

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
City & County Building
451 South State Street, Room 326, Salt Lake City, Utah
Wednesday, March 22, 2017

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:33:51 PM](#). Audio recordings of the Planning Commission meetings are retained for a period of time.

Present for the Planning Commission meeting were: Vice ChairpersonCarolynn Hoskins; Commissioners Maurine Bachman, Weston Clark, Emily Drown, Ivis Garcia, Clark Ruttinger and Andres Paredes. Chairperson Matt Lyon and Commissioner Sara Urquhart were excused.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were Michaela Oktay, Planning Manager; John Anderson, Senior Planner; Daniel Echeverria, Senior Planner; Michael Maloy, Senior Planner; David Gellner, Principal Planner; Michelle Poland, 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, Weston Clark, Carolyn Hoskins and Clark Ruttinger. Staff members in attendance were Michael Oktay, Daniel Echeverria, David Gellner and John Anderson.

The following sites were visited:

- **824, 826, 830 South West Temple** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **45 S, 50 S, and 54 S 700 East, and 667 E 100 South** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **900 S 900 W** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.

APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 8, 2017, MEETING MINUTES. [5:34:34 PM](#)
MOTION [5:34:49 PM](#)

Commissioner Clark moved to approve the March 8, 2017, meeting minutes. Commissioner Garcia seconded the motion. Commissioners Paredes, Bachman, Clark and Garcia voted “aye”. Commissioners Drown and Ruttinger abstained from voting as they were not present at the subject meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR [5:35:46 PM](#)

Vice Chairperson Hoskins stated she had nothing to report.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR [5:35:17 PM](#)

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

[5:36:24 PM](#)

Planned Development and Preliminary Subdivision located at approximately 824, 826, 830 South West Temple - A request by CW The Ruby LLC to construct The Ruby: A proposed twelve-unit townhome style multifamily development to be located at the above listed address. The planned development would have four buildings, consisting of three attached, side by side, units in each single building. Two buildings will face West Temple; two buildings will be located to the rear of the street facing buildings and be without street frontage. The site is approximately 0.40 acres located in the FB-UN2: Form Based Urban Neighborhood 2 zoning district and is within Council District 4 represented by Derek Kitchen. (Staff Contact: Doug Dansie at (801)535-6182 or doug.dansie@slcgov.com) Case number PLNSUB2017-00047 and PLNSUB2017-00129

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.

Mr. Jake Williams, CW Urban, reviewed the history and design of the proposal. He reviewed the target audience to rent the units and amenities of the development. Mr. Williams asked the Commission for their approval of the petition as presented.

The Commission, Applicant and Staff discussed the following:

- How the live/work space would be rented and used.
- If nightly rentals were allowed for the live/work spaces.
- The reasoning for fronting the units on the alley and having garage access in the center of the development.
- If the HOA would be responsible for the maintenance of the alleyway.
- If the city was looking to improve more alleys in the form based zones that would allow for these developments to use alleys for access.

PUBLIC HEARING [5:55:43 PM](#)

Vice Chairperson Hoskins opened the Public Hearing seeing no one wished to speak; Vice Chairperson Hoskins closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission, Applicant and Staff discussed the following:

- The cost and loan options for the units in the development.
- The live/work space and how it would be regulated in the design.
- The historic house proposed to be removed on the property.

MOTION [6:00:45 PM](#)

Commissioner Drown stated regarding PLNSUB2017-00047 Planned Development, PLNSUB2017-00129 Preliminary Subdivision, based on the information in the Staff Report, the information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, she moved that the Planning Commission approve the petition with the conditions listed in the Staff Report. Commissioner Clark

seconded the motion. Commissioners Drown, Bachman, Clark, Garcia, Parades and Ruttinger voted “aye”. The motion passed unanimously.

