

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
City & County Building
451 South State Street, Room 326, Salt Lake City, Utah
Wednesday, February 14, 2018

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:30:08 PM](#). Audio recordings of the Planning Commission meetings are retained for a period of time.

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

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were Nick Norris, Planning Director; Daniel Echeverria, Senior Planner; David Gellner, Principal Planner; Ashley Scarff, 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: Weston Clark, Maurine Bachman, Ivis Garcia, Carolyn Hoskins and Clark Ruttinger. Staff members in attendance were Nick Norris, Daniel Echeverria, David Gellner and Ashley Scarff.

- **2473 S 700 East** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal. The Commissioners asked if trees would be removed. Staff stated yes the trees would be removed but would be replaced. The Commission asked how deep the lot was. Staff stated it was 200 feet.
- **754 North 800 West** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **131 E 700 S** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **275 W High/242 W Paramount Avenue** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.

APPROVAL OF THE JANUARY 24, 2018, MEETING MINUTES. [5:30:39 PM](#)

MOTION [5:30:48 PM](#)

Commissioner Bachman moved to approve the January 24, 2018, meeting minutes. Commissioner Hoskins seconded the motion. Commissioners Bachman, Lyon, Ruttinger and Garcia voted “aye”. Commissioner Hoskins abstained from voting as she was not present at the subject meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR [5:31:16 PM](#)

Chairperson Clark stated he had nothing to report.

Vice Chairperson Garcia stated she had nothing to report.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR [5:31:22 PM](#)

Mr. Nick Norris, Planning Director, reviewed the petitions the City Council would be reviewing in the next few weeks. He reviewed the discussion regarding the Northwest Quadrant and the inland port.

[5:33:01 PM](#)

700 Horizon Planned Development and Preliminary Subdivision at approximately 2473 S 700 East - Carlos Nunez, representing the property owner North Rock Capital LLC, is requesting approval for a Planned Development and Preliminary Subdivision to create four townhome lots. Planned Development approval is required as three of the lots would not front on a public street. Other zoning requirements may be modified through the Planned Development process. The subject property is located in a RMF-30 (Low Density Multi-family Residential) zoning district and is located in Council District 7 represented by Amy Fowler. (Staff contact: Daniel Echeverria at (801)535-7165 or daniel.echeverria@slcgov.com) Case numbers: PLNSUB2017-00980/00981(Administrative matter)

Mr. Daniel Echeverria, 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 outlined in the Staff Report.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The zoning standards for rooftop decks.

Mr. Trent Smith, architect, reviewed the proposal, the changes made in response to the Community Council and neighbors, the existing trees and which ones would be saved or removed. He reviewed the property access, building materials, layout of the units and the fencing for the proposal.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- Access to the units.

PUBLIC HEARING [5:46:42 PM](#)

Chairperson Clark opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Judy Short, Sugar House Community Council, stated the proposal did not meet the intent of the proposed ordinance. She stated the Community Council felt the proposal was too large for the lot and was not clear on the usefulness of the green spaces. She suggested having the doors open to the green space and not the side of the building would be more appealing to residences. Ms. Short stated moving the drive and adding the additional windows was a benefit and made the building more attractive. She stated the purpose of a planned development was to create a better project and asked if the city was looking for quality housing or just building what was allowed by zoning. Ms. Short stated the proposal needed to meet the intent of the new ordinance and the master plan, the units would be high priced and they would like to see at least one affordable unit in the development.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Mr. Bob Norwood and Mr. Ramsie Henderson

The following comments were made:

- Originally concerned about the placement of the building, but the current proposal was acceptable.

- The development would add to the value of the area
- The proposal would fit the area and improve the streetscape.

Chairperson Clark closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- The elements of the proposal being modified under the Planned Development.
- The required setbacks.
- The reasoning for changing the lot widths.
- How the building front was determined and if the proposal met the standards for frontage.
- What could be built on the lot without the Planned Development.
- How the pending ordinance affected the current proposal.

The Commission discussed and stated the following:

- The need to encourage the developers to articulate the building facades and give it a more traditional front, not just a box turned sideways.
- How to address two story infill structures and surrounding neighbor's privacy.

