that would shield the mechanical systems for the building. The Applicant stated the walls will be on the east and west sides of the building. The Commission and Applicant discussed the energy sufficiency of the proposed design and what other things that could be done to make it more energy efficient.

DISCUSSION 6:42:44 PM

The Commission and Staff discussed the parking and if it could be limited. Staff stated the proposal met the requirements for the standard.

The Commission discussed if a compromise could be reached with the height and façade of the building. It was stated that the mass of the building (particularly the roof) was an issue.

Commissioner Adams asked what solutions the Commissioners would suggest to address the concerns of the neighborhood.

The Commissioners stated they had no issue regarding the reasons the building needed to be replaced but the design of the proposed building needed to be addressed. The Commission stated that it was not uncommon for the Commission to request design changes to address neighborhood compatibility.

Mr. Neilson stated he would need to research the law and see what was allowed. He stated businesses could not come into a community and disregard the standards or there would be no control over developments.

Mr. Sommerkorn reviewed the standards for such buildings regarding creating a pleasing environment and parking. He stated that any conditions imposed by the Planning

Commission would have to relate to specific impacts and would have to be tied to standards in the ordinance.

Mr. Neilson read the ordinance language addressing the Conditional Building and Site Design review process.

The Commission agreed they would like more information from the City Attorney's Office, regarding what design changes could be negotiated under the ordinance standards for this project.

MOTION 6:53:24 PM

Commissioner Woodhead stated as to petition PLNSUB2013-00016, PLNPCM2013-00027 and PLNPCM2013-00100, she moved that the Planning Commission table the petitions to allow the Planning Commission to receive further guidance regarding the scope of their authority in regards to these petitions. She stated the Public Hearing had been closed. Commissioner Flores-Sahagun seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Neilson asked the Petitioner to send him comments as to why they were claiming there was an expressive protected first amendment, in regards to the petition.

The meeting adjourned at 6:54:54 PM.

Exhibit B –
Staff Report of March 13, 2013

PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT ADMINISTRATIVE ITEM



Planning Division
Department of Community &
Economic Development

PARLEY'S MEETINGHOUSE

Planned Development – PLNSUB2013-00016

Conditional Use – PLNPCM2013-00027

Special Exception – PLNPCM2013-00100

2350 South 2100 East

March 13, 2013

Applicant

Brad Gygi, on behalf of the Church of
Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints

Staff

Lex Traughber, Senior Planner
(801) 535-6184 or
lex.traughber@slcgov.com

Tax ID & Lot Area

16-22-154-011 (~2.48 Acres)

Current Zone

R-1/7,000 (Single-Family Residential
District)

Master Plan Designation

Sugar House Master Plan –
Very Low Density Residential

Council District

District 7 – Søren Simonsen

Community Council

Sugar House Community Council,
Christopher Thomas - Chair

Current Use:

Church

Applicable Land Use Regulations:

- Chapter 21A.54 – Conditional Uses
- Chapter 21A.55 – Planned Developments
- Chapter 21A.59 – Conditional Building and Site Design Review
- Chapter 21A.24.060 – R-1/7,000 Single-Family Residential District

Attachments:

- A. City Comments
- B. Community Council Comments
- C. Citizen Comments
- D. Site Plans & Elevations

Request


This is a request by Brad Gygi on behalf of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints for Conditional Use, Planned Development, Conditional Building and Site Design Review, and Special Exception for a new LDS meetinghouse. The existing meetinghouse on the subject property will be demolished and a new one built in its place. The Planning Commission has final decision-making authority for this series of applications.

Recommendation

Based on the findings listed in the staff report, it is the Planning Staff's opinion that the project generally meets the applicable standards for Conditional Use, Planned Development, Conditional Building and Site Design Review, and Special Exception and therefore recommends the Planning Commission approve the applications subject to the following conditions:

1. Final Planned Development site plan approval is delegated to the Planning Director.
2. Through the Planned Development process, the Planning Commission approves a modification of the R-1/7,000 Zoning District regulations to include parking in the front yard along Parley's Circle as proposed and shown on the site plan attached to this report (Exhibit D).
3. A Special Exception is granted to allow for a building height of approximately thirty-one feet (31') as proposed and shown on the elevation drawings attached to this report (Exhibit D).

VICINITY MAP



Background

Project Description

The proposal is for the redevelopment of an existing LDS Church meetinghouse site to demolish the existing meetinghouse building and accessory structures and to construct a new meetinghouse and related site improvements. The existing building has structural, functional, and accessibility issues. The Church has determined that the best course of remedy is the demolition and reconstruction proposed. The new meetinghouse will be used in the same manner as current.

A meetinghouse or "Place of Worship" is a conditional use in the R-1/7,000 Zoning District. A Planned Development is required in this case because the applicant is seeking modification to a required zoning standard related to parking. Additionally, through the Planned Development process, the Conditional Building and Site Design review process is relevant. The applicant is also seeking a Special Exception to address the proposed building height which is approximately three feet (3') over the maximum height allowed in the Zone. The Planning Commission has decision making authority in all of these processes and has the ability to modify regulations as warranted.

Existing and proposed site plans, as well as elevation drawings are attached for review (Exhibit D).

Zoning Summary

Ordinance Requirement	Proposed	Compliance
Use	A church is a Conditional Use in the R-1/7,000 Zone.	Must obtain approval from the Planning Commission
Minimum Lot Area And Lot Width: Places of Worship on lots less than 4 acres in size: 12,000 square foot minimum lot size and 80 feet in lot width	The subject lot is approximately 2.48 acres in size and exceeds the minimum lot width.	Complies
Maximum Lot Size: 10,500 square feet	Exceeds the maximum lot size but is a "grandfathered" lot as it has been in existence prior to City regulation regarding maximum lot size.	Complies
Maximum Building Height: 20 ft. for flat roof/ 28 ft. for pitched roof	Pitched roof portion of meetinghouse ~ 31 feet. There is no height limit for the proposed steeple.	Must obtain approval from the Planning Commission
Minimum Front Yard Requirements: Average of the block face	The subject site has three block faces. Along Parley's Circle and Parkway Avenue the subject lot essentially comprises the block, and along 2100 East the proposed setback is consistent with the other existing structures on this block face as demonstrated on the site plan.	Complies
Interior Side Yard: 6 ft.	Exceeds requirement.	Complies
Rear Yard: 25 ft.	Exceeds requirement.	Complies
Maximum Building Coverage: 40%	~ 18%	Complies
Required Parking: 63 spaces based on 314 seats in the main assembly hall.	126 spaces provided, with 6 ADA stall and bicycle parking	Complies

Public Notice, Meetings and Comments

The following is a list of public meetings that have been held related to the proposed project:

- Community Council held on March 6, 2013.

Notice of the public hearing for the proposal includes:

- Public hearing notice mailed on February 28, 2013.
- Public hearing notice posted on property on February 28, 2013.
- Public hearing notice posted on City and State websites on February 28, 2013.

Public Comments

The application was presented to the Sugar House Community Council on March 6, 2013. The comments from the Community Council are attached for review (Exhibit B). One citizen letter was also received (Exhibit C).

City Department Comments

Comments were received from various City departments and are attached (Exhibit A). No comments were received which would preclude the development of the proposed meetinghouse. The applicant will be required to meet City standards for development as stipulated by the various City Departments/Divisions in the attached comments.

Analysis and Findings

Standards for Conditional Uses; Section 21A.54.080

A conditional use shall be approved if reasonable conditions are proposed, or can be imposed, to mitigate the reasonably anticipated detrimental effects of the proposed use in accordance with applicable standards set forth in this section. If the reasonably anticipated detrimental effects of a proposed conditional use cannot be substantially mitigated by the proposal or the imposition of reasonable conditions to achieve compliance with applicable standards, the conditional use shall be denied.

In order to identify and evaluate the detrimental effects and the need for and/or adequacy of mitigating conditions, the Planning Commission shall review and consider the following:

Approval Standards: A conditional use permit shall be approved unless the evidence presented shows that one (1) or more of the standards set forth in this subsection cannot be met. The Planning Commission, or, in the case of administrative conditional uses, the Planning Director or the Director's designee, may request additional information as may be reasonably needed to determine whether the standards of this subsection can be met.

1. The use complies with applicable provisions of this title;

Analysis: The proposed meetinghouse or place of worship use is specifically allowed in the R-1/7,000 Zone through the Conditional Use process. The table in the "Project Description" section above demonstrates that the project generally meets the standards required in this particular Zone with a couple of exceptions. The project does not meet the standard for the location of required parking as allowed in the R-1/7,000 Zone, and hence the application for a Planned Development. In addition, the applicant is seeking Special Exception approval because the peak of the roof exceeds the maximum allowed building height by approximately three feet (3'). The applicant is addressing both of these design issues through the Planned Development process and the Special Exception process as discussed below. The Planning Commission has the authority to grant Condition Use approval, as well as Planned Development and Special Exception approval based on standards adopted by the City for these processes.

Finding: In general, the proposed meetinghouse project meets or will meet the provisions of this Title with approvals granted by the Planning Commission for a relaxation of the parking and building height requirements through the Planned Development and Special Exception processes.

2. The use is compatible, or with conditions of approval can be made compatible, with surrounding uses;

Analysis: Churches intended to serve neighborhoods should be located where they can be easily accessed by a variety of transportation means and by a variety of age groups. For these reasons, churches are often located in close proximity to residential uses. The existing meetinghouse is located in a predominantly residential area, serving the surrounding community. The proposed structure will serve the same purpose. The subject meetinghouse has also been located and has functioned on the subject site for many years. No issues have been identified related to this meetinghouse in the time that it has existed, a fact that further demonstrates compatibility with the surrounding uses. Landscaping is being proposed over the entire site to enhance the appearance of the property and to ensure that the project is a positive attribute to the neighborhood.

Finding: The meetinghouse use is compatible with surrounding uses.

3. The use is consistent with applicable adopted city planning policies, documents, and master plans;

Analysis: The subject property is located within the Sugar House Master Plan area. The property is identified for low density residential use according to this Plan, and is subsequently zoned to be consistent with this residential land use category. Should the use of the property ever cease to be a church, the City Council has adopted the Sugar House Master Plan with the intent that the subject property would revert to a residential land use. The subject property will continue to be used as a "Place of Worship", only the appearance of the building and surroundings will be altered through the redevelopment.

Finding: The Zoning Ordinance provides for "Place of Worship" uses in residential zones through the Conditional Use process, subject to approval by the Planning Commission. Because of this provision, any approval by the Planning Commission for the proposed Conditional Use would deem the use consistent with City policies, documents, and plans.

