

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
City & County Building
451 South State Street, Room 326, Salt Lake City, Utah
Wednesday, July 26, 2017

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:30:41 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 Clark Ruttinger. Commissioner Brenda Scheer and Sara Urquhart were excused.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were Nick Norris, Planning Director; Michaela Oktay, Planning Manager; 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: Carolyn Hoskins, Maurine Bachman, Ivis Garcia and Clark Ruttinger. Staff members in attendance were Michael Oktay and Michael Maloy.

- **603 S 600 East Street** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal and oriented the Commission to the area.

APPROVAL OF THE JULY 12, 2017, MEETING MINUTES. [5:30:53 PM](#)

MOTION [5:31:05 PM](#)

Commissioner Hoskins moved to approve the July 12, 2017, meeting minutes. Commissioner Garcia seconded the motion. Commissioners Hoskins, Bachman, Garcia and Clark voted “aye”. Commissioners Drown, Paredes and Ruttinger abstained from voting as they were not present at the subject meeting.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR [5:31:37 PM](#)

Chairperson Matt Lyon stated he had nothing to report.

Vice Chairperson Carolynn Hoskins stated she had nothing to report.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR [5:31:44 PM](#)

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

[5:31:49 PM](#)

Trolley Square Ventures Rezone at approximately 603 S 600 East Street - Douglas White, on behalf of Trolley Squares Ventures LLC, has requested a zoning map amendment from RMF-30 Low Density Multi-Family Residential District to R-MU-35 Residential/Mixed Use District at the above listed address. The property is currently undeveloped. The purpose

of the request is to facilitate development of a 24 unit apartment building that will not exceed 35 feet in height. Although the applicant has requested the property be rezoned to R-MU-35 District, consideration may be given to rezoning the property to another zoning district with similar characteristics. The subject property is located within Council District 4, represented by Derek Kitchen. (Staff contact: Michael Maloy, Senior Planner, at (801)535-7118 or michael.maloy@slcgov.com). Case number: PLNPCM2017-00373 (Legislative Matter)

Mr. Michael Maloy, Senior Planner, reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff recommended that the Planning Commission send a favorable recommendation to the City Council.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The application before the Planning Commission was for the rezone and not a Master Plan Amendment.
- The history of the rezone for the area.
- The property the applicant owned and which parcels would be affected by the rezone.

Mr. Khosrow Semnani, reviewed the proposal and the need for the rezone. He reviewed the process the project had been through and asked the Planning Commission to approve the proposal as presented as it would revitalize the area and make it better.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- Who owned the abutting properties and why they were not part of the rezone.
- The affordability of the proposed units.

PUBLIC HEARING [5:44:19 PM](#)

Chairperson Lyon opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Cindy Cromer read the following statement -

To Members of the Planning Commission

From Cindy Cromer

Re proposed rezone to RMU-35 for Trolley Square Ventures

7 / 26 /17

I own property in the 700 to 800 block of 600 East. I have spent much of the last year and a half addressing requests from Trolley Square regarding the redevelopment of the parcels south of the Trolley barns.

PROCESS A year and a half ago, I argued that the Landmarks Commission should be consulted regarding zoning petitions in the City's historic districts. I was told that wasn't possible because of the administrative function of the Landmarks Commission. Well, clearly it is possible because it just happened this month. I am asking you to make sure that this process of including the Landmarks Commission continues because

1. Landmarks Commissioners cannot come before you individually regarding zoning issues on proposals that they will subsequently consider. That would be very messy in terms of

process. Yet, these Commissioners are some of the most knowledgeable people regarding the Districts.

2. The relationship between the base zone (your turf) and the overlay zone (HLC turf) is identified in multiple adopted plans including the Preservation Plan, the zoning ordinance, and the Central Community Master Plan.

SUPPORT FOR THE REQUEST

1. The request is consistent with the historic development pattern in the City and this neighborhood which places larger structures on the corners of blocks. This development pattern is recognized in the height limits Downtown, and is evident in neighboring blocks near this proposal. The North Park apartment building at 577 E 600 S is an example. Another one is 703-709 S 600 E.
2. These larger buildings which anchored the blocks historically have reduced setbacks from the public sidewalk. North Park is 4'3" off the sidewalk on 500 E and 5' off on the 600 S frontage. The building at 703-709 S 600 E is 5'6" off the sidewalk on 600 E and less than 6 feet from the sidewalk on the 700 S frontage.
3. Property diagonally across the intersection from the proposal was rezoned RMU-35 recently.
4. If the RMU zones had been available in 1995, this property would have been appropriately zoned RMU-35 then. Wally Wright could have redeveloped it.
5. When I arrived for the open house, the representative for the petitioner assumed that I would be opposed to the request. That is a reflection of how little he understands about the historic character of the area. I could have supported this request 22 years ago as a member of this Commission.

Chairperson Lyon closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- If the Historic Landmark Commission was briefed on the proposal.

MOTION [5:48:57 PM](#)

Commissioner Drown stated regarding PLNPCM2017-00373 Trolley Square Ventures Zoning Map Amendment, 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 forward a positive recommendation to the City Council regarding the proposal with attachments A through F. Commissioner Hoskins seconded the motion. Commissioners Hoskins, Bachman, Garcia, Drown, Paredes, Ruttinger and Clark voted "aye". The motion passed unanimously.

