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**To:** Salt Lake City Planning Commission  
**From:** Sara Javoronok, Senior Planner  
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---

**Planned Development**

**Property Address:** 1739 S. Main Street  
**Parcel ID:** 16-18-301-009-0000  
**Master Plan:** Central Community Master Plan  
**Zoning District:** CC Corridor Commercial  

**Request:** A request by Andrew Black of CW Urban, for approval of two buildings with 13 multi-family residential units. The subject properties are located in the CC (Commercial Corridor) zoning district. The applicant is requesting Planned Development approval for a building without street frontage.

**Recommendation:** Based on the information in this staff report, Planning Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the proposal as proposed and subject to complying with all applicable regulations and the conditions below:

1. Final approval of the plans shall be delegated to planning staff to ensure compliance with the zoning standards and conditions of approval.
2. Approval is for the specific items discussed and identified in the staff report. All other applicable zoning regulations and requirements from other city departments still apply.
3. The developer will need to record against the property an estimate of the costs for maintenance and capital improvements of all infrastructure for the planned development for a period of 60 years in compliance with 21A.55.110 Disclosure of Private Infrastructure Costs for Planned Developments.

**Attachments:**

A. Vicinity Map  
B. Property & Vicinity Photographs  
C. Applicant Submittal  
D. Existing Conditions  
E. CC Zone Standards Summary
F. Analysis of Planned Development Standards

G. Public Process & Comments

H. Department Review Comments

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:
The subject property is approximately 0.46 acres (20,050 square feet) in size. It is located on the east side of Main Street between 1700 South and Coatsville Avenue. The site was previously occupied by a used car dealer and two small structures remain on the site. The proposal is for two buildings, one facing Main Street and the other located directly behind it. The west building, facing Main Street, will have seven units and the east building will have six units. The applicant anticipates completing a condominium plat for the units, but has not submitted a complete application, and it will be completed separately from this process. A single unit faces Main Street and the others are located to the rear of it. Pedestrian access to the other units is provided from a sidewalk located to the south of the buildings. Each unit has a two-car garage and vehicular access is provided from a shared driveway located to the north.

The property is located within the South State Street Overlay District that is designed to reinforce historic development patterns in the area. It meets the requirements of this district and the underlying Commercial Corridor (CC) zoning district. Planned Development approval is required to meet 21A.36.010.B.1, which requires all buildings to have frontage on a public street.

The surrounding properties are a mix of residential and commercial uses zoned CC. The properties to the north and west are residential uses and the properties to south and east are commercial uses. The Central Community Master Plan land use map identifies this property and the area between 1700 South and Coatsville Avenue as Medium Residential/Mixed Use with 10-50 dwelling units per acre. The proposal is for 28 dwelling units per acre, which is consistent with the Master Plan.
Rendering of the proposal as seen from Main Street

Main Street (west) elevation
The Main Street elevation, which is Building 1, has a single unit facing the street. The exterior material on the first floor is brick, Interstate Stratford, or similar deep red. The entry is centrally located with a pair of windows on each side. The South State Street Corridor Overlay District requires 25% glass on the first floor of residential units and the proposal has 27.8%. The second and third floors are hard coat stucco in two shades, charcoal gray and white. The charcoal gray stucco element is slightly articulated from the white stucco. The paired window pattern is continued with the exception of the south side of the second floor where there is a single window and a balcony. The south elevation, the “front” entry for the remainder of the units in the building, has a similar appearance with a paired window and brick on the first floor and charcoal gray and white stucco on the second and third floors.

The first floor of the north elevation of the building provides access to the two car garages for each unit. The second and third floors are charcoal gray stucco. The east elevation is mostly white stucco. The brick and charcoal gray stucco wrap around the southern side of the elevation.

Building 2 is a mirror image of Building 1. The majority of front entries are location on the south elevation, the garages are accessed from the north elevation, and the east elevation is the primary entry for the rear unit.

The applicant modified the plans from the initial submittal, moving the west building closer to the street to allow for a transformer, meter boxes, and dog run area in the space between the west and east buildings. The revised setback of the west building is consistent with the development to the north. Additionally, the location of the mechanical equipment between the two buildings and less visible from the right-of-way is preferred by staff.

The applicant is requesting relief from 21A.36.010.B.1, which requires that all buildings have frontage on a street. Building 2 does not have street frontage. The bulk and massing created by splitting the units between two buildings provides for a form that is more compatible with the existing development in the neighborhood and the goals of the adopted master plans that are applicable to the area. These issues are discussed in the following section.
KEY ISSUES:
The key issues listed below have been identified through the analysis of the project, neighbor and community input and department review comments.

1. Compliance with Adopted Master Plans
2. Requested Modification

Issue 1: Compliance with Adopted Master Plans
The proposed project is consistent with the citywide Plan Salt Lake, and the Central Community Master Plan. The project is consistent with Guiding Principle #3 in Plan Salt Lake, “Access to a wide variety of housing types for all income levels throughout the City, providing the basic human need for safety and responding to changing demographics.” The proposed project’s residential units provide additional housing units in the neighborhood to accommodate more residents.

