

**SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**Room 326 of the City & County Building**  
**451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah**  
**Wednesday, February 24, 2016**

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:33:22 PM](#). Audio recordings of the Planning Commission meetings are retained for an indefinite period of time.

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

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director; Michaela Oktay, Planning Manager; Casey Stewart, Senior Planner; Jonathan Goates, Principal Planner; Christopher Lee, Principal Planner; Tracy Tran, Principal Planner; Kelsey Lindquist, Associate 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, Maurine Bachman, Carolynn Hoskins, Andres Paredes and Clark Ruttinger. Staff members in attendance were Michaela Oktay, Jonathan Goates, Tracy Tran, Christopher Lee and Kelsey Lindquist.

The following sites were visited:

- **2471 South and 1700 East** – Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **1059 East 900 South** – Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **845 W Hoyt Place** – Staff gave an overview of the proposal.

[5:33:49 PM](#)

Ms. Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director, reviewed the request for reconsideration. She reviewed the process and basis for reconsideration.

[5:34:07 PM](#)

Commissioners Gallegos and Dean arrived at the meeting.

The Commission and Staff discussed the process and criteria for reconsideration, the next steps for the proposal and if a motion was needed.

[5:39:11 PM](#)

**APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 10, 2016, MEETING MINUTES.**

**MOTION [5:39:06 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Fife moved to approve the February 10, 2016, meeting minutes. Commissioner Dean seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. Commissioner Gallegos abstained from voting as he was not present at the subject meeting.**

**REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR [5:40:05 PM](#)**

Vice Chairperson Paredes stated he had nothing to report.

**REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR [5:40:11 PM](#)**

Ms. Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director, reviewed the Historic Preservation workshops in March. She asked the Commissioners to let Staff know if they would like to attend.

The Commission and Staff discussed when Staff was going to give a report on the TSA zoning and the current legislation for Historic Districts.

[5:43:40 PM](#)

**Salt Lake Swimming and Tennis Club Addition at approximately 2471 South and 1700 East - A request by Ben Schreiter, architect, for approval of a proposed addition to the Salt Lake Swimming and Tennis Club with a reduced north setback and additional height. This project is being reviewed as a planned development because the applicant is asking for a zero feet (0') north setback and five feet (5') in additional height. The property is located at the above listed address and is in the OS zoning district (Open Space) in Council District 7, represented by Lisa Adams. (Staff contact: Tracy Tran at (801)535-7645 or [tracy.tran@slcgov.com](mailto:tracy.tran@slcgov.com))  
Case Number -PLNSUB2015-01012**

Ms. Tracy Tran, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff was recommending the Planning Commission approve the petition as presented.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following

- If there were UDOT easements on the property line.

Mr. Dade Rose, applicant, reviewed the project, history and future of the tennis club.

Mr. Ben Schreiter, applicant, reviewed the layout and design of the proposal. He discussed the UDOT easements on the property and stated the easements would not affect the proposal. Mr. Schreiter reviewed the parking and how the new facilities would enhance the area.

Mr. Rose reviewed how the proposal met the standards of the ordinance.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant reviewed the following:

- The location of the solar panels on the roof.
- The issues with adding solar on the existing tennis shed.
- If the proposed height included the height of the solar panels.
- The final pitch of the roof would be reviewed by Staff.
- The green features of the building.
- The definition of general public.
- The community amenities of the facility.

**PUBLIC HEARING [6:19:44 PM](#)**

Vice Chairperson Paredes opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Judy Short, Sugar House Community Council, stated the Community Council supported the proposal. She stated hosting tennis tournaments, the improvements and trail connections would be a large amenity to the area. Ms. Short stated the general response was positive and negative comments were mainly about parking.

Mr. Chris Manning stated he supported the proposal, loved the red tennis courts but was glad to see them go in order for the improvements. He stated the club was an asset to the area and community.

Vice Chairperson Paredes closed the Public Hearing.