4. The anticipated detrimental effects of a proposed use can be mitigated by the imposition of reasonable conditions.

Analysis: Zoning ordinance section 21A.54.080 B identifies specific items that may determine what constitutes a detrimental effect. In determining a detrimental effect, the following items shall be adequately addresses and/or mitigated:

1. This title specifically authorizes the use where it is located;
2. The use is consistent with applicable policies set forth in adopted citywide, community, and small area master plans and future land use maps;
3. The use is well suited to the character of the site, and adjacent uses as shown by an analysis of the intensity, size, and scale of the use compared to existing uses in the surrounding area;
4. The mass, scale, style, design, and architectural detailing of the surrounding structures as they relate to the proposed have been considered;
5. Access points and driveways are designed to minimize grading of natural topography, direct vehicular traffic onto major streets, and not impede traffic flows;
6. The internal circulation system is designed to mitigate adverse impacts on adjacent property from motorized, non-motorized, and pedestrian traffic;
7. The site is designed to enable access and circulation for pedestrian and bicycles;
8. Access to the site does not unreasonably impact the service level of any abutting or adjacent street;
9. The location and design of off street parking complies with applicable standards of this code;
10. Utility capacity is sufficient to support the use at normal service levels;
11. The use is appropriately screened, buffered, or separated from adjoining dissimilar uses to mitigate potential use conflicts;

12. The use meets city sustainability plans, does not significantly impact the quality of surrounding air and water, encroach into a river or stream, or introduce any hazard or environmental damage to any adjacent property, including cigarette smoke;
13. The hours of operation and delivery of the use are compatible with surrounding uses;
14. Signs and lighting are compatible with, and do not negatively impact surrounding uses; and
15. The proposed use does not undermine preservation of historic resources and structures.

Finding: The applicant has taken into consideration anticipated detrimental effects and has reasonably addressed or mitigated said effects through the design of the proposed church.

Conditions Imposed

The Planning Commission may impose any condition upon a proposed Conditional Use in order to address any of the factors listed in Section 21A.54.080 of the Zoning Ordinance. The conditions may include:

1. Conditions on the scope of the use; its character, location, hours and methods of operation, architecture, signage, construction, landscaping, access, loading and parking, sanitation, drainage and utilities, fencing and screening, and setbacks; and,
2. Conditions needed to mitigate any natural hazards; assure public safety; address environmental impacts; and mitigate dust, fumes, smoke, odor, noise, vibrations; chemicals, toxins, pathogens, gases, heat, light, and radiation.

Analysis: The use of the property will not change; the property has been used as an LDS meetinghouse and will continue to operate as such. Planning Staff suggests no additional conditions be imposed on the proposal in association with the Conditional Use portion of this project.

Finding: Planning Staff recommends no conditions associated with the Conditional Use portion of the overall project. It is the Planning Commission's prerogative to impose any conditions necessary to mitigate unaddressed impacts as it sees fit.

Overview of the Planned Development Proposal

The applicant has submitted an application for a Planned Development to address a parking issue. The subject lot fronts three public streets and therefore has three "front" yards. This presents significant challenge for the location of parking on the lot. Parking in the front yard is not allowed by Code. The applicant has proposed to locate the majority of the parking for the meetinghouse in the "front" yard facing Parley's Circle, just as the current parking is configured. Planning Staff asserts that the parking located along Parley's Circle is preferable because it puts the majority of the parking for the site away from residential uses to the north. It is also certainly preferable to front yard parking located along Parkway Avenue or 2100 East. The parking on the west side of the property will also maintain the built streetscape along 2100 East. The applicant is requesting that the Planning Commission consider the challenges of the property (fronting three public streets), and allow parking on the property as it is currently configured in what is technically a "front" yard along Parley's Circle.

The Planning Commission has decision making authority under the Zoning Ordinance for Planned Development requests, and any warranted relaxation of development standards associated with this process.

Standards for Planned Developments; Section 21A.55.050

A Planned Development is intended to encourage the efficient use of land and resources, promoting greater efficiency in public and utility services and encouraging innovation in the planning and building of all types of development. Through the flexibility of the Planned Development regulations, the City seeks to achieve *any* of the following specific objectives:

- A. Combination and coordination of architectural styles, building forms, building materials, and building relationships;
 - B. Preservation and enhancement of desirable site characteristics such as natural topography, vegetation and geologic features, and the prevention of soil erosion;
 - C. Preservation of buildings which are architecturally or historically significant or contribute to the character of the city;
 - D. Use of design, landscape, or architectural features to create a pleasing environment;
 - E. Inclusion of special development amenities that are in the interest of the general public;
 - F. Elimination of blighted structures or incompatible uses through redevelopment or rehabilitation;
 - G. Inclusion of affordable housing with market rate housing; or
 - H. Utilization of “green” building techniques in development.
- A. Planned Development Objectives: The Planned Development shall meet the purpose statement for a Planned Development (Section 21A.55.010) and will achieve at least one of the objectives stated in said Section;

Analysis: The proposed meetinghouse meets the purpose statement for Planned Developments and also meets several of the specific objectives of the Planned Development process; specifically items A, B, and D.

Item A – Combination and coordination of architectural styles, building forms, building materials and building relationships. The proposed new meetinghouse will be sited in such a manner to maintain the existing architectural presence of the existing structure on the corner of the lot. Some materials will be salvaged from the existing building in an attempt to maintain a portion of the character and material of the existing structure, including the existing steeple/spire and stone from the existing façade. Additionally, the new brick veneer will be a similar color and style as the existing building.

Item B – Preservation and enhancement of desirable site characteristics such as natural topography, vegetation and geologic features, and the prevention of soil erosion. The proposed site design will carefully incorporate and maintain most of the existing mature trees, particularly on the streets and at the front of the property. Through the redevelopment of the site, additional vegetation will be added, including shade trees in the parking areas. All of the landscaping and irrigation will be designed to a drought-tolerant specification.

Item D – Use of design, landscape or architectural features to create a pleasing environment. The new landscaping and site design will be carefully incorporated into the neighborhood to continue and enhance the site as a walkable destination. The existing divided parking area and non-matching accessory buildings will be removed and replaced with a more attractive development for the neighborhood.

Finding: The project meets the intent of the purpose statement adopted for Planned Developments. The project also achieves at least three (3) of the objectives for Planned Development, thereby satisfying this standard. Those objectives are A, B, and D related to a combination and coordination of architectural styles, the preservation and enhancement of desirable site characteristics, and the creation of a pleasing environment.

B. Master Plan And Zoning Ordinance Compliance: The proposed planned development shall be:

1. Consistent with any adopted policy set forth in the Citywide, community, and/or small area master plan and future land use map applicable to the site where the planned development will be located, and,
2. Allowed by the zone where the planned development will be located or by another applicable provision of this title.

Finding: This same standard was addressed previously as item "3" under the Conditional Use review on page 5. As noted previously, the use is consistent with adopted City planning policies, documents and master plans. A place of worship is a use that is allowed in the R-1/7,000 Zone through the Conditional Use process.

C. Compatibility: The proposed planned development shall be compatible with the character of the site, adjacent properties, and existing development within the vicinity of the site where the use will be located. In determining compatibility, the planning commission shall consider:

1. Whether the street or other means of access to the site provide the necessary ingress/egress without materially degrading the service level on such street/access or any adjacent street/access;
2. Whether the planned development and its location will create unusual pedestrian or vehicle traffic patterns or volumes that would not be expected, based on:
 - i. Orientation of driveways and whether they direct traffic to major or local streets, and, if directed to local streets, the impact on the safety, purpose, and character of these streets;
 - ii. Parking area locations and size, and whether parking plans are likely to encourage street side parking for the planned development which will adversely impact the reasonable use of adjacent property;
 - iii. Hours of peak traffic to the proposed planned development and whether such traffic will unreasonably impair the use and enjoyment of adjacent property.
3. Whether the internal circulation system of the proposed planned development will be designed to mitigate adverse impacts on adjacent property from motorized, non-motorized, and pedestrian traffic;
4. Whether existing or proposed utility and public services will be adequate to support the proposed planned development at normal service levels and will be designed in a manner to avoid adverse impacts on adjacent land uses, public services, and utility resources;
5. Whether appropriate buffering or other mitigation measures, such as, but not limited to, landscaping, setbacks, building location, sound attenuation, odor control, will be provided to protect adjacent land uses from excessive light, noise, odor and visual impacts and other unusual disturbances from trash collection, deliveries, and mechanical equipment resulting from the proposed planned development, and;
6. Whether the intensity, size, and scale of the proposed planned development is compatible with adjacent properties.

7. If a proposed conditional use will result in new construction or substantial remodeling of a commercial or mixed used development, the design of the premises where the use will be located shall conform to the conditional building and site design review standards set forth in chapter 21A.59 of this title.

Analysis: This same standard was addressed previously as items "2" and "3" under the Conditional Use review starting on page 4. Various City Departments/Divisions reviewed the proposal for the reconstructed meetinghouse. No comments were received that would prevent the proposed redevelopment in terms of compatibility with the surrounding area. The project has been designed to be compatible with the character of the site and surrounding area and is not anticipated to create unusual pedestrian or traffic patterns/volumes. Vehicle traffic exiting the site will be directed onto the three surrounding streets. This traffic pattern is acceptable to the Transportation Division and will not degrade the existing traffic flow. Parking provisions are considered adequate to contain all required parking on site. Appropriate setbacks, screening, and landscaping are provided to minimize impact to adjacent properties.

The project is also subject to the Conditional Building and Site Design Review standards. These are addressed in the next section of this report.

Finding: The project satisfies this standard. Staff finds that the redevelopment maintains compatibility with the existing adjacent properties and poses little impact to surrounding streets.

- D. Landscaping: Existing mature vegetation on a given parcel for development shall be maintained. Additional or new landscaping shall be appropriate for the scale of the development, and shall primarily consist of drought tolerant species;

Analysis: Most of the existing trees on the borders of the site will be retained. The proposed landscaping is substantially more than the existing, particularly within the parking areas, and has been proposed to promote a pleasing environment for the surrounding community. As plans progress, a final landscaping plan will be required.

Finding: The proposed Planned Development adequately meets this standard.

- E. Preservation: The proposed Planned Development shall preserve any historical, architectural, and environmental features of the property;

Analysis: As noted previously, much of the existing landscaping will be maintained. The existing building is not listed on any national or local registers of historic places or cultural resources. The site has no other features that would need preservation.

Finding: The project satisfies this standard.

- F. Compliance with Other Applicable Regulations: The proposed planned development shall comply with any other applicable code or ordinance requirement.

Analysis: Other than the specific modifications requested by the applicant, the project appears to comply with all other applicable codes. Further compliance will be ensured during review of construction permits.

Finding: The project satisfies this standard.

Standards for Conditional Building and Site Design Review; Section 21A.59.060

Conditional Building and Site Design review shall be approved in conformance with the provisions of the following standards for design review found in chapter 21A.59.060 of the City's Zoning Ordinance.

- A. Development shall be primarily oriented to the street, not an interior courtyard or parking lot.
 - 1. Primary building orientation shall be toward the street rather than the parking area. The principal entrance shall be designed to be readily apparent.
 - 2. At least sixty percent (60%) of the street frontage of a lot shall have any new building located within ten feet (10') of the front setback. Parking is permitted in this area.
 - 3. Any buildings open to the public and located within thirty feet (30') of a public street shall have an entrance for pedestrians from the street to the building interior. This entrance shall be designed to be a distinctive and prominent element of the building's architectural design, and shall be open to the public during all business hours.
 - 4. Each building shall incorporate lighting and changes in mass, surface, or finish to give emphasis to its entrances.

- B. Primary access shall be oriented to the pedestrian and mass transit.
 - 1. Each building shall include an arcade, roof, alcove, portico, awnings, or similar architectural features that protect pedestrians from the rain and sun.

