

+

**SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**City & County Building**  
**451 South State Street, Room 326, Salt Lake City, Utah**  
**Wednesday, August 9, 2017**

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:29:56 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, Ivis Garcia, Andres Paredes, Brenda Scheer and Sara Urquhart. Chairperson Matt Lyon, Commissioners Emily Drown, Weston Clark and Clark Ruttinger were excused.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were Nick Norris, Planning Director; Casey Stewart, Senior Planner; Chris Lee, Principal Planner; Katia Pace, 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, Brenda Scheer and Sara Urquhart. Staff members in attendance were Wayne Mills, John Anderson, Katia Pace and Casey Stewart.

- **301 West South Temple** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal and oriented the Commission to the area. The Commission asked if the current construction was approved under a separate permit. Staff stated yes.
- **1050 W 500 South**- Staff gave an overview of the proposal and oriented the Commission to the area. The Commission asked how long the building had been on the site and why there was so much parking in the area. Staff stated the building had been there for fifty seven years.
- **361 W Reed Ave**- Staff gave an overview of the proposal and oriented the Commission to the area. The Commission asked if the alley was public. The Commission and Staff discussed the character of the single family homes east of the site. The Commission asked if the developer would have elevations of the apartment project next door and who would own the alley after the proposal was complete.

**APPROVAL OF THE JULY 26, 2017, MEETING MINUTES.** [5:32:03 PM](#)

**MOTION** [5:32:15 PM](#)

**Commissioner Bachman moved to approve the July 26, 2017, meeting minutes. Commissioner Paredes seconded the motion. Commissioners Bachman, Garcia, Paredes and Scheer voted “aye”. Commissioner Urquhart abstained from voting as she was not present at the subject meeting.**

**REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR** [5:32:29 PM](#)

Vice ChairpersonCarolynn Hoskins stated she had nothing to report.

**REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR** [5:30:07 PM](#)

Mr. Nick Norris, Planning Director, reviewed the items for the August 23, agenda. He reviewed the October Utah APA conference and asked Commissioners interested in attending to send him an email.

[5:33:00 PM](#)

**Vivint Arena Sign Overlay at approximately 301 West South Temple - A text amendment to amend a section of the Salt Lake City Zoning Ordinance and create a localized alternative sign overlay district on the block that currently houses the Vivint Arena. It is bounded by 300 West, 400 West, South Temple and 100 South. This overlay would allow the owners of the property to request to install signage that would not meet the basic standards of the Zoning Ordinance. Related provisions of title 21A may also be amended as part of this petition as necessary. The property is located in Council District 4 represented by Derek Kitchen. (Staff contact: John Anderson at (801)535-7214 or john.anderson@slcgov.com.) Case number: PLNPCM2017-00407 (Legislative Matter)**

Mr. Chris Lee, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as outlined 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 petition.

Mr. Wade Budge, applicant, reviewed the proposal and reasoning for the text amendment. He reviewed the design and use of the proposed signs and the next steps for the proposal.

Mr. Brad Holms, LHM Group, reviewed the updates to landscaping.

The Commission and applicant discussed the following:

- The proposed digital signs.
- The use of solar panels on the wayfinding signs.
- The size of the proposed signs versus what was currently on the site.
- The round sign in the proposal.
  - The applicant stated they were not constructing the round sign.
- The height of the “J” monument, if it would be a climbing hazard and how operations would remedy the climbing hazard.
- The maximum size and number of signs that could be placed on the building under the proposed sign overlay.
- Where the animated signs would be located on the building and site.
- If sponsors advertising would be projected on the animated signs.
- If the animated signs would have sound.
- How the landscaping would be affected by the sign plan.
- The operating hours for the digital signs.

**PUBLIC HEARING** [6:00:07 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 and stated the following:

- The proposed signage may not be enough to create the excitement the applicant was looking for.
- The signage on other arenas and how it compared to the proposal.
  - There was potential to grow and add additional signs in the future.
- The other arenas were not like Salt Lake, they had electronic signs all over their cities and Salt Lake does not.
- If the proposal was too much for Salt Lake City.
- If the arena was going to be the only area in the city with this type of signage the proposal seemed modest.
- Options for the signage at the practice facility.
  - Staff felt the practice facility signage should be addressed separately.

**MOTION [6:06:32 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Garcia stated based on my analysis in the Staff Report and public comments presented, she moved that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council regarding petition PLNPCM2017-00407, to amend section 21A.46.110 Sign Regulations of Downtown Districts, to allow for the creation of a localized alternative sign overlay district on the block bounded by 300 West, 400 West, 100 South, and South Temple Street with conditions one and two listed in the Staff Report. Commissioner Scheer seconded the motion. Commissioners Bachman, Garcia, Paredes and Scheer voted “aye”. Commissioner Urquhart voted “nay”. The motion passed 4-1.**

