

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Room 126 of the City & County Building
451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah
Wednesday, May 28, 2014

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:34:45 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 Emily Drown, Vice Chair Clark Ruttinger; Commissioners Angela Dean, Michael Fife, Michael Gallegos, James Guilkey, Matt Lyon, Marie Taylor, Matthew Wirthlin and Mary Woodhead. Commissioner Carolynn Hoskins was excused.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Wilford Sommerkorn, Planning Director; Michaela Oktay, Planning Manager; Everett Joyce, Senior Planner; Carl Leith, Senior Planner; Lex Traughber, Senior Planner; Michael Maloy, Principal Planner; Chris Lee, Associate Planner; Michelle Moeller, Senior Secretary and Paul Nielson, Senior City Attorney.

FIELD TRIP

A field trip was held prior to the work session. Planning Commissioners present were: Emily Drown, Angela Dean, Michael Fife, James Guilkey, Matt Lyon, Clark Ruttinger and Mary Woodhead. Staff members in attendance were Michaela Oktay, Michael Maloy, Carl Leith, Lex Traughber and Chris Lee.

The following locations were visited:

- **654 East 3rd Avenue** - Staff gave an overview of the petition.
- **1202 E Wilmington**- Staff gave an overview of the petition.
- **2568 S Filmore**- Staff gave an overview of the petition.
- **200 West and Fayette Avenue** - Staff gave an overview of the petition.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE MAY 14, 2014, MEETING [5:34:54 PM](#)
MOTION [5:35:04 PM](#)

Commissioner Fife moved to approve the May 14, 2014. Commissioner Dean seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. Commissioner Wirthlin and Guilkey abstained from voting as they were not present at the subject meeting.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR [5:35:23 PM](#)

Chairperson Drown stated she had nothing to report.

Vice Chairperson Ruttinger stated he had nothing to report.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR [5:35:31 PM](#)

Mr. Wilford Sommerkorn, Planning Director, stated he had nothing to report.

[5:35:57 PM](#)

Morton In-line Addition at approximately 2568 S Filmore - Dave Webster, representing the property owner, Chad Morton, is requesting an in-line addition to an existing residential building which does not currently comply with the required front yard setback. The applicant is specifically requesting an addition to the north side of the building which would contain a two car garage on the lower level with additional living space above. The property is in the R-1/7000 zoning district. This type of project must be reviewed as a special exception. The subject property is within Council District 7, represented by Lisa Ramsey Adams. (Staff contact: Chris Lee at (801) 535-7706 or christopher.lee@slcgov.com.) Case number: PLNPCM2014-00195

Mr. Chris Lee, Associate Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff was recommending that the Planning Commission approve the petition as presented.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The distance from the north end of the lot to the addition.
 - Staff stated it would be fifty-five feet from the addition to the back property line.
- The average setbacks for the area.

Mr. Dave Webster, Architect, stated it was their goal to create a structure that fit with and complimented the area. He discussed the façade of the structure and the proposed materials.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- If other designs had been considered to address the location of the garage on the property.
- If other properties had three car garages at the front of the properties.
 - The Applicant stated other properties had three car garages and therefore the proposal did fit the area.

PUBLIC HEARING [5:45:58 PM](#)

Chairperson Drown opened the Public Hearing;

Ms. Judy Short, Sugar House Community Council, stated people supported the proposal if it stayed within the standards for height. She stated the neighborhood was sensitive about the size of homes being constructed. Ms. Short stated the garage should be moved to the rear of the site to ensure that it complimented the neighborhood. She stated new design standards needed to be developed to address additions to existing homes. Ms. Short stated the land use committee was not in favor of the petition as presented.

Chairperson Drown closed the Public Hearing.

[5:49:07 PM](#)

Commissioner Gallegos joined the meeting.

DISCUSSION [5:49:27 PM](#)

Commissioner Dean stated she understood the concerns of the Community Council however; the impacts to the neighborhood were mitigated by the existing setbacks and the layout of the addition on the lot.