Initiatives from the growth and housing chapters are also applicable. The following Growth initiatives apply:

- Locate new development in areas with existing infrastructure and amenities, such as transit and transportation corridors.
- Promote infill and redevelopment of underutilized land.
- Accommodate and promote an increase in the City’s population.

The proposed project is in a developed area with transit service and easy access to transportation corridors. It is located one block west of State Street and less than one block south of 1700 South. The development of the site with housing will provide additional infill development and residents in the neighborhood.

Two Housing initiatives apply:

- Increase the number of medium density housing types and options.
- Enable moderate density increases within existing neighborhoods where appropriate.

The density of the project is 28 dwelling units per acre, consistent with the medium density of 10-50 dwelling units per acre called for in the Central Community Master Plan. This infill development will add more residents to this existing neighborhood that is transitioning from a more commercial focus to a mix of uses with commercial and residential areas.

As identified above, the Central Community Master Plan identifies the land use for the property as Medium Residential/Mixed Use and this designation is consistent with the proposed residential density. Several goals and criteria in the Central Community Master Plan are applicable to this project. The plan’s Vision for the Future identifies two applicable criteria within the Livable communities and neighborhoods goal:

- A variety of residential land use supports all types of housing and the affordability of the housing stock.
- The appropriate transition of multi-family housing with mixed land uses in designated areas supports sustainable development within the community.

The proposed project is within the Ballpark neighborhood planning area, formerly referenced as the People’s Freeway neighborhood, and the land use designation is Medium-Density Residential Mixed Use. The proposed use is consistent with the designation since it would provide a stand-alone residential use near other residential uses as well as mixed and commercial land uses.
The proposal is also consistent with the following residential land use goals:

- Encourage the creation and maintenance of a variety of housing opportunities that meet social needs and income levels of a diverse population.
- Ensure that new development is compatible with existing neighborhoods in terms of scale, character, and density.

The proposed units are of a similar height and massing as the street facing units to the north, although attached parking is provided with the proposed project. They are also a compatible scale and form with the residences located across the street and to the west. The proposal is also consistent with several land use policies:

- RLU-1.2 Provide opportunities for medium-density housing in areas between the Central Business District and lower-density neighborhoods and in areas where small multi-family dwellings are compatible.
- RLU-1.5 Use residential mixed-use zones to provide residential land uses with supportive retail, service, commercial, and small-scale offices and monitor the mix of uses to preserve the residential component.
- RLU-3.3 Use the planned development process to encourage design flexibility for residential housing while maintaining compatibility with the neighborhood.

As described above, the proposal provides medium-density housing near existing multifamily units and would serve as a transition from the commercial uses located to the east for the single-family residences that are located to the west. The planned development process enables the opportunity for this form and type of development in the neighborhood.

**Issue 2: Requested Modification**

As outlined in the Project Description the applicant’s request is for a building without street frontage. The applicant proposes two buildings, one with six units and the other with seven. The buildings are separated by a sidewalk surrounded with plantings. The two buildings are appropriate given the relatively narrow width of the property at 65 feet with a depth of 310 feet. Without a Planned Development, the applicant could build a single, long building. Staff’s preference is for the proposal, which has the two buildings, rather than the single, long building that could be built without the Planned Development process. The separation between the buildings provides a form that is more compatible with the scale of the neighborhood and the multifamily building that is proposed. It would also allow for ease of circulation throughout the site for residents and guests. Additionally, the multifamily building to the north also has two buildings on the property. Similar to this property, one is located to the front (west) of the property and the other is located to the rear.

The Ballpark Community Council held a virtual meeting on August 6th. Staff and the applicant attended. Residents had general questions regarding the project. Since the meeting, staff received emails from two residents in support of the proposed project (Attachment G). The residents supported having additional residences in the neighborhood and stated that this type of mid-density development is critical for the city to become more vibrant and walkable community.

**DISCUSSION:**
The applicant is seeking relief from 21A.36.010.B.1, which requires all buildings to have street frontage. The proposed project has 13 units in two buildings. The property has a relatively narrow width of 65 feet and a depth of 310 feet. The proposal for two buildings breaks up the form and massing of the buildings to be more compatible with the existing development in the area and provides a more pedestrian friendly circulation pattern for the site. The proposal has been generally well received by
the community with staff receiving three comments from the neighborhood. Two were in support of
the proposal and the third was from Alliance House, which is located nearby, inquiring as to the
affordability of the units as potential residences for clients. Based on the project’s substantial
compliance with the zoning requirements, staff has not requested modifications from the applicant.
Minor modifications needed to meet zoning requirements are included in the conditions of approval
identified in the recommendation.

