

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Room 126 of the City & County Building
451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah
Wednesday, July 8, 2015

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:30:25 PM](#). Audio recordings of the Planning Commission meetings are retained for an indefinite period of time.

Present for the Planning Commission meeting were: Chairperson Clark Ruttinger; Vice Chairperson James Guilkey; Commissioners Angela Dean, Michael Fife,Carolynn Hoskins, Andres Paredes and Marie Taylor. Commissioner Emily Drown, Michael Gallegos and Matt Lyon were excused.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Nora Shepard, Planning Director; Nick Norris, Planning Manager; Doug Dansie, Senior Planner; Jonathan Goates, Principal Planner; Maryann Pickering, Principal Planner; Molly Robinson, Urban Planner; Tracy Tran, Principal Planner; Michelle Moeller, Administrative Secretary and Paul Nielson, Senior City Attorney.

Field Trip

A field trip was held prior to the work session. Planning Commissioners present were: Michael Fife, James Guilkey, Carolynn Hoskins, Andres Paredes and Clark Ruttinger. Staff members in attendance were Nick Norris and Doug Dansie.

The following site were visited

- **620 East 1700 South** – Staff gave an overview of the project and oriented the Commission to the site.
 - Staff reviewed the following concerns:
 - Width of the property.
 - Privacy for adjacent use.
 - East property line dispute.
 - Height (complies with zoning).
 - Access to the property.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE JUNE 10, 2015, MEETING. [5:30:46 PM](#)
MOTION [5:30:51 PM](#)

Commissioner Fife moved to approve the June 10, 2015. Commissioner Taylor seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. Commissioner Ruttinger and Paredes abstained as they were not present at the subject meeting.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR [5:31:22 PM](#)

Chairperson Ruttinger stated he had nothing to report.

Vice Chairperson Guilkey stated he had nothing to report.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR [5:31:28 PM](#)

Ms. Nora Shepard, Planning Director, introduced Andres Paredes as a new Planning Commissioner. She reviewed the issue with the other Commissioner and that she was no longer eligible to serve on the Commission. Ms. Shepard stated Commissioner Fife decided to remain on the Commission. She reviewed the Local Historic Districts that were withdrawn and those that may come to the Commission in the future.

The Commission and Staff discussed why the petitions were withdrawn and the Appeal Hearing Officers decision on the 9th and 9th development. They discussed when Commissioner Lyon's leave of absence would be over.

Ms. Shepard stated Commissioner Ruttinger's term was extended and the status of the others remained unknown.

[5:35:50 PM](#)

[Alpenridge Planned Development and Preliminary Subdivision at approximately 620 East 1700 South](#) - A request by Alpenridge development LLC for a Planned Development to construct seven residential condominium units, located at the address listed above. The project is located in the RMF-35 Zoning District, located in Council District 5 represented by Erin Mendenhall (Staff contact: Doug Dansie at (801)535-6182 or doug.dansie@slcgov.com). Case numbers PLNSUB2015-00075 and PLNSUB2015-00418

Mr. Doug Dansie, Senior Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff was recommending the Planning Commission approve the petition as presented.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- Proposals that could be approved administratively and if Planners reviewed the proposals to determine if they were compatible with the surrounding area.
- The reasoning as to why the project was in front of the Commission and the standards it would have to meet prior to approval.
- The issues with the uniqueness of the lot and that fire code limited the size of the structure that could be constructed on the lot.

Mr. David Rogers Alpenridge Development LLC, reviewed the objective of the project, the building would be built at silver LEED certification and stated they were willing to comply with all the landscaping and recycling requirements.

Mr. Allen Roberts, CRSA, stated the original proposal was for eight units but the fire department required a turnaround therefore, they were proposing seven units.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- If the original eight unit proposal was contained in one structure.
 - Yes the design was for one structure.
- The previous layout of the proposal and how the turnaround affected the design.
- If the proposal was not approved was there another design.

PUBLIC HEARING [5:51:40 PM](#)

Chairperson Ruttinger opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke in favor of the petition: Mr. Ted Payne and Mr. Patrick McGarvey.

The following comments were made:

- Great care and consideration, for the neighborhood, were taken during the design of the proposed structure.
- Egress and ingress were taken into consideration and safely designed.
- Proposal was an improvement to the area and the property.
- Property and existing home were not habitable and had not been for years.
- Other similar developments were being constructed in the area.
- Garbage cans are emptied three times a week for regular neighborhoods so why would a once a week service be an issue.
- Children in the area would not be negatively affected by the proposal.
- Would be a good project for the city.