[6:01:42 PM](#)

The Other Side Academy Conditional Use for Large Group Homes and Office Use at approximately 50 S, 54 S 700 East, and 667 E 100 South – A request by Soren Simonsen, representing The Other Side Academy, for approval from the City for a large group home that provides pro-social and life skill training to individuals who commit to a two-year residency. The petitioner is requesting to serve approximately 120 persons in total across the above addresses. Residents are required to stay for a minimum of 2 years, though some may stay longer until they feel ready to re-enter society. The Academy’s model is a "learning by doing" approach to rehabilitation that allows residents to have a hands-on experience running businesses. The proposal also includes a request to approve a portion of the building at 667 E 100 South for office use through the "Adaptive Reuse of a Landmark Site" conditional use. The subject properties are zoned RMF-35 (Moderate Density Multi-family Residential District) and RMF-45 (Moderate/High Density Multi-family Residential District.) The subject properties are located within Council District 4, represented by Derek Kitchen. (Staff Contact: Daniel Echeverria at (801)535-7165 or daniel.echeverria@slcgov.com.) Case numbers PLNPCM2016-01020, -01021, & -01023.

Mr. Daniel Echeverria, 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.

Mr. Joseph Grenny, the Other Side Academy, gave a history of the program and the people it served. He reviewed the benefits of the program, the difference it made to the community and area.

Mr. Dave Durocher reviewed the program model, the student intake and funding for the proposal.

Mr. Leo Castleton, resident, reviewed the help and hope the program had given him.

Mr. Tim Stay, the Other Side Academy, reviewed the target market for the facility and how they helped improve the lives of those that used the program. He asked the Commission to approve the request as proposed.

Mr. Soren Simonsen, representing The Other Side Academy, reviewed vocational programs provided by the facility, the layout of the campus and the intended use of the

structures. He reviewed the waste and recycling facilities for the properties. Mr. Simonsen stated businesses were not being operated from the facility but vocational programs that provided job and life training for the residences of the facility. He reviewed the safety and security programs, parking and reiterated no commercial uses were housed at the facility. Mr. Simonsen asked the Commission to find that the vocational program uses were part of the conditional use. He reviewed the impacts the facility had to the surrounding neighborhood. Mr. Simonsen asked the Commission to approve the petition as presented and if possible include the Beverly Apartments in the campus approval.

PUBLIC HEARING [7:04:24 PM](#)

Vice Chairperson Hoskins opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Ms. Anne Prince, Mr. Jason Mull, Ms. Camille Winnie, Ms. Christine Cooke, Mr. Vince Rampton, Ms. Babs DeLay, Ms. Jessica Carter, Mr. Jared Parkinson, Mr. Monte Hanks, Mr., Cary Ruggles, Mr. Justin Hosman, Ms. Tracy Temple, Ms. Sarah Matheson, Ms. Lori Haglund, Mr. Roger Haglund, Mr. Seth Grenny, Mr. Francis Armstrong Madsen, Ms. Jane Owen, Mr. Scott Howell, Ms. Holly Berry, Ms. Terrell Douglas, Ms. Rachel Santizo, Ms. Kelsey Garner, Dr. Warner Woodworth. Mr. Kelly Andrews, Ms. Kenna Mathews, Mr. Daniel Temple and Mr. Daniel Merrill.

The following comments were made:

- The individuals using the facility were great to work with and not a danger to the neighborhood.
- The facility and residence were a positive for the neighborhood
- The programs The Other Side Academy provided were life changing and lifesaving.
- The Downtown Alliance supported the Other Side Academy and the programs they provide.
- The commercial activities were part of the vocational training and have been going on for eighteen months with City knowledge and approval.
- The programs and facility were a package deal it was not a group home but a vocational training facility.
- Do not dismantle the program or it would not be self-sufficient.
- The Other Side Academy was a steward to the neighborhood.
- The program was a hand up to the individuals using the facility it keeps them off the street and out of jail.
- The facility was in keeping with the City goals to improve the homeless situation in the city.
- The help the Other Side Academy offers was priceless to those that used it.
- This was a residential neighborhood and operating businesses in a residential neighborhood was inconsistent with the Master Plan and zoning for the area.