**NEXT STEPS:**
If the Planned Development is approved, the applicant will need to comply with any conditions
of approval, including any of the conditions required by City departments and the Planning
Commission. The applicant will then be able to submit for building permits for the development. The
applicant has applied for a condominium plat, but the application is not complete and will be reviewed
separately from this process. If the Planned Development is denied, the applicant can submit a
building permit application that complies with the requirements of the CC zoning district and proceed
with a permitted development.
ATTACHMENT B: SITE & VICINITY PHOTOS

Subject property

View toward the rear of the subject property
Apartment building to the north of the subject property

Property to the south, owned by Sunburst Auto
Residential buildings across the street from the subject property

Sunburst Auto lot, photo taken from State Street right-of-way. Lot abuts the subject property on the east. The apartments to the north of the subject property are visible toward the rear of the photo.
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1739 SOUTH MAIN STREET
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84115

APPLICANT: CW URBAN, 1222 LEGACY CROSSING BLVD #6, CENTERVILLE, UT 84014 (OWNER)

CONTACT: SAUL BESLOW

ARCHITECT: JON GALBRAITH, JON@CW.LAND, 801-698-6685

TAX PARCEL NO.: 16183010090000

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: COM 4 RDS E & 67 FT S FR NW COR LOT 13 BLK 6 5 AC PLAT A BIGFIELD SUR S 65 FT E 310 FT N 65 FT W 310 FT TO BEG 6504-8599

ZONING: CC - COMMERCIAL CORRIDOR

PRESENT USE: VACANT LOT

PROPOSED TITLE OF PROJECT: THE ABBIE

PROPOSED DENSITY: 13 TOWNHOME DWELLING UNITS. TOTAL ACREAGE: 0.46 ACRES. DENSITY = 28.26 DWELLING UNITS PER ACRE

PROJECT INFORMATION

UNIT ADDRESS: 1739 SOUTH MAIN
UNIT COUNT: 13
UNIT TYPES: TOWNHOUSES
UNIT A AREA: 1544
UNIT B AREA: 1748
ENTITLEMENT: PD
FIRE SPRINKLERS: 13D+Increased Density

SITE SQUARE FOOTAGE

TOTAL BUILDING COVER = 9,481 SQ FT (47% OF TOTAL SITE)
TOTAL GREEN SPACE = 4,178 SQ FT (21% OF TOTAL SITE)
TOTAL OPEN SPACE = 10,669 (53% OF TOTAL SITE)
TOTAL ACREAGE: 0.46 ACRES

FIRE SPRINKLER NOTES

BOTH BUILDINGS WILL HAVE A 13D SYSTEM. THEY WILL HAVE A 13D SYSTEM WITHOUT THE SMALL ROOM RULE AND WILL NEED TO INCLUDE SPRINKLERS IN THE GARAGE.
UNIT TYPE A

UNIT TYPE B

CLEAR

18' - 6"

CLEAR

17' - 6"

CLEAR

18' - 6"

CLEAR

17' - 6"

LEVEL 1: 280 SF
LEVEL 2: 631 SF
LEVEL 3: 633 SF
TOTAL: 1544 SF
UNFINISHED SPACE (GARAGE & MECHANICAL): 380 SQ FT

LEVEL 1: 335 SF
LEVEL 2: 680 SF
LEVEL 3: 733 SF
TOTAL: 1748 SF
UNFINISHED SPACE (GARAGE & MECHANICAL): 405 SQ FT

AREA UNIT TYPE A
(FINISHED SPACE MEASURED TO INSIDE OF DRYWALL AND EXCLUDING MECHANICAL CLOSETS AND GARAGE):
LEVEL 1: 335 SF
LEVEL 2: 680 SF
LEVEL 3: 733 SF
TOTAL: 1748 SF
UNFINISHED SPACE (GARAGE & MECHANICAL): 405 SQ FT

AREA UNIT TYPE B
(FINISHED SPACE MEASURED TO INSIDE OF DRYWALL AND EXCLUDING MECHANICAL CLOSETS AND GARAGE):
LEVEL 1: 280 SF
LEVEL 2: 631 SF
LEVEL 3: 633 SF
TOTAL: 1544 SF
UNFINISHED SPACE (GARAGE & MECHANICAL): 380 SQ FT

SHEET: A111
TITLE: BLD 1 LEVEL 1 - FLOOR PLAN
PROJECT: THE ABBIE
CONCEPTUAL DESIGN
1739 S. MAIN ST. SLC UT 84115
Issue Date
C.W. URBAN
REVISIONS:
UNLESS A PROFESSIONAL SEAL WITH SIGNATURE AND DATE IS AFFIXED, THIS DOCUMENT IS PRELIMINARY AND IS NOT INTENDED FOR CONSTRUCTION, RECORDING PURPOSES, OR IMPLEMENTATION. THE DESIGNS SHOWN AND DESCRIBED HEREIN INCLUDING ALL TECHNICAL DRAWINGS, GRAPHIC REPRESENTATIONS & MODELS THEREOF, ARE PROPRIETARY & CAN NOT BE COPIED, DUPLICATED, OR COMMERCIALLY EXPLOITED IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT THE SOLE AND EXPRESS WRITTEN PERMISSION FROM C.W. URBAN.
AREA UNIT TYPE A
(FINISHED SPACE MEASURED TO INSIDE OF DRYWALL AND EXCLUDING MECHANICAL CLOSETS AND GARAGE):

