

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

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:30:24 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 Michael Gallegos, Ivis Garcia,Carolynn Hoskins, Matt Lyon, Clark Ruttinger and Sarah Urquhart. Commissioner Maurine Bachman was excused.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were Nora Shepard, Planning Director; John Anderson, Senior Planner; Casey Stewart, Senior Planner; Daniel Echeverria, Principal Planner; Michelle Moeller, Administrative Secretary and Megan DePaulis, City Attorney.

Field Trip

A field trip was held prior to the work session. Planning Commissioners present were: Emily Drown, Carolyn Hoskins, Sarah Urquhart and Clark Ruttinger. Staff members in attendance were John Anderson and David Gellner.

The following sites were visited:

- **2189 S McClelland Avenue** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.

APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 10, 2016, MEETING MINUTES. [5:30:36 PM](#)
MOTION [5:30:40 PM](#)

Commissioner Ruttinger moved to approve the August 10, 2016, meeting minutes as amended. Commissioner Gallegos seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR [5:30:56 PM](#)

Chairperson Drown welcome Commissioner Sarah Urquhart to the Planning Commission.

Vice Chairperson Paredes reminded the Commission about the training meeting on Saturday, August 27.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR [5:32:08 PM](#)

Ms. Nora Shepard, Planning Director, reviewed the time extension for the Regent Street Hotel and asked the Commission for a motion.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The changes to the design and why the extension was requested.

- If the applicant was present at the meeting.

MOTION [5:34:53 PM](#)

Commissioner Gallegos stated regarding, Regent Street Hotel Design Approval Time Extension PLNPCM2015-00463, based on the plans submitted, the Staff Report and testimony provided, he moved that the Planning Commission grant the time extension as requested. Commissioner Ruttinger seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Shepard reviewed the FB-UN2 rezone for Trolley Square, the issues with noticing for the proposal and that the Applicant preferred to start the public noticing period over. She reviewed the time line for the proposal and how the process would be followed.

[5:37:51 PM](#)

Sugarmont Apartments at approximately 2189 S McClelland Avenue - A request by Jeff Vitek, representing Boulder Ventures, for the approval of a Planned Development and Conditional Building and Site Design in order to construct a 352 unit multi-family residential development at the above listed address. The property is located in the CSHBD1 Sugar House Business District. The properties are located within Council District 7, represented by Lisa Adams. (Staff Contact: John Anderson at (801)535-7214, or john.anderson@slcgov.com)

- Conditional Building and Site Design - The applicant has made a request for Conditional Building and Site Design approval for the proposed project as the Zoning Ordinance requires that any structure in the CSBHD1 Sugar House Business District that exceeds 50 feet or 20,000 square feet must be approved through this process. Case number PLNPCM2015-00847**
- Planned Development - The applicant has also made a request to modify two requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. These modifications must be approved as a Planned Development. The two requests would only affect a portion of the south façade of a building located near the intersection of McClelland Street and Sugarmont Drive. The first request is to exceed the maximum front yard setback along Sugarmont Drive. The second request is that the building not be required to step back the building façade 15 feet after it rises higher than 30 feet in height. Case number PLNPCM2016-00511**

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.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The setback of the proposed building along the S Line.

Mr. Jeff Vitek, Boulder Ventures, and Mr. Robert Miiller, architect, reviewed the design, parking, setbacks and layout of the proposal.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- The setbacks from the S Line corridor.
- The street interaction with the building.
- The use of the building's ground floor.
- What draws people through the pedestrian space, to the north.
- The location of the café on the first floor.
- The signage for the proposal.
- The designs of the public path way through the property.
- The number of bedrooms in the townhomes.
- If any of the units will be Handicap accessible.
- The height of the structure.
- If commercial uses would be included in the proposal.
- The directional signage for the proposal.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:15:19 PM](#)

Chairperson Drown opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Judi Short, Sugar House Community Council, stated the project had improved over the review period. She reviewed the standards/conditions of approval listed in the Staff Report and why they were important to the proposal. Ms. Short stated parking for adjacent retail services needed to be included in the proposal for evening use, signage was a must for the proposal to direct people through the plaza. Ms. Short reviewed how the alley way and public path could be addressed to be more public friendly, the ingress and egress for the proposal would affect the area, how to break up the building and make it look like a number of different buildings, that the alignment of the tunnel needed to reflect the old Granite Furniture entry. Ms. Short stated there needed to be a COA for each phase of the project, Planning and Transportation needed to review the traffic pattern and pedestrian flow of the area, the sidewalk needed to be widened and the Commission was doing a great job in helping Sugar House evolve.