- C. Building facades shall include detailing and glass in sufficient quantities to facilitate pedestrian interest and interaction.
 - 1. At least forty percent (40%) of any first floor wall area that faces and is within thirty feet (30') of a primary street, plaza, or other public open space shall contain display areas, windows, or doorways. Windows shall allow views into a working area or lobby, a pedestrian entrance, or display area. First floor walls facing a side street shall contain at least twenty five percent (25%) of the wall space in window, display area, or doors. Monolithic walls located within thirty feet (30') of a public street are prohibited.
 - 2. Recessed or projecting balconies, verandas, or other usable space above the ground level on existing and new buildings is encouraged on a street facing elevation. Balconies may project over a public right of way, subject to an encroachment agreement issued by the city.

- D. Architectural detailing shall emphasize the pedestrian level of the building.

- E. Parking lots shall be appropriately screened and landscaped to minimize their impact on adjacent neighborhoods.
 - 1. Parking areas shall be located behind or at one side of a building. Parking may not be located between a building and a public street.
 - 2. Parking areas shall be shaded by large broadleaf canopied trees placed at a rate of one tree for each six (6) parking spaces. Parking shall be adequately screened and buffered from adjacent uses.
 - 3. Parking lots with fifteen (15) spaces or more shall be divided by landscaped areas including a walkway at least ten feet (10') in width or by buildings.

- F. Parking lot lighting shall be shielded to eliminate excessive glare or light into adjacent neighborhoods.

- G. Parking and on site circulation shall be provided.
 - 1. Connections shall be made when feasible to any streets adjacent to the subject property and to any pedestrian facilities that connect with the property.
 - 2. A pedestrian access diagram that shows pedestrian paths on the site that connect with a public sidewalk shall be submitted.

- H. Dumpsters and loading docks shall be appropriately screened or located within the structure.
1. Trash storage areas, mechanical equipment, and similar areas are not permitted to be visible from the street nor permitted between the building and the street.
 2. Appropriate sound attenuation shall occur on mechanical units at the exterior of buildings to mitigate noise that may adversely impact adjacent residential uses.
- I. Signage shall emphasize the pedestrian/mass transit orientation.
- J. Lighting shall meet the lighting levels and design requirements set forth in Chapter 4 of the Salt Lake City lighting master plan dated May 2006.
- K. Streetscape improvements shall be provided as follows:
1. One street tree chosen from the street tree list shall be placed for each thirty feet (30') of property frontage on a street.
 2. Landscaping material shall be selected that will assure eighty percent (80%) ground coverage occurs within three (3) years.
 3. Hardscape (paving material) shall be utilized to designate public spaces. Permitted materials include unit masonry, scored and colored concrete, grasscrete, or combinations of the above.
 4. Outdoor storage areas shall be screened from view from adjacent public rights of way. Loading facilities shall be screened and buffered when adjacent to residentially zoned land and any public street.
 5. Landscaping design shall include a variety of deciduous and/or evergreen trees, and shrubs and flowering plant species well adapted to the local climate.
- L. Street trees shall be provided as follows:
1. Any development fronting on a public or private street shall include street trees planted consistent with the city's urban forestry guidelines and with the approval of the city's urban forester.
 2. Existing street trees removed as the result of a development project shall be replaced by the developer with trees approved by the city's urban forester.
- M. **[Not Applicable to the project due to size being less than 60,000 square feet]** The following additional standards shall apply to any large scale developments with a gross floor area exceeding sixty thousand (60,000) square feet:
1. The orientation and scale of the development shall conform to the following requirements:
 - a. Large building masses shall be divided into heights and sizes that relate to human scale by incorporating changes in building mass or direction, sheltering roofs, a distinct pattern of divisions on surfaces, windows, trees, and small scale lighting.
 - b. No new buildings or contiguous groups of buildings shall exceed a combined contiguous building length of three hundred feet (300').
 2. Public spaces shall be provided as follows:
 - a. One square foot of plaza, park, or public space shall be required for every ten (10) square feet of gross building floor area.
 - b. Plazas or public spaces shall incorporate at least three (3) of the five (5) following elements:
 - (1) Sitting space of at least one sitting space for each two hundred fifty (250) square feet shall be included in the plaza. Seating shall be a minimum of sixteen inches (16") in height and thirty inches (30") in width. Ledge benches shall have a minimum depth of thirty inches (30");
 - (2) A mixture of areas that provide shade;
 - (3) Trees in proportion to the space at a minimum of one tree per eight hundred (800) square feet, at least two inch (2") caliper when planted;

- (4) Water features or public art; and/or
- (5) Outdoor eating areas or food vendors.

N. Any new development shall comply with the intent of the purpose statement of the zoning district and specific design regulations found within the zoning district in which the project is located as well as adopted master plan policies, the city's adopted "urban design element" and design guidelines governing the specific area of the proposed development. Where there is a conflict between the standards found in this section and other adopted plans and regulations, the more restrictive regulations shall control. (Ord. 61-08 § 2 (Exh. B), 2008; Ord. 89-05 § 8, 2005; Ord. 3-05 § 11, 2005)

Analysis: The standards for the Conditional Use and the Planned Development processes, as previously discussed, address essentially the same design standards as the Conditional Building and Site Design Review process. Staff finds the proposal overall adequately satisfies the standards of the three review processes, and therefore is compliant. The project incorporates many building design and site layout features that lend themselves to both pedestrian, mass transit, and automobile access, while maintaining overall compatibility with the adjacent uses and surrounding neighborhood.

Arguably, there are a couple of design element standards that this project will not meet and justifiably so. The standard requiring that at least sixty percent (60%) of the street frontage of a lot shall have any new building located within ten feet (10') of the front setback, and the requirement for at least forty percent (40%) of any first floor wall area shall contain display areas, windows, or doorways, are not applicable in this instance. The proximity to the front setback may well be appropriate for a place of worship located in a more urban setting, however given the subject property, which is located in a predominantly residential neighborhood with setbacks greater than ten feet, it is not appropriate nor warranted. A portion of the proposed building located within ten feet of the front property lines along any of the adjacent streets at the proposed location would interrupt the established streetscape. Further, the requirement for glass on the first floor is not realistically applicable for a place of worship. Places of Worship are structures providing sanctuary and privacy for the purpose of religious practice. In other words, they are not commercial or retail institutions that are typically open and inviting for the passing general public.

Finding: The project as proposed meets the standards of the Conditional Building and Site Design Review process.

Standards for Special Exceptions; Section 21A.52.060

No application for a Special Exception shall be approved unless the Planning Commission or the Planning Director determines that the proposed Special Exception is appropriate in the location proposed based upon its consideration of the general standards set forth below and, where applicable, the specific conditions for certain Special Exceptions.

- A. **Compliance With Zoning Ordinance And District Purposes:** The proposed use and development will be in harmony with the general and specific purposes for which this title was enacted and for which the regulations of the district were established.
- B. **No Substantial Impairment Of Property Value:** The proposed use and development will not substantially diminish or impair the value of the property within the neighborhood in which it is located.
- C. **No Undue Adverse Impact:** The proposed use and development will not have a material adverse effect upon the character of the area or the public health, safety and general welfare.

- D. **Compatible With Surrounding Development:** The proposed special exception will be constructed, arranged and operated so as to be compatible with the use and development of neighboring property in accordance with the applicable district regulations.
- E. **No Destruction Of Significant Features:** The proposed use and development will not result in the destruction, loss or damage of natural, scenic or historic features of significant importance.
- F. **No Material Pollution Of Environment:** The proposed use and development will not cause material air, water, soil or noise pollution or other types of pollution.
- G. **Compliance With Standards:** The proposed use and development complies with all additional standards imposed on it pursuant to this chapter. (Ord. 73-11, 2011)

Analysis: Additional building height in the R-1/7,000 Zone is only realized through the Special Exception process. Section 21A.24.060(D)(6) states, "For properties outside the H Historic Overlay District, additional building height may be granted as a Special Exception by the Planning Commission subject to the Special Exception standards in Chapter 21A.52 of this title and if the proposed building height is in keeping with the development pattern on the block face. The Planning Commission will approve, approve with conditions, or deny the request pursuant to Chapter 21A.52 of this title."

The meetinghouse property is essentially only a part of one block face with which to compare building heights, as the property comprises the entire block face along Parkway Avenue and Parley's Circle. The block face along 2100 East contains four structures including the meetinghouse itself. The meetinghouse is not the tallest structure on the block face as the residence adjacent to the north is taller. There are two other residences further north on 2100 East in the same block face that are not as tall as the meetinghouse. It is reasonable to state that there is no consistent development pattern on the block face in terms of building height. Planning Staff also notes that there is a considerable space between the meetinghouse and the adjacent residence to the north; a space consisting of parking area and mature landscaping/vegetation.

The maximum building height allowed in the R-1/7,000 Zone is twenty-eight feet (28') for a pitched roof. The proposed design shows that the roof will be approximately thirty-one feet (31') in height. The applicant has noted that the existing structure is approximately twenty-eight feet (28'). Planning Staff asserts that the additional height proposed is warranted, given the location of the proposed building on the site and the size of the lot itself, in addition to a lack of consistent height along the 2100 East block face. An additional three feet (3') in height is probably not that significant due to the location and magnitude of the building on such a large lot.

Finding: The request for additional building height of approximately three feet (3') meets the standards of review for Special Exceptions.

Potential Motions

The motion recommended by the Planning Division is located on the cover page of this staff report. The recommendation is based on the above analysis. The following is a potential motion that may be used in case the Planning Commission determines the project should be denied:

Not Consistent with Staff Recommendation: Based on the testimony, plans presented, and the following findings, I move that the Planning Commission deny the Parley's Meetinghouse located at approximately 2350 South 2100 East. The proposal fails to meet the standards for Conditional Use, Planned Development, Conditional Building and Site Design, and Special Exception or some combination thereof. The proposed project therefore, is not compliant with the following standards and is denied:

**Exhibit A –
City Comments**



Work Flow History Report

2350 S 2100 E

PLNSUB2013-00016

Date	Task/Inspection	Status/Result	Action By	Comments
1/17/2013	Staff Assignment	Assigned	Paterson, Joel	Planning Commission consideration by 4/10/2013
1/17/2013	Staff Assignment	Assigned	Traughber, Lex	
1/18/2013	Planning Dept Review	In Progress	Traughber, Lex	
1/18/2013	Staff Assignment	Routed	Traughber, Lex	
1/22/2013	Fire Code Review	Complete	Itchon, Edward	
1/23/2013	Engineering Review	Complete	Weiler, Scott	Curb, gutter and sidewalk exist along the frontage of this site. Three drive approaches also exist, although the preliminary site plan suggests that these will be replaced to make them wider. If replacing three drive approaches is the only work that will occur in the public way, a Permit to Work in the Public Way must be obtained from SLC Engineering, prior to performing this work. However, if there are other significant items of work that will occur in the public way, a Subdivision Improvement Construction Agreement may be needed as the document to administrate the work in the public way. The agreement requires the applicant to provide a security device, such as a performance bond, letter of credit or escrow agreement as well as insurance and a fee to ensure successful completion of the improvements. SLC Transportation, SLC Public Utilities, SLC Planning, SLC Engineering and Fire are required signatures on the cover sheet of the plans. APWA Standards, which have been adopted by the City Engineer apply to the work, whether it is performed under a Subdivision Improvement Construction Agreement or a Permit to Work in the Public Way.
1/23/2013	Transporation Review	Complete	Walsh, Barry	The Site plan submitted notes 126 parking stalls with 6 ADA stalls provided. Provide parking calculations to document required parking provisions - one stall per 5 seats in Main Assembly hall. Note the ADA and the 5% bicycle parking provision.
1/30/2013	Police Review	Complete	Traughber, Lex	No issues

