

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
City & County Building
451 South State Street, Room 326, Salt Lake City, Utah
Wednesday, January 25, 2017

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 a 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 Michaela Oktay, Planning Manager; John Anderson, Senior Planner; Doug Dansie, Senior Planner; Wayne Mills, Senior Planner; David Gellner, Principal Planner; Lauren Parisi, Associate 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, Emily Drown, Carolyn Hoskins and Sara Urquhart. Staff members in attendance were Michaela Oktay, David Gellner, Lauren Parisi and Doug Dansie.

The following sites were visited:

- **3200 South Richmond Street** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **562 S. Denver Street** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **2594 South 800 East** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.

[5:33:36 PM](#)

APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 11, 2017, MEETING MINUTES.

MOTION [5:33:45 PM](#)

Commissioner Drown moved to approve the January 11, 2017, meeting minutes. Commissioner Bachman seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR [5:34:00 PM](#)

Chairperson Lyon stated he had nothing to report.

Vice Chairperson Hoskins stated he had nothing to report.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR [5:34:06 PM](#)

Ms. Michaela Oktay, Planning Manager, stated she had nothing to report.

[5:34:09 PM](#)

Harmons Brickyard Fuel Center Planned Development at approximately 3200 South Richmond Street - A request by Kristen Voros of Design Sequence

representing Harmons is requesting approval from the City for a new Fuel Center at the Harmons Brickyard store located at the above listed address. The property is zoned CS – Community Shopping and is located within Council District 7, represented by Lisa Adams. The CS zoning district requires Planned Development approval for all new uses and additions. (Staff contact: David J. Gellner at (801)535-6107 or david.gellner@slcgov.com) Case number PLNSUB2016-00838

Mr. David Gellner, 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.

Ms. Kristen Voros, Design Sequence, reviewed the issues with parking in the area and how it would be addressed by Harmons.

PUBLIC HEARING [5:38:51 PM](#)

Chairperson Lyon opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Judy Short, Sugar House Community Council, stated they liked the proposal, parking was an issue but Harmons would resolve it.

Chairperson Lyon closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION [5:41:31 PM](#)

Commissioner Drown stated regarding PLNSUB2016-00838 – Harmons Brickyard Fuel Center Planned Development, based on the information in the Staff Report, public testimony, and discussion by the Planning Commission, she moved that the Planning Commission approve the Planned Development and Conditional and Building Site Design Review request subject to conditions one through three as listed in the Staff Report. Commissioner Garcia seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

[5:42:25 PM](#)

Special Exception for an Over-Height Wall and Fence at approximately 562 S. Denver Street - A request by Holly Addi, the property owner, for a Special Exception approval to accommodate a proposed over-height wall and fence in the front yard of the property located at the above listed address. The proposed 6-foot concrete wall would be installed parallel to the front property line and span the width of the lot in order to provide additional security on the site. The proposed 6-foot chain link fence would replace an existing 6-foot fence along the south property line. Walls and fences are allowed up to 4 feet in front yards of residential zoning districts. The subject property is located within Council District 4, represented by Derek Kitchen. (Staff Contact: Lauren Parisi at (801)535-7932 or lauren.parisi@slcgov.com) Case number PLNPCM2016-00898

Ms. Lauren Parisi, Associate Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff was recommending the Planning

Commission deny the request for an over-height wall and approve the request for an over height fence as proposed.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The height of the fence on the condo property and the subject property.
- If the height of the fence on the condo property was compliant with the code?
- The crime statistics or evidence for the property and why this property was unique.
- If other fences in the area met the ordinance.

Ms. Holly Addi, and Mr. Skyler Nelson, applicants reviewed the placement, reasoning and benefits of the proposed fence to the neighborhood. They reviewed how the fence would be seen from the neighboring properties, how it would fit the area, other fences and uses of concrete in the area that fit with the proposal.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- The properties the Applicant owned in the neighborhood.
- The plan and use of the subject property.
- The reasoning for the proposed fence material.
- The history of crime on the street and issues with trespassing.
- Other materials the fence could be made of that were more compatible with the area.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:00:27 PM](#)

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

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- How to deter graffiti on the wall if it was constructed.
- The public comments for the proposal.
- The use of the building and if the building had been vacant prior to the applicant owning the property.
- The future improvements to the structure.
- Different ways to achieve the same security and have a transparent fence.
- The proposed fence was an art piece not just a fence.
- How to address the issues with light reduction to the property.
- If the uses of the building were legal.