The following individuals spoke in opposition of the petition: Mr. Dennis Brunatti, Mr. James Glascock, Ms. Tammy Georgelas, Ms. Tasha Stolz, Ms. Molly Clark, Mr. Daniel Grolley, Ms. Molly Noonan, Ms. Patti Simpkins, Mr. Adam Goetz, and Mr. Nick Boyer, Mr. Shawn Wetterberg and Ms. Shelly Reynolds.

The following comments were made:

- Proposal trespassed on neighboring property.
- Height did not fit with the neighborhood.
- Would negatively impact the neighborhood.
- Existing trees, shrubs and historical marker should remain.
- Light, noise and traffic issues should be made to not negatively affect the surrounding neighbors.
- Property dispute should be resolved prior to approval.
- Traffic would increase in the area and it was all ready an issue.
- Would be a safety risk for the kids that attend the school in the neighborhood.
- Height impeded on the privacy of the surrounding properties.
- If the design stayed as proposed the windows on the highest level should be relocated.
- Landscaping requirements should be followed.
- Trees and a hedge with a cinderblock wall should be put in place for privacy and sound barrier along the rear of the property.

- Information regarding the Public Hearing should be clearly stated on the notice.
- Structures did not fit with the character of the neighborhood.
- Landscape buffers of ten feet should be required.
- Mature trees should be planted and current trees should remain.
- Dumpster should not be located adjacent to any surrounding property line.
- Current weeds should be taken care of immediately.
- Privacy fence should be taller than six feet.
- The historic nature of the existing home should be taken into consideration.
- Should be developed into single family homes not an apartment complex.
- House was only inhabitable because the developer started tearing it down.

The Commission and Ms. Tammy Georgelas discussed the property/fence line under dispute and how it needed to be addressed. They discussed if there was a quiet title action being taken.

Chairperson Ruttinger closed the Public Hearing.

The Applicants stated they were thankful for the concerns of the neighbors many of which were common with redevelopment. They stated they did care about the neighborhood and were trying to make the development work with the property. The Applicant stated it was not economically possible to fix the current structure due to the crumbling foundation, leaning walls and asbestos issues in the home. They stated they would develop the property with the least amount of impact to the neighbors and the proposal would help to revitalize the neighborhood. The Applicant discussed the boundary dispute and how it was being addressed. They stated they were going off the property lines recorded with the county. They discussed the current state of the property and that they would address the concerns as quickly as possible. The Applicants stated they would work with the property owner in regard to the boundary dispute, to resolve the issues and still allow the subject property to be developed. They stated they were working to accommodate the code, the ordinance and the zoning for the property. They are more than willing to discuss any questions with anyone that would like additional information.

The Commission and Applicants discussed the following:

- The fencing for the proposal.
- The height of the proposed fence.

Mr. Nick Norris stated the Planning Commission did have the authority to modify the requirements such as the fence height in a Planned Development.

Mr. Dansie stated there was nothing in the code that required enclosed parking when developing townhomes.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The rear yard setback was a concern but if no windows were on that side it would not be an issue.
- The location of the windows on the top units.
- The setbacks for the proposal.
- The intention of the Planned Development process.
- The need to make the building fit the scale and mass of the neighborhood.
- The zoning history for the property.
- Counsel's direction on the quiet title.
 - The Commission could not put the application on hold as it would be setting a precedent.
- Requiring underground parking to lessen the height of the structure.
- How best to protect the privacy of the neighborhood while allowing for the best use of the property.
- The standards for the proposal and if the structure could be limited to two stories.
- The compatibility of the proposal to the neighborhood.

MOTION [7:00:22 PM](#)

Commissioner Taylor stated regarding the Alpenridge Townhomes PLNSUB2015-00075 and 00418, based on the information in the Staff Report, the testimony and plans presented, she moved that the Planning Commission deny the planned development based primarily on the lack of context and compatibility to the adjacent property.

Mr. Paul Nielson, City Attorney, asked for clarification on the motion stating Commissioner Taylor based the motion on the Staff Report and Staff was recommending approval of the proposal.

The Commission and Staff discussed how to best word the motion to reflect Commissioner Taylor's proposal to deny the petition.

Commissioner Taylor amended the motion to state the petition did not meet item C.6 regarding the intensity, size and scale of the planned development, was not compatible with the adjacent properties based on the height, footprint size and based on the fact that the adjacent properties were a majority of single family dwellings and the intent of the neighborhood was to keep within the scale of single family dwellings.