LEVEL 1: 280 SF
LEVEL 2: 631 SF
LEVEL 3: 633 SF
TOTAL: 1544 SF

UNFINISHED SPACE (GARAGE & MECHANICAL): 380 SQ FT

AREA UNIT TYPE B
(FINISHED SPACE MEASURED TO INSIDE OF DRYWALL AND EXCLUDING MECHANICAL CLOSETS AND GARAGE):

LEVEL 1: 335 SF
LEVEL 2: 680 SF
LEVEL 3: 733 SF
TOTAL: 1748 SF

UNFINISHED SPACE (GARAGE & MECHANICAL): 405 SQ FT
AREA UNIT TYPE A
(FINISHED SPACE MEASURED TO INSIDE OF DRYWALL AND EXCLUDING MECHANICAL CLOSETS AND GARAGE):

- LEVEL 1: 335 SF
- LEVEL 2: 680 SF
- LEVEL 3: 733 SF
- TOTAL: 1748 SF

UNFINISHED SPACE (GARAGE & MECHANICAL): 405 SQ FT

AREA UNIT TYPE B
(FINISHED SPACE MEASURED TO INSIDE OF DRYWALL AND EXCLUDING MECHANICAL CLOSETS AND GARAGE):

- LEVEL 1: 280 SF
- LEVEL 2: 631 SF
- LEVEL 3: 633 SF
- TOTAL: 1544 SF

UNFINISHED SPACE (GARAGE & MECHANICAL): 380 SQ FT
ATTACHMENT D: EXISTING CONDITIONS

Zoning and Uses in the Immediate Vicinity of the Property

**East:** (CC), Main lot for Sunburst Auto Sales (State Street)

**West:** (CC), Residential buildings

**North:** (CC), 1735 South Main Apartments

**South:** (CC), mostly vacant lot for Sunburst Auto Sales
# ATTACHMENT E: CC ZONE STANDARDS SUMMARY

## 21A.26.050: CC CORRIDOR COMMERCIAL DISTRICT:

A. **Purpose Statement:** The purpose of the CC Corridor Commercial District is to provide an environment for efficient and attractive commercial development with a local and regional market area along arterial and major collector streets while promoting compatibility with adjacent neighborhoods through design standards. This district provides economic development opportunities through a mix of land uses, including retail sales and services, entertainment, office and residential. Safe, convenient and inviting connections that provide access to businesses from public sidewalks, bike paths and streets are necessary. Access should follow a hierarchy that places the pedestrian first, bicycle second and automobile third. This district is appropriate in areas where supported by applicable master plans. The standards are intended to promote a safe and aesthetically pleasing environment to all users.

B. **Uses:** Uses in the CC Corridor Commercial District as specified in section 21A.33.030, "Table Of Permitted And Conditional Uses For Commercial Districts", of this title, are permitted subject to the general provisions set forth in section 21A.26.010 of this chapter and this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum lot area:</strong> Ten thousand (10,000) square feet.</td>
<td>Lot area is 20,150 square feet</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minimum lot width:</strong> Seventy-five feet (75°).</td>
<td>Existing lot is 65 feet. Use does not have a minimum width.</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Front And Corner Side Yards:</strong> Fifteen feet (15°).</td>
<td>3’6” setback proposed, complies with South State Street Corridor Overlay (SSSC, see below)</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interior Side Yards:</strong> None required.</td>
<td>13’8” on the south and none on the north. 12’ of 24’ shared drive aisle, and a 2’ setback are located on the north.</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rear Yard:</strong> Ten feet (10’).</td>
<td>14.8’</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buffer Yards:</strong> All lots abutting property in a Residential District shall conform to the buffer yard requirement of chapter 21A.48 of this title.</td>
<td>Lot does not abut property in a Residential District.</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessory Buildings And Structures In Yards:</strong></td>
<td>No accessory structures are proposed.</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Landscape Yard Requirements:** A landscape yard of fifteen feet (15’) shall be required on all front and corner side yards, conforming to the requirements of section 21A.48.090 and subsection 21A.48.100C of this title.

Per SSSC, 3’6” landscaped setback proposed. Complies

**Maximum Height:** No building shall exceed thirty feet (30’). Buildings higher than thirty feet (30’) may be allowed in accordance with the provisions of subsections F1 and F3 of this section.

