

**SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**City & County Building**  
**451 South State Street, Room 326, Salt Lake City, Utah**  
**Wednesday, May 24, 2017**

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:31:34 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 Chairperson Carolynn Hoskins; Commissioners Sara Urquhart, Ivis Garcia, Brenda Scheer, Weston Clark and Andres Paredes. Commissioners Maurine Bachman, Emily Drown and Clark Ruttinger were excused.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were Nick Norris, Planning Director; Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director; Wayne Mills, Planning Manager; Daniel Echeverria, Senior Planner; David Gellner, Principal Planner; Molly Robinson, Urban Planner; Tracy Tran, 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: Sara Urquhart, Ivis Garcia, Weston Clark and Brenda Scheer. Staff members in attendance were Nick Norris, Michaela Oktay, Wayne Mills, David Gellner and Tracy Tran.

- **Northwest Quadrant** – Staff and the property owners gave an overview of the area.
- **416 East 500 South** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.

**APPROVAL OF THE MAY 10, 2017, MEETING MINUTES. [5:31:42 PM](#)**

**MOTION [5:32:04 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Clark moved to approve the May 10, 2017, meeting minutes. Commissioner Hoskins seconded the motion. Commissioners Hoskins, Scheer, and Clark voted “aye”. Commissioner Urquhart and Garcia abstained from voting as they were not present at the subject meeting. The motion passed unanimously.**

**REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR [5:32:39 PM](#)**

Chairperson Matt Lyon stated he had nothing to report.

Vice Chairperson Carolynn Hoskins stated she had nothing to report.

**REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR [5:32:38 PM](#)**

Mr. Nick Norris, Planning Director, reviewed the zoning items the City Council held hearings on and the upcoming projects the Council would be reviewing. He reviewed

the 27<sup>th</sup> Street Cottages Plan Development that would be returning to the Commission for review due to modifications in the plan.

[5:34:38 PM](#)

**Rezone and Master Plan Amendment at approximately 416 East 500 South - James Alfandre, representing property owner Protean Properties, is requesting that the City amend the zoning map and associated future land use map of the Central Community Master Plan for the property located at the above listed address. The applicant's intent is to provide flexibility to make future changes to the property including the ability to add or create a retail component and add residential density. No specific site development proposal has been submitted at this time. This project requires both a Zoning Map and Master Plan Amendment. The property is located within Council District 4, represented by Derek Kitchen. (Staff contact: David J. Gellner at (801)535-6107 or david.gellner@slcgov.com)**

- a. **Master Plan Amendment - The associated future land use map in the Central Community Master Plan currently designates the property as "Residential/Office Mixed Use". The petitioner is requesting to amend the future land use map for the parcel to "High Mixed Use". Case number: PLNPCM2017-00185**
- b. **Zoning Map Amendment - The property is currently zone RO - Residential Office. The petitioner is requesting to amend the zoning map designation of the property to R-MU – Residential/Mixed Use. Case number: PLNPCM2017-00184 (Legislative Matter)**

Mr. David Gellner, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff recommended that the Planning Commission forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council regarding the proposal.

[5:39:56 PM](#)

Commissioner Parades arrived at the meeting.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The zoning for other parcels in the area and why they were not being changed as part of the proposal.
- The reasoning for the requested zoning and why it was appropriate for the area.
- If the Master Plan called for residential office why was retail being suggested.

Mr. James Alfandre, applicant, reviewed the proposal and the reason for the requested zoning.

**PUBLIC HEARING [5:48:00 PM](#)**

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

The Commission, Applicant and Staff discussed the following:

- The zoning and height limits on 400 South and if the proposal was keeping with the development pattern.
- If the proposal would be setting a precedent for the area.
- The parking requirements for the proposed zoning.
- The setbacks for the proposal and the existing zoning.
- If conditions could be added to the approval requesting the setbacks and character defining features remain.
- The items the Commission could approve under a Planned Development and the approval process.
- If the entire area should be rezoned as a whole and what the process would be for a rezone of that size.

