

**SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**Room 326 of the City & County Building**  
**451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah**  
**Wednesday, June 22, 2016**

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:29:54 PM](#). Audio recordings of the Planning Commission meetings are retained for an indefinite period of time.

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

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were Ms. Nora Shepard, Planning Director; Michaela Oktay, Planning Manager; Michael Maloy, Senior Planner; Molly Robinson, Urban Designer, Anthony Riederer, Principal Planner; Amy Thompson, 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: Maurine Bachman, Michael Fife and Clark Ruttinger. Staff members in attendance were Nick Norris, Doug Dansie and Wayne Mills and JP Goates.

The following sites were visited:

- **1176/1182 South 400 East** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **974 E 2100 S.** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **550 East 2100 South** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **475 S 300 East** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.

**APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 8, 2016, MEETING MINUTES. [5:30:23 PM](#)**  
**MOTION [5:30:28 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Fife moved to approve the June 8, 2016, meeting minutes. Commissioner Bachman seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. Commissioners Hoskins and Paredes abstained from voting as they were not present at the meeting.**

**REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR [5:31:00 PM](#)**

Chairperson Drown stated thanked the Staff for their effort on finding new members of the Commission.

Vice Chairperson Paredes stated he had nothing to report.

**REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR [5:31:19 PM](#)**

Ms. Nora Shepard, Planning Director, reviewed the flyer sent out to recruit Planning and Historic Landmark Commission members. She reported on the name change for the department to Community and Neighborhoods.

[5:33:23 PM](#)

**Zenith 1 Planned Development 1176/1182 South 400 East - A request by Mitchell Spence, the owner of the properties, for a Planned Development to create five lots to construct single family detached dwellings with reduced required rear yard setbacks, and four of the dwellings would not have frontage on a public street. The properties are located at the above listed addresses in the R-1/5000 (Single Family Development) zoning district within Council District 5, represented by Erin Mendenhall. (Staff contact: Amy Thompson at (801)535-7281 or [amy.thompson@slcgov.com](mailto:amy.thompson@slcgov.com).) Case Number: PLNSUB2015-01008**

Ms. Amy Thompson, 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. Mitchell Spence and Mrs. Tiffany Spence, applicants, reviewed the proposal and why it was a benefit for the community. They reviewed the request for the relief of the setbacks and the energy efficient programs that would be included in the building design.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- The reason for the requested setbacks.
- How the development would affect the surrounding neighborhood.

**PUBLIC HEARING** [5:55:56 PM](#)

Chairperson Drown opened the Public Hearing

The following people spoke to the petition: Ms. Jaclyn Bishop, Ms. Rian Bornling, Ms. Marie Taylor and Mr. Rick Robins.

The following comments were made:

- Supports the development of the property to clean it up the area.
- Proposal would be a great improvement to the neighborhood.
- The environmental aspects would benefit the area.
- The development embraced the idea of community that existed in the area.
- Would not negatively affect the neighboring properties.
- Existing homes need to be demolished and replaced.

Chairperson Drown closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- The waste removal for the development.
- The conditions of approval in the Staff Report.

- The setbacks for the proposal.

**MOTION [6:05:08 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Fife stated regarding, PLNSUB2015-01008 Zenith1 Planned Development 1176 & 1182 South 400 East, based on the information in the Staff Report, public testimony, and discussion by the Planning Commission, he moved that the Planning Commission approve the petition subject to conditions one through nine in the Staff Report. Commissioner Hoskins seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

**[6:06:04 PM](#)**

**Apartment Building Conditional Building and Site Design Review at approximately 974 E 2100 S. - A request by John Gardiner for approval from the city for a new 126-unit multi-family apartment project. Specifically, the proposed development gross floor area (165,425 square feet) and building height (60 feet) requires additional consideration. In this zoning district (CSHBD2 Commercial Sugar House Business District), new construction of buildings that exceed 30 feet in height or 20,000 square feet in size are subject to the Planning Division's Conditional Building and Site Design Review (CBSDR) process outlined in chapter 21A.59 of the Salt Lake City Zoning Ordinance. The subject property is within Council District 7, represented by Lisa Adams. (Staff contact: Molly Robinson at (801)535-7261 or [molly.robinson@slcgov.com](mailto:molly.robinson@slcgov.com).) Case Number: PLPCCM2016-00299**

Ms. Molly Robinson, Urban Designer, 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:

- The height of the buildings, in the Sugar House Building District, in relation to the proposal.
- The buildings included in the development.
- The parking for the proposal.