The Commission and Staff discussed the standards for the Special Exception and how the garage was regulated within those standards. They discussed the lot configuration, the regulations for the garage and the issues with the property being a corner lot.

MOTION [5:55:29 PM](#)

Commissioner Wirthlin stated regarding petition PLNPCM2014-00195, Morton In-Line Addition, based on the findings in the Staff Report, testimony and plans presented, he moved that the Planning Commission approve the petition as presented, subject to the conditions listed in the Staff Report. Commissioner Taylor seconded the motion. Commissioners Ruttinger, Dean, Fife, Guilkey, Lyon, Taylor and Wirthlin voted “aye”. Commissioner Woodhead voted “nay”. Commissioner Gallegos abstained. The motion passed 7-1.

[5:57:16 PM](#)

Wilmington Mixed Use Development at approximately 1202 E. Wilmington Avenue - Lynn Woodbury of Woodbury Corporation, is requesting Conditional Building & Site Design Review to construct a mixed-use development consisting of street level retail, senior housing, and associated parking. Mr. Woodbury is also requesting Planned Development approval for the relaxation of certain required zoning standards related to increased building stepback height, and a partial elimination of “active” uses at the street level. Finally, Mr. Woodbury is requesting Special Exception approval for increased building height. The subject property is zoned CSHBD-1 (Sugar House Business District) and is located in Council District 7

represented by Lisa Ramsey Adams. (Staff contact: Lex Traughber at (801) 535-6184 or lex.traughber@slcgov.com.) Case numbers PLNPCM2014-00137, PLNPCM2014-00287 & PLNSUB2014-00138

- a. **Conditional Building & Site Design Review - In order to build the above referenced project, Conditional Building & Site Design Review is required per Zoning Ordinance Section 21A.26.060(D) - Sugar House Business District Zone. The project exceeds fifty feet in building height and exceeds 20,000 square feet in floor area. Case number PLNPCM2014-00137**
- b. **Planned Development - In order to build the above referenced project, the applicant is also requesting Planned Development approval for the relaxation of required zoning standards related to increased building step back height (from 30' to 40') and a partial elimination of "active" uses at the street level. Case number PLNSUB2014-00138**
- c. **Special Exception - In order to build the above referenced project, the applicant is also requesting Special Exception approval for increased building height. The maximum building height allowed by Zone is 105'. The applicant is requesting a building height of 115'. Case number PLNPCM2014-00287**

Mr. Lex Traughber, Senior Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff was recommending that the Planning Commission approve the proposal subject to complying with all applicable zoning regulations as outlined in Section 21A.26.060 - Sugar House Business District. Specifically, the approval was based on the Applicant's compliance with:

- Section 21A.26.060(G)(1) - Maximum Building Height
- Section 21A.26.060(G)(3) - Stepback Requirement
- Section 21A.26.060(J)- First Floor/Street Level Requirements
- As well as: Table 21A.36.020C - Height Exceptions for Mechanical Equipment Parapet Wall.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The dimensions of the building.
- The length of a standard city block and if there was a proposed midblock walkway.
- The standards for waiver and the conditions of approval.
- Staff's opposition to relaxing the stepbackss.

Mr. Aabir Malik, Developer, gave a history of the site, the development plans and discussed the location of the proposal and similar designs in the area. Mr. Malik reviewed the future development for the area and how the block would be divided to provide more efficient

walkability. He reviewed the parking ratios, how parking would slowly be redeveloped and reduced. He discussed the design and look of the parking garage, how it would be configured and masked.

Mr. Lyle Beacher, Architect, reviewed the research for the development and how the parking would be masked. He discussed the cost of having underground versus above ground parking. Mr. Beacher stated the cost savings would be passed on to the residents of the development.

Mr. Malik gave a history of the project and the outreach they had done to gain the support of the Community. He stated they were asking for approval on overall building height, the podium stepbacks and retail use along Wilmington Avenue.