1/30/2013	Public Utility Review	Complete	Stoker, Justin	<p>After looking over the proposed plan, we do not have any concerns regarding the conditional use or the planned development.</p> <p>At the time that building permits are sought, we would review a detailed demolition plan regarding the treatment of the existing utilities and then we will review the civil engineering plans for the new structure regarding compliance with city codes, department policies and standards. It is unclear at this point if existing services will be retained for future use or if new services will be needed. Please note that the water mains in 2100 East and Parkway Ave are both only 6-inch water mains. Recent changes in the fire code require fire flow that will likely exceed the capacity of the lines (note that during peak day with fire, a hydraulic model must show water flow in the mains at a speed less than 7 feet per second). This will need to be evaluated by the design team and planned/designed accordingly.</p>
2/26/2013	Building Review	Complete	Traughber, Lex	<p>A request for review was sent to the Building Permits Office on 1/18/13. Comments were requested by 2/6/13. No comments were received as of 2/26/13.</p>
2/26/2013	Planning Dept Review	Complete	Traughber, Lex	

Traughber, Lex

TRANSPORTATION

From: Walsh, Barry
Sent: Wednesday, January 23, 2013 12:46 PM
To: Traughber, Lex
Subject: RE: Petition PLNSUB2013-00016, Parley's Meetinghouse

January 23, 2013

314 FIXED SEATS

Lex,

Transportations comment for PLNSUB2013-00016 have been entered into Accela as –

The Site plan submitted notes 126 parking stalls with 6 ADA stalls provided. Provide parking calculations to document required parking provisions - one stall per 5 seats in Main Assembly hall. Note the ADA and the 5% bicycle parking provision.

Barry

From: Traughber, Lex
Sent: Friday, January 18, 2013 2:12 PM
To: Walsh, Barry; Weiler, Scott; Garcia, Peggy; Itchon, Edward; Ross, Michelle; Butcher, Larry; McFarland, Ryan; Limburg, Garth
Subject: Petition PLNSUB2013-00016, Parley's Meetinghouse

Hello all,

Brad Gygi, of Brad Gygi Architect & Associates, representing the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, has submitted a Conditional Use and a Planned Development application in anticipation of a new meetinghouse to be located at approximately 2350 South 2100 East. The existing meetinghouse on the subject property will be demolished and a new one built in its place.

The parcel number is 16-22-154-011. The subject property is zone R-1/7,000 (Single Family Residential District). A place of worship is a conditional use in this Zone. The applicant has submitted a Planned Development application to request a relaxation of several zoning standards that the Planning Commission has the authority to grant. Attached is the applicant's narrative and plans.

Please review the information submitted and respond with any comments (preferably in Accela under the project number PLNSUB2013-00016) as soon as you are able, but no later than **Wednesday, February 6, 2013**. If you do not have any comments, please respond by email with "no comment" so that I can be sure that you have at least seen the request. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you,

Lex Traughber
Senior Planner
Salt Lake City Planning Division
451 S. State Street, Room 406
P.O. Box 145480
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-5480

Traughber, Lex

PUBLIC UTILITIES

From: Stoker, Justin
Sent: Tuesday, January 29, 2013 11:20 AM
To: Traughber, Lex
Cc: Garcia, Peggy
Subject: FW: Petition PLNSUB2013-00016, Parley's Meetinghouse
Attachments: Site Plan & Elevations.pdf; Application.pdf

Lex,

After looking over the proposed plan, we do not have any concerns regarding the conditional use or the planned development.

At the time that building permits are sought, we would review a detailed demolition plan regarding the treatment of the existing utilities and then we will review the civil engineering plans for the new structure regarding compliance with city codes, department policies and standards. It is unclear at this point if existing services will be retained for future use or if new services will be needed. Please note that the water mains in 2100 East and Parkway Ave are both only 6-inch water mains. Recent changes in the fire code require fire flow that will likely exceed the capacity of the lines (note that during peak day with fire, a hydraulic model must show water flow in the mains at a speed less than 7 feet per second). This will need to be evaluated by the design team and planned/designed accordingly.

Feel free to contact me with any other questions.

Thanks,
Justin

Justin D. Stoker, PE, LEED® AP, CFM
Salt Lake City Public Utilities
1530 S. West Temple, SLC, UT 84115
ph. (801) 483-6786 - justin.stoker@slcgov.com



Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

From: Garcia, Peggy
Sent: Friday, January 18, 2013 2:37 PM
To: Stoker, Justin
Subject: FW: Petition PLNSUB2013-00016, Parley's Meetinghouse

Justin,

Please send a response to Lex in Planning before February 6, 2013.

Thank you,

Peggy

Traughber, Lex

ENGINEERING

From: Weiler, Scott
Sent: Wednesday, January 23, 2013 1:10 PM
To: Traughber, Lex
Subject: FW: Petition PLNSUB2013-00016, Parley's Meetinghouse
Attachments: Site Plan & Elevations.pdf; Application.pdf

Lex,

As a Planned Development, this project is subject to our subdivision requirements. However, whether or not we require the applicant to enter into a Subdivision Improvement Construction Agreement depends on the extent of the public way work. Consequently, I've placed the following comment in Accela:

Curb, gutter and sidewalk exist along the frontage of this site. Three drive approaches also exist, although the preliminary site plan suggests that these will be replaced to make them wider. If replacing three drive approaches is the only work that will occur in the public way, a Permit to Work in the Public Way must be obtained from SLC Engineering, prior to performing this work. However, if there are other significant items of work that will occur in the public way, a Subdivision Improvement Construction Agreement may be needed as the document to administrate the work in the public way. The agreement requires the applicant to provide a security device, such as a performance bond, letter of credit or escrow agreement as well as insurance and a fee to ensure successful completion of the improvements. SLC Transportation, SLC Public Utilities, SLC Planning, SLC Engineering and Fire are required signatures on the cover sheet of the plans. APWA Standards, which have been adopted by the City Engineer apply to the work, whether it is performed under a Subdivision Improvement Construction Agreement or a Permit to Work in the Public Way.

SCOTT WEILER, P.E.
Development Engineer

ENGINEERING DIVISION
COMMUNITY and ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
SALT LAKE CITY CORPORATION

TEL 801-535-6159
FAX 801-535-6093

WWW.SLCGOV.COM

From: Traughber, Lex
Sent: Friday, January 18, 2013 2:12 PM
To: Walsh, Barry; Weiler, Scott; Garcia, Peggy; Itchon, Edward; Ross, Michelle; Butcher, Larry; McFarland, Ryan; Limburg, Garth
Subject: Petition PLNSUB2013-00016, Parley's Meetinghouse

Hello all,

Brad Gygi, of Brad Gygi Architect & Associates, representing the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, has submitted a Conditional Use and a Planned Development application in anticipation of a new meetinghouse to be located at approximately 2350 South 2100 East. The existing meetinghouse on the subject property will be demolished and a new one built in its place.

The parcel number is 16-22-154-011. The subject property is zone R-1/7,000 (Single Family Residential District). A place of worship is a conditional use in this Zone. The applicant has submitted a Planned

From: Limburg, Garth
Sent: Friday, January 18, 2013 3:25 PM
To: Traughber, Lex
Subject: RE: Petition PLNSUB2013-00016, Parley's Meetinghouse

TREASURER

Categories: Other

No comment. There are no special assessments associated with this property. Thanks.

From: Traughber, Lex
Sent: Friday, January 18, 2013 2:12 PM
To: Walsh, Barry; Weiler, Scott; Garcia, Peggy; Itchon, Edward; Ross, Michelle; Butcher, Larry; McFarland, Ryan; Limburg, Garth
Subject: Petition PLNSUB2013-00016, Parley's Meetinghouse

Hello all,

Brad Gygi, of Brad Gygi Architect & Associates, representing the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, has submitted a Conditional Use and a Planned Development application in anticipation of a new meetinghouse to be located at approximately 2350 South 2100 East. The existing meetinghouse on the subject property will be demolished and a new one built in its place.

The parcel number is 16-22-154-011. The subject property is zone R-1/7,000 (Single Family Residential District). A place of worship is a conditional use in this Zone. The applicant has submitted a Planned Development application to request a relaxation of several zoning standards that the Planning Commission has the authority to grant. Attached is the applicant's narrative and plans.

Please review the information submitted and respond with any comments (preferably in Accela under the project number PLNSUB2013-00016) as soon as you are able, but no later than **Wednesday, February 6, 2013**. If you do not have any comments, please respond by email with "no comment" so that I can be sure that you have at least seen the request. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you;

Lex Traughber
 Senior Planner
 Salt Lake City Planning Division
 451 S. State Street, Room 406
 P.O. Box 145480
 Salt Lake City, UT 84114-5480
 Telephone: (801) 535-6184
 Fax: (801) 535-6174

Police

Traughber, Lex

From: Ross, Michelle
Sent: Tuesday, January 22, 2013 9:25 AM
To: Traughber, Lex
Subject: RE: Petition PLNSUB2013-00016, Parley's Meetinghouse

Categories: Other

Lex,

The police department has no issues with this application.

Thank you,
Sgt. Michelle Ross

From: Traughber, Lex
Sent: Friday, January 18, 2013 2:12 PM
To: Walsh, Barry; Weiler, Scott; Garcia, Peggy; Itchon, Edward; Ross, Michelle; Butcher, Larry; McFarland, Ryan; Limburg, Garth
Subject: Petition PLNSUB2013-00016, Parley's Meetinghouse

Hello all,

Brad Gygi, of Brad Gygi Architect & Associates, representing the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, has submitted a Conditional Use and a Planned Development application in anticipation of a new meetinghouse to be located at approximately 2350 South 2100 East. The existing meetinghouse on the subject property will be demolished and a new one built in its place.

The parcel number is 16-22-154-011. The subject property is zone R-1/7,000 (Single Family Residential District). A place of worship is a conditional use in this Zone. The applicant has submitted a Planned Development application to request a relaxation of several zoning standards that the Planning Commission has the authority to grant. Attached is the applicant's narrative and plans.

Please review the information submitted and respond with any comments (preferably in Accela under the project number PLNSUB2013-00016) as soon as you are able, but no later than **Wednesday, February 6, 2013**. If you do not have any comments, please respond by email with "no comment" so that I can be sure that you have at least seen the request. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you,

Lex Traughber
Senior Planner
Salt Lake City Planning Division
451 S. State Street, Room 406
P.O. Box 145480
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-5480
Telephone: (801) 535-6184
Fax: (801) 535-6174

Traughber, Lex

PROPERTY MGMT

From: McFarland, Ryan
Sent: Friday, January 18, 2013 2:25 PM
To: Traughber, Lex
Subject: RE: Petition PLNSUB2013-00016, Parley's Meetinghouse

Categories: Other

I have no questions or comments.