**[6:08:21 PM](#)**

**Neighborhood House Subdivision Amendment, Street Closure and Zoning Amendment at approximately 1050 W 500 South - A request by Neighborhood House to amend the subdivision, close a portion of 1100 West Street and to amend the zoning of four parcels (419, 422, 423, and 430 South 1100 West) from R-1/5,000 (Single Family Residential) to I (Institutional.) The applicant’s intent is to renovate the site and replace the daycare center building. The subject property is zoned I (Institutional) and R-1/5000 Single Family Residential District and is located within Council District 2, represented by Andrew Johnston. (Staff contact: Katia Pace at (801)535-6354 or [katia.pace@slcgov.com](mailto:katia.pace@slcgov.com))**

- a. **Subdivision Amendment and Street Closure - request to amend the subdivision by consolidating lots and to close a portion of 1100 West that is located within the Neighborhood House site. This portion of 1100 West only exists on paper and is not utilized for transportation purposes or access to other properties. Case number: PLNSUB2017-00320**
- b. **Zoning Amendment - zoning change for four parcels (419, 422, 423, and 430 South 1100 West) from R-1/5,000 (Single Family Residential) to I (Institutional.) Currently, the site consist of several parcels that are zoned Institutional except for the four parcels mentioned above. Case number: PLNPCM2017-00447 (Legislative Matter)**

Ms. Katia Pace, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as outlined 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 and approve the preliminary plat for subdivision as presented.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The proposed zoning changes and which parcels were affected.

Ms. Jennifer Nuttall, Neighborhood house, reviewed the history of the facility and its use. She reviewed the changes to the site and additional parking that would be added as part of the proposal.

Mr. Jackson Ferguson. FFKR architects, reviewed the traffic and deliveries for the site.

The Commission and applicant discussed the following:

- If a formal traffic study had been conducted.
- The number of children and adults using the facility.
- The parking for the proposal.
- The benefit of having delivery trucks out of the side street traffic.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING [6:26:52 PM](#)**

Vice Chairperson Hoskins opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Mr. Brandon Feldsted and Mr. James Reynolds.

The following comments were made:

- Traffic was a disaster in the area.
- The business was an issue for the area and the neighborhood.
- Needed to address the parking in the neighborhood.
- The growth of the facility would ruin the neighborhood.
- The garbage needed to be addressed.
- The parking could be addressed if the office were moved to the new parking area.
- More needed to be done to protect the users of the facility when they are exiting.

Vice Chairperson Hoskins closed the Public Hearing.

The applicants stated the reason for the proposal was to add off street parking and help the neighborhood. They reviewed the ingress and egress for the proposal that would help alleviate traffic in the area.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- How deliveries would be accommodated for the proposal.
- The entrances and exits for traffic.
- The pickup and drop off areas.
- The number of parking stalls that would be added to the site.

- The number of handicap stalls that would be included.
- The use and future of the community garden.
- The proposed fencing for the site.
- The conditions of the approval and the requested parking/traffic study.

**MOTION** [6:43:02 PM](#)

**Commissioner Bachman stated regarding the Neighborhood House Zoning Amendment, Subdivision Amendment & Street Closure, based on the findings and analysis listed in the Staff Report and the testimony and plans presented, she moved that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for the requested Zoning Map Amendment PLNPCM2017-00447 and Street Closure PLNSUB2017-00320 with the conditions that:**

1. A traffic and parking study be submitted to the city in conjunction with the site plan review.
2. The portion of 1100 West, after it is closed, will be zoned I (Institutional.)

**Further she moved that the Planning Commission approve the preliminary plat for Subdivision Amendment PLNSUB2017-00320 with the condition:**

1. Closure of portion of 1100 West be approved by the City Council.

**Commissioner Garcia seconded the motion. Commissioners Bachman, Garcia, Scheer and Urquhart voted “aye”. Commissioner Paredes voted “nay”. The motion passed 4-1.**

[6:44:47 PM](#)

**Young Planned Development at approximately 361 W Reed Ave - A request by Dave Young, new owner/applicant, for planned development approval to construct a 5-unit residential condominium project with modified building setbacks, parking stall count, and alley access at the above listed address in a MU (Mixed Use) zoning district located in Council district 3, represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff contact: Casey Stewart at (801)535-6260 or [casey.stewart@slcgov.com](mailto:casey.stewart@slcgov.com).) Case number: PLNSUB2017-00176 (Administrative Matter)**

Mr. Casey Stewart, Senior Planner, reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff recommended that the Planning Commission approve the petition as presented.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The structures proposed to be demolished.
- The number of parking spaces in the proposal.

Mr. Jordan Atkin, Mr. Dave Young and Mr. Rodrigo, reviewed the changes made to the proposal in response to Staff’s comments. They reviewed the layout, parking and how the proposal improved the area. The applicants reviewed the architectural elements of the proposal and the care taken to make the proposal fit the neighborhood.

## **PUBLIC HEARING [7:10:35 PM](#)**

Vice Chairperson Hoskins opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Ms. Tiffany Provost, Mr. Matt McKnight and Mr. Steven Moosman.