**MOTION [6:26:16 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Gallegos stated regarding, PLNSUB2015-01012, Salt Lake Swimming and Tennis Club Addition, based on the information in the Staff Report, public testimony, and discussion by the Planning Commission, he moved that the Planning Commission approve petition PLNSUB2015-01012, regarding the Salt Lake Swimming and Tennis Club planned development. Subject to conditions one through three in the Staff Report. Commissioner Ruttinger seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

**[6:27:18 PM](#)**

**Mixed Use Planned Development & Special Exception at approximately 1059 East 900 South - A request by Richard Martin for approval of a proposed mixed-use project which includes second story addition on an existing building and outdoor dining. Through the Planned Development, a reduced front & corner side yard setback is proposed to accommodate for the Outdoor Dining, reduced side yard building setback of one foot on the interior yard for the building addition. Building height in the RB zoning district is thirty (30') feet. The applicant is seeking five feet (5') in additional height to accommodate an elevator shaft and additional building height for two elevations of the second story addition. Relocation of required front**

**and corner side yard landscaping and additional glazing (50% to 95%) on the south and west elevations. A Special Exception is also being requested for outdoor dining. The property is located in a RB zoning district (Residential Business) in Council District 5, represented by Erin Mendenhall. (Staff contact: Kelsey Lindquist at (801)535-7930 or [kelsey.lindquist@slcgov.com](mailto:kelsey.lindquist@slcgov.com)) Case Number - PLNSUB2015-01019 and PLNPCM2016-00011**

Ms. Kelsey Lindquist, Associate Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff was recommending the Planning Commission approve the petition as presented.

Mr. Phil Winston and Mr. Ron White reviewed the proposal and how it met the standards in the ordinance. They reviewed the use of the building, parking, the elevator requirement, landscaping, noise and privacy features of the building.

The Commission, Staff and Applicants discussed the following:

- The public concerns regarding the style of the building and how it fit with the neighborhood.
- The design details of the building.

**PUBLIC HEARING [6:38:23 PM](#)**

Vice Chairperson Paredes opened the Public Hearing.

**[6:38:27 PM](#)**

Commissioner Lyon asked to be recused as there may be an appearance of a conflict of interest.

Vice Chairperson Paredes read the comment card from Ms. Cammille Chant in opposition to the proposal.

Mr. Darryl High, Community Council, reviewed the Community Council meeting and the presentation from the Developer. He stated parking was discussed, the proposal met the standards for the area and how the restaurant parking would be mitigated. Mr. High stated the elevator placement was great, the glazing fit with other properties in the area and the overall design would be an improvement to the area. He stated the Community Council supported the proposal.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Ms. Marie Taylor, Mr. Joseph Hatch, Ms. Sandra Hatch, Mr. Bryan Clifton, Ms. Marielos Patilogas, Ms. Judy Short and Ms. Cindy Cromer

The following comments were made:

- Parking was an issue in the area.

- The RB Zoning was appropriate but the building should not need exceptions to fit the zone.
- Building would not fit with the eclectic nature of the area.
- The building should be scaled down and changed to fit the area.
- Building did not meet the Master Plan or the zoning.
- The amount of glass did not fit with the nature of the area.
- Why was there a code if exceptions are given.
- The City was losing the small neighborhood areas where local businesses are showcased.
- Should revisit the zoning before opening the area up to these types of projects.
- Structure should be in a CB zone not RB.
- Need a picture of the streetscape to properly see how it the proposal fit with the neighborhood.
- Use of the word pleasing in the ordinance was appropriate.
- Building was not compatible with the existing surrounding uses.

The Commission asked Ms. Hatch if she participated in the Community Council meeting. She stated she did not.

The Commission asked Ms. Patilogas if the current building was compatible with the zoning. Ms. Patilogas stated she did not feel it was compatible but the proposal was for a remodel and there was more that could be done to make the building compatible.

Vice Chairperson Paredes closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Winston stated they appreciated the comments from the neighbors. He stated the buildings used as examples, in the Staff Report, were in the adjacent area and similar to the proposal.

Mr. White stated most of the exceptions were for the outdoor dining patio.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- If the property called for a Planned Development solution.
  - A building could be built within the zoning without a Planned Development.
  - The applicant applied for a Planned Development and should be considered.
- The purpose of the RB zone.
- The proposed building would be good for Neighborhood Commercial zone but not the RB zone.
- The compelling reason for the request.
- If encroachment was allowed for outdoor dining without the setback exception.
- Moving the landscaping to the rear of the property and if that was a reasonable request.
- The amount of glazing on the building and how it could be addressed
  - The Applicant stated they could break up the face of the building with brick to match the existing structure

- The materials that could be used for the proposal and if the applicant was willing to make changes.
- The community outreach for the proposal.
- The current building was out of character with the neighborhood and the new structure would not negatively impact it.
- Changing the amount of glazing on the building and allowing Planning Staff to make the decision on the final product.
- The use of the building.
- What constituted a sloped roof versus a pitched roof.
- How landscaping could be added to the front of the building in the public way.
- If the patio did or did not negate a Planned Development
- Direction to Staff on the glazing and if a percentage should be determined.