The Commission and Ms. Short discussed why parking was needed for retail customers. It was asked why the development should provide parking for other establishments. Ms. Short stated most of the spots were needed for the developer's employees and took away from the business parking. They discussed how to make the south façade more interesting.

The following people spoke to the petition: Ms. Lynn Schwartz, Mr. Scott Kisling, Ms. Kim Ecklund, Mr. Joedy Lister, Mr. Milton Braselton and Mr. Jave Mulder.

The following comments were made:

- The building was an improvement but there was not a reason a setback of thirty feet could not be reached.
- The garage doors needed to be improved possibly with a trellis.
- Great apartment for people that live in them.
- The location of the door and the need to break up the length of the wall.

- There was nothing in writing that ensured the road would be installed.
- Development was not ready for approval.
- Supported the proposal and design of the building.
- Liked that there was no commercial space to compete with the existing businesses.
- The need for apartments was great as most of the existing units were rented.
- Would bring in more successful people to the area.
- The size of the walkway was sufficient.
- Having multiple colors on the structure would get too busy for the building.
- The parking that would be removed would not affect the restaurants that are currently in the area.
- A midblock crosswalk on Highland would be a benefit.
- The Sugar House Business District Vision statement and how the proposal effected that vision statement.
- The development design should reflect the vision statement and the proposed building was headed in the right direction
- The block should be developed holistically to ensure midblock connectivity.
- Form, function and look of the building was great but needed more ground floor activity.
- Building made a great artistic statement for the area and should work with other developments to connect midblock walkways.
- The traffic impact study was not complete.
- Street layout could not handle the increase in traffic.
- The approval of the project would be a traffic detriment to the area.
- Not in scale to the number of people that would need parking in the area.

The Commission and Ms. Ecklund discussed the parking for her business and if the parking on the subject property would reduce the parking for local businesses in the area or if parking was available. They discussed if Ms. Ecklund was concerned over the addition of a coffee shop in the proposed building. Ms. Ecklund stated a coffee shop would be a great addition to the building and not an issue for surrounding businesses.

Chairperson Drown closed the Public Hearing.

The Applicants stated they were committed to extending the space to the adjacent trails along the property. They reviewed the sidewalk project with the City and they would widen the sidewalk on McClelland. The Applicants stated they had met with FFKR, the developer of the Dixon Building, to align the public walkways and were working to coordinate the passageways. They reviewed the parking for the proposal and stated the proposal was for more parking than required under the ordinance. The Applicant reviewed the design and use of the café element, signage for the proposal, the traffic for the area and that the residential use would create less traffic than a commercial use.

Staff reviewed the McClelland Trail proposal that was included in the Staff Report.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- If there was anything requiring the pedestrian walk through.
- The parking for the proposal and if neighboring businesses would be affected by the removal of the existing parking on the property.
- The standards of approval for the project.
- The height of neighboring structures.
- The setbacks for the proposal.
- If affordable units would be part of the proposal.
- How to address the length of the wall and breaking up the design.
- If commercial or retail could be added to the proposal.
- Why commercial elements would not work for the development.
- The width of the walkway and the width of the unobstructed portion of the path.
- The easements for public access through the property.
- The benches and public activities that could be in the public way.
- The fencing for the proposal.
- The waste programs for the proposal.

MOTION [7:19:26 PM](#)

Commissioner Ruttinger stated regarding, Sugarmont Apartments 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 request subject to conditions one through ten listed in the Staff Report, in addition a condition to work with staff final approval of signage, and including way finding signage for the proposal.

Commissioner Lyon asked Commissioner Ruttinger would be open to an amendment that the midblock crossing remain at twenty two feet wide and unobstructed by any landscaping or other items. Commission Ruttinger accepted the addition. Commissioner Gallegos seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

[7:22:26 PM](#)

Commissioner Gallegos left for the evening.