Mr. John Gardiner, applicant, reviewed the proposal and how it would fit with the development of Sugar House. He discussed how the development would contribute to the neighborhood.

Mr. Warren Lloyd, Architect, reviewed the process to make sure the proposal met the needs of the area and the amenities of the structure.

Mr. Aaron Day, architect, reviewed the floor plans for the proposal, the interaction with the street and the landscape buffer. He reviewed the parking for the proposal.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- The areas where concrete would be used as a facade on the first floor of the structure and if that would be redesigned.
- The amenities of the facility for residents and public use.
- How many units would be in the structure and how many parking stalls would be included.

## **PUBLIC HEARING [6:37:21 PM](#)**

Chairperson Drown opened the Public Hearing

Ms. Judy Short, Sugar House Community Council, reviewed the discussions they had held regarding the development. She stated there was nothing interesting or that stood out on the building. Ms. Short stated the proposal did not reflect the definition of walkability and there needed to be something interesting in that area to draw people up the street. Ms. Short reviewed the issues with transportation and parking in Sugar House and stated the affordability of the units was important to bring diversity to the area.

The Commission and Ms. Short discussed the comments from the public and issue with all the buildings looking similar.

The following people spoke to the petition: Mr. George Chapman, Mr. Michael Budge, Mr. Jonathan Richards and Mr. Jim Johnson.

The following comments were made:

- Not a walkable project.
- Did not reduce the shadow impact on the street.
- Did not have mixed use on the ground floor as required in the ordinance.
- The design complimented the area and would fill a void in this type of housing.
- Sidewalks should be wider than proposed to make the area more walkable.
- Parking for the proposal was an issue.
- The heights of the surrounding buildings were less than the proposed structure.
- The lack of commercial should not be an issue for the proposal as others have had issues with keeping their commercial areas rented.
- Proposal fit with the area and walkable feel.
- People love Sugar House and the proposal would satisfy the need for this type of housing and fit the community.
- People like Sugar House and would walk the area.
- Project would enhance the neighborhood.
- This was the best development for the property and would fit with the neighborhood.

Chairperson Drown read the following card:

Mr. Phil Hathaway – recent U of U graduate, wife and I live in Sugar House for last three years. We love our apartment and are grateful to Gardiner Properties for the quality work they have done. We are especially happy to be in the heart of Sugar House. My wife and I love having everything so close by. I eat at Cubby’s weekly, my gym is in Sugar House, I shop at Smith’s and Whole Foods, I run the in the Park every other morning I spend night studying at Sprague Library. I am always a little disappointed in meetings similar to this when I listed to negative remarks about the “Sugar House” has become. There is no doubt to me that Sugar House is one of the most vibrant and enjoyable areas in the valley. Proof of this come from popular places to eat (we have so many) Monday food truck night (always packed), the great night life and any event in the Sugar House Courtyard. I anticipate these new apartments will with careful preparations bring in resident who really want to live here while respecting the Sugar House lifestyle.

Chairperson Drown closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- The areas considered for commercial uses on the street level of the proposal.
- The location of retail in relation to the proposal.
- If a smaller building was considered for the proposal.
- If there were height limits in the city plan.

