

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

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:30:59 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; Commissioners Maurine Bachman, Amy Barry, Emily Drown,Carolynn Hoskins, Matt Lyon, Sara Urquhart and Clark Ruttinger. Commissioner Ivis Garcia, Andres Paredes, Brenda Scheer and were excused.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were Wayne Mills, Planning Manager; Casey Stewart, Senior Planner; JP Goates, Principal Planner; Katia Pace, Principal Planner; Michelle Poland, Administrative Secretary and Allison Parks, Assistant City Attorney.

Field Trip

A field trip was held prior to the work session. Planning Commissioners present were: Maurine Bachman, Weston Clark, Carolynn Hoskins, Sara Urquart and Clark Ruttinger. Staff members in attendance were Wayne Mills, Casey Stewart, Katia Pace and JP Goates.

- **1569 South 1100 East** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **569 E 2nd Ave** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **1316 E. Downington Avenue** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **1056 East 500 South** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.

APPROVAL OF THE FEBRUARY 28, 2018, MEETING MINUTES. [5:31:10 PM](#)

MOTION [5:31:21 PM](#)

Commissioner Hoskins moved to approve the February 28, 2018, meeting minutes. Commissioner Ruttinger seconded the motion. Commissioners Hoskins, Lyon and Ruttinger voted “aye”. Commissioner Barry, Bachman and Urquhart abstained from voting as they were not present at the subject meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR [5:31:47 PM](#)

Chairperson Clark welcomed Amy Barry as a new Commissioner.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR [5:32:03 PM](#)

Mr. Wayne Mills, Planning Manager, welcomed Alison Parks, Assistant City Attorney.

Ms. Alison Parks reviewed the district court hearing regarding the Ferry Special Exception. She stated the court upheld the Planning Commissions discussion.

The Commission and Staff discussed the bill regarding the Inland Port and the City’s role in the planning and zoning of the area.

Mr. Mills reviewed the status of the Planned Development Ordinance.

Commissioner Drown arrived at the meeting.

[5:35:06 PM](#)

800 West Street Vacation at approximately 150 South and 800 West - JF Capitol, developer representing the property owner, is requesting to vacate a portion of 800 West where it dead ends at approximately 144 South. This portion of 800 West became obsolete when the I-15 freeway wall was built and access to 200 South eliminated. If the city finds that this portion of the street is not needed, this portion of 800 West can be vacated, declared surplus property and sold at market-rate. The property is located within Council District 2, represented by Andrew Johnston. (Staff contact: Katia Pace at (801)535-5364 or katia.pace@slcgov.com.) Case number: PLNPCM2015-00651 (Administrative 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 regarding the petition.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The uses allowed in the SA-UN-T zone.
- The height limit for the zone.
- The transit corridor and traffic flow for the property
- The process of buying the vacated parcel.

Mr. Kyle LaMalfa, applicant, reviewed the history and lack of maintenance on the property. He stated the proposal would improve the area and reviewed the transit options located within blocks of the development.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- The proposed development for the property.
- If the zoning would remain with the property if the use changed.
- The current use of the property.
- The public outreach and comments for the proposal.

PUBLIC HEARING [5:48:53 PM](#)

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

MOTION [5:49:22 PM](#)

Commissioner Bachman stated, based on the findings and analysis listed in the Staff Report, the testimony and plans presented, she moved that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for the requested Street Vacation, according to PLNPCM2015-00651, with the following conditions:

1. **To amend the subdivision and consolidate the parcels into one parcel including the portion of 800 West.**

2. To record easements that would allow the city and other utility owners to maintain existing utility lines.
3. To reconfigure the street with curb and gutter according to Salt Lake City's specifications.

Commissioner Urquhart seconded the motion. Commissioners Bachman, Barry, Drown, Hoskins, Lyon, Urquhart and Ruttinger voted "aye". The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Kyle LaMalfa stated he appreciated the service of the Commission and especially for Staff member Cheri Coffey who we lost a few weeks ago.