[7:22:36 PM](#)

Design Standards Chapter - A request by former Mayor Ralph Becker 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 requesting impute and comments from the Planning Commission and would return at a later date for approval of the final document.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The members of the subcommittee.
- The tables in the ordinance and what information was still needed to complete them.

PUBLIC HEARING [7:30:12 PM](#)

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

The Commission stated the following:

- Great job
- The tables made the proposal much easier to understand.

[7:31:47 PM](#)

TSA Zoning District Text Changes - A request by the Salt Lake City Council to review and modify the zoning regulations for the TSA Zoning District. The TSA Zoning District is located along North Temple between 400 West and 2200 West and along 400 South between 200 East and 900 East. The Planning Division will provide on update on the proposed changes, the process to make the changes and the timeline. The list of possible changes include: • Clarifying what land uses are allowed in the zone; Reviewing and changing how far buildings can be setback from the street along 400 South; Clarifying what types of uses are allowed on the ground floor of buildings; Modifying design standards related to overall building size, street level design, building materials, parking garage design, mid-block walkways and other design standards; Modifying the approval process and development guidelines to further incentivize affordable housing, higher quality development and other related issues; and Minor changes to other sections of the TSA zoning district or other related provisions in the zoning ordinance. Information can be found and comments regarding this proposal may be found at www.slcgov.com/opencityhall or on the Planning Division website at www.slcgov.com/planning. (Staff contact is Daniel Echeverria at (801)535-7165 or daniel.echeverria@slcgov.com.) Case Number PLNPCM2016-00522

Mr. Daniel Echeverria, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff was requesting impute and comments from the Planning Commission and would return at a later date for approval of the final document.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- How hard or difficult was it to increase points such as 100 to 125.

- The number of projects reviewed under the current point system.
- The incentive to decrease parking and the reasoning behind that incentive.
- The possible incentive for developers/ property owners to provide transit passes for an extended period of time.
- Adding a chart to show the point system would simplify the proposal.
- When a petition would be required to come to the Commission for review.
- The average score for new proposals.

PUBLIC HEARING [7:45:51 PM](#)

Chairperson Drown opened the Public Hearing.

The following people spoke to the petition: Ms. Ali Oliver, Mr. Bryce Garner, Mr. Sean Neves, Ms. Cindy Cromer, Mr. Jade Sarver, Mr. Russ Swansen and Mr. Dru Steadman.

The following comments were made:

- The affordability element needed to be considered in context to the surrounding services.
- The developments on the TSA corridor and the affordability aspect is building communities of necessity and not opportunity.
- Cap the percentage of affordability so that it is not 80 or 90 percent affordable
- Different point systems for different areas regarding affordability
- The proposal concentrates the affordable housing in one area and puts the other areas in poverty.
- The uses allowed in the TSA that are not allowed in other zoning.
- The restrictive zoning on alcohol establishments and breweries need to be changed.
- Leave the land use tables open for review, to allow for other players to have a say.
- Developers are going to great lengths to avoid the Planning Commission and Community Councils when working on these types of projects.
- Shouldn't give points for things the developers were going to do anyway such as building parking structures.
- Reducing parking would not benefit any area in the city.
- Need to attach higher quality businesses in the North Temple area.

Chairperson Drown closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- If the TSA took guidance from the Master Plan in order to define the types of uses were allowed in the various areas.
- How the City was trying to spread affordable housing throughout the city.
- The point system for affordable housing and how to address where it is located.

- Possibly have a north temple TSA zone that would help make the area more enticing.
- Mixing incomes in developments.

ELECTIONS [8:21:06 PM](#)

NOMINATIONS AND MOTION

Commissioner Hoskins Commissioner Hoskins nominated Commissioner Hoskins as Chair. Commissioner Ruttinger seconded the nomination.

Commissioner Drown nominated Commissioner Lyon as Chair. Commissioner Paredes seconded the nomination.

The Commissioners did a secret ballot and Commissioner Lyon was elected as Chair.

Commissioner Ruttinger nominated Commissioner Hoskins as Vice Chair Commissioner Lyon seconded the nomination.

Commissioner Hoskins was elected Vice Chair.

The meeting adjourned at [8:25:14 PM](#)