**MOTION [7:27:55 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Gallegos stated regarding, PLNSUB2015-01019 and PLNPCM2016-00011 Mixed Use Planned Development & Special Exception at approximately 1059 East 900 South, based on the findings listed in the Staff Report, discussion and public hearing, he moved that the Planning Commission approve PLNSUB2015-01019 and PLNPCM2016-00011, Subject to conditions one through six in the Staff Report and in addition :**

- 1. That Staff work with the Developer to meet the seventy percent glazing and also look at ways to improve the landscaping of the proposed development in the front yard.**

**Commissioner Ruttinger seconded the motion. Commissioners Gallegos, Bachman and Ruttinger voted “aye”. Commissioners Paredes, Fife, Hoskins and Dean voted “nay”. The motion failed 3-4.**

**[7:31:28 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Dean stated regarding PLNSUB2015-01019 Planned Development request, based on presentation, discussion and issues being raised about compatibility, scale and the standard for Planned Development for the RB zone and the RB zone objectives and purpose, she moved that the Planning Commission deny the petition. Commissioner Fife seconded the motion. Commissioners Paredes, Fife, Hoskins and Dean voted “aye” Commissioners Gallegos, Bachman and Ruttinger voted “nay”. The motion passed 4-3.**

**[7:32:58 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Dean PLNPCM2016-00011 Outdoor Dining Special Exception, she moved that the Planning Commission approve the outdoor dining within the front yard setbacks. Commissioner Ruttinger seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously**

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- What was approved and denied for the petition.
- The next steps for the proposal.
- The requirement for the elevator to meet ADA regulations.

[7:35:53 PM](#)

**Commissioner Fife moved to reconsider the petition. Commissioner Gallegos seconded the motion**

The Commission discussed the reasoning for the reconsideration.

**Commissioners Ruttinger, Bachman, Hoskins, Fife and Gallegos voted “aye” Commissioner Dean voted “nay”. The motion passed 5 - 1.**

[7:39:02 PM](#)

**Commissioner Fife stated regarding, PLNSUB2015-01019 Mixed Use Planned Development at approximately 1059 East 900 South, he moved that the Planning Commission approve the Planned Development items one, two and three and deny item four and item five that they relocate the front yard landscaping to the Public right of way, these items are listed as conditions in the Staff Report. Commissioner Gallegos seconded the motion.**

The Commission and Staff discussed the height of the building and how it could be addressed.

**Commissioner Ruttinger, Bachman, Hoskins, Fife and Gallegos voted “aye”. Commissioner Dean voted “nay”. The motion passed 5 - 1.**

Vice Chairperson Paredes reviewed the postponed agenda items.

[7:44:16 PM](#)

The Commission took a five minute break.

[7:49:46 PM](#)

The Commission reconvened

Commissioners Lyon returned to the meeting.

[7:50:45 PM](#)

**Hoyt Place Zoning Amendment at approximately 845 W Hoyt Place - A request by David Robinson, on behalf of multiple property owners, to amend the zoning map**

**for properties on the private street Hoyt Place to SR-3 Special Development Pattern Residential from R-1/5000 and R-1/7000 Single Family Residential. The purpose of the amendment is to allow for more flexible development and accommodate potential residential infill. The subject property is within Council District 2, represented by Andrew Johnston. (Staff contact: J.P. Goates at (801)535-7236 or [jp.goates@slcgov.com](mailto:jp.goates@slcgov.com)) Case Number - PLNPCM2015-00301**

Mr. Jonathan Goates, 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 required updates to the road and utilities if the properties were developed.
- Who owned the street and how it would be addressed when the property was developed.

Mr. David Robinson, applicant, reviewed the issues with developing the parcels and the public support for the petition. He reviewed the improvements that would be made to the road and area.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- The ownership of the road and how it would affect the proposal.
- The parking for the property.
- The potential development of the properties.
- If the additional parcels could be approved with the current application or were required to be done separately.
- The height limits of the proposed zoning and how they related to the current zoning.
- The setbacks for the current zoning versus the proposed zoning.
- The proposed homes would not front a street.
- The maintenance for the street.
- The density allowed under SR3.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING [8:09:32 PM](#)**

Vice Chairperson Paredes opened the Public Hearing. He read the comment cards in support of the petition from Ms. Marie Taylor and the questions from Mr. Eddy Del Rio.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Mr. David Charboneau, Mr. Tom DaVroom and Ms. Michelle Fahmy.