The Commission discussed and stated the following:

- A tall wall would create a walled in affected on the street.
- If esthetics could be considered as a basis for a Special Exception.
- Graffiti would be a continuous issue.
- If the proposal met or did not met the standards in the ordinance.
- If a percentage of transparency could be added as a condition if the additional height were granted.

The Commission Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- If the applicant was willing to change the materials of the fence.
- If the Commission's concern was aesthetics or function of the fence.
- Having a solid wall made the street feel very narrow.
- The height of the proposed wall, in a front yard, did not meet the ordinance.
- How the past use of the building affected the current zoning.
- If the proposed wall matched the setbacks of the neighboring property.
- Whether to table or deny the proposal.
- If it would help to lower the wall to five feet and allow it to be concrete.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The ordinance standards and transparency requirements for fences.
- The aesthetics of the fence and the preferred materials.
- Why the height change was appropriate as outlined in the Staff Report.
- The percentage of transparency for the fence.
- Need to ensure the applicant understood that the Commission was not promising the additional height would be approved with the revisions to the fence material.

MOTION [6:32:27 PM](#)

Commissioner Drown stated regarding PLNPCM2016-00898 – Denver Street Over-Height Wall and Fence, she moved that the Planning Commission table the petition pending alternates consideration for attachment E, standard A on the fence and to be reheard at the February 22, 2017, Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Garcia seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

[6:34:05 PM](#)

Commissioner Garcia left for the evening.

[6:34:07 PM](#)

Sego Homes Roof Garden Planned Development at approximately 2594 South 800 East - A request by Wayne Corbridge, of Sego Homes, for a planned development to construct the "Roof Garden". The development is proposed to be 5 townhome units of which four of the units would not have frontage on a public street, located at the above listed address. The subject property is located in the RMF-30 (Residential Multi-family) zoning district and is within Council District 7 represented by Lisa Adams. (Staff Contact: Doug Dansie at (801)535-6182 or doug.dansie@slcgov.com) Case number PLNSUB2016-00865

Mr. Doug Dansie, 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 modifications being reviewed in the proposal.
- The waste and recycling programs for the development.

Mr. Wayne Corbridge, Sego Homes, reviewed the importance of making the proposal fit the property and the area. He reviewed the waste and recycling, fire suppression system, how they accommodated privacy and the public comments for the project. Mr. Corbridge reviewed the setbacks, the improvements to the site, layout of the proposal and the height for the structures.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- How the proposal would be viewed from the street.
- The front door location and design of the proposed town homes.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:53:08 PM](#)

Chairperson Lyon opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Judy Short, Sugar House Community Council, stated the parcel was unique and the proposal offered unique amenities. She reviewed the public comments, the rear setbacks and stated the Community Council supported the proposal.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Mr. Ryan Cooper

The following comments were made:

- Taking away the existing vegetation was a negative.
- The proposed access road would create traffic noise for the neighboring property.
- Removing the trees was a negative for the area.
- Property was narrow and five units was too many for the lot.

Chairperson Lyon closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- How to mitigate the traffic and noise for the neighbors.
- Conditions that could be placed on the motion regarding use of the road.
- The reason for the location of the property access.
- The issues with the existing drainage ditch and the layout of the proposal.
- Adding landscaping or fencing at the rear of the proposal as a buffer to the neighboring property.

The Commission discussed the following:

- If specific language was needed for the motion regarding landscaping.

MOTION [7:05:37 PM](#)

Commissioner Bachman stated regarding PLNSUB2016-00865 Roof Garden Planned Development, based on the information in the Staff Report, public testimony, and discussion by the Planning Commission, she moved that the Planning Commission approve the Planned Development and Conditional and

Building Site Design Review request. Subject to conditions one through four as listed in the Staff Report. With the additional two conditions

- **That access for recycling and garbage trucks not be down the lane.**
- **A landscape buffer at the rear of the lot to mitigate the impact to the neighbors from vehicles entering the property.**

Commissioner Drown seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

[7:07:56 PM](#)

21st and 21st Small Area Plan - A City initiated petition to develop a small area plan for the 21st and 21st Business District. The project area extends along 2100 South from approximately 1900 East to 2300 East and includes all properties zoned CB Community Business or RMF-35 Moderate Density Multi-Family Residential. The project does not propose any changes to single family residential properties. The plan will establish goals and policies related to the future growth of the 21st and 21st neighborhood and will create design criteria for future private and public development. The project area is located in Council District 6 represented by Charlie Luke and Council District 7 represented by Lisa Adams. The draft plan can be reviewed at http://www.slcdocs.com/Planning/Projects/Current_Initiatives/21.pdf (Staff contact: John Anderson at (801)535-7214 or john.anderson@slcgov.com.) Case number PLNPCM2015-00141

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 review the information and provide comments.