Height does not exceed 30’. Complies

---

### 21A.34.090: SSSC SOUTH STATE STREET CORRIDOR OVERLAY DISTRICT:

A. **Purpose:** The purpose of the SSSC South State Street Corridor Overlay District is to acknowledge and reinforce the historical land development patterns along South State Street between 900 South and 2100 South.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum Building Height Exemption:</strong> Buildings located within the BP Business Park Base Zoning District within the SSSC South State Street Corridor Overlay District may exceed the height of the base zoning district to a height not to exceed ninety feet (90’).</td>
<td>Property located in CC zoning district</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Front Yard:</strong> Structures located within the CC Corridor Commercial Base Zoning District and the SSSC South State Street Corridor Overlay District are exempted from the minimum front yard setback requirement. The required fifteen foot (15’) landscaped setback applies to all other uses, including open storage and vacant land.</td>
<td>A 3’6” landscaped setback is proposed.</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum Setback:</strong> A maximum setback is required for at least thirty five percent (35%) of the building facade. The maximum setback is twenty five feet (25’). Exceptions to this requirement may be authorized through the design review process, subject to the requirements of chapter</td>
<td>Proposed setback is less than maximum.</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of this title, and the review and approval of the Planning Commission. The Planning Director may waive this requirement for any addition, expansion, or intensification, which increases the floor area or parking requirement by less than fifty percent (50%) if the Planning Director finds the following:
  a. The architecture of the addition is compatible with the architecture of the original structure or the surrounding architecture.
  b. The addition is not part of a series of incremental additions intended to subvert the intent of the ordinance. Appeal of administrative decision is to the Planning Commission.

| 3. Parking Setback: Surface parking lots within an interior side yard shall maintain a twenty-five foot (25') landscape setback from the front property line or be located behind the primary structure. Parking structures shall maintain a forty-five foot (45') minimum setback from a front or corner side yard property line or be located behind the primary structure. There are no minimum or maximum setback restrictions on underground parking. The Planning Director may modify or waive this requirement if the Planning Director finds the following: |
|---|---|
| a. The parking is compatible with the architecture/design of the original structure or the surrounding architecture. |
| b. The parking is not part of a series of incremental additions intended to subvert the intent of the ordinance. |
| c. The horizontal landscaping is replaced with vertical screening in the form of berms, plant materials, architectural features, fencing |
| A surface parking lot is not proposed. |
| Not applicable. |
and/or other forms of screening.

d. The landscaped setback is consistent with the surrounding neighborhood character.

e. The overall project is consistent with section 21A.59.050 of this title. Appeal of administrative decision is to the Planning Commission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum First Floor Glass:</th>
<th>Proposal is for a residential use and 27.8% first floor is glass.</th>
<th>Complies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The first floor elevation facing a street of all new buildings or buildings in which the property owner is modifying the size of windows on the front facade, shall not have less than forty percent (40%) glass surfaces. All first floor glass shall be nonreflective. Display windows that are three-dimensional and are at least two feet (2') deep are permitted and may be counted toward the forty percent (40%) glass requirement. Exceptions to this requirement may be authorized through the design review process, subject to the requirements of chapter 21A.59 of this title, and the review and approval of the Planning Commission. The Planning Director may approve a modification to this requirement if the Planning Director finds:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. The requirement would negatively impact the historic character of the building,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The requirement would negatively impact the structural stability of the building, or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The ground level of the building is occupied by residential uses, in which case the forty percent (40%) glass requirement may be reduced to twenty five percent (25%). Appeal of administrative decision is to the Planning Commission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Facades: Provide at least one operable building entrance per | One operable building entrance is provided. | Complies |
elevation that faces a public street. Buildings that face multiple streets are only required to have one door on any street, if the facades for all streets meet the forty percent (40%) glass requirement as outlined in subsection E1 of this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Length: The maximum length of any blank wall uninterrupted by windows, doors, art or architectural detailing at the first floor level shall be fifteen feet (15').</td>
<td>The longest uninterrupted length of blank wall is 3 feet.</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screening: All building equipment and service areas, including on grade and roof mechanical equipment and transformers that are readily visible from the public right-of-way, shall be screened from public view. These elements shall be sited to minimize their visibility and impact, or enclosed as to appear to be an integral part of the architectural design of the building.</td>
<td>Transformer and meters are located between the two buildings.</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lot/Structure Lighting: If a parking lot/structure is adjacent to a Residential Zoning District or land use, the poles for the parking lot/structure security lighting are limited to sixteen feet (16') in height and the globe must be shielded to minimize light encroachment onto adjacent residential properties. Lightproof fencing is required adjacent to residential properties.</td>
<td>No parking lot proposed.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT F: ANALYSIS OF PLANNED DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

