

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
City & County Building
451 South State Street, Room 326, Salt Lake City, Utah
Wednesday, November 30, 2016

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:30:00 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, Emily Drown, Ivis Garcia, Andres Paredes and Sara Urquhart. Commissioner Clark Ruttinger was excused.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were Nick Norris, Planning Manager; Lex Traughber, Senior 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, and Sara Urquhart. Staff members in attendance were Nick Norris, Lex Traughber and Anthony Riederer.

The following sites were visited:

- **868 E. 2700 South and 2716 S. 900 East** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal. The following questions were asked:
 - **Q** - Location of the access.
 - **A** - There is an easement from 2700 South for three homes and one from the cul-de-sac.
- **3101 S 900 East through 3129 S 900 East** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal. The following questions were asked:
 - **Q** – Could the Planning Commission request a change from a long lot to smaller lots?
 - **A** –There were a variety of lot sizes in the area.
 - **Q** – Was the character standard referring to the existing home and did the homes provide that?
 - **A** – Yes the models provided were examples but they have to meet the zoning requirements and the neighborhood was eclectic.
 - **Q** – Were the homes all the same?
 - **A** – The developer could answer that question but the Commission could consider conditions to address the issue.

APPROVAL OF THE November 9, 2016, MEETING MINUTES. [5:30:17 PM](#)
MOTION [5:30:19 PM](#)

Commissioner Bachman moved to approve the November 9, 2016, meeting minutes. Commissioner Paredes seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR [5:31:35 PM](#)

Chairperson Lyon stated he had nothing to report.

Vice Chairperson Hoskins stated he had nothing to report.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR [5:31:42 PM](#)

Mr. Nick Norris, Planning Manager, reminded the Commission of the training meeting on December 1, and the next Planning Commission meeting would be held on December 14.

[5:32:06 PM](#)

City Wide Draft Transit Master Plan - The draft plan, developed over the past two years with input from thousands of residents and stakeholders, is available for review online at www.slcrides.org. Public transportation is an essential component of Salt Lake City's transportation network, and the plan creates a 20-year vision and action plan for service, transit-supportive investments, programs and policies. The plan also includes a comprehensive look at the City's overall travel patterns, identifies places where transit would be used if it met the needs of potential riders, as well as areas where transit improvements are needed for existing riders. Public comment can be submitted through open city hall at www.slcgov.com or through the staff contact below. The Planning Commission is required to make a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council will make a decision on whether or not to adopt the transit master plan at a later date. (Staff contact is Julianne Sabula at (801)535-6678 or julianne.sabula@slcgov.com)

Ms. Juliane Sabula, Transportation, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff was recommending the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The Comments received from the public since the last meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING

Chairperson Lyon opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Mr. George Chapman, Ms. Judy Short, and Mr. Don Butterfield.

The following comments were made:

- The plan needed more work and public input.
- All public comments should be included in the plan.
- The airport Trax reconfiguration should be included in the plan.

- There were too many items not addressed and that needed to be reviewed prior to the plans approval.
- Priorities needed to be outlined in the Master Plan.
- Bus service was cheaper than rail service and more of an immediate need.
- Infrastructure needed to be updated and included in the plan.
- Simplification and back to basics was a must then the plan could move forward.
- Work to get the public on the buses now.
- Implement the transit grid now and the other plans later.
- Education on how to use the bus system would benefit the public.
- Foothill plan should be included in the subject plan.
- Transport hubs with park-n-rides needed to be part of the plan.
- Needed to be more specific and give a timeline for implementation.
- Plan should be tabled for further review.
- Simple and elegant solutions were neglected.
- Need to address the growth in population now and not later.
- Services needed to be reliable.

Chairperson Lyon closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- The comments from Open City Hall and if those were included in the plan.
- The role of a Master Plan and how budgets are affected by a Master Plan.
- How bus service, security, safety and infrastructure were addressed in the plan.
- The access to the “HIVE” pass and education regarding the pass.
- The rapid bus transit to Davis County.
- How the Airport plan would affect the Transit Master Plan.
- The public outreach for the proposal.