[5:51:45 PM](#)

Turiya's Gifts Expansion Planned Development at approximately 1569 South 1100 East - A request by Chris Dallimore, representing the owners AEON, LLC, Series, for approval of a proposed expansion of an existing business (Turiya's Gifts). The applicant requests relief from the required front yard setback (25 feet reduced to 9 feet). The property is located at approximately 1569 South 1100 East and is located in a RB zoning district (Residential Business) in Council District 5, represented by Erin Mendenhall. (Staff contact: Casey Stewart at 801-535-6260 or casey.stewart@slcgov.com) Case number: PLNSUB2016-00792 (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:

- How the setbacks compared to the neighboring buildings.
- How many properties in the area had setbacks granted under a Planned Development or were allowed under the zoning.
- The height of the surrounding structures.
- If a second story was allowed under the current zoning.
- The development pattern of the area.
- If it was important to have uniform setbacks or if varied setbacks were acceptable.
- The side and front yard for the property.
- The required parking and if additional parking would be added with the proposal.
- The side yard setback required for the zone.
- The materials for the proposal.

Mr. Chris Dallimore, Dallimore Construction, reviewed the history of the proposal and reason for the planned development request.

Ms. Stephanie Pappas, applicant, stated the goal was to create a project that provided beauty in the area and did not create a monolithic building on the corner.

Mr. Dallimore review how the project improved the area and the space for the business.

Ms. Kristen Dalson, applicant, stated the building was the smallest on the block and they were committed to a high quality project for all involved. She explained this was a neighborhood place that was beloved by the community and they would like to comfortably grow the existing business.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- The history of the building.
- The roof overhang.
- The layout of the building.
- The materials for the proposal.
- The use of stucco on the building and if other options were considered.
- If adding a full second story was considered.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:15:54 PM](#)

Chairperson Clark opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Dave Richards, Community Council, stated the proposal was scaled back considerably and the Council was pretty much in favor of the petition as presented. He reviewed the fabric of the area and how it had changed over time. Mr. Richards stated the Community Council was trying to keep a neighborhood feel in the area and the developer had accommodated the concerns. He stated the Community Council was happy with the proposal.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Ms. Claudia Johnson.

The following comments were made:

- The building used to be a gas station and had changed over the years.
- The current number of cars versus parking for the store was an issue.
- An apartment in the upper floor would not be appropriate for the area or the development.

Chairperson Clark closed the Public Hearing.

The Applicants stated an apartment would not fit on the second floor and the space would be used for storage.

The Commission, Applicant and Staff discussed the following:

- If the apartment was part of the approval.
- If the building could be moved further north to accommodate the setbacks.
- The impacts to the setbacks were mitigated due to the size of the yard.
- The number of employees for the business and where the employees park.
- The amount of stucco on the building and if it was appropriate for the area.
- The standards of review for the proposal.

The Commission discussed and stated the following:

- The setbacks for the proposal were a little alarming but the Community Council supported it.
- More could be done by right, but the proposal was the best way for the applicant to get what they needed.

MOTION [6:33:50 PM](#)

Commissioner Lyon stated regarding The Turiya’s Expansion Planned Development, based on the information in the Staff Report, the information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, he moved that the Commission approve the Turiya’s Expansion Planned Development PLNSUB2016-00792. Commissioner Drown seconded the motion. Commissioners Barry, Bachman, Drown, Hoskins, Lyon, Urquhart and Ruttinger voted “aye”. The motion passed unanimously.

[6:34:33 PM](#)

Boldspace, LLC Rezone and Planned Development at approximately 569 E 2nd Ave - Boldspace LLC, represented by Joseph Hatch, is requesting a zoning map amendment and approval for a planned development to bring two existing buildings on a single lot with differing uses into alignment with the zoning ordinance. The long-standing uses on the site are considered legal, but non-conforming. Likewise, the existing condition of the site – that of two buildings on a single lot – is legal, but non-complying. The applicant is also requesting a special exception for alternative means to address vehicle parking on site. Currently the land is used as a salon, a small architecture and design office, and a residential unit. The subject property is within Council District 3, represented by Chris Wharton. (Staff contact: Casey Stewart at (801)535-6260 or casey.stewart@slcgov.com)

- Map Amendment - The applicant is requesting a rezone from SR-1A (Special Development Pattern Residential) to SNB (Small Neighborhood Business). The businesses that are presently on-site are considered legal, but non-conforming. The proposed change would bring them each into conformance and clarify the uses permitted on the property into the future. Case number: PLNPCM2015-00273 (Legislative matter)**
- Planned Development - In order to allow the existing project to be in compliance with the zoning ordinance planned development approval is required to allow multiple buildings on a single lot and to allow the rear building to continue to not have street frontage. These buildings have long been in existence on the site and are currently considered legal, but non-complying. No additional buildings would be constructed as a result of this planned development. Case number: PLNSUB2015-00271 (Administrative matter)**
- Special Exception -The site currently has two off-street parking stalls. Upon the completion of the residential unit in the front building, the applicant would like to assign one of those spots to the resident, leaving one general purpose parking spot on-site. A parking study has been submitted indicating expected usage and proposing alternative means to achieve the necessary parking. Case number: PLNPCM2015-00269 (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 and forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The allowed uses under the current zoning and what the new zone would allow.
- The use restrictions in the SNB zone.
- The change to the setbacks, height, mass and scale under the proposed zoning.
- If the building was historic and if additional requirements would need to be reviewed by the Historic Landmark Commission.

