

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
City & County Building
451 South State Street, Room 326, Salt Lake City, Utah
Wednesday, October 12, 2016

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:33:35 PM](#). Audio recordings of the Planning Commission meetings are retained for an indefinite period of time.

Present for the Planning Commission meeting were: Chairperson Matt Lyon, Vice ChairpersonCarolynn Hoskins; Commissioners Maurine Bachman, Weston Clark, Ivis Garcia, Andres Paredes, Clark Ruttinger and Sara Urquhart. Commissioners Emily Drown and were excused.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were Nick Norris, Planning Manager; John Anderson, Senior Planner; Casey Stewart, Senior Planner; David Gellner, Principal Planner; Anthony Riederer, Principal Planner; Michelle Poland, Administrative Secretary and Paul Nielson, City Attorney.

Field Trip

A field trip was held prior to the work session. Planning Commissioners present were: Maurine Bachman, Weston Clark, Ivis Garcia, Carolyn Hoskins, Clark Ruttinger and Sarah Urquhart. Staff members in attendance were Nick Norris, Casey Stewart, John Anderson, David Gellner and Anthony Riederer.

The following sites were visited:

- **1600 -1700 E 1490-1455 South** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **200 East 269 East** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal. The Commission asked if the alley ran through the entire block. Staff stated yes it did.
- **470 S 700 W** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **2188 S Highland Drive** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal. The Commission asked about the location of the street that ran through the block and the location of the plaza. Staff oriented the Commission on the site. The Commission asked if the bar owner had commented. Staff stated the bar owner had not commented. The Commission asked what would happen to the existing businesses. Staff stated the applicant would have to address that at the meeting.
- **2206 South 1300 East** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.

[5:34:11 PM](#)

APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 28, 2016, MEETING MINUTES.

MOTION [5:34:22 PM](#)

Commissioner Paredes moved to approve the September 28, 2016, meeting minutes. Commissioner Hoskins seconded the motion. Commissioner Clark abstained from voting as he was not present at the meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR [5:34:43 PM](#)

Chairperson Lyon welcomed Commissioner Clark to the Planning Commission.

Vice Chairperson Hoskins reported on the conference regarding diversity.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR [5:35:26 PM](#)

Mr. Nick Norris, Planning Manager, reviewed the need for a Planning Commission member to participate with Public Utilities regarding the updates/upgrades to the water reclamation facility.

The Commission discussed the parameters for the group, who would like to attend and what was going to be discussed at the meetings.

Commissioner Garcia stated she would be attending some of the meetings.

The Commission discussed rearranging the agenda.

[5:42:00 PM](#)

Design Standards Chapter Text Amendment - A request by the Mayor for creation of a Design Standards Chapter for new development. The new chapter will consolidate existing design standards from various zoning districts, with some updates and revisions, into one chapter in the Zoning Ordinance. The amendment will affect multiple sections of the Salt Lake City Zoning Ordinance and will be applicable city-wide. (Staff contact: Casey Stewart at (801) 535-6260 or casey.stewart@slcgov.com.) Case number PLNPCM2015-00150.

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

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The Commissioners on the subcommittee and the input that was given from those members.

PUBLIC HEARING [5:49:38 PM](#)

Chairperson Lyon opened the Public Hearing, seeing no one wished to speak; Chairperson Lyon closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION [5:50:07 PM](#)

Commissioner Ruttinger stated regarding, PLNPCM2015-00150 Design Standards Chapter Text Amendment, based on the findings and analysis listed in the Staff Report and the testimony and proposals presented, he moved that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council for the requested Design Standards Chapter text amendment. Commissioner Bachman seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

[5:51:15 PM](#)

Emerson/Roosevelt Alley Vacation at approximately 1600 -1700 E 1490-1455 South
- Salt Lake City Real Estate Services has initiated a petition to vacate a 710 foot section of unused alley in order to convey one-half of the alley to the abutting property owners on each side. The alley runs in an east/west direction from 1600 East to 1700 East and is located between Emerson Avenue (1490 South) and Roosevelt Avenue (1455 South). The project area is located within Council District 6, represented by Charlie Luke. (Staff contact: David J. Gellner at (801)535-6107 or david.gellner@slcgov.com.) Case Number PLNPCM2016-00573

Mr. David Gellner, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff was recommending the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council regarding the petition.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The process for dividing the property.
- The Public comment received for the petition.