MOTION [6:03:16 PM](#)

Commissioner Ruttinger stated based on the information in the Staff Report, the information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, he moved that the Planning Commission approve petitions PLNSUB2017-00980 and PLNPCM2017-00981, 700 Horizon Planned Development and Preliminary Subdivision, with the conditions listed in the Staff Report. Along with the proviso that the driveway of the planned development be to the north of the property rather than to the south as it appeared in the Staff Report. Commissioner Lyon seconded the motion. Commissioners Garcia, Bachman, Hoskins, Lyon, and Ruttinger, voted "aye". The motion passed unanimously.

[6:04:36 PM](#)

The Commission discussed the public hearing portion of the Homeless Resource Centers and if public comments would be heard. It was determined that public comments would be taken and the comment period would remain open.

[6:07:04 PM](#)

Rose Park Neighborhood Community Center Conditional Use at approximately 754 North 800 West - Dan Rip, Real Property Manager for Salt Lake City Corporation (property owner), is requesting the approval of a community recreation center conditional use at the above listed address on parcels that were recently created from street closures. If approved, the City plans to extend a long-term land lease to the Good Samaritan Foundation to allow the organization to build a facility on the subject property that will operate as a resource for local refugees. The site is located in the RMF-35 Moderate Density Multi-Family Residential Zoning District and is located in Council District 3, represented by Chris Wharton. (Staff contact: Ashley Scarff (801)535-7660 or ashley.scarff@slc.gov.com.) Case number: PLNPCM2017-01020 (Administrative matter)

Ms. Ashley Scarff, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff recommended that the Planning Commission approve the petition as outlined in the Staff Report.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- What was proposed for the space behind the building?
- The history of the property and rezoning.

Mr. Tom Lloyd, Good Samaritan Project, stated they were excited to move forward with construction and reviewed the programs that would be offered in the facility.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- The layout of the parking on the street.
- If a parking lot for the facility could be added in the future.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:15:59 PM](#)

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

MOTION [6:16:21 PM](#)

Commissioner Bachman stated based on the findings listed in the Staff Report and the testimony and plans presented, she moved that the Planning Commission approve the requested conditional use application for the Rose Park Neighborhood Community Center PLNPCM2017-01020 with the following condition:

- 1. The subject property currently consists of two (2) separate parcels, which will need to be combined through the lot consolidation process prior to the issuance of any building permits.**

Commissioner Hoskins seconded the motion. Commissioners Garcia; Bachman, Hoskins, Lyon, and Ruttinger, voted “aye”. The motion passed unanimously.

Conditional Use for a Homeless Resource Center at approximately 131 E 700 S - Shelter the Homeless is requesting Conditional Use approval for a new homeless resource center to be located at the above listed address on a 1.29 acre property in the D-2 (Downtown Support) zoning district. The proposed women’s resource center will be approximately 61,229 square feet in size and will include areas for sleeping and personal hygiene, client intake, community and day uses spaces, client services, administration, food services, support and donations. 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: PLNPCM2017-01063

Mr. David Gellner, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated this was a work session and asked the Commission for feedback and input on the proposal.

Ms. Jill Jones, Mr. Preston Cochran and, Mr. Steve Simmons stated they were open to answer any questions the Commission may have.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- The Shelter the Homeless program.
- How cueing would be addressed and the programs for the dining hall.
- The individuals that would be using the facilities and programs.
- How the residents would be tracked and accounted for.
- The average time someone would stay at the facility.
- If research had been done on similar facilities and the programs they offer.
- How long the average person stayed at the current shelters.
- How spreading the facilities out helped the people using the facilities and the neighborhoods.
- The impact of affordable housing on homelessness.
- The proposed height of the fence around the facility.
- The entrance for the center.
- How the facilities differed from current shelters.
- How loitering would be prevented on the sites and neighboring properties.
- The public outreach for the proposals.
- The changes made because of the public outreach.
- How bikes and shopping carts would be addressed in the building.
- How animals would be accommodated in the facilities.
- The placement of the wall around the facility.
- If the parking areas were gated.
- The potential detrimental effects that needed to be worked through for the proposals.
- The lighting for the sites and how it accommodated the neighborhood and facility.
- Needed to ensure the impacts, required to be mitigated, were related to the use of the building not current issues in the area.
- The operating hours for the facility.
- Security for the facilities and the surrounding properties.
- The surrounding property uses.
- The current number of homeless persons in the city and the number of people the facilities can house.
- Where homeless people would go if they were not housed in the facilities.
- The programs being put in place throughout the state to address homelessness.
- The day spaces and activities available in the facilities.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:52:32 PM](#)