- It was not right to have this type of facility in a residential area and in the neighborhood with a school so close by.
- The impacts and mitigation of those impacts had not been addressed in the proposal.
- Issues with crime and traffic would be a detriment to the neighborhood.
- The facility was not a group home it was a place of hope and a missing link the city needed.
- The Other Side academy offered an interactive neighborhood aspect for the residence.
- The program was changing the way these programs work and how people improve their lives.
- The hours of operation and circumstances were no different than those a normal person would encounter in their home or neighborhood.
- An Architect had been hired to ensure the facility met the requirements of the area.
- Please approve the petition as it fit the neighborhood and left the area better than before.
- The Other Side Academy was not like other rehab programs and it worked far better than other programs.
- Delighted the building would be maintained and restored to its original nature.
- The facility was improving the neighborhood.
- The transformation the students was amazing and worth so much to the families it serviced.
- The Coalition supported the Academy and the programs it provided.
- The homeless services in the city are overrun with people that would benefit from, this facility.
- The Other Side Academy generates contributing members of society and was a benefit to the city.
- If there was any way possible to allow the facility to stay, please do so.
- The issue was protecting human lives not the zoning.
- The facility was a blessing and more facilities like this were need to help the issues in the city.
- The environment of the area had changed for the positive with the addition of the Other Side Academy.
- The Academy should be welcomed into the community and not ostracized.
- The facility was fixing a broken system.

Vice Chairperson Hoskins read the following cards:

- Mr. Davi Johnson – I have been both to the Other Side Academy Home and to the Promised Land Food Truck. I was greeted in both of the occasions with respect and warmth. I have never been treated so respectfully by any fast food establishment than I was by the Promised Land Food Truck. When I visited the Other Side Academy after learning about their mission, I was immensely impressed. Every one of these strangers whose home I was invading said hello to me, and many of them stopped to speak with me to make me feel comfortable.

I left that home emotionally being so overwhelmed by the positive effect this program was having on so many incredible individuals. This people inspired me to start seeing the world differently. It would be a sad, sad loss for this community to lose some of the finest, hardworking people I have ever met.

- Mr. Boyd Matheson – Many talk about changes criminal justice, homelessness, poverty or addiction TOSA is doing it. The work in the historic mayor's mansion it's truly historic.
- Ms. Karen Ashton – This is an amazing organization with a proven track record for making significant contributions to our community.

The following people submitted cards but were not present when their name was called: Ms. Julee Attig, Ms. Heather Ingham, Ms. Casie Franz, Ms. Jody Johnson

Vice Chairperson Hoskins closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Soren Simonsen stated they did not have any additional comments but were willing to answer questions.

The Commission, Applicant and Staff discussed and stated the following:

- Thanked everyone for attending the meeting and sharing their thoughts.
- The purview of the Commission for approval or denial of the fencing, the commercial use ban and the building code as listed in the Staff Report.
- What the Conditional Use application allowed or prohibited.
- If there was another way to classify the use and allow the vocational programs.
- If rezoning the property had been considered.
- If the business issues could be addressed under the Homeless Resource Center Text Amendments.
- Why hurdles were being put up for this type of facility when the facility was doing everything the City aspiring to do.
- This was not a typical use and it did not fit with the zoning in any city within the state.
- A new zone needed to be created and currently that tool was not available.
- The Planning Commission had the authority to initiate a petition to amend the Zoning Ordinance.
- An Administrative Interpretation was issued and the vocational uses were allowed as an accessory use to the group home, but there were different understandings of that interpretation.
- How the commercial uses played into the approval of the Conditional Use and their approval.
- The fencing was not a requirement, it was added by Staff and was not a benefit to the area.
- The building code issue needed to be removed from the Conditional Use in order to allow the facility to address the life safety issues with the facilities and keep the historic nature of the structure.

- Allow the applicant to work with the building code department on the life safety issues.
- Removing the fencing, building code issues and commercial aspects of the petition would allow the facility to continue in its current form.
- What constituted vocational activities.
- The process for appealing the Administrative Interpretation.
- The options to allow the commercial use component.
- The language for the motion.
- The funding for the facility.
- The staff for the program.
- The number of students that would be housed at the facility.

MOTION [8:41:13 PM](#)

Commissioner Drown stated regarding The Other Side Academy Conditional Use Petition Numbers: PLNPCM2016-01020, 01021, & 01023, based on the information in the Staff Report, the information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, she moved that the Planning Commission approve petitions PLNPCM2016-01020, 01021 and 01023, The Other Side Academy Group Home Conditional Use excluding conditions 1, 2, 4(c), 6, 7, and 8 as listed in the Staff Report. Commissioner Bachman seconded the motion. Commissioners Bachman, Clark, Drown, Garcia, Parades, and Ruttinger voted “aye”. The motion passed unanimously.