WORK SESSION [5:50:02 PM](#)

Centro Civico Senior Housing Planned Development & Conditional Building and Site Design Review at approximately 145 S 600 West – Peter Corroon, representing Centro Civico Mexicano is requesting approval for the Centro Civico Senior Housing project at the above listed address. The proposal is for a 6-story, 61-unit apartment building to be located on a 0.38 acre (16,500 square foot) vacant parcel in the G-MU – Gateway-Mixed Use zoning district. The building would be the first phase of a larger mixed-use project to

be built at this location. The G-MU zoning district requires Planned Development approval for all new principal buildings and uses. In addition, Conditional Building and Site Design Review (CBSDR) approval is requested to address some design aspects of the building. 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) Case number: PLNSUB2017-00370 and PLNPCM2017-00525- (Administrative Matter)

Mr. David Gellner, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated this was a discussion for the proposed development and to identify any issues or concerns with the proposal as they related to the applicable standards.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- Why corrugated metal was a limited use material in the zone.
- The access to the property.

Mr. Peter Corroon, applicant, reviewed the proposal, the issues with the site, parking and reasoning for the height of the proposal. He reviewed the energy efficiency for the building and asked the Commission to move the proposal toward approval.

Mr. Bernardo Flores-Sahagun, architect, reviewed the reasoning for the suggested materials and durability.

The applicants reviewed the layout, amenities, windows, access, artwork that would be located on the concrete wall and midblock walkways, for the proposal.

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

- The orientation of the building and how the proposed materials would detract from the look of the building.
- The parking, fencing, artwork, pedestrian interaction and walkability for the proposal.
- The length of the building dimension on 600 West.
- Ways to liven the street from all directions of the proposal.
- The issues with having windows facing west.
- The durability of the proposed metal material and if it would rust over time.
- Who would be able to access and use the plaza.
- If the amenities would be accessible to the public or only the residences.
- Would liven up the area and be a great improvement to the area.
- Using different colors of metal siding or artistic elements would enhance the development.
- Ways to promote the Hispanic culture in the area with the development.

The Commission stated they would like the following listed in the Staff Report for the next presentation:

- A breakout of the dimensions for the building.
- A clear site plan.

[Training Session 6:30:12 PM](#)

Zoning 101 Training - Planning staff will provide the commission with a training session focused on the basics of zoning. Topics covered may include why we have zoning, how to read a zoning map, approval processes, public engagement, administrative vs. legislative decisions, and recent changes to state law that impact zoning and land use. (Staff contact: Nick Norris (801)535-6173 or nick.norris@slcgov.com)

Mr. Nick Norris, Planning Director, gave the following presentation on Zoning:

What is zoning?

- A set of rules used to control where businesses and home are built in a city

Why have zoning?

- Health, safety, and welfare
- Implement adopted plans
- State law requires it
- Link transportation and land use
- Reduce threat from fire
- Provide adequate light and air
- Distribute land use and development
- Protect the tax base
- Efficient government expenditure
- Foster industrial, business, and residential development

Zoning Text

- Establishes types of zoning districts
- Identifies the rules
 - Building height
 - Setbacks
 - Parking
 - Allowed uses
- How to administer
- Approval processes
- Who the decision makers are and what they can do

Zoning Map

- How do you read the zoning map?
- What do the colors mean?

How are things approved?

Permitted

- Projects that meet the zoning requirements
- Listed as a permitted use
- Also called “by right”
- Only need a building permit

Administrative vs. Legislative

- Legislative
 - Legislative: more discretion, up to City Council.
 - Opinions count

- Zoning changes, master plan amendments.
- Administrative
 - Are standards met?
 - Decisions have to be backed by facts
- Special Approvals
 - Special exception
 - Conditional use
 - Planned developments
 - Conditional building and site design review
 - Changes to historic buildings
 - Variances
- Conditional Uses
 - Uses that may have a bigger impact
 - Impacts are related to the use
 - Impacts may impact larger areas
 - Have to be approved if impact can be reduced (even by a small amount)
 - Examples
 - Bars and taverns
 - Fire stations
 - Some cell towers
- Planned Developments
 - Allows a change to a zoning rule in exchange for some community benefit
 - Mostly discretionary
 - Useful for oddly shaped lots, large lots without a lot of street frontage
 - Examples
 - Lots without street frontage
 - More than one building on a lot
 - Large lots
- Conditional Building and Site Design Review
 - Intended for new buildings over a certain size
 - Way to modify individual design standards (amount of ground floor glass)
 - Currently redoing this process
 - Develop new standards of review
 - Clarify the process
 - Define what the Planning Commission can and cannot do
- Variances
 - Intended to preserve a property right
 - Dictated by state law
 - Must be a hardship
 - Related to land
 - Hardship cannot be economic (i.e. expense isn't a factor)

Role of public engagement

- Key goals:
 - Learn about a project
 - Learn about the process/regulations
 - Identify issues and concerns

- Offer suggestions
- How input is used
 - Can impacts be reduced?
 - Are impacts related to standards?
 - How can concerns be addressed?
 - Are suggestions appropriate?

State Law Changes

- New state law (10-9a-306):
 - Interpret and apply ordinance to favor the application.
 - “Plain language” cannot require things not called out in ordinance
- Vague language
 - Ex: Building shall be oriented to the pedestrian
 - Building close to sidewalk
 - Spacing of entrances
 - Canopies or recessed entrances
 - Amount of glass
 - Building materials

The Commission and Staff discussed and stated the following:

- Who else the training had been presented too.
- The ways to get the subject information to the public.
- Was a great presentation and very useful.
- The Commission would like more information on why a certain process was chosen versus another process.
- Offering versions of the presentation in Spanish.

The meeting adjourned at [6:56:28 PM](#)