The Commission discussed the following:

- Important for the public to continue submitting comments.
- Encouraged continued engagement outside of the normal structures.

MOTION [6:00:34 PM](#)

Commissioner Bachman stated regarding Transit Master Plan, based on the analysis and findings listed in the Staff Report dated November 5, 2016, the testimony from the public and plans presented, she move that the Planning Commission transmit a positive recommendation to the City Council for the proposal. Commissioner Clark seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

[6:01:29 PM](#)

27th Street Cottages Zoning Map Amendment, Subdivision and Planned Development at approximately 868 E. 2700 South and 2716 S. 900 East - Adam Nash, representing Growth Aid LLC, is requesting approval from the City to develop five (5) residential lots on two properties located at the above listed

address. The existing home on the 2700 South property will be demolished and the home on the 900 East property will remain. The project requires a zoning map amendment, a subdivision, and planned development approval. The two properties are currently zoned R-1/7,000 (Single Family Residential District), and are located in City Council District 7, represented by Lisa Adams. (Staff contact: Lex Traughber, (801)535-6184, or lex.traughber@slcgov.com.)

- a. **Zoning Map Amendment – A request to amend the zoning map for the subject properties from R-1/7,000 (Single Family Residential) to R-1/5,000 (Single Family Residential). Case Number PLNPCM2016-00577**
- b. **Preliminary Subdivision Plat – A request to subdivide and reconfigure two existing parcels into five new parcels. One parcel will contain an existing home and four new vacant residential parcel will be created. Case Number PLNSUB2016-00578**
- c. **Planned Development – A request for planned development approval to address the creation of a lot without street frontage and the creation of a development with average lot sizes to meet or exceed the 5,000 square foot minimum in the R-1/5,000 Zone. Case Number PLNSUB2016-00579**

Mr. Lex Traughber, Senior Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the Subdivision and Planned Development requests as proposed at approximately 868 E. 2700 South and 2716 S. 900 East, forward a positive recommendation to the City Council regarding the Zoning Map Amendment request as proposed and that if the City Council did not approve the Zoning Map Amendment request, any approval by the Planning Commission of the Planned Development and Subdivision requests became null and void.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- If a Master Plan amendment was necessary for the plan.
- The orientation of each property.
- The access to the properties.
- The location of the front yards and if the setbacks were met.
- The square footage of each lot.

Mr. Adam Nash, Growth Aid LLC, reviewed the proposal and square footage for the lots. He reviewed the alley access, parking and layout of the development. Mr. Nash stated there would be a walkway through the development to the school and the design of the homes.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:17:40 PM](#)

Chairperson Lyon opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Judy Short, Sugar House Community Council, stated the Community Council approved the proposal and it was a unique way to add single family housing to Sugar House. She stated they liked the sidewalk connection that would be added with the

proposal and the removal of the blighted homes in the area. Ms. Short reviewed the public outreach for the proposal and stated there was not a lot of objection to the project.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Mr. Mike Jamesoul, Ms. Linda Thomas, Mr. Gary Wilkinson, Mr. Kent Frandsen, Mr. John Blankevoort and Mr. George Chapman.

The following comments were made and questions asked:

- Would the proposal set a precedent for the area?
- Would the development affect the property values of the neighborhood?
- The access to the development off of Sierra Circle.
- The parking for the proposal needed to be clarified.
- Four lots would be better than five.
- Should not allow properties to be landlocked.
- What was the timeline for the proposal and cleanup of the property?
- Supported the sidewalk through the property.
- Concerned over the increase traffic to the area.
- Did not like the sidewalk to Sierra Circle as it would promote bad behavior in the area.
- Roads in the area needed to be fixed before additional traffic was added.
- Was the alley dedicated, who owned it and who was responsible to maintain it?
- The city boundaries on the property.
- What was the mitigation plan to curb the loitering and crime in the area?
- What was the proposed zoning for the area?
- Supported the proposal as it would remove a vacant home.
- Would benefit the kids in the area to have the walkway through the block.
- The proposal was doubling the density but was minimal for what was allowed in the area.
- It was the quickest way to get rid of the blighted home.