The Commission took a short break. [8:44:29 PM](#) -

The Commission reconvened. [8:54:47 PM](#)

Commissioner Paredes Left for the evening. [8:54:50 PM](#)

MOTION [8:55:14 PM](#)

Commissioner Garcia moved to initiate a petition to create a new ordinance to allow commercial uses in group homes. Commissioner Drown seconded the motion.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The pros and cons such an ordinance would have on all group homes in the city.
- A time table and how to go about reviewing this type of petition.
- Whether to move forward with a petition.

[9:05:04 PM](#)

Commissioner Garcia withdrew her motion.

[9:05:59 PM](#)

Homeless Resource Center Zoning Regulations – A request by Salt Lake City to amend the zoning ordinance to (1) define what a homeless resource center is, (2) add homeless resource center as a conditional use in the General Commercial District (CG), Downtown Support District (D-2), and Downtown Warehouse/Residential District (D-3), and (3) establish qualifying provisions that mitigate potential adverse impacts of homeless resources centers and homeless shelters. The amendment will affect chapter 21A.36, and sections 21A.33.030, 21A.33.050, 21A.44.030, 21A.60.020, and 21A.62.040 of the zoning ordinance. Related provisions of Title 21A Zoning may also be amended as part of this petition. (Staff contact: Michael Maloy, AICP at (801)535-7118 or michael.maloy@slcgov.com) Case number PLNPCM2016-00910

Mr. Michael Maloy, Senior 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 sites under consideration in the proposal and if future sites should be considered.
- The purview of the Planning Commission regarding the community based review board the Mayor would be creating.
- The backup plan for individuals when the shelters were at capacity.
- The issues the operational plans would need to address including emergency plans for extreme weather or natural disasters.
- The public comments received for the proposal.

PUBLIC HEARING [9:28:09 PM](#)

Vice Chairperson Hoskins opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Ms. Judy Short, Ms. David Kingston and Mr. Chris Croswite.

The following comments were made:

- Love the idea of a community committee to help with regulating the facilities.
- Loitering was a public concern.
- All facilities should be required to have internal areas for smoking.
- Trash should be addressed and emptied more frequently than outlined in the proposal.
- The individuals using the facilities needed access to computers and a mailbox to help them achieve employment.
- Should be a reference to providing day care and transportation for children in the proposal.

- Please include language or provisions allowing adjacent property owners to secure their properties and premises such as fencing etc. to prevent loitering or trespassing.
- Concerned over criminal activity in the areas of the new shelters.
- Everyone needed to be protected not just the homeless.
- Table the petition to allow for protective language to be added.
- Oppose to the changes as it made it difficult for existing shelters to expand or update their facilities.
- The proposal was contradictory to the benefits of the facilities.
- The new ordinance needed to give a voice to the existing shelters.
- There was more than one model to solving the homeless issues in Salt Lake City and those options needed to be supported.

Vice Chairperson Hosking read the following cards: [9:33:07 PM](#)

- Ms. Angelique Brebia – I am a downtown resident. I also work with the homeless at SLC mission (although I don't necessarily represent their views) unless the shelter includes a dining hall to serve breakfast and dinner to the homeless clients, the begging and stealing in the area will be unmanaged
- Mr. John Grisley – Are you going to guarantee my property values next to High Avenue.

Vice Chairperson Hoskins closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The comments from the public and if they were incorporated into the proposal.
- Requiring shelters to make offsite improvements could not be required.
- The requirements an existing facility would have to meet if they relocated and if that facility would be limited to two hundred beds.
- The neighborhood coordinating council that would be created by the Mayor.
- The neighborhoods around the two remaining sites that might feel they are not being heard.
- How the centers would be monitored regarding their function.
- If there was a distance requirement for the facilities.
- How the activities of homeless individuals would be regulated outside of the facilities.
- How to build in language giving the community assurance that the facilities would operate and function as proposed.
- Analyzing the faculties to monitor their impacts to the surrounding neighborhoods.
- If the petition should be tabled to allow further discussion on the monitoring language and flush out how the Neighborhood Community Committee should look in the zoning.
- Adding monitoring language to the Conditional Use permits for these facilities and not in this proposal.
- The language for the motion.

- Would like the Neighborhood Community Committee formed prior to the construction of these facilities to help review the information.
- The purpose of the Neighborhood Community Committees.
- How to determine the number and members of the Neighborhood Community Council for these petitions.