The Commission discussed and stated the following:

- The property should not be rezoned just to allow a developer to make more money.
- Should not deviate from the Master Plan unless there was a compelling reason to do so.
- The proposal would be out of character for the area.

**MOTION [6:11:37 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Scheer stated regarding PLNPCM2017-00184 and PLNPCM2017 00185, 416 East 500 South Zoning Map and Master Plan Amendment, based on the findings and analysis in the Staff Report, testimony, and discussion at the public hearing, she moved that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council deny the proposed Zoning Map and Master Plan Amendments, proposed zone change from the RO (Residential/Office) zoning district to the R-MU (Residential/Mixed Use) zoning district and corresponding Master Plan Amendment. Commissioner Clark seconded the motion. Commissioners Hoskins, Scheer, Clark and Lyon voted “aye”. Commissioner Garcia, Urquhart, and Paredes voted “nay”. The motion passed 4-3.**

**[6:13:32 PM](#)**

**Early Notification Text Amendments - Salt Lake City is reviewing proposed changes to the regulations and processes relating to early notification of the public and recognized community organizations. The purpose of the proposed changes is to clarify the language in the ordinance as well as increase awareness and participation by the public while affording a timely review process for applicants and projects. The proposed regulation changes will affect various sections of the City Code including Section 2.60, Recognized Community Organizations, Title 20, Subdivisions and Title 21A, Zoning Ordinance. Related provisions of the City Code may also be amended as part of this petition. (Staff contact: Cheri Coffey at (801)535-6188 or [cheri.coffey@slcgov.com](mailto:cheri.coffey@slcgov.com)). Case number: PLNPCM2016-00300 (Legislative Matter)**

Ms. Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff recommended that the Planning

Commission forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council regarding the proposal.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- Who would determine what type of public outreach activities would be done for a proposal.
- If a proposal located within multiple Community Council districts should go to all Community Councils affected by the proposal or have an Open House.
- When the notification signs were posted on properties.

**PUBLIC HEARING [6:39:46 PM](#)**

Chairperson Lyon opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Ms. Victoria Collard, Mr. Dave Alderman, Mr. Jeff Salt, Ms. Cindy Cromer and Mr. Jim Webster.

The following comments were made:

- Petitions for variances, Special Exceptions, developments that occupy twenty five percent of a given block face and subdivisions should be brought to the Community Council and have early notification.
- Community Council meetings are a means to engage the community and offer the community an opportunity to discuss issues as a group.
- Community Councils should be the one to decide how information is presented to the community not the Staff.
- Ensure the public comment period is not reduced from what is currently in the ordinance.
- If timing was so important, the development should be built to meet the code.
- It was important to keep the public input in play.
- Community Council meeting schedules were more routine and accessible than the Open Houses held by the City.
- Table the petition and allow further review of the amendments as they do not accomplish the goals of the city.
- Public input increased with a controversial topic or an expensive development.
- Needed to allow more time for people to gather information on proposals before they are presented to the decision makers.
- The time the applicant was given to speak at a meeting, versus the time the public was given to speak was not equal and the public engagement process allowed for more meaningful discussions.
- The City should not delegate its responsibility to community organizations.
- The City should establish an effective baseline.
- Staff needed to provide the relative information on the ordinance as part of the Staff Report.
- It was wrong to hold up a development because a Community Council Chair chose not to respond.

- There was very limited accountability of the City departments to enforce the Master Plans.
- The rules needed to apply to everyone across the board.

Chairperson Lyon closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- Proposals that are and are not presented to the Community Councils and the reasoning.
- Trainings for the Community Councils would be a benefit.
- It was hard for some Community Councils to get their constituents to attend meetings.
- The option to use Community Learning Centers for outreach.
- Include more specifics of what the public activities are.
- The process of forwarding the proposal or tabling it for further review.
- The history behind the 45 day period and the timeline for a proposal.
- The varying ways to engage with a project was confusing for the public.
- Make sure Staff was involved in the process at all times.
- The ordinance was not proposing to turn Open Houses over to the Community Councils.
- The developer has the right to a timely process.
- If a Community Council did not respond the proposal should move ahead.
- Need a definition of what constituted a comment and how those comments were recorded.
- The best way to notify people of public meetings, where to hold them and the quality of responses.
- Need a definition of public activity.
- The benefit of the proposed language allowing a public hearing to be held within the forty five days.
- Idea of looking at this from a general public engagement standpoint and not just specifically about how to engage recognized organizations.