Mr. Joseph Hatch, Bold Space, reviewed the history of the property and how well Staff had worked with the property owner to create the best project. He reviewed the public outreach for the proposal, the history of the area and use of the building. Mr. Hatch reviewed the parking and the study conducted for parking in the area.

The Commission and Applicant discussed and stated the following:

- The proposed location of the bike rack on the property and if it could be moved to the front of the building.
- The placement and style of the bike rack.
- Should not allow for less parking just because a bike rack was being added to the site.
- Why the applicant decided to go through a planned development versus another process.
- The potential future uses for the building.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:59:01 PM](#)

Chairperson Clark opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Mr. Peter Caroon, Ms. Carol Swenson and Mr. Michael Budge.

The following comments were made:

- Supported the proposal.
- The parking was not an issue
- Putting a bike rack in the park strip would take away from the landscaping.
- Would love to see the proposal move forward.
- The applicant was not telling the truth, Mr. Ruben was no longer in the building as he was bought out.
- The weeds on the property needed to be maintained.
- What are the bike racks for as no one would be using them.
- Love renting the building as a business.

- Love the area and want to stay there.
- The maintenance would be addressed.
- The owner would like the option to lease the space to various businesses and the proposal would allow that.

Chairperson Clark closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission, Applicant and Staff discussed the following:

- ADA parking for the property.
- Restrictions that would be applied to future uses.
- If parking requirements would change with different uses.
- What would be allowed if the Special Exemption was granted.
- Language that could be added to the Motion to prevent intense uses from renting the building.
- The square footage of the front portion of the building.
- The standards of review for the petition.
- The number of parking stalls required for different uses.
- How the current parking was determined for the building and use.
- The options to reduce the parking for the proposal and grant the Special Exception.
- The most intensive use allowed in the SNB and what the parking requirements for that use.
- Tabling the petition to allow further review of the code.

The Commission decided to move on to the next agenda items and allow Staff to come back at the end of the meeting with additional information and then make a decision.

[7:50:44 PM](#)

Downington Avenue Townhouses Planned Development at approximately 1316 E. Downington Avenue - Downington Place LLC, requesting a Zoning Map Amendment, Planned Development and Preliminary Subdivision approval for a proposed three-unit single-family attached dwelling (townhouse) project on a single parcel located at the above listed address. The subject property is approximately 0.28 acres (12,150 square feet) in size and is zoned R-1/7000 (Single Family Residential). It contains two existing duplexes. The applicant has requested to amend the zoning map designation of the property to RMF-30 (Low Density Multi-Family) in order to allow the three-unit townhouse project. Planned Development approval is required to reduce the front yard setback from the required 20-feet to 17-feet which is the approximate block face average and to allow 5 feet of additional building height for a roof top deck at the rear of each unit. All three applications will be considered simultaneously by the Planning Commission. The property is located within Council District 7, represented by Amy Fowler. (Staff contact: David J. Gellner at (801)535-6107 or david.gellner@slcgov.com.) Case number: PLNPCM2017-00487, PLNSUB2017-01012 and PLNSUB2017-01013 (Administrative matter)

Commissioner Barry stated she was involved in a discussion at the Community Council for this petition however, it is not the plan presented. She stated she felt she could be impartial to the conversation.

The Commissioners determined there was not a conflict of interest.

Mr. Wayne Mills, Planning Manager, 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 square footage for the driveways.

Mr. Peter Caroon, applicant, reviewed the history of the property, the size of the development and the reasoning for reducing the number of units on the property.

Mr. Prescott Muir, architect, reviewed the square footage of the driveways.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- The ownership of the townhomes and how to guarantee the homes are owner occupied, not rentals.
- If the applicant explored having the primary entrance off of 1300 E.
- The layout and entrances to the property.
- The 1300 East elevation.
- The trees that would be preserved on the site.
- The regulations for the proposal along the Riparian Corridor.