Mr. Lynn Woodbury, Woodbury Corporation, reviewed the language in the ordinance supporting the proposal and grade changes. He stated the grade change would be significant on the west side of the property and which would also be where the increase in height was requested. He reviewed the distance to surrounding neighborhoods, how the height would relate to those areas, the existing businesses and the placement of the proposed building in relation to the surrounding area. Mr. Woodbury stated the justification of the increased height was to mask the parking garage and keep the cost of living there affordable.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- Why it was not feasible to have underground parking on the subject property.
- How the retail spaces would activate the street.
- The parking in relation to the street.
- The view of the building from the street with the proposed stepbacks.
- The stepbacks for surrounding properties and the proposal.
- The height and grade of the proposal in relation to the surrounding buildings.
- The design and location of the proposal's "Plaza" feature.
- If the mechanical equipment would be masked by the additional height.
 - No the mechanical would require additional height of five feet.
- The public walkways and future streets for the proposal.
- The targeted average income for the facility.

Mr. Steve Miles, Western States Lodging, gave a history of their company and stated the site worked because it would create affordable and high quality housing for seniors in Sugar House.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:45:43 PM](#)

Chairperson Drown opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Judy Short, Sugarhouse Community Council, stated this was a complex and exciting project. She reminded Staff that community agreed on a height limit of seventy five feet and the City Council increased the limit to one hundred and five feet. Ms. Short stated the additional height would be acceptable for this proposal because of the location and slope of the property. She stated the Community Council liked the way the plaza feature fit and it was an amenity to the project. Ms. Short stated the retail was an issue regarding the way it addressed the block face however, the Community Council commended the developer on adding retail on the side street. She stated the development met the spirit of the ordinance and the Community Council agreed that this would be the exception in terms of height that they would allow. She stated future developments could not be taller than this proposal no matter what the slope of the property was. Ms. Short stated they liked the idea of the historical streets/blocks being put back in and suggested adding the street signs sooner rather than later.

The Commission and Ms. Short discussed why the Community Council was open to allowing the exception in height at this location and not in any other areas. Ms. Short stated because the rest of the area was essentially flat and this area was a little different. They discussed the parking structure cost and how it would decrease the affordability of the housing. The Commission asked Ms. Short for clarification on which pieces of the proposal the Commission Council supported. Ms. Short stated the Community Council supported the three issues on the table.

Mr. Josh Mettle, neighbor, stated he supported the proposal as it would create less traffic and less impacts to the area than a traditional apartment building.

Chairperson Drown closed the Public Hearing.

[6:53:41 PM](#)

The Commission and Applicants discussed the following:

- The difference between the proposed site and the site the Applicant was developing across the street regarding height.
- The number of units in the facility and the parking.
- Who would pay for the parking and how many surface parking spaces were being replaced.
 - Staff stated all parking met the standards and the Applicant's commitments to the RDA.
- The economical impact, to the project, created by requiring underground parking.
- If the Commission could discuss or review economical impacts to projects as they did not have supporting documents to review.
- Other projects in the area that have underground parking.

- The Applicant stated the RDA had given developers loans to help with costs of parking and those loans were not available for this project due to the RDA program ending in the subject area.

The Commission discussed how the proposal met or did not meet the standards and what standards should be approved or denied. They discussed the Staff recommendation and what would happen if the project was denied.

MOTION [7:23:24 PM](#)

Commissioner Dean stated regarding petition PLNSUB2014-00137 - Conditional Building & Site Design Review, PLNPCM2014-00138 - Planned Development, and PLNPCM2014-00287- Special Exception, based on the information in the Staff Report, testimony, site tour and findings, she moved that the Planning Commission approve the petitions with the exception of the condition that the project meet the height and step back requirements in the ordinance. Commissioner Woodhead seconded the motion.

The Commissioners discussed why they were for or against the petition and what requests they would support. They discussed the validity of the economic impacts and if there was justification to support the additional height.

Commissioners Woodhead, Guilkey, Dean and Lyon voted “aye”. Commissioners Gallegos, Taylor, Wirthlin, Fife and Ruttinger voted “nay”. The motion failed 4-5.