Chairperson Lyon closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Nash reviewed the frontage, parking, benefits of and timeline for the proposal.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- The maintenance and ownership of the alley way.
- If an HOA would be part of the development.
- The timeline for the proposal.
- How the walkway would be laid out along the property.
- How the lot sizes and zoning compared to others properties in the area.
- How the proposal impacted the neighboring lots and affected property values.
- The cost of the proposed homes.
- The access from the street to Sierra Circle.
- Why the lot sizes changed in the area over the years.

- If a condition of approval requiring a study to determine if access to the property was achievable.
- The proposed density was less than the surrounding zoning allowed resulting in a benefit to the area.

The Commission discussed the following:

- There were concerns but the developer was willing to address the concerns for the benefit of the community.
- The conditions and language of the motion.

MOTION [6:54:30 PM](#)

Commissioner Clark stated regarding Petition 27th Street Cottages – Petition PLNPCM2016-00577 – Zoning Map Amendment, Petition PLNSUB2016-00578 – Subdivision, Petition PLNSUB2016-00579 – Planned Development, based on the analysis and findings listed in the Staff Report, testimony and the proposal presented, he moved that the Planning Commission approve the Subdivision and Planned Development requests as proposed, and forward a positive recommendation to the City Council regarding the Zoning Map Amendment request to rezone the property from R-1/7,000 to R-1/5,000. If the City Council does not approve the Zoning Map Amendment request, any approval by the Planning Commission of the Planned Development and Subdivision requests becomes null and void. The Planning Commission finds that the proposed project complies with the review standards as demonstrated in Attachments E, F and G of the Staff Report and the approval of the Planned Development and Subdivision request is subject to the conditions listed in the Staff Report and in addition the confirmation of access to Sierra Park Circle and that the Commission was approving the petition as a Planned Development and all other zoning requirements still apply that are not modified by the Planned Development. Commissioner Urquhart seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

[6:56:08 PM](#)

Cottage Court Development - Zoning Map Amendment, Subdivision and Planned Development at approximately 3101 S 900 East through 3129 S 900 East - Adam Nash, representing Growth Aid LLC, is requesting approval from the City to develop sixteen (16) residential lots on four properties located at the above listed address. The existing homes on the properties would be demolished to facilitate this project. The project requires a zoning map amendment, a subdivision, and planned development approval. The two properties are currently zoned R-1/7,000 (Single Family Residential District), and are located in City Council District 7, represented by Lisa Adams. (Staff contact: Anthony Riederer, (801)535-7625, or anthony.riederer@slcgov.com.)

- Zoning Map Amendment – A request to amend the zoning map for the subject properties from R-1/7,000 (Single Family Residential) to R-1/5,000 (Single Family Residential). Case Number PLNPCM2016-00542**
- Preliminary Subdivision Plat – A request to subdivide and reconfigure four existing parcels into sixteen new parcels. Case Number PLNSUB2016-00541**

- c. Planned Development – A request for planned development approval to address the creation of a lots without street frontage, for relief from required yards, and for the creation of a development with average lot sizes to meet or exceed the 5,000 square foot minimum in the R-1/5,000 Zone. Case Number PLNSUB2016-00542.**

Mr. Anthony Riederer, 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 approve the Subdivision and Planned Development requests as proposed at approximately 3075-3129 South 900 East, forward a positive recommendation to the City Council regarding the Zoning Map Amendment request as proposed and that the Subdivision and Planned Development are conditioned upon approval of the new zoning. Hence, should the City Council not approve the Zoning Map Amendment request, any approval by the Planning Commission of the Planned Development and Subdivision requests become null and void.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The size of the surrounding lots.
- The setbacks for the proposal.
- The zoning request and how it differed from the surrounding area.
- Why the reductions in setbacks were being requested if the lots were smaller.
- The width of the street and why city garbage services would not be available on the street.
- Why an HOA was not necessary for the maintenance of the street.
- Emergency services access.