PUBLIC HEARING [8:08:55 PM](#)

Chairperson Clark opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Judy Short, Sugar House Community Council, stated the applicant found a creative solution to a difficult parcel. She reviewed the comments from the neighborhood, the issues with the current structure, and the concerns over the size of the proposed structures. She stated the development had amenities that worked for the property and made the site desirable. Ms. Short reviewed the parking for the proposal and stated it was a very difficult parcel to develop due to the lack of space. She stated over all the Developer had done a very good job on the proposal.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Ms. Susan Slattery, Ms. Julie Plaga and Mr. Tate Moyer.

The following comments were made:

- Completely in favor of the petition as it would greatly improve the property.
- The crime in the area because of the current structure was awful.
- The neighborhood had never been a single family neighborhood.
- The current structure was a danger to the area and should be removed.
- The current structure was an eyesore and the neighborhood deserved better
- Would like to know the time line for construction.

Chairperson Clark closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission, Applicant and Staff discussed the following:

- The different elevations of the building and what was the best entrance for the structure.

MOTION [8:19:54 PM](#)

Commissioner Bachman stated 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 approve the proposed Zoning Map Amendment, file PLNPCM2017-00487, for the property located at 1316 E. Downington Avenue, proposed zone change from R-1/7000 (Single-Family Residential) to RMF-30 (Low Density Multi-Family Residential) on the subject property. Commissioner Drown seconded the motion. Commissioners Barry, Bachman, Drown, Hoskins, Lyon, Urquhart and Ruttinger voted “aye”. The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION [8:21:47 PM](#)

Commissioner Bachman stated based on the findings and analysis in the Staff Report, testimony, and discussion at the public hearing, she moved that the Planning Commission approve the proposed Planned Development request for the Downington Avenue Townhouses PLNPCM2017-01012 and PLNSUB2017-01013 subject to the four conditions listed in the Staff Report. Commissioner Drown seconded the motion. Commissioners Barry, Bachman, Drown, Hoskins, Lyon, Urquhart and Ruttinger voted “aye”. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Urquhart left the meeting.

[8:23:01 PM](#)[8:52:09 PM](#)

TAG 500 Townhomes at approximately 1056 East 500 South - TAG SLC represented by Jordan Atkin, is requesting Planned Development and Preliminary Subdivision approval to develop a three unit, single-family attached development at the above listed address. The project relates to proposed single-family attached dwellings that would be located on the property where a single-family dwelling currently exists. The front unit will be oriented toward 500 South and the two rear units will be located and accessed by a private drive, with each unit providing two car garages. The applicant is requesting relief of zoning standards that include: a 351 square foot reduction below the 3,000 square foot minimum lot size, two lots without frontage on a public street, a 10’ reduction from a

required 20' rear yard, one lot that exceeds lot coverage by .7% above the required 40% maximum, a 2' reduction from the required 8' side entry building landscape requirements, and an approximate 1' encroachment of architectural features into a 20' front yard setback. The subject property is zoned RMF-30 (Low Density Multi-Family Residential) and is located in Council District 4, represented by Derek Kitchen. Staff Contact: JP Goates (801)535-7236 or jp.goates@slcgov.com.) Case number: PLNSUB2017-00455 & PLNSUB2017-00456 (Administrative matter)

Mr. JP Goates, Principal 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 square footage requirement for each lot and what was being requested.
- The landscape yard requirement and where it was located on the property.
- What was provided in the setback that would be lost with the reduction of the setbacks.
- The request to reduce the rear yard setback.
- The fire access to the property.

Mr. Jordan Atkin and Mr. Nathaniel Rather reviewed the fire access to the property and how the landscape buffer requirement was being met in the proposal.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- The interaction between the building and 500 South and what the applicant had done to make it feel welcoming.
- If larger windows were considered for the north facing wall.
- Using windows to break up the wall face would make the development pedestrian.
- The layout on the site and the importance for the development to interact with the street.
- Facing the door to the street would make the entry way a focal point of the design.
- Architectural elements that could be added to make the development more welcoming to the neighborhood.

PUBLIC HEARING [8:52:10 PM](#)

Chairperson Clark opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Ms. Susan Monahan, Mr. Larry Holder and Mr. Matt Monahan.

The following comments were made:

- The proposed development created a privacy issue for the neighbors.
- The current retaining wall was fragile and what would happen to it during construction.
- There would not be a city view as stated in the proposal due to the trees.
- The Staff Report stated if requested the developer would build a fence but how tall could that fence be.