MOTION [7:34:13 PM](#)

Commissioner Taylor stated inconsistent with Staff's recommendation, based on the testimony, plans presented, the findings in the Staff Report, and conditions of project approval, she moved that the Planning Commission approve the 1202 East Wilmington Ave, mixed use development petitions PLNSUB2014-00137 - Conditional Building & Site Design Review, PLNPCM2014-00138 - Planned Development, and PLNPCM2014-00287- Special Exception as proposed. Commissioner Wirthlin seconded the motion and stated the findings of the motion would be that the Commission found sufficient evidence based on testimony from the Applicant and from the Commission's investigation that the requested exceptions are justified because of the grade change and the peculiar and unique characteristic of the subject property.

Commission Taylor stated she agreed to the additions to the motion.

Commissioners Taylor, Gallegos, Ruttinger and Wirthlin voted “aye”. Commissioners Dean, Woodhead, Guilkey, Fife and Lyon voted “nay”. The motion failed 4-5.

MOTION [7:36:31 PM](#)

Commissioner Fife stated regarding petition PLNSUB2014-00137 - Conditional Building & Site Design Review, PLNPCM2014-00138 - Planned Development, and PLNPCM2014-00287- Special Exception, he moved that the Planning Commission approve the petitions and all the conditions in the Staff Report except for issue two, the proposed step back height, and against the Staff recommendation, for issue one, based on the change in grade and the requirements imposed on the Applicant by the RDA. Commissioner Woodhead seconded the motion.

The Commissioners discussed the issue of the step back and how it affected the proposal.

Commissioners Fife voted “aye”. Commissioners Wirthlin, Taylor, Dean, Woodhead, Guilkey, Gallegos, Lyon and Ruttinger voted “nay”. The motion failed 1-8.

Mr. Paul Nielson, Senior City Attorney recommended that the Commission vote on the three petitions separately.

The Commission and Staff reviewed what was included in each of the petitions and how to address the issues. They discussed to what extent the economic issues were a factor and if they could review them.

MOTION [7:42:21 PM](#)

Commissioner Woodhead stated regarding petition PLNPCM2014-00287- Special Exception for additional height on the Wilmington Avenue project, she moved that the Planning Commission deny the Special Exception on the basis that there was no information specific to the site that supported the additional height. Commissioner Dean seconded the motion. Commissioners Lyon, Dean, Guilkey and Woodhead voted “aye”. Commissioners Wirthlin, Taylor, Fife, Gallegos, and Ruttinger voted “nay”. The motion failed 4-5.

MOTION [7:43:33 PM](#)

Commissioner Fife regarding PLNPCM2014-00287 Special Exception, he moved that the Planning Commission approve the additional ten feet in building height requested by the Applicant for 1202 East Wilmington Avenue, based on the slope change and the additional parking requirements that are required by the RDA. Commissioner Wirthlin seconded the motion. Commissioners Wirthlin, Taylor, Fife,

Gallegos and Ruttinger voted “aye”. Commissioners Lyon, Dean, Guilkey and Woodhead voted “nay”. The motion passed 5-4.

MOTION [7:45:04 PM](#)

Commissioner Woodhead stated regarding PLNPCM2014-00138 - Planned Development, which includes two elements, the exception to the thirty foot setback requirement and an exception to the street level retail, she moved that the Planning Commission approve the exception to the street level retail but deny the exception to the thirty foot setback requirement. Commission Fife seconded the motion. Commissioners Lyon, Fife, Dean, Guilkey and Woodhead voted “aye”. Commissioners Wirthlin, Taylor, Gallegos and Ruttinger voted “nay”. The motion passed 5-4.

The Commission and Staff discussed what would be approved or denied in the final motion with the other petitions having been approved.

MOTION [7:48:41 PM](#)

Commissioner Woodhead stated regarding PLNSUB2014-00137 - Conditional Building & Site Design Review, she moved that the Planning Commission approve the plan as provided and amended by the Commission’s votes on the Plan Development and Special Exception. Commissioner Fife seconded the motion. Commissioners Ruttinger, Gallegos, Lyon, Fife, Dean, Guilkey, Wirthlin and Woodhead voted “aye”. Commissioner Taylor voted “nay”. The motion passed 8-1.