**MOTION [7:36:01 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Clark stated regarding PLNPCM2016-00300, Early Engagement Text Amendment, based on the findings and analysis in the Staff Report, testimony, and discussion at the public hearing, he moved that the Planning Commission table the matter, request Staff to return to the Commission with the information as discussed and to reopen the Public Hearing. Commissioner Urquhart seconded the motion. Commissioners Hoskins, Urquhart, Garcia, Scheer, Clark and Paredes voted “aye”. The motion passed unanimously.**

Commissioner Paredes left for the evening [7:37:01 PM](#)

[7:37:11 PM](#)

**Northwest Quadrant Zoning Amendments - Salt Lake City Council is requesting to develop zoning regulations for the Northwest Quadrant that would help implement the vision and goals of the Northwest Quadrant Master Plan. The proposed amendments will include the creation of the Northwest Quadrant Overlay to address the development area, natural area, and buffer areas, changes to the Lowland Conservancy Overlay, and changes to other related sections of the ordinance. Most of the changes will impact the area north of I-80 and west of the Salt Lake International Airport. (Staff contact: Tracy Tran at (801)535-7645 or [tracy.tran@slcgov.com](mailto:tracy.tran@slcgov.com)) Case number PLNPCM2016-00724. (Legislative Matter)**

Ms. Tracy Tran, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff recommended that the Planning Commission forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council regarding the proposal.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The Conditional Use for wind generation and if it should be the same for large solar farms.
- Protecting birds from the solar farms and what type of solar panels were an issue for birds.
- If there was a way to mitigate windmills to not harm wildlife.
- What was allowed under the current zoning.
- Adding a condition to allow trails on the land when the zoning was changed.
- If a Master Plan for trails and transit would be put in place.
- Ensuring buildings were not built in areas where future transit would be constructed.
- If consideration of constructing a light industrial area like Daybreak was discussed.
- The drainage and utilities plans for the area.

Mr. Brad Stewart, public utilities, reviewed the plans for the utilities and drainage plan for the area.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The water retention plan and if mechanical units would be used for utilities.
- The proposed glazing and coverings for windows.
- It was important to maintain the public use of the area.
- If there was a higher risk of contamination of the lake with the development of the property.

**PUBLIC HEARING [8:15:59 PM](#)**

Chairperson Lyon opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Mr. Jeff Salt, Ms. Jan Striffle, Mr. Matt Clark and Mr. Lance Boulden

The following comments were made:

- Not impressed with the process the plan had gone through thus far.
- The lowland areas needed to be protected but so did the upland areas.
- The animals in the area needed to be protected and a public access plan was necessary to educate the public.
- Did not want massive warehouses in the area and development needed to be more sensitive.
- The plan still needed work.
- Needed to plan for the future.
- Accommodate recreational uses in the Development Plan.
- Impressed with the Planning Division's willingness to work with the property owners to preserve the natural use of the land.
- Four thousand acres were being dedicated to the natural areas.
- The wetlands are protected and the studies have been done.
- The drainage plan was not really a plan and there were other options.
- The intent of keeping the lowland conservancy area in the development area when it was being removed from the natural area.

Chairperson Lyon closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The lowland conservatory area and drainage plan.
- How the proposal affected the area and the location of the overlay zone.

**MOTION [8:34:05 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Urquhart stated regarding Northwest Quadrant Zoning Amendments, based on the information in the Staff Report, the information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, I move that the Commission recommend that the City Council approve PLNPCM2016-00724, Northwest Quadrant Zoning Amendments. Commissioner Garcia seconded the motion. Commissioners Hoskins; Urquhart, Garcia, Scheer and Clark voted "aye". The motion passed unanimously.**

**[8:34:57 PM](#)**

The Commission took a short break.