Mr. Dean Rip, Salt Lake City Real Estate Services, reviewed the petition and reasoning for the request.

PUBLIC HEARING [5:55:12 PM](#)

Chairperson Lyon opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Mr. Kent Alderman, Mr. Phil Garn and Ms. Judy Short.

The following comments were made:

- In favor of the alley vacation as it would benefit the neighborhood.
- Would allow for improvements to the property.
- It was never an alley and was never intended to be an alley.
- The County did not have the alley on record as City property.
- Opposed to closing alleys because of potential accessory dwelling units.
- Would prohibit further development of the rear yards of these properties.

Chairperson Lyon closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- If the public's concerns were addressed in the Staff Report.

MOTION [6:04:20 PM](#)

Commissioner Bachman stated regarding, PLNPCM2016-00573, Emerson / Roosevelt 16-17E Alley Vacation, based on the findings and analysis in the Staff Report, testimony, and discussion at the public hearing, she moved that the Planning Commission transmit a positive recommendation for the alley closure to the City Council subject to the conditions listed in the Staff Report. Commissioner Garcia seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

[6:05:14 PM](#)

Darling/Lincoln Elementary South Alley Vacation between 200 East and approximately 269 East - Mr. Logan Darling, an adjacent property owner has initiated a petition to vacate a 600-foot section of alley located at the above listed address, south of the Lincoln Elementary School and behind the homes on Hampton Avenue. The alley was previously closed by City Council action in 1983 but the property was not vacated and ownership was retained by the City. This proposal is to vacate the property and incorporate the land into the neighboring residential properties along the alley. The project area is located within Council District 5, represented by Erin Mendenhall. (Staff contact: David J. Gellner at (801)535-6107 or david.gellner@slcgov.com.) Case Number PLNPCM2016-00520

Mr. David Gellner, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff was recommending the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council regarding the petition.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The utility services access to the area.

Mr. Logan Darling reviewed the petition and reasoning for the request.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:13:17 PM](#)

Chairperson Lyon opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Mr. John Wilson, Mr. Darrin Brooks, Ms. Nora Gallegos, Mr. Joe Gallegos and Mr. Gray Starling.

The following comments were made:

- The school Community Council supported closing the alley.
- Alley promoted criminal mischief and was a nuisance.
- The buildup of waste on the alley was a health hazard.
- Utilities could be access from the school property.
- If the fenced off portion of the alley were open it would allow the property owners to access their garages.
- The number of signatures on the petition was not properly reflected.
- Who was responsible for the storm drain on the property.

- Closing the alley would lower the property values of the properties who have access to the alley.
- Some of the homes did not have off street parking and this would make it harder to use their garages.

Chairperson Lyon closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission, Applicant and Staff discussed the following:

- The access property owners had to the alley way.
- The number of garages on the alley and the access to those garages.
- What happened when the City closed the alley way.
- The location of the storm drain on the alley.
- If the property owners were required to absorb the abutting land or if it was if possible for them to leave it vacated.
- If the property owners would be allowed to put gates in the school fence.
- The verification of the petition and who verified the signatures.

The Commission discussed and stated the following:

- Appreciated the public comment.
- If it was possible to make a motion contingent to the verification of the petition signatures.