From: Traughber, Lex
Sent: Friday, January 18, 2013 2:12 PM
To: Walsh, Barry; Weiler, Scott; Garcia, Peggy; Itchon, Edward; Ross, Michelle; Butcher, Larry; McFarland, Ryan; Limburg, Garth
Subject: Petition PLNSUB2013-00016, Parley's Meetinghouse

Hello all,

Brad Gygi, of Brad Gygi Architect & Associates, representing the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, has submitted a Conditional Use and a Planned Development application in anticipation of a new meetinghouse to be located at approximately 2350 South 2100 East. The existing meetinghouse on the subject property will be demolished and a new one built in its place.

The parcel number is 16-22-154-011. The subject property is zone R-1/7,000 (Single Family Residential District). A place of worship is a conditional use in this Zone. The applicant has submitted a Planned Development application to request a relaxation of several zoning standards that the Planning Commission has the authority to grant. Attached is the applicant's narrative and plans.

Please review the information submitted and respond with any comments (preferably in Accela under the project number PLNSUB2013-00016) as soon as you are able, but no later than **Wednesday, February 6, 2013**. If you do not have any comments, please respond by email with "no comment" so that I can be sure that you have at least seen the request. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you,

Lex Traughber
Senior Planner
Salt Lake City Planning Division
451 S. State Street, Room 406
P.O. Box 145480
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-5480
Telephone: (801) 535-6184
Fax: (801) 535-6174

Exhibit B –
Community Council Comments

March 7, 2013

TO: Salt Lake City Planning Commission

FROM: Judi Short, First Vice Chair, and Land Use Chair
Sugar House Community Council

RE: Parley's Meetinghouse 2450 South 2100 East



**Sugar House
Community Council**

The architect for this project, Brad Gygi, met with the Sugar House Community Council Land Use Committee (SHCC-LUZ) on February 11, 2013, and on March 6 with the entire council. A number of neighbors from the area were also in attendance. We also did a field trip on February 9, attended by some members of the Land Use Committee and neighbors of the church.

The existing church has been in our neighborhood for some sixty years, and we find it quite attractive. We are sorry to see it go. We understand that it has some structural issues, and that it would function more efficiently if the building were all on one level and ADA accessible, the gym was full-sized instead of a half court, and other needed improvements were made. We do not have an issues with this as a conditional use in a residential zone.

The question you want answered is whether or not this proposal is compatible with the character of the site and the area, and many of us do not think it is. This has been a beautiful point of entrance to this community from the south for many years. It is a gateway to the neighborhoods to the south of I-80. It is the point where someone entering the neighborhood gets his or her first visual impression of the area. This building as such *defines* the form and scale of the area. It is for this reason that we do not like the proposed replacement building. Yes, they will attempt to save the steeple, reuse some of the flagstone on the existing building, and make it out of red brick. However, the beauty of this building will not be replicated in the Standard Plan Design chosen for this site by the LDS Church.

We do not have a problem with the church being built with a street on three sides. This has worked quite well at this particular site. However, we do not understand how the "front" of the building, which will now face south instead of east, will not have an entrance. That makes no sense. It does not seem very welcoming for those using the building to have to cross through the parking lot to gain entrance. The stated policy of the LDS Church is that the wards should be small, and within walking distance of home. For that reason, we find it hard to understand why the Church needs so many parking places next to a meetinghouse. The architect tells us that the Church would like to have 200 spaces for each one. This plan calls for about 135, and we know the Church is still talking to neighbors about whether they would like to sell their home to have it torn down to be a parking lot for the meetinghouse. One of those homes is a very large, beautiful home that clearly adds to the historic character of the neighborhood. Our community council has consistently opposed tearing down homes to make room for parking, and we do so again today. We would like to see even fewer than 135 parking spaces, perhaps 100, in this design. This would help with our serious air quality issues in the Salt Lake Valley. As long as there is plenty of parking, the congregants will drive. Every trip to and from home will have two cold starts (a start after an automobile engine has cooled for an hour or more) which creates the most pollution.

We have requested that there be access to the parking lot from Parley's Terrace in two locations. We would like to have it easy to get to the building on foot, with the pedestrian not having to jump over bushes to get to the pavement. The neighbors tell us that the parking lot is not filled on Sunday, and

there is only overflow parking during a funeral or wedding reception. Most ward members are within easy walking distance, and in fact takes as long to drive as it does to walk. If anything, we would argue for reduced parking and more landscaping. We would like to see bike racks to accommodate 50 bikes, to encourage alternative means of transportation.

I have attached a photo of the existing building, as well as several photos of the newly constructed Eldredge Ward at 3219 South 300 East, that is of the same Standard Plan Design that has been selected for this church. I ask you to look at the size and scale difference. The new church appears to be all roof, with short walls on the sides. It just looks poorly proportioned. Another new church building, the Sugar House Stake, is on 1700 South and 11th East, and gives a similar feel, a big huge roof, and short walls. We realize that there are economies of scale and money saved by using a Standard Plan, but we don't like how the poor design is affecting the feel of our neighborhoods. Sugar House is an old, well-established neighborhood, and these new buildings don't seem to fit. We know the church can do better.

Another worry we have is noise. Because of the design, the air conditioners and chillers have to be put on the ground in a row next to the building. We realize that these are just the size of a home air conditioner, but a whole row is another matter. My own air conditioner disrupts the quiet in my yard, and even though these will have a screening wall in front of them, the noise on the street when they are all running is quite intrusive. An example is the 31st ward on McClelland Avenue. If the side walls of these new churches were taller, the mechanical equipment could be placed on the roof, or hidden inside the building.

Take another look at the photos I provided of the new church. Notice that there is asphalt on three sides, and the street on the fourth. It is a very cold, unfriendly, and uninviting building. Perhaps in twenty years the few trees will be taller, but the asphalt will still be there. This new Parleys Meetinghouse will have some grass, from the drawings it looks like it will be on the southeast corner. Using the Eldredge Ward building as an example, I would urge you to require some additional, softer landscaping along the edges of this building that abut the parking lot.

We are pleased that they will make an effort to retain as many of the large existing trees as possible, and will plant more trees as well. We like the fact they will do xeriscaped plantings, however, we want to be sure that they appropriately buffer the building from the parking lots, so as to make it feel tucked into the neighborhood rather than a big plot of land has been scraped clean and a building plopped down on it.

At the SHCC-LUZ meeting, Mr. Gygi indicated that he would be submitting revised drawings to the Planning Commission, to reflect a 28-foot tall building, to comply with what is allowed in the R-1/7000 zone. Last night, at the meeting of our SHCC, he told us that the Standard Plan Design would not be modified, and they are requesting a 31'6" tall building. The SHCC voted to NOT approve that additional height. You can see the discussion in the attached transcript of the meeting of March 6.

Discussion at Sugar House Community Council Meeting March 6, 2012
Parleys Meetinghouse 2100 East 2350 South

Parleys Meetinghouse rebuild 2350 South 2100 East. Brad Gygi, architect for the Parleys Meetinghouse at 2350 South 2100 East. Judi distributed a set of pictures, one picture from Mrs. Bateman of the existing church and then four pictures that Judi took of the Eldredge meetinghouse on 300 East, which is the same Standard Plan Design that will be used in the new Parleys Meetinghouse. Brad said the church is 2100 East 2350 South. It is an existing red brick and stone building built in 1951. He showed a picture of the existing building. An aerial view was also shown. It was built around the same time as most of the surrounding neighborhood. It does not meet functional needs of the users, spaces are not working poor accessibility, split level, steep ramps hard to get around, needs seismic and structural repairs, energy efficiency, additional maintenance due on existing equipment, needs new finishes and furnishings. Existing building is concrete walls and brick, which are not up to seismic standards. Boiler, etc are dated and need work.

Church has made determination to take down the building and build a new single level building on the existing site. There is a ramp on the existing site for handicapped people to get in, lots of stairs to other entrances. Proposed site plan 132 total parking stalls, 6 accessible stalls - 4 on west 2 on north, and we will be maintaining pedestrian access from the street along 2100 East and on Parkway. There will be bicycle racks around entrances. All will be on-grade entrances. We are asking for an exception on the maximum building height, and for parking on the main building. Conditional use place of worship is allowed in the zone, compatible in the neighborhood, and the fact that the building has frontage on three streets. Since we are building a new building, that needs to be re-approved by the Planning Commission. Any new construction that needs a conditional use has to be approved.

The current zoning has an allowance of 28 feet of height. We are asking for 31.6" feet of height. Current site fronts on three streets and city does not allow you to park in front of the main building, so we need a Planned Development to be approved to allow that. Those are the issues that we are asking approval from the Planning Commission. We are planning to light the stalls adjacent to the building that would come on at dusk, and off at midnight. We have shields on the lights to prevent the light from spilling into the neighboring yards. Plan is not to light all parking just those close to the building that might be in use at night.

We will build a new parking lot with shade trees. Our plan is to maintain the existing street trees. Maintain as many as possible. We will expand the landscaping to 10' along the perimeter properties. New parking lot will have the required landscaping, a total of 20 shade trees to meet the ordinance. Site will be planted with drought tolerant plants and a drip system, and grass on front side of the building.

Architecturally, we are looking to maintain the look of the existing building by using red brick, salvage the steeple, using some of the existing stone from the current building, landscaping to compliment the structure, with a variety of accessibility options on the first level. Here is a rendering of the proposed building using red brick, the salvaged stone, and then the existing steeple would be salvaged and placed on the new building.

Trustees can ask questions:

Cabot Nelson asked a question which queried which direction the drawing was made, and Brad Gygi said that this is a stock drawing, not a drawing of the actual building for this site that they are proposing. So this is a standard plan not something unique for our neighborhood? Using the same plan that you use for other churches. Yes, but modifying a few elements to fit it to this site. So this is a stock plan? Yes

Larry Migliccio - Why does it have to be taller?? Brad said It will be about 31.6' tall, compared to 29' for current building (did not answer the question)(the answer was because the Standard Plan Design is 32' tall.

Maggie Shaw - is it air conditioned? Where is Mechanical? Brad said on the sides, that will be enclosed by masonry. How high are the enclosures? I live one block away from Giovale Library, a block away from Westminster that also has air conditioning units on the ground, you can hear them at my house, they are very loud. Brad said these are of residential size, there will be about 20 units. They might make some noise, Not any more than what is there now.

Scott Kisling - Sugar House Master Plan asks for plan to be similar in character and scale to the neighborhood. This location is a gateway location, if coming under I-80 on 20th east most of the comes up and around this building, and the old building has defined that neighborhood. This proposed building is so squatty, it makes it look so low it looks like what one neighbor described as a funeral home. It has kind of a drive through look, it protects people from the weather but does not add much for architecture. It is not in scale or character that the master plan requires. Brad Gygi said this process is not a design review process of the architecture, it is to approve talk about the use. Scott said that he thought that statement needed to be corrected, things need to go by the master plan.

Sheila O'Driscoll - I pass this old church all the time. When the one across from Dilworth was built (Foothill Stake) it looks a lot like this one will look. With the materials that you want to use I don't think it will be that different from what is there now. It won't look like the one from 50 years ago but will be fine.