The following comments were made:

- Concerned with the neighboring apartments and the proposed townhomes not being combined into one development.
- How a project could be approved when no one knew who owned the alley.
- The traffic study for Reed Avenue needed to be complete prior to construction.
- The number of developments in the area raised concern due to traffic.
- If the property was combined with the neighboring project a better development would be possible.
- The height of the development encroached on the privacy of neighbors.
- This was not a transit friendly development as grocery stores and other services were not located within walking distance.
- Reed Avenue was small, very busy and could not handle the additional traffic the development would create.
- Parking would be an issue with the development.
- Needed to ensure construction activities were not an issue for the neighboring businesses.

Vice Chairperson Hoskins read the following card:

- Mr. Vince Rogers- The developer needs to have more space allocated for the project. There is not sufficient ingress and egress.

Vice Chairperson Hoskins closed the Public Hearing.

The applicants reviewed the request for additional parking,

The Commission, Applicant and Staff discussed the following:

- The original number of parking stalls and how the designs were changed to reflect the current number of stalls.
- Options to improve the parking for the area.
- The issues with the ownership of the alley.
- If it mattered that traffic would increase and the right of way to the existing properties would be affected.
- The width of the alleyway and the egress and ingress
- The approval process for the surrounding developments.
- At what point was a lot too small to develop on.
- The parking requirements for the property.
- The issues with constructing a smaller building on the property.

- It was important for the Commission to understand how the proposal fit the area and related to the other developments in the area.
- The next steps for the proposal.
- The standards of review for a planned development and how compatibility played a part.

The applicant reviewed how the proposal enhanced the area, met the standards and created a benefit for the neighborhood.

**MOTION [7:38:38 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Scheer moved to table the petition with the proviso that the Commission get additional information about the site plans of the properties that area surrounding the subject property and their elevations. Since the applicant has clearly stated that they are blending, the Commission needs to know if that was in fact the case before a final decision could be made.**

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The issues with tabling the petition and requiring information be gathered from other petitions.
  - Mr. Neilson stated information on neighboring site plans was discussing offsite conditions.
- Compatibility was being argued by the applicant but the provided information did not clearly show the variables in the neighborhood.
- The Commission would like the site plans of the neighboring building, currently under construction.
- The setbacks on the property were a concerns.
- If the other elements of the proposal were a concern.
- The risk to the Commission due to the ownership of the alleyway.
- The access to the garages from the alleyway.
- The size of the alley that allowed for ingress and egress to the garages.
- Why the applicant felt they needed a five unit development instead of something that fit the lot.
- The open space that would be included in the development.
- The number of exceptions in the request and why all of them were necessary.

**MOTION [7:59:05 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Scheer stated regarding the Young Condominium Planned Development, based on the information in the Staff Report, the information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, she moved to deny the Young Condominium Planned Development PLNSUB 2017- 00176 because evidence had not been presented that demonstrated the proposal complies with the following standards :**

**2. Compatibility with the neighborhood.**

**Commissioner Urquhart seconded the motion. Commissioners, Garcia, Paredes, Scheer and Urquhart voted “aye”. Commissioner Bachman voted “nay”. The motion passed 4-1.**

**The commission took a short break. [8:00:46 PM](#)**

The commission reconvened. [8:03:46 PM](#)

[8:03:48 PM](#)

**Temporary Use Provisions Text Amendment** - A petition initiated by the Salt Lake City Mayor, Jackie Biskupski, to modify section 21A.42 (Temporary Uses) of the Salt Lake City zoning ordinance. Temporary uses are of a limited duration and include carnivals, fairs and similar events, fundraisers, large scale outdoor sales events, temporary food service, Christmas tree sales and other outdoor holiday sales, etc. This is part of an ongoing effort to simplify and streamline planning processes and regulations. Current temporary use standards have created confusion for the public, the business community, and for city departments involved with applying them. This text amendment will clarify and facilitate the process to obtain a temporary use permit. The proposed text amendment is applicable citywide. (Staff contact: Chris Lee at (801)535-7706 or [chris.lee@slcgov.com](mailto:chris.lee@slcgov.com).) Case number: PLNPCM2017-00272 (Legislative Matter)

Mr. Chris Lee, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as outlined 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.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The reasoning behind the eliminated uses.
- How food trucks and taco stands are regulated in the ordinance.

**PUBLIC HEARING** [8:12:27 PM](#)

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

**MOTION** [8:12:35 PM](#)

Commissioner Urquhart stated regarding the Zoning Text Amendment to the Temporary Uses, PLNPCM2017-00272, based on the information in the Staff Report, the information presented and input received during the public hearing, she moved that the Planning Commission transmit a favorable recommendation to the City Council regarding petition PLNPCM2017-00272 for text amendments to the Temporary Uses (21A.42) section of the Salt Lake City Zoning Code. The Commission finds that the project complies with the review standards as demonstrated in Attachment C of the Staff Report. Commissioner Scheer seconded the motion. Commissioners Bachman, Garcia, Paredes, Scheer and Urquhart voted “aye”. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at [8:13:44 PM](#)