MOTION [6:36:19 PM](#)

Commissioner Clark stated regarding, Darling/Lincoln Elementary South Alley Vacation PLNPCM2016-00520, based on the findings and analysis in the Staff Report, testimony, and discussion at the public hearing, he moved that the Planning Commission transmit a positive recommendation for the alley closure to the City Council subject to the conditions listed in the Staff Report and the verification of the property owners signatures on the petition. Commissioner Ruttinger seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

[6:37:26 PM](#)

Street Closure at approximately 470 S 700 W - Mr. Jim Lewis, representing FFKR Architecture, is requesting to close a section of street near the above listed property to accommodate improvements to their adjacent property. The subject property is located in the CG (General Commercial) zoning district and is in Council District 4 represented by Derek Kitchen. (Staff Contact: Anthony Riederer at (801)535-7625 or anthony.riederer@slcgov.com.) Case number PLNPCM2016-00487

Mr. Anthony Riederer, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff was recommending the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council regarding the petition.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:39:51 PM](#)

Chairperson Lyon opened the Public Hearing, seeing no one wished to speak; Chairperson Lyon closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission discussed the following:

- The importance of ensuring walkability would remain on the parcel.

MOTION [6:41:45 PM](#)

Commissioner Urquhart stated regarding, Street Closure at approximately 470 S 700 W PLNPM PLNPCM2016-00487, based on the findings listed in the Staff Report, testimony and plans presented, she moved that the Planning Commission transmit positive recommendation to City Council for the request to close the subject portion of 500 South. Commissioner Garcia seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

[6:42:39 PM](#)

Dixon Medical Office Building Conditional Building and Site Design at approximately 2188 S Highland Drive - Mr. Eric Thompson from FFKR Architects representing the property owner is requesting design approval for a new office building at the above listed address. The use is allowed in the zone. The proposed structure would be 105 feet in height and 160,000 square feet in size. The development must be approved through the Conditional Building and Site Design process due to the building size. The property is located in the CSHBD1 - Sugar House Business District and is located within Council District 7, represented by Lisa Adams. (Staff contact: John Anderson at (801)535-7214 or john.anderson@slcgov.com.) Petition number PLNPCM2016-00585

Mr. John Anderson, 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.

Mr. Eric Thompson, Ms. Christina Haas and Mr. Rick Frericks FFKR Architects reviewed the petition and reasoning for the request. They reviewed the parking, materials, layout and amenities for the proposal.

The Commission, Applicant and Staff discussed the following:

- The canopy structure above the entry way.
- The use of the building.
- The standards for residential zoning in the Sugar House Business District.
- The features on the property to draw people through it.
- The way finding signage for the proposal.
- If there were concerns over the private road becoming a more active road.
- The parking for the proposal and if it would be available in the evenings.
- The effect of the proposal on the existing businesses.

- Why the proposal was going through the Conditional Building and Site Design Review process.
- If the neighboring bar owner had been contacted.
- If there was consideration given, in regards to design, to the local businesses and helping them remain in the area.
- If the parking at the bar would create an issue for the development.

PUBLIC HEARING [7:18:13 PM](#)

Chairperson Lyon opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Judy Short, Sugar House Community Council, commended the developer on a job well done. She reviewed the public outreach for the proposal, the past designs of the proposal and the use of the structure. Ms. Short stated generally the Community Council was in favor of the proposal but would like it to look more like the smaller buildings in Sugar House. Ms. Short stated they were glad to see the wall was removed, there were concerns over j walking on Highland Drive and metal pillars would be more open than the brick pillars in the design. She stated a lot of the Community Councils concerns were considered, such as signage, the roadway and lighting. Ms. Short stated Staff needed to give more input on the design of the building and the Community Council would like to see the following as conditions: additional parking for retail in the evening and another Staff review of a modified entrance if the medical building was not the actual use of the building.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Mr. Eric McGill, Mr. Steve Bateson, Mr. Milton Braselton and Mr. Gerry Litcher.

The following comments were made:

- Connectivity on the block was a big concern of the Community Council.
- The proposal was a new concept for the area.
- The large wall along the bar needed to be addressed.
- More walkability was needed for the area and should be a strong condition.
- The issues with past demolitions in the area.
- The demolition needed to be very careful that they did not damage the neighboring buildings.
- New design fit with the area.
- Proper pedestrian and vehicle access was a must.
- Proposal for the intersection was a bonus.
- If the residence of Sugar House were to vote on the design of the building they would say this was not a reflection of the area.
- The Sugar House Business district vision statement should be used to help change the design to match the area.