Steve Lester - I'd like to have a clarification with this process - you said that we had we are not able to discuss the architecture? Brad said the process is to apply for the conditional use and the two exceptions, those do not necessary include a review of the architectural design. The Planning Commission will not have to approve the design. That is the way I understand it, this is the image that the church has determined that they want me to portray as their image, and that is what they have asked me to present.

Judi Short - this a Planned Unit Development, and as I understand it (and Lex is standing here so we will ask him to be definitive on this) we need to determine whether it meets the standards of the Planned Development. Lex Traughber said that is correct, the Planned Development is a conditional use, and they are also asking for a special exception, which is the extra height. Topher Horman - The height is the first exception, what is the second exception? Brad, it is that we want to park on the front of our building along the third street, there will be no parking on the third street. Even though I am very familiar with this street, and even though there is parking there on Sundays and other days weddings and funerals and you are reducing the number of stalls (Brad by about 70 stalls).

Judi Short - Let me just clarify and read Master Plan and zoning compliance that we are to judge the plan by- The proposed planned development shall be compatible with the character of the site and adjacent properties, and existing development within the vicinity of the site where the use will be located. In determining compatibility, the Planning commission shall consider whether the street access works, whether the planned development will create unusual traffic patterns, orientation of driveways, parking area locations and size, whether parking plans are likely to encourage street side parking which will adversely impact reasonable use of adjacent property, hours of peak traffic. I think most of the things on here that we are judging are appropriate for us to be discussing. Amy said she did not want to squash any of the comments, they are useful and important and a lot of them are in the context of our master plan. Brad does not have to respond, but I do want to encourage you to make those comments. It is in our purview to highlight those parts of our master plan, in the report, and have it be part of our communication to the Planning Commission.

It is puzzling that we are arguing about the difference of a couple of feet of height. It is compatible with the other buildings around it, they are all single story. Amy in our purview to make these comments as it applies to our master plan.

Rawlins Young This is the neighborhood I represent. Street system is residential with standard setbacks, no cars allowed in the front. Brad there will be a parking lot, and we are asking for an exception to have a parking lot on Parleys Terrace, but not to have parking on the street. Rawlins it is a difficulty without

enough parking you intrude into the neighborhood. There is a bike lane on the east side. You cannot park there. Brad said calculations require 75-80 stalls, we are providing more. Lex said they are providing more than required. Rawlins said people should be able to walk to church.

Topher Horman- 1951 construction date. So I am clear, you are going to tear it down, replacing it with a building that is a similar plan to what you have put up in Taylorsville and Sandy, etc, not a building that is appropriate to the history and character of this neighborhood. This is a very important centerpiece of this neighborhood, the four items that you listed as to how you are making it appropriate to the neighborhood and its history are the red brick, similar steeple, some flagstone, and similar landscaping. Those are the four items that you are listing to make it appropriate. Brad said that was correct.

Soren Simonsen (City Council) – I live up the street, I attend this one, and am very fond of it, I understand all the reasons for replacement and I do not oppose the replacement. I do have some concerns about the design. I have four specifics and must say I am very pleased with the bicycle racks added at both doorways. 1) Existing building is oriented on 2100 East to the east and spire and main entrance front the street, and the history, and heritage along that street would be that most buildings orient to 2100 East. I would like that to continue to be the main entrance as well as entrance on west. Moving the spire and changing the proportion of the building that faces east would be a nice way to respect that history and heritage. I think that could be accomplished architecturally very easily by raising the height and changing the proportion of the east entrance. 2) Another thing, which is of major concern, is the massive roof. There are a number of large structures in this neighborhood, and the proportions of those buildings are very nice, and some are even higher. The proportions of this building are not. It could be changed by using a combination of pitched roofs and higher volumes, and flat roofs, which would allow moving a lot of the mechanical units to the rooftop. The current plan shows the mechanicals hidden behind screen walls along the street. This would help with proportions of the building. I am not an expert on this type of design, but know enough about this Standard Plan Design to know that this would be entirely possible. 3) it looks like a lawn on the south side, frequently used for community events and would love to see the lawn maintained. Although there will be other more natural landscape, we should have some regular lawn. 4) I would like to see us greatly expand the number of trees in the parking lot. Parking lot is a unique challenge because of the three streets. Personally, I would like to see the parking lot get smaller. I usually ride my bike or walk here and I find large parking lots to be a bit of a blight in neighborhoods. I would love to see us reduce the parking by a few more stalls, and add some landscape islands to break up the space.

Steven Dibble - I am an architect, I live in same home that my parents built in 1942. This building serves an incredible community function. It was built before any of the seismic codes existed. Because it is unreinforced masonry, it would be extremely difficult and hard to restore it and still meet the current code. There is a slim possibility that my family would be in the church (3 hours a week) during a seismic event. The Church has a policy of building buildings to be used for disaster relief. Because nearly all of the buildings in the neighborhood were built before seismic code, undoubtedly this new building will be a refuge in a disaster. It is important to have this building. I think the scale is appropriate and seems ridiculous that we are quibbling over a couple of feet. I'd like to see some controlled lighting that provides better security on the west side. Lot of history with the building, and sentiment, but it is important to replace the building. It is of a colonialesque style and really not of any architectural value.

Ron Larkin - I have lived a block away for 32 years. Sounds like we are in agreement that the building needs to be replaced. In discussions with some of the church leaders, to try to bring it up to code would be very expensive, about 80% of the cost of rebuilding it, and it still would not be a very functional building. Another consideration is that we might lose the building, we might tear it down and not replace it, have those meetings outside our congregation, outside of our immediate area. On Sunday both of the congregations had meetings to discuss this plan, went over the pros and cons, and there was pretty much unanimous agreement to go along with the plan. I disagree with what Soren and Scott have said. I like the design. I think it is a very attractive chapel and I think it would fit in fine with the neighborhood especially with the church trying to preserve the esthetics such as the brick and the flagstone. Currently parking is terraced and hazardous, the new parking would be graded and much safer. On the north end

there is currently a scout house, which has been necessary to house these two congregations. That would also be taken down and the use would be incorporated into the new building. The scout house has been a real source of problems to the community, vandalism and drug use, and has outlived its usefulness. I totally support this plan.

Jim Jardine, - I have lived on the north end for 33 years. I am in the 1929 old Tudor home. For a time I served as the Bishop, and know the building is not functional in many ways. I defer to Steve and Soren about the architecture. We have a fair number of elderly people who have difficulty to get around that building. It is a very important anchor to our community and I support the new, more functional building.

George Chapman - I walk in the area a lot. I know that 2000 East is a gateway, but it is not a good place to walk. I think it this new building is an improvement to the neighborhood. 2000 East is a pretty bad place to look at. It is not the fault of any church or resident, it is actually the fault of the city. Salt Lake City does not clean it up much.

Rawlins Young-- the steeple should be attached to the front of the building. The neighborhood is across the street on 2100 East. On the south is the golf course and country club. It would be nice to be oriented to the neighborhood. None of the neighbors come in from that direction. Nice if you would orient to the neighborhood on the east, and not away from it.

Larry Migliaccio - I have heard comments tonight that if we don't accept this, the church might go away and we might have to go elsewhere to go to church. I don't know that is realistic or not. A template design, with an attempt to make it fit in is not the right approach. I'd like to see them back up to take another look at the design of that building. I can't believe the design is not that costly, they could preserve the original aesthetic nature of that building. This is not the look of what is there, from a historic perspective.

Judi Short said that in the Land Use Meeting, and now in this meeting, I have not heard anyone say that we should not tear this building down. We all recognize that it has some big limitations and should be replaced. I think our questions are more about whether is the appropriate new building that we want in the neighborhood. This is not the first issue that we have had with the Standard Plan Design church, so I think we will have a motion to that regard in just a moment. But, one thing I did not hear in our Land Use meeting that I heard tonight, is that Mr Gygi said they were requesting a special exception for the height of 31.6 feet, whereas at the Land Use meeting he said they would revise the plans to show 28 feet. Mr. Gygi said the height was changed since that meeting and now they are requesting 31.6 feet. So I think we need to take a vote on that. Obviously making that roof 32 feet makes that big long roof even longer.

Larry Migliaccio would like to hear why it has to be higher. Because that is the Standard Plan Design.

Scott Kisling - the Land Use Subcommittee had a meeting, and also met at the site, and through email, and as Judi says there has been no talk on anyone's part that the building should be saved, it should be replaced, and not an issue in anyone's mind. Issue is more with the design of the current plan. Scott made a motion "I move that we write a letter to the LDS Church stating that "the Sugar House Community Council is disappointed in the recent design changes slated for LDS Church meetinghouses in Sugar House and requests that future design efforts focus on better integration with the surrounding neighbourhood as outlined in the Sugar House Master Plan." This is from the committee so does not require a second. Dave I think it is very important that we say there is no question about keeping the existing building or modifying it, we are asking that the replacement fit the design of the community, we don't feel that this is it.

Sheila O'driscoll said that there are certain specific things that have been brought up, some of those specific things need to be articulated in what we said so the Church has specific ideas about what the issues area.

Scott would it be appropriate to include Judi's PC comments in the letter?

Cabot read the motion again "We move that the Sugar House Community Council is disappointed in the recent design changes slated for LDS Church meetinghouses in Sugar House and requests that future design efforts focus on better integration with the surrounding neighborhood as outlined in the Sugar House Master Plan."

Dave very important no question about tearing down the building but just that the replacement fits the design of the committee. Sheila says it seems to me that are certain things that we feel are important. Some of those specific items need to be spelled out for the Planning Commission.

The vote was called and the motion passed unanimously.

Judi made a motion "I move that we deny the request for a 32 foot high building and approve a 28 foot high building, which is the maximum allowed in an R 1/7000 zoning district."

Scott I don't agree with that motion. If you look at churches that are well-designed you don't have to look far, most are height and spire, this does not. I don't mind if it goes up, if it is done well. I oppose it just to make it bigger. So I will vote against this motion.

Larry I also have a comment, I don't disagree with the motion, but don't want to be in a position where it looks like we are voting for the design because it conforms to 28 feet. Steve Lester I want to speak in favor of the motion, the code reads 28 feet, the rules of our community are 28 feet, if someone wants to build beyond that they should start at the beginning and change the rule first.

Topher Horman - I would like to speak in favor of the motion to make the point that they create something new and beautiful and specific that is special for the second most historic neighborhood in Salt Lake City. Please don't plop down something you are plopping down all over the city, our neighborhood deserves something better.

The vote was taken, 9 voted in favor, 3 were opposed to the motion.

Sugar House Community Council

Comments Received Regarding Parleys Meetinghouse March 2013

Received by email

I agree completely with Soren's suggestions. ESPECIALLY the location of the steeple. I am glad they are going to keep it, as that at least that provides a link to the history of the old building which I think is very important. The steeple should be on the East facing 21st east with a larger entrance.


The new design is similar to the Highland Stake Center in my neighborhood on 27th south. In my opinion, when the steeple is located on the "end" of the building both entrances look like side entrances. You never get the feeling that you are going in the front, main entrance.

Personal thought: Mormons tend to be practical to a fault when it comes to their meeting houses. By sticking to 4 main designs they save a lot of money. They save all the beauty and awe for the Temples. Too bad.

I just wanted to re-emphasize one point that I made tonight in light of the council vote to try to change the architecture of the proposed replacement. That point I want to state again is that both congregations of this ward house, which represent over half of the adults in the immediate neighborhood, were unanimously in favor the Heritage 09T plan which Brad Gygi displayed at the meeting.