- The proposed setbacks for the proposal were not correct as there should be twenty feet at the back of the structure.
- Parking in the area was a problem and the addition of the homes would increase those issues.
- The noise from the homes and occupants on the patios would be an issue for surrounding neighbors.
- What was the guarantee that the homes would not become a rental.
- The balconies should be to the east of the building.
- Would block the view from the neighboring properties.
- Need to address the storm drains and run off from the property.
- The height was exacerbated by the elevation difference of neighboring properties.
- The building will shadow neighboring structures due to the height.
- The lighting on the back of the structure may be an issue for neighboring homes.

Chairperson Clark closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission, Applicant and Staff discussed the following:

- What could be built on the property by right.
- The concerns of the public and how they could be addressed under the ordinance.
- The guidelines for lighting and how to ensure there was no impact on the neighbors.
- How lighting and noise levels were regulated in the City.
- The Commission's purview over lighting.
- The proposed landscape buffer.
- How porch placement was regulated in the zoning.
- The drainage plan for the proposal.
- The conditions that should be added to the motion.

MOTION [9:11:15 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 PLNSUB2016-00455 for a Planned Development and PLNSUB2017-00456 for a Preliminary Subdivision with the conditions listed in the Staff Report, and with the following modification that they orient the door of the front unit towards 500 South. Commissioner Drown seconded the motion. Commissioners, Bachman, Drown, Hoskins, Lyon and Ruttinger voted "aye". Commissioner Barry voted "nay". The motion passed 5-1.

[9:12:43 PM](#)

Returned to the Bold Space item.

Mr. Stewart reviewed the ordinance and standards the petition had to meet. He reviewed how the petition met the standards regarding parking requirements for potential uses. Mr. Stewart reviewed the use table for the SNB zoning district and parking requirements for each use. He stated with the current uses they would be required to have five parking stalls and they have three.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The language for the motion regarding parking
- The more intense uses that required additional parking.

MOTION[9:21:20 PM](#)

Commissioner Lyon 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 recommend that the City Council approve the Boldspace, LLC zoning map amendment petition PLNPCM2015-00273. Commissioner Bachman seconded the motion. Commissioners, Bachman, Barry, Drown, Hoskins, Lyon and Ruttinger voted “aye”. The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION

Commissioner Lyon 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 both the Boldspace, LLC Planned Development PLNSUB2015-00271. Commissioner Drown seconded the motion. Commissioners, Bachman, Barry, Drown, Hoskins, Lyon and Ruttinger voted “aye”. The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION[9:23:10 PM](#)

Commissioner Lyon stated based on the information in the Staff Report, the information presented, he moved that the Planning Commission approve Special Exception PLNPCM2015-00269 subject to the related zoning map amendment being approved by the City Council, at which time the expiration period starts and the change that it was not twenty five hundred feet exempted but that the overall parking requirements on the lot be reduced by two.

The Commission and staff discussed if the language was appropriate and if the bike rack and bench needed to be included in the motion.

MOTION [9:25:08 PM](#)

Commissioner Lyon stated based on the information in the Staff Report, the information presented, he moved that the Planning Commission approve the Boldspace, LLC Special Exception PLNPCM2015-00269 subject to the related zoning map amendment being approved by the City Council, at which time the expiration period starts and that the exemption is reducing the overall parking requirement on the parcel by two not exempting the first twenty five hundred feet, complies with the parking study and that the Applicant put in the pedestrian friendly amenities such as a bike rack and a bench per the Staff Report.

The Commission and Staff discussed the motion language.

MOTION

Commissioner Lyon amended and clarified his motion to be based on the information in the Staff Report and the information presented he moved that the Planning Commission approve the Boldspace, LLC Special Exception PLNPCM2015-00269 subject to the following conditions:

- 1. The related zoning map amendment is approved by the City Council.**
- 2. The special exception granted approves the current number of parking stalls of three (3), and for future uses allows for an overall reduction of the number of parking stalls required by three (3) stalls rather than exempting the first 2, 500 square feet as proposed.**
- 3. The applicant complies with the submitted parking study.**
- 4. The applicant provides the pedestrian-friendly amenities to include a bicycle rack and a bench as noted in the staff report.**
- 5. On-street parking directly in front of the property can be used in satisfying the parking requirement.**

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

The meeting adjourned at [9:29:06 PM](#)