Staff stated there were conditions in the Staff Report that were not addressed.

Commissioner Woodhead amended her motion to include conditions one through nine listed in the Staff Report. Commissioner Fife seconded the amendment. The motion passed unanimously.

[7:50:45 PM](#)

The Commission took a short break.

[8:00:35 PM](#)

The Commission agreed to move the Outdoor Dining petition to the next item on the agenda.

[8:00:39 PM](#)

Outdoor dining with a Nonconforming Restaurant Use Text Amendment - Jude Rubadue is requesting that the City amend the zoning regulations in order to allow outdoor dining in conjunction with a legal nonconforming restaurant at approximately 654 East 3rd Avenue. The subject property is located in an SR1-A (Special Development Pattern Residential zoning district.) The text amendment could affect all nonconforming restaurants citywide. The proposed regulation changes will affect chapter 21A.38 Nonconforming Uses and Noncomplying Structures of the zoning ordinance. Related provisions of Title 21A-Zoning may also be amended as part of this petition. (Staff contact: Everett Joyce at (801) 535-7930 or everett.joyce@slcgov.com.) Case number PLNPCM2014-00106

Mr. Everett Joyce, Senior Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff was recommending that the Planning Commission further discuss the issues and determine if they want to table the petition or forward a recommendation to the City Council.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- Did the staff recommendation allow the Planning Commission or the approval authority to place conditions on applications in order to help the petition better fit the proposed area
 - Staff stated if there were impacts to the neighboring properties and design solutions could mitigate the impact it would be acceptable to make recommendations or conditions.

Mr. Wade Budge, Applicant's Attorney, stated they were supportive of Staff's recommendation as well as finding a way to remedy the situation on the subject property. He explained the history of the proposal and the text amendment that would allow such businesses to operate in this area and other similar such areas. Mr. Budge asked the Commission to forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council regarding the petition.

Commissioner Taylor stated her husband and the applicant knew each other and recused herself from the discussion.

PUBLIC HEARING [8:14:24 PM](#)

Chairperson Drown opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Mary Ann Wright, Greater Avenues Community Council, stated the parties had worked with the Community Council on this proposal and the proposal would work well with the area. She stated she would like to see the proposal succeed and all concerns addressed.

Ms. Wright stated the biggest complaints were noise, odor and light. She hoped there was a solution to mitigate the issues for the neighborhood.

The following individuals spoke in favor of the petition: Mr. Alan Andersen, Ms. Kathie Chadbourne, Ms. Paula Bradley, Mr. Dennis Piercy, Mr. W. Scott Gardner, Mr. Jim Williams, Ms. Nan Seymour, Mr. Andrew Deiss, Mr. Bip Daniels, Mr. Douglas Tilton, Ms. Ray Spilsbury, Mr. Daniel Gaffin, Ms. Beth Saul, Mr. Mark Taylor, Ms. Linda Taylor, Ms. Mary Cartwright, Mr. Douglas Tilton and Ms. Heidi Kyobo.

The following comments were made:

- The location of the Avenues Bistro had been commercial for over sixty years.
- Complaints are about the restaurant in general and not about patio dining.
- A patio would not increase traffic, noise or odors.
- It was not a matter of increasing traffic it was to offer customers the outdoor dining option in the summer.
- Avenues Bistro was not looking to impose on the neighborhood, if there was an issue the owner would address it as quickly as possible.
- Bistro owner tries to be a good neighbor and accommodate any reasonable request.
- Outdoor dining was a way to build communities.
- Policies and laws were all ready in place to address issues without limiting the activities of our neighbors.
- Patio was part of the original scope of business for the Avenues Bistro.
- Outdoor dining was green and part of the city's future.
- Study has proven that the economical impact of local business was far higher than national chains therefore; these businesses help the local economy and are a positive for everyone.
- Parking has always been an issue in the area, but property owners know that when they chose to live in the area.

The following individuals spoke against the petition: Ms. Rita Tyrrell, Ms Kristen Stowell and Mr. Ron DeMass.