Rick Augustine -


As a past resident at 2667 Beverly Street I often drove by the Parleys building. If I may I would add this to the public comments. The use of red brick and original stone and spire with the American Colonial architecture is consistent with the original structure and area. A variance for the height should be granted for two reasons. First: The additional two or three feet proposed is not excessive. I would not be surprised to learn the existing structure is slightly higher than the present code. A good faith effort is being made to use the original spire to maintain the appearance that many enjoy at considerable expense. Second: The approach from the South East is higher than the points of measurement for the building elevation and conversely the Westerly approach is below the elevations. The perception is not so much in the height as it is in the perception of an American Colonial build which we have appreciated.






















**Exhibit C –
Citizen Comments**

March 7, 2012

Salt Lake Planning Commission

Regarding Parleys 1 & 6 Wards Building Replacement

Dear Honorable Members of the Planning Commission:

I am writing to you in my capacity as a citizen and resident in the neighborhood. I live up the block from the proposal building project, and I belong to one of the congregations that meets in this building each Sunday and frequently for other meetings during the week.

Design decisions by the owner of this meetinghouse are not made at the local level of the Church organization. It seems that my best opportunity for input to address what I believe are important design considerations will be through the planned development and special exception processes, for which this project is coming before the Commission.

The Sugar House Master Plan has abundant policy direction about the importance of design and urban design issues, sustainability, community character, pedestrian and bicycle access, and so forth. I believe you and the staff know these documents well and I don't need to reiterate these policies for you. Unfortunately, not all of these policies are clearly articulated in our zoning ordinances, and we must rely on the conditional process to insure that we are meeting the community objectives that we have clearly and carefully outlined, when considering a major redevelopment project like this one.

First of all, I would like to state that I do not object to replacing the existing building with a new one, for the reasons that are well-known to those who use the building regularly, and which the architect has clearly articulated in the application. I also do not object to the height exception, nor the parking lot location exception, though I will describe some recommendations for conditions that I believe will more fully justify these exceptions.

Please consider these 7 points as conditions of your approval:

1. The existing building is situated with its front toward 2100 East, with the primary entrance and spire oriented clearly toward the street. The new building location and entry configuration is similar, however the 2100 East entrance is not emphasized. The proposed spire location has been moved to the south end of the building and is no longer associated with the building entry. I would recommend that the spire be relocated to the 2100 East building entry, and that the height and proportion of this entry portal be redesigned to give greater prominence to the building front. The ridge line for the primary east entrance should be at least as high as the overall building ridge, and the proportion of the entry should be taller and more consistent with proportions of the traditional architectural style that is being applied to the building.

2. The roof mass is overbearing. It is massive, and the proportion of roof to wall is not consistent with the architectural style of the building, nor with the roof and building proportions of other large and small structures characteristic in this neighborhood. I believe the roof mass can be broken by not having a continuous sloped roof across the entire structure, but rather a combination of sloped roof over the central bay of the chapel and social hall, which could be continuous from north to south with gables at each end, similar to the existing building. Flat roofs and higher walls and parapets could be used for the classrooms and meeting rooms that surround the central bay, interrupted by the major and minor the cross forms of the east and west entries. I think that the west entry could mirror the east entry, but it may also be appropriate to give greater emphasis to the east entry, both in its mass and the inclusion of the spire, which is the front and main pedestrian entrance. This would be more consistent with the design guidelines in the master plan, and would add further visual interest to the building mass.
3. By creating areas of flat roof around the building perimeter with parapets higher than the flat roof plane, I believe that the roof and building proportions would not only be improved, but all of the numerous mechanical units around the building perimeter could be moved to the rooftop and out of view. While screening walls for the mechanical equipment is better than having them in plain view, the screening walls themselves obscure the building facade in ways that I don't believe are beneficial to the architectural composition of the building. Nor is the placement of mechanical equipment across the front facade of the building on 2100 East consistent with the design guidelines of the Master Plan. The large number of mechanical units makes them particularly unattractive.
4. Given the large mass of the parking lot, the number of landscape islands should be increased, perhaps doubled. This would add shading to the lot and an improved image and appearance from the homes to the west of the lot. It would provide additional space for snow storage, which has been a problem in years of heavy snow like this one. Although the current landscape islands meet the requirements of our parking ordinance, the fact that the parking lot fronts a street—although in an unusual lot configuration—deserves additional parking lot mitigation. The islands along the west side could be increased and spaced to effectively create a double row of trees along the street. Additional interior islands would further break up the heavy mass of parking and provide additional shading for what could become a large heat sink. Perhaps these islands could be clustered along with a pathway through the parking lot to provide a clear pedestrian way to the west entrance through the parking lot for pedestrians arriving to the building from the west side. I understand that the additional loss of parking could be an issue. However, most people who attend this building live within a half mile, and the parking problems could be solved by encouraging members of the congregation who are physically able, to walk. Large parking lots are a blight, and our air quality issues are becoming unbearable. We should not incentivize driving by creating large, ubiquitous parking lots. For the occasional events that may exceed a smaller parking capacity, which may include a funeral or

special event, instructions can be given to park at the adjacent meeting house a block to the west, or around the "triangle" at Oneida and Country Club Drive, which is a half block to the east.

5. Bicycle racks should be provided ideally at all building entrances, or at least the two primary entrances on the east and west sides. I understand that the application may have been altered from the original version I saw and that bike racks have been added. I would like to make sure this provision is a condition of approval. I frequently ride to this building and have to chain my bike to a flag pole, sign pole or handrail because there are currently no bike racks. We also have to bring our jogging stroller inside the building because there is no place to park and lock it outside. We should make bicycle and pedestrian facilities as ubiquitous as parking spaces to make it as easy for people to make wise choices to improve air quality and personal health.
6. The lawn currently on the south side of the building is used for a variety of church and community events. Though having low-water landscaping around the building perimeter is welcomed, I would request that the lawn area at the south end be preserved as a useful lawn space contiguous to the parking lot to preserve this function.
7. A final condition is to keep the window glazing clear where possible. I understand the desire to use obscure glazing if the view out the window is toward mechanical equipment. By moving the equipment to the rooftop, this problem is solved. There is abundant and growing evidence that the direct visual connection from inside to outside is vital to learning and development, and this should be no less so in a place of religious instruction. My two-year-old who attends nursery in this building each week is delighted to look out the windows at the sun and clouds, the snow and rain, the trees and mountains, people walking by and riding their bikes. Obscure glazing is appropriate where privacy might be an issue, such as offices for clergy, or perhaps in the large meeting hall. I recommend that the Commission consider that having clear windows for classrooms and small meeting rooms where appropriate would also be an appropriate condition of approval.


Thank you for your thoughtful consideration and deliberation. I hope you will consider these friendly conditions that I believe will improve the overall visual character, urban design considerations, sustainability measures that will make the proposal far more consistent with the community objectives of the Master Plan.

Regards,



Soren Simonsen
2155 S 2100 East

**Exhibit D –
Site Plan & Elevations**



SD101


PROJECT TITLE
EXISTING SITE PLAN

DATE: JANUARY 11, 2013
PROJECT NUMBER: 506-8881


PROJECT NUMBER	506-8881
DATE	JANUARY 11, 2013
PROJECT NUMBER	506-8881
DATE	
PROJECT NUMBER	
DATE	
PROJECT NUMBER	
DATE	

PROJECT FOR:
THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS

PARLEYS 1, 6
SL PARLEYS STAKE
2350 SOUTH 2100 EAST
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84109



Bradley Gygi Architect & Associates, PLLC
202 East 5900 South Murray, UT 84107
tel 801.747.2451 fax 801.747.2453



ASPHALT PARKING
128 STANDARD
+ 6 ADA STALLS

PARKING AREA: 48,778 SF
5% INT. LANDSCAPE: 2,339 SF
PROVIDED: 2,584 SF

SHADE TREES: 1 PER 120 SF
2339 SF REQ: 20 TREES
PROVIDED: 19 NEW, 1 EXISTING

NEW MEETINGHOUSE
BUILDING
19,422 SF


PARKWAY AVE

2100 EAST STREET


PARLEY'S CIRCLE

PROPOSED SITE PLAN
SCALE: 1" = 20'-0"

2



**Bradley Gygi Architect
& Associates, PLLC**
202 East 5500 South Murray, UT 84107
Tel 801.747.2451 Fax 801.747.2453



PROJECT FOR:
**THE CHURCH OF
JESUS CHRIST
OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS**

PARLEYS 1.6
SL PARLEYS STAKE
2350 SOUTH 2100 EAST
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84109

PROJECT NUMBER:
508-8581
DATE:
JANUARY 11, 2013
PROPERTY NUMBER:
508-8581

DRAWN BY:
BGG
CHECKED:
BGG

SHEET TITLE:
**PROPOSED
SITE PLAN**

Sheet Number:
SD102

Exhibit C –
Citizen Correspondence – June 26, 2013

April 4, 2013

Salt Lake City Planning Commission
Planning Division
451 South State Street
Salt Lake City, UT

Re: Parleys 1 & 6 Wards Building Replacement

Dear Honorable Members of the Planning Commission:

I am writing a letter to follow up on your continuing discussion and deliberations regarding the Parleys 1 & 6 Wards church meetinghouse replacement. I would like to encourage and reiterate seven recommended conditions for approval of the project, which I presented in more detail in a previous letter and at the previous commission meeting:

1. Maintain and add emphasis to the 2100 East (primary) street entrance, including moving the spire to this more consistent and contextually appropriate location (similar to the existing building)
2. Reduce the roof mass through a combination of a gabled roof over the central building bay (chapel, social hall, and north entrance) similar to the existing building massing, a heightened gabled roof over the east (primary entrance) similar to the existing building massing, and stepped, flat roofs with proportionately higher walls and parapets at the classroom areas at the building perimeter
3. Locate all of the mechanical units at the building perimeter on the lower, flat roof areas (see #2 above), to be screened by parapets
4. Increase and evenly distribute the number of landscape islands to reduce the mass of the asphalt parking lot
5. Include bicycle racks at the east, north and west entrances
6. Preserve the current lawn area at the south of the building for congregation and community outdoor social functions, and extend the lawn continuously to the east and west entrances for ease of access to the building interior
7. Preserve the transparent (not obscured or heavily tinted) glazing in all of the perimeter classrooms, and enlarge the windows proportionate to the mass of wall, more consistent with the existing building.

At the last meeting, there were questions raised about the authority of the planning commission to direct changes to the design of a religious building. There is a long, and well established legal precedent throughout the U.S. and in Utah for the planning commission to administer exactly the types of conditions I have outlined above. Such conditions in no way impede religious or free speech issues guaranteed by the Constitution. Do not be dissuaded, even with the location of the spire.

I have attached several photos showing the variety of building styles, spires and embellishments of other buildings of the same owner, all within about a one-mile radius of the proposed building project. Most of these buildings have a spire that is associated with the

primary pedestrian building entry and foyer facing the street, as is also the case with the current building proposed to be replaced. Two of the photos show buildings with a spire that is located at the central intersection of roof forms, and in both of these instances, the location is above the social hall or foyer, not the chapel. The last photo shows a building that has no spire at all, but does have a very high pitched roof form that gives emphasis to the primary pedestrian entrance, similar to the examples with the spire, and which leads the eye heavenward as one enters the building. You will note that each of these buildings have emphasized the primary entrance in ways consistent with the architectural style, and break up the roof mass with much better proportions between the roof and wall forms.