The following comments were made:

- The character of the neighborhood was at stake with the proposed zoning.
- SR-1 zoning would be more appropriate for the area.



- The developer was proposing to build multiple homes on small lots when the lots should remain similar to the surrounding properties.
- Parking for guest would need to be addressed.
- Design should allow for other properties to be included in the proposal.
- Have the street continue through to 800 West.
- Property lines needed to be clarified.
- Would like communication from the Developer for any upcoming projects on the properties.
- Bringing in new utilities and a HOA would impact the home owners in the area.

The Commission and Staff discussed if current property owners could be forced to participate in a HOA.

Vice Chairperson Paredes closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Robinson stated he would be contacting property owners regarding future development in the area. He discussed the parking for the proposals and stated his company typically liked to provide additional parking and pedestrian passage ways for developments.

The Commission, Applicant and Staff discussed the following.

- The reasoning for the requested zoning.
- The intensity of the proposed zoning.
- If setbacks and height would match the current zoning.

**MOTION [8:27:59 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Lyon stated regarding, PLNPCM2015-00301- Hoyt Place Zone Change from R-1/5,000 and R-1/7,000 to SR-3, 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 to the City Council for the proposed zoning amendment. Commissioner Fife seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

**[8:28:56 PM](#)**

Commissioners Gallegos recused himself from item seven through ten.

**[8:29:16 PM](#)**

**SLV Health Department Surplus Property Exchange at approximately 610 S 200 E - A request by Salt Lake City to convey a significant parcel of real estate pursuant to Municipal Code section 2.58.040 located at the above listed address to Salt Lake County. This is part of the Interlocal Cooperation Agreement between Salt Lake City and Salt Lake County dated December 22, 2015. (Staff contact: Christopher Lee at (801)535-7706 or [christopher.lee@slcgov.com](mailto:christopher.lee@slcgov.com)) Case Number - PLNPCM2016-00049**

**Sunday Anderson Senior Center Surplus Property Exchange at approximately 868 W 900 S** - A request by Salt Lake City to convey a significant parcel of real estate pursuant to Municipal Code section 2.58.040 located at the above listed address to Salt Lake County. This is part of the Interlocal Cooperation Agreement between Salt Lake City and Salt Lake County dated December 22, 2015. (Staff contact: Christopher Lee at (801)535-7706 or [christopher.lee@slcgov.com](mailto:christopher.lee@slcgov.com)) Case Number - PLNPCM2016-00050

**1000 E Senior Center Surplus Property Exchange at approximately 237 S 1000 E** - A request by Salt Lake City to convey a significant parcel of real estate pursuant to Municipal Code section 2.58.040 located at the above listed address to Salt Lake County. This is part of the Interlocal Cooperation Agreement between Salt Lake City and Salt Lake County dated December 22, 2015. (Staff contact: Christopher Lee at (801)535-7706 or [christopher.lee@slcgov.com](mailto:christopher.lee@slcgov.com)) Case Number - PLNPCM2016-00051

**Liberty Senior Center Surplus Property Exchange at approximately 251 E 700 S** - A request by Salt Lake City to convey a significant parcel of real estate pursuant to Municipal Code section 2.58.040 located at the above listed address to Salt Lake County to Salt Lake County. This is part of the Interlocal Cooperation Agreement between Salt Lake City and Salt Lake County dated December 22, 2015. (Staff contact: Christopher Lee at (801)535-7706 or [christopher.lee@slcgov.com](mailto:christopher.lee@slcgov.com)) Case Number - PLNPCM2016-00052

Mr. Christopher Lee, 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:

- A formal motion was not required for the petitions.
- The process for the land swap.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING [8:34:53 PM](#)**

Vice Chairperson Paredes opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Cindy Cromer reviewed the history of the tennis courts on 10<sup>th</sup> East. She stated it was important to put a condition on the petition, especially where there are abutting properties that if the City or County decided to sell the adjacent property the other entity would be given the first right of refusal.

Vice Chairperson Paredes closed the Public Hearing.

**The meeting adjourned at [8:37:51 PM](#)**