

**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](mailto: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](#).