The following comments were made:

- Neighbors are concerned over the proposal as it affected the neighborhoods where these businesses are located.
- Outdoor dining area of the Avenues Bistro has been an issue.
- Increases traffic and parking in the neighborhoods.
- Hours of operation, noise and odors are a problem with the Avenues Bistro.
- Each business needs to be reviewed individually to see if outdoor dining works for the area.
- Outdoor dining in residential areas creates a loss of privacy for the surrounding properties.
- Hours of operation make living near outdoor dining facilities problematic.

- Balance needs to be found between residential and commercial uses, to not impact one more than the other.
- Parking signage and road markings around the Avenues Bistro would help alleviate friction between the neighbors and businesses.
- Should require complete and detailed description of the proposed property use prior to approval including maximum capacity, hours of operation and activities.
- Give the approving authority the ability to add conditions of approval on any application for outdoor dining.
- City needs to be granted the authority for inspections and compliance.
- Neighbors should be notified and allowed to give input on applications for outdoor dining.

Chairperson Drown, Vice Chairperson Ruttinger and Commissioner Gallegos read the following cards:

Ms. Jennifer Cox – The Bistro adds a much needed feeling of community to this area. To thrive any establishment would need to use the patio space. Please bring back our patio and save our bistro

- **Mr. David Kranes-** The Bistro has created a neighborhood gathering place. Its patrons think in terms of cool and healthy food, good and healthy company, good and healthy engagement with local food and produce. Kathie has been great in representing what the master chef, Alice Walters, hopes for.
- **Ms. Beth Saul-** I am in support of an ordinance change to allow Avenues Bistro to use the outdoor patio. It is not too loud for the neighborhood, the outdoor lighting is minimal, and other businesses in the Avenues have night lighting such as 7-11. The Bistro adds to the character of the neighborhood. The street parking belongs to everyone not the neighborhood homeowners. The demand of lighting and off street parking is no different from the neighborhood demands of other business in the Avenues.
- **Mr. Patrick Zwick-** I think Kathie is trying to be a good neighbor and provides SLC with wonderful organic food. Please change the zoning we need the Avenues Bistro.
- **Ms. Sara Williams-** The Bistro is an amazing tribute to the history of the city. They work hard to provide local/fresh food for residence. The place also brings tax revenue to the city. I have been a customer for two plus years and love the peace and quiet of the patio, a sanctuary in the city.
- **Mr. Wesley Smith-** Please allow the use of this patio to provide the atmosphere its creation was intended for.
- **Ms. Anne Mitchell-** Please allow patio dining, this is a wonderful, peaceful, urban setting. It's allowed elsewhere in the avenues and part of our unique community.
- **Ms. Susan Slattery-** What a wonderful addition to the Avenues, a lovely restaurant with thoughtful ambiance and support of Utah products and such a charming, charming spot.

- **Mr. J. Berglier**- I live across the street from the Avenues Bisto. Our issues with this issue were expressed in detail to Mr. Joyce and included in his Staff Report.
- **Ms. Meredith Ohn**- Kathie is a role model to the food community; not only as a business owner but in the way she is creating her menu. I am a nurse in a critical ICU at a local hospital, I go to the Avenues Bistro to sit on the patio to relax and unwind. I believe that Kathie is supported more than opposed. The Avenues is a city neighborhood that has a pedestrian style of living having a café with outside seating compliments the neighborhood and a healthy lifestyle.

Chairperson Drown closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission asked who was notified of the petition. Staff reviewed those that were notified.

DISCUSSION [8:55:06 PM](#)

The Commission and Staff discussed

- The next steps and timeline for the petition.
- How businesses would be affected by the proposal and the approval process after the ordinance was adopted.
- How outdoor dining was currently addressed in the ordinance.
- If the hours of operation should be regulated in the site plan or if they are regulated in other areas of the ordinance.
- Parking in relation to outdoor dining.
- The allowed noise levels for outdoor commercial activities.