Commissioner Dean seconded the motion.

The Commission and Staff discussed if the property was designated as multi-family in the master plan.

Mr. Norris stated it was important to note, in the motion, particularly as it related to the subdivision, one of the standards for the subdivision was that it complied with zoning or complied with an approved Planned Development. He suggested that Commissioner

Taylor clarify the motion to address that the subdivision standards would be not be satisfied due to the findings in the motion.

The Commission and Staff discussed how to correctly word the motion.

Commissioner Taylor amended the motion to state based on the denial of the Planned Development the proposal would not meet the Subdivision requirements. Commissioner Dean seconded the amendment. Commissioner Dean, Hoskins, Taylor and Ruttinger voted “aye”. Commissioners Fife, Andres and Guilkey voted “nay”. The motion passed 4-3

***** Clarified Motion*****

Commissioner Taylor stated regarding the Alpenridge Townhomes PLNSUB2015-00075 and 00418, inconsistent with Staff's recommendation and the Staff Report, based on the testimony and plans presented, she moved that the Planning Commission deny the Planned Development as the petition did not meet item C.6 regarding the intensity, size and scale of the Planned Development, was not compatible with the adjacent properties in regards to height, footprint size and the fact that the adjacent properties were a majority of single family dwellings and the intent of the neighborhood was to keep within the scale of the single family dwellings. She stated based on the denial of the Planned Development the proposal would not meet the Subdivision requirements. Commissioner Dean seconded the amendment. Commissioner Dean, Hoskins, Taylor and Ruttinger voted “aye”. Commissioners Fife, Andres and Guilkey voted “nay”. The motion passed 4-3

[7:08:32 PM](#)

The Commission took a five minute break.

[7:14:05 PM](#)

[Downtown Master Plan and Gateway Master Plan Updates](#) - Planning Staff is recommending changes to the Draft Downtown Community Plan that the Planning Commission recommended for adoption on August 27, 2014. Mayor Ralph Becker is proposing an extensive update to the Downtown Master Plan for property located within or near the boundaries of North Temple, 200 East, 1000 South, and Interstate 15. The proposed Downtown Master Plan will replace the existing Downtown Master Plan, Gateway District land Use and Development Master Plan and the Gateway Specific Master Plan. The Planning Commission is required to make a recommendation to the City Council. The Planning Commission will take public comment, but will continue the public hearing and make a recommendation to the City Council at a later date. A copy of the proposed Downtown Community Plan can be found on the project website at www.downtownplanslc.com. A printed copy can be provided by contacting the staff indicated below. The subject property is within Council Districts 3, 4, and 5, represented by Stan Penfold, Luke Garrott, and Erin

Mendenhall. (Staff contact: Molly Robinson at (801)535-7261 or molly.robinson@slcgov.com). Case number PLNPCM2013-00768

Ms. Molly Robinson, Urban Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff was recommending that the Planning Commission take public input, to continue the public hearing and consider the recommended changes. This recommendation is based on recent public input, consideration of the Mayor's Livability Agenda and City Council Philosophy Statements, and consideration of adopted citywide plans related to the downtown area.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The preferred development for downtown.
- The opportunities for inner block activation and how to address that language in the plan.
- How to address all modes of transportation in relation to midblock walkways.
- The pyramid stepping and how it benefited the city scape.
- Park strategy for the city and offering safe places for people.
- Outdoor spaces for all ages and pets.
- Ways to attract and retain businesses downtown.

PUBLIC HEARING [8:07:29 PM](#)

Chairperson Ruttinger opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Alan Sullivan, City Creek Reserve, reviewed the property owned by City Creek Reserve, stated they support the revisions to the plan and appreciate the opportunity to participate in the process. He commended Staff on the public outreach for the plan and that they were supportive of the idea that the plan needed to coordinate with other efforts such as Enterprise SLC and Plan Salt Lake. Mr. Sullivan stated the Downtown Plan and Plan Salt Lake should announce, as a priority, the need for a strategy to encourage business and employers to locate and remain in downtown Salt Lake City. He stated the City could not assume it would always be the center of economic and professional activity in the valley or it would not succeed. Mr. Sullivan stated they were concerned that the draft plan did not pay attention to the people traveling to downtown in the car as it should promote all modes of transportation and have balance.

The Commission and Mr. Sullivan discussed how parking in downtown effected employees and employees are requesting to move businesses out of the downtown area because of parking.