MOTION [10:22:30 PM](#)

Commissioner Clark stated regarding Resource Center Zoning Text Amendment - Node Rezoning at 800S/900W and 900S/900W, based on information in the Staff Report, information presented, and input received during the public hearing, he moved that the Planning Commission recommend the City Council approve petition PLNPCM2016-00910 for the homeless resource center zoning text amendment with the recommendation to the City Council to strongly consider empowering the community more on the Neighborhood Community Council. Commissioner Ruttinger seconded the motion. Commissioners Bachman, Clark, Garcia, Drown and Ruttinger voted “aye”. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Drown left for the evening. [10:24:49 PM](#)

[10:23:51 PM](#)

900 S. 800 W. and 900 S. 900 W. Node Rezone - The City is proposing to amend the zoning map designation for seventy-nine (79) property parcels located near the intersections of 900 West/800 South and 900 West/900 South respectively. The Westside Master Plan adopted in December 2014 identified these areas as a business district where future zoning changes may be supported. Changes may allow new stores, restaurants, services as well as new residential development. In order to facilitate development of these “nodes”, the City is proposing to rezone them from their current designations of R-1/5000 (Single-family Residential), CB (Community Business), RMF-35 (Moderate Multi-Family Residential) and RMF-45 (Moderate/High Density Multi-Family Residential) to the FB-UN1 (Form-Based Urban Neighborhood), R-MU-35 (Residential/Mixed Use) and R-MU-45 (Residential/Mixed Use) zoning districts. Although these are the zones proposed by staff, consideration may be given to rezoning the properties to another zoning district with similar characteristics. The project area is located in Council District 2, represented by Andrew Johnston. (Staff contact: David J. Gellner at (801)535-6107 or david.gellner@slcgov.com) Case number PLNPCM2016-00924

Mr. David Gellner, 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.

PUBLIC HEARING [10:33:45 PM](#)

Vice Chairperson Hoskins opened the Public Hearing

The following individual's name was called but he was not present to speak:
Mr. Jared Parkinson.

Vice Chairperson Hoskins closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- If the City parcels needed to be addressed separately.

MOTION [10:35:26 PM](#)

Commissioner Ruttinger stated regarding PLNPCM2016-00924 – Westside Master Plan Implementation - Node Rezoning at 800S/900W and 900S/900W, based on the findings and analysis in the Staff Report, testimony, and discussion at the public hearing, he moved that the Planning Commission recommend the City Council approve the proposed zoning map amendments, file PLNPCM2016-00924, Westside Master Plan Implementation - Node Rezoning at 800S/900W and 900S/900W as recommended by staff. Commissioner Bachman seconded the motion. Commissioners Bachman, Clark, Garcia, and Ruttinger voted “aye”. The motion passed unanimously.

[10:36:25 PM](#)

**John Glenn Road Zoning Map Amendment located at approximately 695 N. John Glenn Road - A request by Seefried Development Management, Inc. for the City to amend the zoning map located at the above listed address. The property is currently located in the AG Agriculture District. The proposal is to change the zoning on the property to M-1 Light Manufacturing. The applicant further requests to adjust the boundary of the Lowland Conservancy Overlay District to not include their property. The request is to facilitate the construction of a warehouse project. The property is located within Council District 1, represented by James Rogers. (Staff contact: John Anderson at (801)535-7214 or john.anderson@slcgov.com)
Case number PLNPCM2017-00063**

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 forward a positive recommendation to the City Council regarding the petition.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- Why the subject parcel was allowed to be developed versus other parcels in the area.

Mr. Wayne Budge, Seefried Development Management, thanked the Commission for reviewing the petition. He stated they agreed with Staff's recommendation and asked the Commission to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council. Mr. Budge reviewed the history and future of the area and how the development fit the Master Plan.

PUBLIC HEARING [10:45:50 PM](#)

Vice Chairperson Hoskins opened the Public Hearing seeing no one wished to speak; Vice Chairperson Hoskins closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION [10:46:14 PM](#)

Commissioner Bachman stated regarding PLNPCM2017-00063 John Glenn Road Zoning Map Amendments, based on the information in the Staff Report, information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, she moved that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council regarding PLNPCM2017-00063 John Glenn Road Zoning Map Amendments. Commissioner Ruttinger seconded the motion. Commissioners Bachman, Clark, Garcia, and Ruttinger voted "aye". The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at [10:46:51 PM](#)