None of the requested conditions would change the plan or function of the building in any way, and don't substantially change the essential elements of the building that would identify it as an LDS meetinghouse.

The *LDS Handbook of Instruction* to local church leaders addresses the issue of adaption of Church programs to unique, local circumstances with the following statement:

"Members of the Church live in a wide variety of political, social, and economic conditions. Wards and branches also vary in size and leadership resources. These conditions may require local leaders to adapt some Church programs." (see *LDS Handbook of Instruction*, Section 17.1: Uniformity and Adaptation)

While this general guideline is not directed specifically toward the administration of the Church building program, the encouragement is certainly appropriate when considering how standard buildings are adapted to the physical setting of each building. The subsequent list of specific areas of LDS doctrine and practice that require strict adherence and uniformity does not include buildings. Such areas of strict uniformity include Church canon, moral standards, doctrine, religious ceremonies and ordinances, specified meetings, records and reporting, and religious educational curriculum, none of which would be compromised in any way by the proposed conditions.

There are abundant examples of standard plans like the one proposed that have been adapted to local conditions, be they topography, geography, climate, or context. Thank you for your consideration and assistance in maintaining the integrity of our neighborhood by appropriately adapting this standard plan to address these few important conditions.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Soren Simonsen', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.


Soren Simonsen
2155 Sout 2100 East
Salt Lake City, UT




[2350 South 2100 East]




[1870 Parleys Canyon Blvd.]



[1970 East Stratford Ave.]




[2930 South 2000 East]



[1889 South 1700 East]



[2635 South 1500 East]



[1750 South 1500 East]



[2535 Douglas St.]

Traughber, Lex

From: Brad Taylor [jbtdoc@cox.net]
Sent: Monday, June 17, 2013 8:45 AM
To: Traughber, Lex
Subject: PLNPCM 2013.00016 Parley's Meeting House

June 16th

Dear Mr. Traughber

I am writing in support of the proposed construction of a New Meeting House for the LDS chapel on 21st south.

This is a project that has been considered for a long period of time as the current building is not longer adequate for a number of reasons including safety, energy efficiency, disability access and size for the current wards that meet there.

I believe the new design which I have reviewed incorporates the feel of the neighborhood and many of the elements of the old chapel which have been a part of the neighborhood for several decades. I believe it represents a good effort to maintain a proper balance of the "old and new".

I would encourage the commission to favorably consider this proposed meeting house.

With regards

J. Bradley Taylor, MD
2261 Berkeley
Salt Lake City 84109

Traughber, Lex

From: Tuck Bowers [tuckbo@comcast.net]
Sent: Sunday, June 16, 2013 10:04 PM
To: Traughber, Lex
Subject: Parleys 1st and 6th Ward Chapel Proposal

Dear Mr. Traughber,

I am writing to you in reference to the project PLNPCM2013.00016 Parley's Meeting House. I understand that this project is up for approval at the June 26, 2013 Planning Commission meeting. I would like to express my support for the approval of this project to replace the meeting house. I am a member of the Parleys 6th Ward and am in this building several times each week. I have been able to directly relate to the need to replace this building due to it's inaccessibility for those that are handicapped and aged. It is very difficult for those with any kind of disability to access the restrooms and any of the classrooms in the north wing of the building.

I support the newest proposals for the new building and would like to see the project approved so that a new and functional building can be built for the use of these two congregations and the community at large.

Thank you for your consideration of my desires.

Tuck Bowers
2194 Country Club Dr
Salt Lake City, UT 84109

Traughber, Lex

From: jill vanleeuwen [jhhv@msn.com]
Sent: Sunday, June 16, 2013 8:55 PM
To: Traughber, Lex
Subject: Parleys Church Building

Mr. Traughber,

I have lived at 2217 South 2200 East for the past 12 years. I have been very involved in the neighborhood and community. I am asking you to approve the building that is being proposed to be rebuilt on the corner of 2100 East and Parleys Canyon Blvd. The existing building is great from the outside but the inside is not good and I bet unsafe if there were a natural disaster. Also, the building is not handicap accessible to all areas. This has resulted in people not being able to get about the building and be totally involved.

Please approve the building that will be presented on June 26th.

Thank you,

Jill Van Leeuwen
jhhv@msn.com

Traughber, Lex

From: Mary-Cate Palmer [mcpalmer81@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, June 16, 2013 2:45 PM
To: Traughber, Lex
Subject: PLNPCM2013.00016 parleys meeting house

Hello,

I am a member of this congregation and strongly support the proposed new building. I have lived in this neighborhood for 22 years and I support this new plan mainly because it is more accessible for those with disabilities, it is earthquake safe and it fits the neighborhood very well. I strongly believe that this proposal should be accepted by the planning commission or we will be stuck with a building that does not fit the needs of the majority.

Thank you for your consideration.
Mary-Cate Palmer

Traughber, Lex

From: Kim Briggs [kimhbriggs@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, June 16, 2013 12:53 PM
To: lex.traughber@slcgov.com; Traughber, Lex
Subject: PLNPCM2013.00016 Parley's Meeting House

Dear Mr Traughber,

We are writing to express our support for the revised building plan for the Parleys 1/6 Ward chapel which will come before the Planning Commission on June 26th. We attend church at this building and feel that the new plan (which we have seen) will be ascetically pleasing and conforming to the feel of the Parleys neighborhood.

We need a new building to satisfy the safety, accessibility, energy efficiency and overall functionality of the congregations who attend there. We like the design and hope that it receives the approval of the Planning Commission.

We would also like to express our thanks to you for the important work you do for our wonderful community.

Best regards,

Kim & Vicki Briggs
2215 Berkeley Street
SLC, UT 84109
801-485-7279

Traughber, Lex

From: Bryce Wade [hbrycewade@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2013 12:26 PM
To: Traughber, Lex
Subject: PLNPCM2013.00016 PARLEYS MEETING HOUSE

Dear Mr. Traughber,

We write in support of the recent plans presented on Sunday. They are beautiful and very reminiscent of the current exterior, which we love. We are eager to have a new building in order to better accommodate our handicapped members, and, of course a seismically safe building will be wonderful, too. The anticipated energy savings are really important to us all. We hope that the Planning Commission will be favorably disposed to approve these most recent plans at your meeting on the 26th, particularly since modifications to this plan will, in fact, result in the project being scrapped completely.

Thank you for your help.

Bryce and Peggy Wade
2141 Parleys Terrace, SLC, 84109

Traughber, Lex

From: Andrea Chatwin [andrea.chatwin@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2013 12:41 PM
To: Traughber, Lex
Subject: Support for project PLNPCM2013.00016 Parleys Meeting House

Mr. Traughber

I am writing to express my support for project PLNPCM2013.00016 Parleys Meeting House.

Our current building is seismically unsafe and is not energy efficient. But my main reason for supporting the project is that our building is not handicap accessible in some areas. We have several young people in our congregation with disabilities. The split-level configuration of our building requires that they be carried up and down stairs to participate with their peers. This is also difficult for older members of the congregation..

I support the new design of the building proposal which gives us the needed functionality and also incorporates some of the appealing external design features of the old building. It fits in well with our historic Parleys neighborhood.

If the design is not approved by the planning commission, we will be forced to live with the many inadequacies of our current building. It is my hope that the planning commission will approve the proposal.

Sincerely,

Andrea Chatwin

Traughber, Lex

From: Nancy Jensen [njensen15@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2013 3:30 PM
To: Traughber, Lex
Subject: PLNPCM 2013.00016 (Parley's Meeting House)

I am writing to express my support for the current plan proposed for rebuilding Parley's Meeting House.

Older people and those with handicaps find getting into the building very difficult. Even parking can be difficult if they have to park in the overflow area. Once inside, they are unable to use the north part of the building which includes the library, classrooms, nursery, and the family history center, which all require going up or down stairs.

The number of classrooms is entirely inadequate and having the Scout House as an integral part of the classroom and meeting space is not a good plan. The configuration of other spaces in the building are quite difficult; i.e., the overflow to the chapel, which is used every week, does not look directly at the chapel; the Primary room has decent sized square footage but is a very narrow rectangle that makes presenting to a group of children quite unmanageable. The number of restroom stalls for a good sized congregation is also inadequate.

We have attended church in this building for 26 years. These problems have existed for all 26 years, and I have never felt there was a remodeling plan that could address any of these issues in a meaningful way. I also understand the building is not up to code for earthquakes. All in all, it is time to move forward with the current proposed plans for rebuilding Parley's Meeting House.

Thank you for your consideration.

Nancy Jensen
2301 South 2200 East
Salt Lake City, UT

**Exhibit D –
Revised Elevations**

LIST OF EXTERIOR MATERIALS:

- WALLS: BRICK VENEER (RED SIMILAR TO EXISTING COLOR)
FLAGSTONE SALVAGED FROM EXISTING BUILDING.
- ROOF: FIBERGLASS SHINGLES
- METAL: WHITE FASCIA, SOFFIT, STOREFRONT AND WINDOWS
- STEEPLE: SALVAGED FROM EXISTING BUILDING

**Bradley Gygi Architect
& Associates, PLLC**

208 East 2500 South Murray, UT 84107
Tel 801.747.2431 Fax 801.747.2433



PROJECT FOR:
**PARLEYS 1, 6
SL PARLEYS STAKE**
2350 SOUTH 2100 EAST
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84109



PROJECT FOR:
**THE CHURCH OF
JESUS CHRIST
OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS**

PROJECT NUMBER:
506-8861
DATE:
MAY 23, 2013
PROPERTY NUMBER:
506-8861

DRAWN BY:
BGG
CHECKED:
BGG


SHEET TITLE:
**PROPOSED
EXTERIOR
ELEVATIONS**
REVISED 6-3-13

SHEET:
A201




LIST OF EXTERIOR MATERIALS:

WALLS: BRICK VENEER (RED SIMILAR TO EXISTING COLOR)
 FLAGSTONE SALVAGED FROM EXISTING BUILDING.
 ROOF: FIBERGLASS SHINGLES
 METAL: WHITE FASCIA, SOFFIT, STOREFRONT AND WINDOWS
 STEEPLE: SALVAGED FROM EXISTING BUILDING



3 PROPOSED NORTH ELEVATION
 1/8" = 1'-0"



4 PROPOSED WEST ELEVATION
 1/8" = 1'-0"

Bradley Gygi Architect & Associates, PLLC
 202 East 8500 South Murray, UT 84107
 tel 801.747.2451 fax 801.747.2453



PROJECT FOR:
 PARLEYS 1, 6
 SL PARLEYS STAKE
 2350 SOUTH 2100 EAST
 SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84109

PROJECT FOR:
 THE CHURCH OF
JESUS CHRIST
 OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS

PROJECT NUMBER	505-8681
DATE	MAY 23, 2013
PROPERTY NUMBER	505-8681
DRAWN BY	BGG
CHECKED BY	BGG

SHEET TITLE
PROPOSED EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS
 REVISED 6-3-13

SHEET
A202