Mr. Sullivan stated there needed to be a coordinated parking plan to direct people to parking.

Mr. Jason Mathis, Downtown Alliance, stated they support the plan and are glad it was still a work in progress. He stated he was thankful for the work that being done on the plan and supported adding economic information into the plan.

Ms. Cindy Cromer stated she supported Staff's suggestion that there might be a way of weaving economic development throughout the plan as it would make a much stronger impression, focus and also be more functional. She stated there must be incentives for developing surface parking lots and not wait for it to happen.

Chairperson Ruttinger closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION [8:18:29 PM](#)

Commissioner Guilkey stated regarding the Downtown Master Plan, he moved to continue the Public Hearing until a future meeting. Commissioner Dean seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

[8:18:45 PM](#)

[Zoning Ordinance Fine Tuning Spring 2015](#) - Salt Lake City Mayor Ralph Becker is requesting that various sections of the Zoning Ordinance are modified in order to clarify the regulations and processes related to public hearings and the operations of various boards and commission. The proposed regulation changes will affect several different sections of Title 21A or the Salt Lake City Zoning Ordinance. Related provisions of Title 21A-Zoning may also be amended as part of this petition. (Staff contact: Maryann Pickering at (801) 535-7660 or maryann.pickering@slcgov.com). Case number PLNPCM2015-00146

Ms. Maryann Pickering, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff was recommending that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council regarding the petition.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The process and clarity of the notices for Public Hearings.
 - This was not part of the subject issue but Staff would address the content of the postcards.
- The requirements, time frame and process for noticing.

PUBLIC HEARING [8:23:50 PM](#)

Chairperson Ruttinger opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Cindy Cromer stated there are more changes coming for the ordinance as Staff presented them at recent Open House. She stated the standards for who could file an appeal should be the same for Planning Commission and Historic Landmark Commission as it is significantly challenging for someone to appeal a decision regarding standalone historic districts specifically city parks.

Chairperson Ruttinger closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission and Staff discussed the additional changes to the ordinance that will be brought to the Commission.

MOTION [8:29:02 PM](#)

Commissioner Fife stated regarding PLNPCM2015-00146 Fine Tuning Spring 2015, based on the findings and analysis in the Staff Report and testimony provided, he moved that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation for PLNPCM2015-00146 to adopt the proposed zoning ordinance text amendment related to clarifying the regulations of noticing and operations of various boards and commission within the zoning ordinance. Commissioner Taylor seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

[8:30:04 PM](#)

Off Street Parking Standards Update – The Planning Commission has requested an update on the status of proposed changes that will affect Title 21A.44.030- Number of Off Street Parking Spaces Required under the Salt Lake City Zoning Ordinance. The changes would affect the parking requirements for mixed use developments in certain zoning districts, clarify the maximum parking requirements and address issues related to exceeding the maximum off street parking requirements. Related provisions of Title 21A Zoning may also be amended as part of this petition (Staff contact: J.P. Goates at (801) 535-7236 or jonathon.goates@slcgov.com). Case number PLNPCM2015-00430

Mr. Jonathon Goates, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff was asking the Planning Commission for direction and input on the petition.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The Parking study for the proposal.
- Why Developers preferred to not have less than one stall per unit for their developments.
- The Open House for the proposal.
- Where Staff thought a half parking stall per unit was appropriate for developments.
- Parking maximums on the Westside.
- How tandem parking was addressed in the proposal.
- The time line for the proposal.

[8:50:05 PM](#)

Northwest Quadrant Master Plan - The Planning Staff will provide the Planning Commission an update on the Northwest Quadrant Plan. The Northwest Quadrant Master Plan includes portions of the City west of I-215 to the western boundary of

the City and from SR-201 to the northern boundary of the City, but excludes the Salt Lake International Airport and land east of the airport. The commission recommended approval of this plan in 2009. However, it was never adopted. The City Council and Mayor have asked the Planning Division to revise the draft plan in accordance with City Council Resolution 6 of 2015, which supports re-addressing the master plan. (Staff contact Nick Norris (801) 535-6173 or nick.norris@slcgov.com)

Ms. Tracy Tran, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff was asking the Planning Commission for direction and input on the petition.

Mr. Nick Norris reviewed the history of the Northwest Quadrant Master Plan.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- How the proposal affected the prison proposal.
- If a new airport runway was still moving forward.
- The City owned property in the area.
- If a bird refuge was planned for the area.

The meeting adjourned at [9:09:06 PM](#).