**MOTION [7:03:02 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Ruttinger stated regarding, PLCPCM2016-00299 974 East 2100 South Apartments, he moved that the Planning Commission approve the petition based on the plans presented, information in the Staff Report, public testimony and the discussion by the Planning Commission. Commissioner Fife seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously**

**[7:03:51 PM](#)**

**Master Plan and Zoning Map Amendment at approximately 550 East 2100 South -**

**A request by Alec Harwin, on behalf of Myriad Capital, for a Master Plan Amendment and Zoning Map Amendment at the above listed address. These amendments will allow for the development of a mixed-used project which will have ground floor retail along 2100 South and two stories of residential units above. The development will have between 30 and 44 residential units with appropriate parking to serve residents and visitors. Currently the land is used as an indoor recreational facility and a single-family home, and is zoned in the CB (Community Business) District. The proposed project will require a Master Plan Amendment and a Zoning Map Amendment. The subject property is within Council District 5, represented by Erin Mendenhall. (Staff contact: Anthony Riederer at (801)535-7625 or [anthony.riederer@slcgov.com](mailto:anthony.riederer@slcgov.com).)**

- a. **Master Plan Amendment - In order to build the project noted above, a master plan amendment is required. The site is addressed in the Central Community Master Plan and is currently designated Community**

**Commercial. The proposal is to amend the Future Land Use map of the Central Community Master Plan such that the project site, the properties between 527 East 2100 South and 559 East 2100 South, is indicated as Medium-Density Residential Mixed Use. Case Number: PLNPCM2016-00080**

- b. Zoning Map Amendment - In order to build the project noted above, a Zoning Map Amendment is required to allow the development of the proposed mixed-use residential project, as outlined above. The site is currently zoned CB (Community Business), and the applicant is requesting the site be rezoned to RMU-35 (Residential/Mixed Use). Case Number: PLNPCM2016-00081**

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 favorable recommendation to the City Council.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The depth of the lot.

Mr. Alec Harwin, and Mr. Taylor Florence, applicants, reviewed the proposal and the use of the property.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING [7:13:33 PM](#)**

Chairperson Drown opened the Public Hearing

The following people spoke to the petition: Mr. George Chapman, Mr. Jason Peacock, Ms. Teresa Brown, Mr. Jon Liljanquist, Mr. Paul Wright, Mr. Mike Stidham, Ms. Pandora Holder, Ms. Lisa Hunsaker, Mr. Maxwell Loll, Mr. Randy Connell, Mr. Matt Oconner, Mr. Steven Roton, and Mr. Randolph Dwight Connell.

The following comments were made:

- The height of the proposal would block the privacy of the neighborhood.
- Would increase the traffic in the East Redondo area.
- Development did not fit with the area and would impede on the privacy of the neighboring properties.
- Parking would be an issue for the area.
- Please reject the proposal as it will not improve the area.
- People did not ride the Trolley and would drive to the area.
- The proposal affected the current tenants of the building and the landlord needed to hold up the current leases.
- The proposal would ruin the uniqueness of the neighborhood.
- This was an established neighborhood and proposal would cause issues for the area.

- The deep excavation around the older homes should be addressed and insured that they are not negatively affected in any manner.

Chairperson Drown closed the Public Hearing.

The Applicants stated they would following the building codes and ordinances required by the City to develop the property.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- The different zoning that would allow the requested height.
- The way the privacy of the neighbors would be protected.
- The number of units in the proposal.
- The proposal was only for the zoning not the actual development.
- The current parking for the property.
- The square footage allowed under the different zoning.
- How the construction of the development would affect the neighboring area.
- The different criteria used to consider rezones and proposals.
- The benefits of rezoning the property as requested.

**MOTION [7:51:36 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Ruttinger stated regarding, PLNPCM20106-00080 and PLNPCM2016-00081 Master Plan Amendment and Zoning Map Amendment for six parcels at approximately 550 East 2100 South, 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 Master Plan and Zoning Amendments. Commissioner Bachman seconded the motion. Commissioners Fife, Ruttinger Bachman, Hoskins and Paredes voted aye. Commissioner Lyon voted nay. The motion passed 5-1.**

Commissioner fife stated he was voting in favor to help move the building farther from the neighboring properties

Commissioner Lyon stated he was not in favor as there was not a answer to how big the foot print of the building was to be.

Commissioner Ruttinger thanked the public for their comments and hoped they felt the Commission had thought through the proposal to reach a better option for the area. Ms. Shepard reviewed the next steps for the proposal and the additional public comments that could be shared with the City Council.