21A.55.050: Standards for Planned Developments: The Planning Commission may approve, approve with conditions, or deny a planned development based upon written findings of fact according to each of the following standards. It is the responsibility of the applicant to provide written and graphic evidence demonstrating compliance with the following standards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Planned Development Objectives: The planned development shall meet the purpose statement for a planned development and will achieve at least one of the objectives stated in said section. To determine if a planned development objective has been achieved, the applicant shall demonstrate that at least one of the strategies associated with the objective are included in the proposed planned development. The applicant shall also demonstrate why modifications to the zoning regulations are necessary to meet the purpose statement for a planned development. The Planning Commission should consider the relationship between the proposed modifications to the zoning regulations and the purpose of a planned development, and determine if the project will result in a more enhanced product than would be achievable through strict applicable of the land use regulations.</td>
<td>Complies</td>
<td>The purpose statement for a Planned Development states: “A planned development is intended to encourage the efficient use of land and resources, promoting greater efficiency in public and utility services and encouraging innovation in the planning and building of all types of development. Further, a planned development implements the purpose statement of the zoning district in which the project is located, utilizing an alternative approach to the design of the property and related physical facilities. A planned development incorporates special development characteristics that help to achieve City goals identified in adopted Master Plans and that provide an overall benefit to the community as determined by the planned development objectives. A planned development will result in a more enhanced product than would be achievable through strict application of land use regulations, while enabling the development to be compatible with adjacent and nearby land developments. The City seeks to achieve at least one or any combination of the following objectives through the planned development process.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Housing: Providing affordable housing or types of housing that helps achieve the City’s housing goals and policies:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The proposal includes housing types that are not commonly found in the existing neighborhood but are of a scale that is typical to the neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Master Plan Implementation: A project that helps implement portions of an adopted Master Plan in instances where the Master Plan provides specific guidance on the character of the immediate vicinity of the proposal:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. A project that is consistent with the guidance of the Master Plan related to building scale, building orientation, site layout, or other similar character defining features.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and are of a scale that is typical to the neighborhood. The immediate vicinity, generally in the area south of 1700 South, has not seen recent development and has a mix of uses and housing types. Much of it is older and a different form and type than the proposal for residential units with attached garages. This is unique to the immediate area. The height and massing is consistent with other residential buildings and homes nearby.

As detailed in Issue 1, the proposal is consistent with the Central Community Master Plan and its recommendation for medium density residential/mixed use development in this area, including the scale, density, and form.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Master Plan Compatibility: The proposed planned development is generally consistent with adopted policies set forth in the Citywide, community, and/or small area Master Plan that is applicable to the site where the planned development will be located.</th>
<th>Complies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As discussed in Issue 1, staff finds that the proposal is consistent with adopted policies in Plan Salt Lake and the Central Community Plan. The plan supports a variety of housing types and opportunities – including medium density housing, development that is compatible with the existing neighborhood, and the use of the Planned Development process for design flexibility when developments maintain compatibility with the neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Design and Compatibility: The proposed planned development is compatible with the area the planned development will be located and is designed to achieve a more enhanced product than would be achievable through strict application of land use regulations. In determining design and compatibility, the Planning Commission should consider: 1. Whether the scale, mass, and intensity of the proposed planned development is compatible with the area the planned development will be located and/or policies stated in an applicable Master Plan related to building and site design; 2. Whether the building orientation and building materials in the proposed planned development are</th>
<th>Complies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The scale, mass and intensity of the planned development is compatible with the area and its existing development and, as detailed in Issue 1, compatible with Master Plan policies and future land use map. 2. The orientation of the development is compatible with the neighborhood. The street facing elevation has the primary pedestrian entry for the unit and has features that identify it as the front façade. The brick and stucco proposed for the buildings are compatible with the adjacent buildings, many of which are brick and have areas with stucco. 3. a. The proposed building setbacks are compatible with the mixed visual character on the street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
compatible with the neighborhood where the planned development will be located and/or the policies stated in an applicable Master Plan related to building and site design;

3. Whether building setbacks along the perimeter of the development:
   a. Maintain the visual character of the neighborhood or the character described in the applicable Master Plan.
   b. Provide sufficient space for private amenities.
   c. Provide sufficient open space buffering between the proposed development and neighboring properties to minimize impacts related to privacy and noise.
   d. Provide adequate sight lines to street, driveways and sidewalks.
   e. Provide sufficient space for maintenance.

4. Whether building facades offer ground floor transparency, access, and architectural detailing to facilitate pedestrian interest and interaction;

5. Whether lighting is designed for safety and visual interest while minimizing impacts on surrounding property;

6. Whether dumpsters, loading docks and/or service areas are appropriately screened; and

7. Whether parking areas are appropriately buffered from adjacent uses.

b. A small setback is proposed for the Main Street elevation. This is a modification from the original proposal and allows for the accommodation of a transformer and meters internal to the site and between the two buildings. The proposed setback is consistent with the setbacks on the two properties to the north that have buildings constructed close to the property line and the goals of the overlay.

c. The proposed project is to share the drive aisle with the property to the north, which also uses it to access their units. The property to the south is part of the property for Sunburst Auto, whose primary entrance is on State Street. It is currently lightly occupied and the landscaped area to the south of the proposed residential units will serve as a buffer to this property.

d. The proposal provides adequate sight lines from the drive aisle to the street.

e. The site plan and conditions of approval ensure adequate space for maintenance requirements.

4. The Main Street elevation meets the 25% requirement for glass on the first floor and has 27.8% glass. The front door is centrally placed on the first-floor elevation and has a set of paired windows on either side. These provide adequate transparency for a residential unit and provide pedestrian interest and interaction for passersby.

5. Lighting is not shown at this stage and will be subsequently reviewed by staff to ensure compliance with requirements.