Chairperson Lyon closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission, Applicant and Staff discussed the following:

- The traffic pattern for the street and the safety features that would be added.

- The issue of J walking on Highland Drive and how it would be addressed in future transportation projects.
- The protections for the bar during the demolition of the building.
- If evening parking was part of the design phase and if it could be reviewed by the Planning Commission.
- The exterior features and design that could be reviewed by the Commission.
- The materials proposed for the development.
- What the Community Council could do to require future developers to capture the feel of Sugar House.
- The consideration given to the design of the building to make it look like surrounding buildings.
- The basis for the design and layout of the development.
- The design was not refined to the finished product at this time.

The Commission discussed the following:

- It seemed like the biggest concern was that the pedestrian / Sugar House feel was not reached.
- The standards that were and were not met with the current design.
- How to make the building better fit the area.
- The options for approval that required the applicant to return to the Commission for approval on final design details but move ahead with the application.
- The conditions of approval and the fine details that were still needed for the proposal.
- A potential motion for the proposal.

MOTION [8:23:39 PM](#)

Commissioner Clark stated regarding, PLNPCM2016-00585 Dixon Medical Office Building Conditional Building and Site Design Review, based on the information in the Staff Report, public testimony, and discussion by the Planning Commission, he moved that the Planning Commission approve the Conditional and Building Site Design Review request. Subject to conditions one through nine as listed in the Staff Report in addition standards C and D which speak to pedestrian engagement and interest could comply better and we strongly urge the Application to find fit better with the neighborhood.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The language in the motion.
- The need to give specific information on how to make the design meet the standards of the ordinance.
- That more definition was needed in the materials used.
- The articulation of the ground floor was a must.
- The need to vary and articulate the building massing and facades to contribute to pedestrian scale environment on the street level.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION [8:27:54 PM](#)

Commissioner Clark stated regarding, PLNPCM2016-00585 Dixon Medical Office Building Conditional Building and Site Design Review, based on the information in the Staff Report, public testimony, and discussion by the Planning Commission, he moved that the Planning Commission approve the Conditional and Building Site Design Review request. Subject to conditions one through nine listed in the Staff Report with the addition that the applicant better comply with standards C and D which refer to better detailing of the façade on the pedestrian level - to better engage pedestrian activity and interest, articulation and return to the Planning Commission for final approval of those fine details on the lower two levels. Commissioner Urquhart seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Paredes let for the evening. [8:29:20 PM](#)

[8:30:03 PM](#)

Marriot Springhill Suites Hotel Conditional Building and Site Design Review and Planned Development at approximately 2206 South 1300 East - Wilmington Hotel LLC represented by the Woodbury Corporation is requesting approval from the City for a new 6-story, 125-room Springhill Suites Hotel with a 2.5 story semi-underground parking structure to be located at the above listed address. Although the property is addressed off of 1300 East, it fronts on Wilmington Avenue. The applicant is proposing to eliminate the building step-back on the Wilmington Avenue frontage and to eliminate the ground-floor use requirement along Wilmington Avenue. The development also requires Conditional Building and Site Design Review (CBSDR) due to the building size and to address other design elements. The Planning Commission may modify other development standards as authorized by the zoning ordinance. The 0.67 acre property is located in the CSHBD1 - Sugar House Business District and is located within Council District 7, represented by Lisa Adams. (Staff contact: David J. Gellner at (801)535-6107 or david.gellner@slcgov.com.) Case numbers PLNPCM2016-00528 & PLNSUB2016-00529

Mr. David Gellner, Principal 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.

Mr. Lynn Woodbury, Mr. Aabir Malik and Mr. Riley Jarrett, Woodbury Corporation, reviewed the petition and request. They discussed the design and details for the hotel and how it would benefit the area. The Applicants discussed the issues with the slope of the property and percentage of glass required in the ordinance.