MOTION [9:06:09 PM](#)

Commissioner Fife stated regarding petition PLNSUB2014-00106, Nonconforming Restaurants - Outdoor Dining Text Amendment, based on the findings in the Staff Report, public input and discussion, he moved that the Planning Commission transmit a favorable recommendation to the City Council to adopt the proposed zoning text amendment to allow a special exception process for outdoor dining when associated with a nonconforming, use specifically using section D the Staff Recommendation for the text. Commissioner Dean seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

[9:07:24 PM](#)

Form Based Urban Neighborhood Text Amendment - Michael Allred is requesting that the City amend the Form Based Urban Neighborhood District ordinance to increase building height on the corner of 200 West and Fayette Avenue. The proposed regulation changes will affect Table 21A.27.050.E of the zoning ordinance. Related provisions of Title 21A-Zoning may also be amended as part of

this petition. (Staff contact: Michael Maloy at (801) 535-7118 or michael.maloy@slcgov.com.) Case number PLNPCM2014-00085

Mr. Michael Maloy, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff was recommending that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to approve a text amendment to Chapter 21A.27 to allow 5 stories or 65 feet of building height on the corner parcel located at the intersection of 200 West and Fayette Avenue.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The parcels being combined in the proposal.
- The parcel that would be considered the corner lot for the proposal.

Mr. Mike Allred, Applicant, reviewed the history of the property and the reason for the request. He reviewed the issues with the ordinance and how they affected the development of his property. Mr. Allred stated one of the issues the neighbors had with these projects was parking however; proposal addressed parking for the tenants and eliminated the issue.

PUBLIC HEARING [9:17:16 PM](#)

Chairperson Drown opened the Public Hearing; seeing no one in the audience wished to speak to the petition, Chairperson Drown closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION [9:17:30 PM](#)

Commissioner Woodhead stated regarding petition PLNPCM2014-00085, Form Based Urban Neighborhood Districts Ordinance Amendments, she moved that the Planning Commission transmit a favorable recommendation to the City Council, based on testimony received, the recommendation in the Staff Report, information gleaned during the hearing, the field trip, plans presented, and the findings listed within the Staff Report, with the addition that the proposal was appropriate because it was consistent with the Master Plan and the zoning intentions for the neighborhood. Commissioner Gallegos seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

[9:18:42 PM](#)

Design Guidelines for Historic Apartments and Multi-Family Buildings- Mayor Ralph Becker initiated a petition to create Design Guidelines for Historic Apartments and Multifamily Buildings in Salt Lake City regulated by the H Historic Preservation Overlay Zoning District. The design guidelines will provide design advice to owners and applicants, and serve to guide the review and decisions of the Historic Landmark Commission and Staff. The design guidelines are new and will supplement the current design guidelines for Residential and Commercial historic buildings and signs. They reflect best practices in information, guidance, organization and clarity. No sections of the Zoning Ordinance will be modified or affected by this petition. On April 3, 2014, the Historic Landmark Commission forwarded a positive recommendation to City Council to adopt the guidelines. The Planning Commission is required to review the Design Guidelines because it is a land use document, and to forward a recommendation to City Council concerning its adoption. (Staff contact: Carl Leith at (801) 535-7758, or carl.leith@slcgov.com.)
Case number PLNPCM2012-00870

Mr. Carl Leith, Senior Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated that Staff was recommending that the Planning Commission forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council regarding the petition.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- If the Commission would be forwarding a recommendation or if further review would be warranted.
- If there were specific items that needed to be addressed.
- Seismic standards.
- The definition of multifamily.
- Energy efficiency and accessibility.
- Adding a glossary, appendix and bibliography.

The Commission stated they would like more time to review the document and give further comments.

PUBLIC HEARING [9:38:54 PM](#)

Chairperson Drown opened the Public Hearing; seeing no one in the audience wished to speak to the petition, Chairperson Drown closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION [9:39:38 PM](#)

Commissioner Gallegos stated regarding petition PLNHLC2012-Design Guidelines for Historic Apartment and Multifamily Buildings; he moved that the Planning Commission table the petition to the June 11, meeting to allow for further review of documents. Commissioner Woodhead seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at [9:43:44 PM](#)