6. Dumpsters and any other service areas will be appropriately screened.

7. The proposed parking is located in the attached garages for each unit. No additional off-street parking is provided.

D. Landscaping: The proposed planned development preserves, maintains or provides native landscaping where appropriate. In determining the landscaping for the proposed planned

| Complies | 1. There are currently no mature trees along the street. The applicant has proposed two honey locust and a Norway maple trees for the park strip. The existing |
development, the Planning Commission should consider:
1. Whether mature native trees located long the periphery of the property and along the street are preserved and maintained;
2. Whether existing landscaping that provides additional buffering to the abutting properties is maintained and preserved;
3. Whether proposed landscaping is designed to lessen potential impacts created by the proposed planned development; and
4. Whether proposed landscaping is appropriate for the scale of the development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. Mobility: The proposed planned development supports City wide transportation goals and promotes safe and efficient circulation within the site and surrounding neighborhood. In determining mobility, the Planning Commission should consider:</th>
<th>Complies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Access to the attached garages for the units will be from a shared drive aisle located to the north of the buildings. This will be an expansion of the existing drive aisle and its usage for the proposed development will not negatively impact the safety, purpose, and character of the street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The proposed project is oriented to the street and there is pedestrian access to all units.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. The proposed project is oriented to the street and there is pedestrian access to all units.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Bicycle facilities are not specifically identified and not required for this 13-unit proposal that includes garages. Bicycles will likely be accommodated individually by each unit. The project is located within ¼ mile of two bus lines, one that is high frequency.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. There are no anticipated conflicts between different transportation modes. The vehicular access is located on the north side of the property and the pedestrian access is located to the south. Pedestrian pathways provide access to each unit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There are limited on-site amenities due to the small size of the proposed project. Pedestrian pathways provide access to all areas of the site and sidewalks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The proposal will need to comply with all requirements from other divisions and departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>Existing Site Features: The proposed planned development preserves natural and built features that significantly contribute to the character of the neighborhood and/or environment. <strong>Complies</strong> The existing built features will not be preserved. The site is not located within a National or Local historic district. There are no natural or built features that significantly contribute to the character of the neighborhood and environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Utilities: Existing and/or planned utilities will adequately serve the development and not have a detrimental effect on the surrounding area. <strong>Complies</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...
ATTACHMENT G: PUBLIC PROCESS AND COMMENTS

Ballpark and Liberty Wells Community Councils: Staff sent a notice to the community councils on October 31, 2019. Staff and the applicant attended the Zoom Ballpark Community Council meeting on August 6, 2020. The applicant presented the proposal. There were general questions regarding the project, a comment requesting wider sidewalks on Main Street, and a question regarding whether trees would be provided in the park strip and the type of trees. The 45-day comment period ended on August 31, 2020.

An Online Open House for The Abbie was posted on July 21, 2020.

Staff has received three public comment emails that are attached. One email wanted to know if the housing would be affordable and staff passed this question on to the applicant. The other two emails are in support of the proposal.
Hello,

My name is Rachel, and I'm reaching out from the Alliance House - just across the street from the Main Street proposed development. We serve adults living with mental illness, and work to find them housing. We also own two apartment buildings in this area as well - it's proven very helpful for the members of our organization to live closeby, so they can access mental health and other resources. I know this may be a premature question, but would you know if any of these apartments will be subsidized at all? Or all market rate prices? Either way, I know some of our members could benefit from living in this location.

I was also wondering if it would be possible to form some kind of partnership with the property managers of this building, maybe reserving some apartments in the building for our members? If this may be a possibility, or if there is someone else I should ask about this, please let me know!

Thanks!

Rachel Wilkerson  
Clubhouse Generalist  

1724 South Main Street  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84115  
Phone 801-486-5012 / Fax 801-466-5077  
www.alliancehouse.org
Sara,

Just a quick public comment in favor of The Abbie – 1739 S Main St. From what I can see on the Open House forum, it seems this project will be a good addition to the neighborhood. Main street can use more residences to help keep each other safe and support surrounding local businesses.

Best,

Megan Townsend
35 W Van Buren Avenue, SLC UT 84115
Hello

I am writing in support of the Planned Development for The Abbie. I think this type of smart mid density development is critical to helping SLC become a more vibrant and walkable community.

Jarod Hall
**ATTACHMENT H: DEPARTMENT REVIEW COMMENTS**

**Planning** – Sara Javoronok, sara.javoronok@slcgov.com  
There is a 9.8 foot rear yard setback shown on the site plan submitted on 7/28/20, but not previous plans. A 10-foot setback is required. The front yard setback has an additional 2+ feet than required, I recommend moving building slightly to the west.