**[8:40:41 PM](#)**

The Commission reconvened.

**[8:40:58 PM](#)**

**Sugar House Planned Development and Conditional Building and Site Design Review at approximately 2290 S 1300 East - David Dixon, representing the property owner Sugar House Property, LLC is requesting Planned Development and Conditional Building and Site Design Review approval to develop two office buildings with an associated parking structure, and a multi-family residential building with ground floor retail. The development must be reviewed as a Planned**

**Development as two of the buildings will not have frontage on a public street. Other zoning requirements may be modified through the Planned Development process. The development also must be reviewed through Conditional Building and Site Design Review as the process is required for buildings that exceed 50 feet in height in the associated zone. Currently the land is occupied by a parking lot and vacant retail store. The subject property is located in the Sugar House Business District-1 (CBSD1) zoning district and is within Council District 7, represented by Lisa Adams. (Staff contact: Daniel Echeverria at (801)535-7165 or [daniel.echeverria@slcgov.com](mailto:daniel.echeverria@slcgov.com).) Case numbers PLNSUB2017-00298 and PLNPCM2017-00300**

Mr. Daniel Echeverria, Senior Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff was asking the Commission for comments and suggestions for the proposal.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The other building proposed to be used for a U of U Clinic.

Mr. Colbe Durnon, property owner, reviewed the process for the proposal and the vision of the development.

Mr. David Dixon, architect, reviewed the design, how the building addressed the street and the materials for the proposal.

The applicants reviewed how the property would be developed, used and designed to enhance and bring people to the area.

Mr. Mark Isaac, developer, reviewed the vacancy rate for retail spaces in the city. He stated this was an opportunity to help the stores in the area but they were nervous to bring in retail as it may be an issue to keep them occupied. Mr. Isaac stated it was their intent to enhance the area not detract from it.

The Commission and Applicants discussed the following:

- The buildings that would be removed.
- The artwork that would be added to the neighboring buildings.
- The size of the storefronts.
- The percentage of Stringham Ave that would be active space.
- Why the second office tower was placed along the back of the lot and not on Stringham Ave.
- The developments on Wilmington and how it detracted from the character of the area.
- The street engagement.
- The options for the retail space and how it could interact with the street.
- The proposal felt suburban because it was oriented to the freeway.
- Reconnecting the old Sugar House grid was an important factor of the proposal.



- The materials and details for the proposal that could address the site and fit the area.
- The location of the bike trail.

The Commission thanked the Applicants for the presentation and open discussion.

[10:08:19 PM](#)

**Revisions to the Conditional Building and Site Design Review Program - The Salt Lake City Council has requested a zoning text amendment that clarifies the intent and eases administration of the Conditional Building and Site Design Review (CBSDR) process (Chapter 21A.59) of the Salt Lake City Code. Proposed changes include alignment of the purpose statement (21A.59.010) with citywide livability goals, clarifications to the authority (21A.59.020) section that more clearly determine administrative versus Planning Commission approvals, and replacement of the design standards in favor of design guidelines that define objectives and provide flexibility. Related future text amendments include changing Planned Development requirements in the GMU District (21A.31 Gateway Mixed Use) to Design Review and elimination of landscape requirements for additional height in the CG District (21A.26.070 General Commercial). Related provisions of Title 21A-Zoning may also be amended as part of this petition. (Staff Contact: Molly Robinson (801)535-7261 or [molly.robinson@slcgov.com](mailto:molly.robinson@slcgov.com)) Case number PLNPCM2016-00615**

Ms. Molly Robinson, Urban Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff was asking the Commission for comments and suggestions for the proposal.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The confusing language in the ordinance and how the guidelines would be applied.
- How the proposal would be incorporated into the zoning ordinance.
- Adding detailed design elements such as the relation of entrances to the street and making buildings fit the surrounding area.
- More pressure on the Developer to demonstrate why and how the criteria was met.
- It was hard to apply the presented guidelines to every area of the city.
- Emphasize the design of the public realm and not just the design of the building.
- The next steps for the proposal.

**The meeting adjourned at [10:51:56 PM](#)**