Mr. Adam Nash, Growth Aid LLC, reviewed the proposal, access to the property, and the maintenance agreement that would be recorded with the properties. He reviewed the surrounding uses and lot sizes, how the development would benefit the area, why the setback reductions were requested and asked the Commission for approval of the proposal.

PUBLIC HEARING [7:17:47 PM](#)

Chairperson Lyon opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Judy Short, Sugar House Community Council, reviewed the other projects given similar approvals. She stated the proposal was ideal and more lots in the area should go through the same process. Ms. Short stated the development was a benefit and kept with the trends of the city. She stated the only negative was that the garbage service would create issues with parking.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Mr. George Chapman and Mr. Clark McIntosh.

The following comments were made:

- Increase in density would be double what existed.
- Would cause issues with emergency access to the properties.
- Table the issue to allow further review on setbacks.
- The homes were not affordable housing as stated.
- Mature trees were not being saved as required by the ordinance.
- The west setback was not an issue but the backyard setback should mirror what was required by other homes in the area.
- Water lines should be increase to allow for better fire suppression systems.
- Area was an eyesore and proposal would clean it up.
- Encouraged developer to buy other properties in the area.

Chairperson Lyon closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Nash stated the homes were affordable per HUD's definition. He reviewed the emergency services access, garages and parking, the request for setback reduction and why the proposal would benefit the area.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- The definition of affordable housing and how the proposal fit the definition.
- The homes that were proposed to be demolished.
- The trees that would be saved or removed from the property.
- If the homes would be similar or vary in design.
- The other departments that reviewed the proposal and the comments from those departments.
- The conditions of approval that should be part of the motion.
- The standards for protecting existing trees and if conditions could be added to the motion.
- The approval process for the petition.
- Public comments from residences on Lincoln Street.
- How the proposal would affect the privacy of neighboring properties.

The Commission discussed the following:

- The reduction in setbacks and the effect to the area.
- The allowable building height for the area and the Commissions purview over the height.
- The response from the neighborhood regarding the proposal.
- If the applicant would be willing to change the setbacks for the proposal.
- How to change the design and allow for the requested setbacks.
- The Commission's purview over the design of the homes.
- If the homes would be visible from the street and if the repeated design would be noticed.
- The size and scale of the homes along 900 East were a concern.

MOTION [8:11:10 PM](#)

Commissioner Clark stated regarding Petition Cottage Court Development –

Petition PLNPCM2016-00542 – Zoning Map Amendment, Petition PLNSUB2016-00541 – Subdivision, Petition PLNSUB2016-00540 – Planned Development, based on the analysis and findings listed in the Staff Report, testimony and the proposal presented, he moved that the Planning Commission approve the Subdivision and Planned Development requests as proposed, and forward a positive recommendation on to the City Council regarding the Zoning Map Amendment request to rezone the property from R-1/7,000 to R-1/5,000. If the City Council does not approve the Zoning Map Amendment request, any approval by the Planning Commission of the Planned Development and Subdivision requests becomes null and void. The Planning Commission finds that the proposed project complies with the review standards as demonstrated in Attachments E, F and G of the Staff Report the Planned Development and Subdivision request is subject to the conditions listed in the Staff Report and in addition, on the eastern four lots the eastern setback will be ten feet, in exchange the garage door would be allow to be no more than 18 feet wide on the four eastern specified properties, any specimen tree that was in a required yard area must be preserved, a note put on the subdivision plat that these were private streets and responsibility of maintenance fell to the property owner. Commissioner Urquhart seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at [8:16:28 PM](#)