**[7:53:57 PM](#)**

Commissioner Paredes left for the evening,

**[7:54:37 PM](#)**

**Map Amendment at approximately 475 S 300 East - A request by Salt Lake City Corporation, represented by Daniel Rip to amend a small portion of the subject lot located at the above listed address. The purpose of the amendment is to rezone the portion to TSA-UC-C, so that it is consistent with the zoning of the parcels to the north. The subject property is located in the PL-2 (Public Lands) Zoning District and is located in Council District #4, represented by Derek Kitchen. (Staff contact: Kelsey Lindquist at (801)535-7930 or [kelsey.lindquist@slcgov.com](mailto:kelsey.lindquist@slcgov.com).) Case Number: PLNPCM2016-00303**

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 forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council.

Mr. Todd Reeder, City Capitol Asset Manger, reviewed the proposal and reason for the rezone.

**PUBLIC HEARING [7:57:56 PM](#)**

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

**MOTION [7:58:15 PM](#)**

Commissioner Fife stated regarding, PLNPCM2016-00303, 475 South 300 East – Zoning Map Amendment, based on the findings and analysis in the staff report, testimony, discussion and public hearing, he moved that the Planning Commission transmit a positive recommendation to the City Council for the proposed zoning amendment. Commissioner Lyon seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**[7:58:55 PM](#)**

**Accessory Dwelling Units Amendment - A request by Salt Lake City to broaden and clarify accessory dwelling unit regulations within the following districts where single-family dwellings are permitted: FR-1/43,560, FR-2/21,780, FR-3/12,000, R-1/12,000, R-1/7,000, R-1/5,000, SR-1, SR-3, R-2, RMF-30, RMF-35, RMF-45, RMF-75, RB, R-MU-35, R-MU-45, R-MU, RO, FP, AG, AG-2, AG-5, AG-20 and MU. 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](mailto:michael.maloy@slcgov.com).) Case Number: PLNPCM2014-00447**

Mr. Michael Maloy, Senior Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff was recommending the Planning Commission forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- How attached ADU's were different than traditional additions to homes.



- The allowable height of an ADU.
- The difference between hobby shops and ADUs.
- The reasons ADUs are allowed in one place versus another.

**PUBLIC HEARING [8:22:55 PM](#)**

Chairperson Drown opened the Public Hearing

Ms. Judy Short, Sugar House Community Council, stated there should be a minimum lot size for ADUs and only approved if there was available parking. She stated there should be only one person in charge of approving these types of units. Ms. Short stated this would be someone that would research each application to see if they fit with the neighborhoods. She stated some zones would not be adequate for ADUs like RMF.

The following people spoke to the petition: Ms. Cindy Cromer and Mr. Jim Burdett.

The following comments were made:

- Thanked Staff for their work on the proposal.
- Need to figure out the result of the ordinance and its outcome.
- Was impossible to require one of the units be occupied by the property owner.
- ADUs are very expensive to construct.
- The ordinance was a great addition for the city and should be approved.
- Should be forwarded to the Council with no borders and let them decide what should be done.

Chairperson Drown read the following cards:

Ms. Marie Taylor – Owner occupied should be removed, should be able to go from two to three or three to four, ADU opportunity to resolve odd units that don't qualify for other unity legalization methods.

Mr. George Chapman- in opposition to the proposal.

Chairperson Drown closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- If there something that hold up when the proposal went to the City Council.
- The review process for ADUs.
- How the City Council would review the proposal and if there was an end point for the ordinance.

**MOTION [8:42:09 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Lyon stated regarding, PLNPCM2014-00447 Accessory Dwelling Units Amendment, based on the findings and analysis in the Staff Report, testimony received, and discussion at the public hearing, he moved that the**

**Planning Commission transmit a positive recommendation to the City Council to adopt the proposed zoning text amendment related to accessory dwelling units in districts that permit single-family dwellings. Commissioner Bachman seconded the motion. Commissioners Ruttinger, Hoskins, Bachman and Lyon voted aye. Commissioner Fife voted nay. The motion passed 4-1**

Commissioner Ruttinger stated it should be left to the City Council to decide the boundaries for the proposal and let the zoning regulate the size and percentage of the lot could be covered by the ADU.

**The meeting adjourned at [8:43:51 PM](#)**