**Zoning** – Anika Stonick, patriciaanika.stonick@slcgov.com  
PLNPCM2020-00378, multifamily Planned Development application for 1739 So. Main Street, a parcel with CC zoning designation that is also within South State Street Corridor overlay;  
Planned Development application needed due to two buildings being proposed for site, but only one will have frontage at public street (21A.36.010.B.1), and, due to plans showing 9.8’ deep rear yard instead of minimum required rear yard of 10 feet (21A.26.050.D.3); all modifications needing to be addressed with Planned Development petition should be listed in approvals to help building permit reviews and other processes;  
Landscaping proposal to be per special landscape regulations that exist for CC zoning district (see 21A48.100.C) and is to be per 21A.48 in general, including 21A.48.055 Water Efficient Landscaping;  
dumpster enclosure to be per 21A.48.120 and the removal of existing trees is to be per 21A.48.135;  
park strip landscaping to be per 21A.48.060;  
Shared driveway to reviewed by Development Review Team per 2A.44.020.F.7.c; all shared and cross access agreements, recorded versions of, to be provided for building permit requests reviews;  
All facades of building to meet required or modified yards and to propose obstructions in required yards per 21A.36.020 table (including architectural projections to project only 4 inches);  
Interiors of garages to be at least 17’ 6” deep by 18’ 6” wide in order to provide required parking for two vehicles;  
Development proposal to address required electric vehicle charging station and bicycle parking (21A.44.050);  
Development also to address design requirements of 21A.34.090.E (for street facing facades in the SSSC overlay, screening and other requirements) and to provide required recycling collection station (to be per 21A.36.250)

**Public Utilities** – Jason Draper, jason.draper@slcgov.com  
CW Urban is familiar with our requirements so I don’t think any of this is new.  
Fire Protection and culinary water must have separate connections to the main.  
It is very likely that the main street water line will need to be replaced back to Coatsville or Qualye ave. When plans are submitted, we can verify.  
Unused Existing utility connections must be capped at the main.  
Reuse of existing sewer lateral will require video inspection to verify the condition.  
Exception is required to have two buildings share a sewer lateral.

**Fire** – Doug Bateman, douglas.bateman@slcgov.com  
Fire department access roads shall be provided to within 150-feet of all first story exterior portions of the structures. Buildings 30-feet and less are to be provided with a minimum fire department access roads of 20-feet and clear height of 13-feet 6-inches. Buildings greater in height than 30-feet require a 26-foot wide road.  
the highest roof surface shall be determined by measurement to the eave of a pitched roof, the intersection of the roof to the exterior wall, or the top of parapet walls, whichever is greater. Some exceptions have been added by SLC; those can be obtained from this office.  
*Dead-end fire apparatus access roads in excess of 150 feet in length shall be provided with an approved area for turning around fire apparatus. Turn areas for hammerhead are increased to 80-
feet (160-feet total) to accommodate SLC Fire Department apparatus. See appendix D for approved turnarounds.

*Fire apparatus access roads shall be designed and maintained to support the imposed loads of fire apparatus (80,000 pounds) and shall be surfaced to provide all-weather driving capabilities.

*The required turning radius of a fire apparatus access road shall be the following: Inside radius is 20 feet, outside is 45-feet.

*Buildings or portions of buildings constructed or moved into or within the jurisdiction is more than 400 from a hydrant on a fire apparatus access road, as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the facility or building, on-site fire hydrants and mains shall be provided where required by the fire code official.

*Fire department connections shall be located on the street address side of buildings, fully visible and recognizable from the street, and have a fire hydrant within 100-feet on the same side of the street.

*Where a fire hydrant is located on a fire apparatus access road, the minimum road width shall be 26 feet, exclusive of shoulders.

*Aerial fire apparatus access roads shall be provided where the highest roof surface exceeds 30 feet measured from grade plane. For purposes of this section, the highest roof surface shall be determined by measurement to the eave of a pitched roof, the intersection of the roof to the exterior wall, or the top of parapet walls, whichever is greater. Some exceptions have been added by SLC; those can be obtained from this office.

*Aerial fire apparatus access roads shall have a minimum unobstructed width of 26 feet, exclusive of shoulders. Aerial access routes shall be located not less than 15 feet and not greater than 30 feet from the building, and shall be positioned parallel to one entire side of the building.

*Overhead utility and power lines shall not be located over the aerial fire apparatus access road or between the aerial fire apparatus road and the building.

Transportation – Kurt Larson, kurt.larson@slcgov.com

Easement should be provided for shared driveway. No parking will be allowed on driveway isle. Parking will only be allowed in garages.

Building – William Warlick, william.warlick@slcgov.com

No comments

Engineering – Scott Weiler, scott.weiler@slcgov.com

No objections

Rocky Mountain Power – Jeff Barrett, Jeffrey.Barrett@pacificorp.com

In order to know exactly what type of equipment the customer will require, they need to make a request of us for the service, and indicate what their load will be, and where they intend to locate their service panels on the building, etc. They also will need to reserve a space on their property for a transformer, at the very least. The transformer size may vary depending on their request, i.e. are they wanting single or triple phase service. But the clearances required from the building will be the same, regardless. See the graphic below.

Additionally, the customer has a note about moving one of our distribution poles. This will require a separate accommodation request, and they need to get it to us as soon as possible. It’s probably quite doable, but we just need to know exactly what they have in mind so we can assess the situation.

In summary, the plans clearly do not meet our needs, because they haven’t identified a location for our facilities; and the ground mounted box(es) will have to be on their property, not in the ROW.