Chairperson Clark opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Ms. Shannon Bryant, Ms. Shannon Jensen and Mr. David Kingston.

The following comments were made:

- This meeting was the first notice of this facility, she received.
- There is a five star hotel in the area and was in downtown SLC, was this the right location for a center?
- Not fair for neighbors to have to deal with a homeless presence in the area.
- What happened to the people that could not be housed in the facilities if capacity was reached? Where do people go who cannot get in? Would occupancy limits be ignored in cold weather?
- The nearby park is already occupied by homeless, this will make it worse.
- City has allowed too many homeless people to be in the neighborhood
- Loitering is a problem. How will the City deal with that issue?
- Shopping carts are already being dumped on the property, what is the plan to deal with an increase in shopping carts being left throughout the neighborhood?
- How can a business owner get appointed to the community group that is required by ordinance to coordinate with the HRC?
- Security issues needed to be addressed and a six foot wall would not be adequate.
- Lighting was an issue/concern and would like it further investigated.
- The homeless men would be there trying to access the women staying at the facility.
- The Rio Grande sting stirred people into the outlying neighborhoods.
- Property owners have to follow the good landlord program and this was going against that.
- The facility would devalue properties in the area.
- The center should not be in a residential area and the zoning was changed to accommodate it.
- The neighboring parking structure and public spaces would become prime destinations for homeless persons to loiter.
- How would garbage, drugs and other health issues surrounding the facility be addressed?
- How did one get appointed to the community group?
- The improvements to the ordinance were great.
- Will non-HRC residents be allowed to eat at the facility?

Mr. Norris stated additional public comments or questions could be directed to Planning Staff or Mr. David Litvack.

[7:02:01 PM](#)

Conditional Use for a Homeless Resource Center on High/Paramount Avenue at approximately 275 W High Avenue and 242 W Paramount Avenue - Shelter the Homeless is requesting Conditional Use approval for a new homeless resource center to be located at the above listed address on a 3 acre combined property in the CG (General Commercial) zoning district. The proposed resource center will serve both men and women with 100 beds dedicated for each. It will be approximately 63,371 square feet in

size and will include areas for sleeping and personal hygiene, client intake, community and day uses spaces, client services, administration, food services, support and donations. The property is located within Council District 5, represented by Erin Mendenhall. (Staff contact: David J. Gellner at (801)535-6107 or david.gellner@slcgov.com) Case number: PLNPCM2017-01064

Mr. David Gellner, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated this was a work session and asked the Commission for feedback and input on the proposal.

The Commission, Applicants and Staff discussed the following:

- Why the facility entrance was not on High Avenue.
- The driving factors for having the entrance on the south side of the building.
- If there was a plan to continue High Avenue through the block.
- How the height and length of the wall on High Avenue was mitigated.
- The length of the wall on the north.
- Why the drive continued around the entire facility
 - It was required for fire access on both facilities.
- Shelter will be a draw for people to the area. More people lingering in area. Businesses will be impacted.
- What is the overflow plan? The details of the overflow plan are important. Understand details of the overflow plan may not be ready by end of March
- What will happen when the facility is full and there are people that could not be housed?
- Would suggest the center be somewhat responsible to find housing for individuals beyond the 200 at the facility.
- How to address those individuals that did not want housing but would mill around the centers. The street outreach programs to bring people in and how those programs mitigate loitering.
- There will always be homeless individuals that do not want housing and it was increasing the impact to the neighborhood by having the entrance to the facility on Paramount Avenue.
- It seemed like it was prioritizing design over mitigating impacts.
- The programs in place to help these facilities and others around the state house the homeless.
- A plan that outlined how overflow would be addressed would be helpful for the community.
- Having community teams assigned to each center would help mitigate the neighborhoods concerns.
- How one could get involved with the community team.
- The transportation plan for moving individuals to the various shelters.
- If a taller wall should be added to the plan and the Planning Commissions purview over the height of the wall.