Commissioner Urquhart left for the evening. [7:33:51 PM](#)

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- How the plan addressed building length.
- Language that could be included in a small area plan.
- How height was measured for structures.
- Allowing additional height for decorative elements.
- How to slow traffic and address the width of the street.
- Bus routes and stops in the area.

PUBLIC HEARING [7:40:09 PM](#)

Chairperson Lyon opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Judy Short, Sugar House Community Council, reviewed the history of the plan and the public comments received. She stated a problem they had in Sugar House was that some of the things they wanted, that are in the plan, are not codified and allow developers to propose development that was not in line with the ideas of the Master Plan. Ms. Short stated staff had ensured her the items would be written into the ordinance but she was skeptical how it would come about. She asked for details to be added to the code and expressed the need to list the zoning and height specifically in

the plan. Ms. Short stated separate from adopting the Plan the Commission needed to send direction to the Transportation Department to review the 21st and 21st intersection for safety and operation systems. Ms. Short stated percentages of glass needed to be specified as the word large could be interpreted in various ways and provide design information on how to articulate structures and keep rental costs affordable was important for the area. She stated there was a need to reduce the number of drive-thru windows to protect the pedestrians in the area.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Mr. Steve Dibble, Mr. Tom Holbert and Ms. Sheila Driscal.

The following comments were made:

- The intersection needed to be reviewed and improved.
- Plan reinforced the massing and pedestrian access for the area.
- Would like to see the plan accepted without relaxing the standards for environmental concerns.
- Thankful the plan has moved forward, it had been a long process.
- Building heights were difficult to dictate because the code required certain ceiling heights for different uses.
- Residential uses should not be part of the commercial area.
- Heights over two stories should not be allowed in the area.
- Uses should be kept commercial.

Chairperson Lyon stated the Public Hearing would remain open for the time being.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The nature of the plan and how it worked with the other governing documents.
- Why Staff felt the subject zoning was appropriate for the area.
- If the plan was an ordinance document or guidelines for the area.
- The studies for the area and options for the intersection.
- How the plan interfaced with the Parley's Way plan.
- The next steps for the proposal.
- The best height for structures in the area.
- The need to ensure the pedestrian traffic was protected.
- The conditions in the motion.
- The opportunity for additional public comment on the plan.
- The appropriate length for a building in the proposed plan.

Chairperson Lyon closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION

Commissioner Bachman stated regarding 21st and 21st Small Area Plan PLNPCM2015-00141, based on the information in the Staff Report, public testimony, and discussion by the Planning Commission, she moved that the

Planning Commission forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council with the following conditions.

- Include language related to walkable and pedestrian friendly street facades.
- Encourage ways to improve transit opportunities.
- Incorporate comments from the Sugar House Community Council.

Commissioner Drown seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously

[8:20:14 PM](#)

Planned Development Ordinance Amendments - A request by the Salt Lake City Planning Commission to review and modify the Planned Development Ordinance. A Planned Development is a development approval process that allows the Planning Commission to modify zoning standards in an effort to get a better project than what could be allowed under strict zoning regulations. The process is regulated in Chapter 21A.55 of the Salt Lake City Zoning Ordinance. The Planning Division is reviewing the zoning regulations related to Planned Developments in an effort to: Ensure that the development is meeting a citywide planning objective; Ensure that the design of the project is compatible with adjacent development; and Clarify zoning regulations. Information regarding the proposed changes can be found at www.slcgov.com/planning/planning-current-projects. Related provisions of Title 21A-Zoning may also be amended as part of this petition. (Staff contact: Wayne Mills at (801)535-7282 or Wayne.mills@slcgov.com) Case number PLNPCM2016-00600

Mr. Wayne Mills, Senior Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff was recommending the Planning Commission transmit a positive recommendation for PLNPCM2016-00600 to the City Council to adopt the proposed zoning ordinance text amendments.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The intent of the document in regards to determining materials and design of a structure.
- How specific the plan needed to be.

PUBLIC HEARING [8:27:19 PM](#)

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

MOTION [8:27:42 PM](#)

Commissioner Drown stated regarding PLNPCM2016-00600, Planned Development Ordinance Amendments, based on the findings in the Staff Report and the discussion heard, she moved that the Planning Commission transmit a positive recommendation for PLNPCM2016-00600 to the City Council to adopt the proposed zoning ordinance text amendments related to Planned Developments. Commissioner Bachman seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at [8:28:38 PM](#)