The Commission, Applicant and Staff discussed the following:

- Access to the street and proposed trail on the east of the property.
- The retaining wall and if access to the trail would be available along the wall.
- If there was consideration to putting the entrance of the hotel on Wilmington Avenue.

- Why the proposed location was chosen for the hotel versus another location on the property.

PUBLIC HEARING [8:48:45 PM](#)

Chairperson Lyon opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Judy Short, Sugar House Community Council, stated they were pleased with the proposal and the developers design. She reviewed the activity on Wilmington Avenue and stated the hotel would be a great addition to the area. Ms. Short stated the Sugar House circulation plan called for reestablishing the streets that were once part of the Shopko block and as the block developed those access points would be returned. She stated the glass percentage was not an issue for the Council.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Mr. James Guilkey and Mr. Eric McGill.

The following comments were made:

- In opposition to the project as it was not in accordance to the Sugar House Master Plan and did not comply with the ordinance.
- The proposal would not benefit the residences of Salt Lake City as there were no ground level amenities.
- The proposal did not meet the ordinance and was asking for huge reductions in the ordinance requirements.
- Past decisions on projects did not set a precedent for future projects.
- Other projects have respected the step backs and the developer did not want to because he wanted to maximize the rooms in the hotel and his profits.
- The ground floor uses did not meet the requirements in the standards and they should not be given relief from that requirement.
- The percentage of glass requested was far too low for the proposal.
- Open space ordinance should be followed.
- Need to take into consideration the use of the hotel for people in transition that may have large profile vehicles that would not fit in the proposed parking structure.
- Parking access from the lobby was not convenient for patrons of the hotel.

Chairperson Lyon closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission, Applicant and Staff discussed the following:

- The access and entrances to the parking structure.
- The access to Wilmington Avenue from the property.
- The use of the garage for both public and hotel uses.
- The signage or visual plan for the hotel.
- The pedestrian experience between the hotel and the Toys R Us building.
- The public use of the outside spaces of the hotel and surrounding property.
- The hotel amenities and the location of the amenities.
- Why a hotel was the best use for the property.
- If other hotel brands were considered that did not require so many exceptions to the ordinance.

- Why the hotel brand was chosen and why the orientation of the hotel was proposed as shown.
- The difficulties with the slope of the property and the grade of Wilmington Avenue.
- The retail elements of the proposal.
- The ways to make the outside areas more inviting.
- The materials for the proposal.
- The intent of the Master Plan.
- The purpose of the glass requirement standard.
- If a different material could be used in place of glass and still meet the requirements.
- The glass requirement referred to the ground floor and not the entire face of the building.
- The future plan for the Toys R Us shopping center.

Commissioner Hoskins left for the evening. [9:30:01 PM](#)

The Commission discussed the following:

- The proposal was a well thought out plan and the Wilmington Avenue side could be addressed with Staff to change the façade.
- Should let Staff determine if the design elements were met.

MOTION [9:35:00 PM](#)

Commissioner Ruttinger stated regarding, PLNPCM2016-00528 & PLNSUB2016-00529 – Marriot Springhill Suites Hotel – Planned Development and Conditional Building and Site Design Review, based on the information in the Staff Report, public testimony, and discussion by the Planning Commission, he moved that the Planning Commission approve the Planned Development and Conditional and Building Site Design Review. Subject to the conditions one through seven as listed in the Staff Report. Commissioner Bachman seconded the motion.

The Commissioners stated why they supported or did not support the petition.

Commissioners Urquhart, Bachman, Garcia and Ruttinger voted “aye”. Commissioner Clark voted “nay”. The motion passed 4-1.

Mr. Norris stated the process for the Planned Development and Conditional and Building Site Design Review was currently under review and encouraged the Commissioners to send suggestions for improvements to the process to Staff.

The meeting adjourned at [9:37:50 PM](#).