The Commissions purview over the petitions and what public comments should be addressing.

Mr. David Litvack, SLC Mayors office, reviewed how overflow would be addressed. He reviewed the supportive housing that would come online at the same time the facilities opened. Mr. Litvack

reviewed the overall comprehensive plan and how it addressed over flow housing for homeless individuals.

PUBLIC HEARING [7:38:36 PM](#)

Chairperson Clark opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Mr. David Boyer, Mr. Matt Widman, Ms. Michelle Goldberg and Ms. Amy Russell.

The following comments were made:

- There have been break-ins in the area already and the addition of the center would increase crime in the area.
- How many times had the community heard Pioneer Park would be cleaned up, unless the City was willing to have the continued police presence it would not work?
- Don't want the neighborhood to become the Rio Grande area.
- It was not just security, it was cleanliness that needed to be addressed
- What was the curb line and lighting that would be at these facilities
- The streetscapes needed to deter drugs, sleeping etc.
- There needed to be a defined security and cleanliness plan for two to three blocks surrounding the area.
- Buildings in the area will be hard to rent/sale in the future.
- The process was not fair to the surrounding property owners.
- There had been zero mitigation to benefit the surrounding businesses.
- Surrounding businesses have shouldered the brunt of the problems.
- The center would be a downfall for the area.
- People are not familiar with the programs.
- It was scary that people did not know what was in the area and the process of approval was backwards.
- As a community we need to be careful that homelessness is not seen as criminal.
- Salt Lake is a community that takes care of each other and people without a home need a place to be safe and get better.
- Is there a hotline for people to report issues and problems?
- Need a detailed security and operations plan.
- Increased police presence on Paramount and on High Avenue is necessary.
- Need a police presence in the area
- Already issues with homeless sleeping in the area.
- Impacts are more than just the site, need to consider 2-3 surrounding blocks.
- Marketability of property in future for leasing options?
- Want curb, gutters and lighting on Paramount sidewalks. State liquor store is close by. Need security and cleanliness plan.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- Will there be a morning demand? (people waiting for a bed to open)
- Need a connection from the center to the community.

- There are hundreds of north facing properties and the building was not mitigating the impact to the surrounding businesses.
- Turning the building could mitigate the issues.
- Need to have a bigger outward look at the impacts to the neighborhood.
- Need to review community teams, clean up and the City should be willing to help with those issues.
- The final plans needed to include mitigation of impacts to the neighborhood.
- What could and could not be reviewed under the conditional use process
- Identify the purview of the Commission in the next Staff Report and discussion.
- If the applicant was doing to develop strategies to address the concerns of the public.
- The entrances to the building and what would happen if the entrance was changed to High Avenue.
- Need to address how the traffic flow, of homeless individuals, would be mitigated along Paramount Avenue.
- High Avenue was a way to mitigate the concerns of the public and there was not really a reason to face the building to Paramount Avenue.
- The options to relocate the entrance and the effects to the operations, design and function of the building.
- Would like a list of pros and cons of why High Ave would not work for the entrance included in the next presentation.

[8:08:42 PM](#)

Planning Division Annual Report: Nick Norris, Planning Director, will provide an overview of the Planning Division 2017 Annual Report. The Annual Report reviews the activity of the Planning Commission, Historic Landmark Commission, and the Planning Division over the past year, including work load, major accomplishments, master plan implementation, public engagement activities, staff development, and application trends. The Planning Division Annual Report will be posted online at www.slcgov.com/planning

Mr. Norris gave an overview of the Planning Division Annual Report.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The number of affordable units in the City.

The meeting adjourned at [8:24:41 PM](#).