

**SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**This meeting was held electronically pursuant to the**  
**Salt Lake City Emergency Proclamation**  
**Wednesday, September 30, 2020**

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [1:00:43 PM](#). Audio recordings of the Planning Commission meetings are retained for a period of time.

Present for the Planning Commission meeting were: Chairperson, Adrienne Bell; Vice Chairperson, Brenda Scheer; Commissioners, Maurine Bachman, Amy Barry, Carolyn Hoskins, Jon Lee, Matt Lyon, Sara Urquhart, and Crystal Young-Otterstrom. Commissioner Andres Paredes was excused.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Nick Norris, Planning Director; Wayne Mills, Planning Manager; Paul Nielson, Attorney; Nannette Larsen, Principal Planner; and Marlene Rankins, Administrative Secretary.

**APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 26, 2020, MEETING MINUTES. [1:00:59 PM](#)**

**MOTION [1:01:09 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Scheer, moved to approve the August 26, 2020 meeting minutes. Commissioner Urquhart seconded the motion. Commissioners Lyon, Scheer, Barry, Urquhart, Bachman and Bell voted “Aye”. Commissioner Lee abstained from voting as he was not present for the said meeting. The motion passed 6-1.**

**REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR [1:02:04 PM](#)**

Chairperson Bell stated she had nothing to report.

Vice Chairperson Scheer stated she had nothing to report.

**REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR [1:02:18 PM](#)**

Nick Norris, Planning Director, thanked the Commission for attending the meeting for work session items.

**[1:02:51 PM](#)**

**800 South & State Street Design Review at approximately 754 S. State St.** – Aabir Malik, an applicant with Colmena Group, is requesting Design Review approval to develop a portion of the former Sears property into an 11-story, 120 foot tall, mixed-use development consisting of ground floor retail and 360 multi-family residential units in upper floors. The applicant is requesting Design Review approval to allow for additional building height, modification to the spacing of building entrances and to exceed the maximum street facing facade length. The project site is located in the D-2 (Downtown Support) zoning district and is located within Council District 4, represented by Ana Valdemoros (Staff Contact: Nannette Larsen at (801) 535-7645 or [nannette.larsen@slcgov.com](mailto:nannette.larsen@slcgov.com)) **Case number PLNPCM2020-00439**

Nannette Larsen, Principal Planner, briefed the Commission on the proposed Design Review.

Matt Post, Ryan Kimball, Aabir Malik, and Eduardo Illanes, provided a presentation with further design details.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- Clarification on what is the status for the master plan in terms of approvals for subdivisions

- Whether the park is intended to be privately owned or public
- Whether the West part of the street will be part of the plan
- Clarification on whether the service alley goes all the way through the property
- Clarification on length of the building and whether it exceeds what is permitted
- Public interaction
- Length from 8<sup>th</sup> South and State Street to the “Service Alley)
- Clarification on whether the height is allowed by right
- Suggestion was made to make the building visually appealing to the public
- Material changes to break the mass of the pedestrian experience from the ground level
- Clarification on whether the park will be deed restricted

[2:25:25 PM](#)

**Deleting Special Exceptions from the Zoning Ordinance & Associated Ordinance Changes** –

Mayor Erin Mendenhall, at the request of the Planning Division, is requesting amendments to the zoning ordinance regulations regarding special exceptions. The proposal would delete and eliminate the special exception process from the zoning ordinance. A special exception is a minor alteration of a dimensional requirement of the zoning ordinance or addresses accessory uses and structures. There are more than forty special exceptions authorized in the zoning ordinance. The proposal addresses each special exception and results in each special exception being deleted, permitted, or authorized through a different process in the zoning ordinance. Some special exceptions that will become permitted include changes to standards to add flexibility and reduce impacts. Special exceptions are approved by staff of the Planning Division, the Planning Commission, or Historic Landmark Commission. The proposed amendments involve multiple chapters of the Zoning Ordinance. Related provisions of Title 21A-Zoning may be amended as part of this petition. The changes would apply Citywide. This briefing is intended to introduce the changes to the Commission in anticipation of a future public hearing. (Staff contact: Nick Norris at (801) 535-6173 or [nick.norris@slcgov.com](mailto:nick.norris@slcgov.com)) **Case number PLNPCM2020-6060**

Nick Norris, Planning Director, briefed the commission with an overview of the proposal and seek input on 5 key issues with the proposal.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- Front yard parking: proposal is to eliminate.
  - a. Have an issue with eliminating it.
  - b. May impact more modest neighborhoods than wealthier neighborhoods. Some westside neighborhoods have narrow lots where side/rear cannot be accessed. It is not just the avenues or capitol hill.
  - c. Reality is that even if someone has a driveway that leads to a garage, they park in the portion of the driveway in the front yard. If that is allowed, how is this any different in terms of seeing cars parking in the front yard area?
  - d. Would like to see a proposal to allow it with some standards (dimensions, materials, location within front yard)
  - e. If the block face has driveways, it should be allowed.
  - f. Consider standards about parking slab being located closer to the side property line so it is similar to other driveways and not going directly into the middle of the lot.
- Commercial Building height
  - a. Is this an issue that is created by how building height is measured in commercial districts?
    - i. For example, if the height is averaged on one slope, how does that translate to the next building face? One side gets the benefit of the slope, but the other doesn't so in effect it is a meaningless.

- b. Try to figure out how to allow this when it isn't adding an additional story of habitable space. Like if the front yard is fine, but the property slopes towards the back, can the rear of the building be level with the street facing façade?
  - c. Can it be based on the length of the lot? Really wide lots may have to have some sort of stepping.
- Ground Mounted utility boxes
  - a. Support removing them from the ROW or private developments.
  - b. Understands the need for flexibility with underground power requirements and the tradeoff with some utility boxes.
- Accessory building height
  - a. Concerns with just allowing an accessory building up to 75% of the height of the principal structure. What if the principal building is 35 feet tall, should the accessory building be allowed to be almost as tall as the maximum principal building of 28 feet?
    - i. Consider an "up to height" as part of the increased height.
  - b. Concerned with the use of second stories on accessory buildings.
- Inline additions
  - a. Want to find a way to allow them inside yards.
    - i. Can we allow a single-story addition to follow the existing setback line, but require a second story to comply with current step backs?
  - b. OK with the front and rear yard proposals.

Next Steps:

- Engagement period ends on Oct 11<sup>th</sup>. Will see if there are any additional issues and address them when this comes back to the PC
- Will work on addressing the key issues above and work solutions into the proposal.
- Targeting November PC meeting for a public hearing due to workloads but would like to transmit by end of December.

**The meeting adjourned at [3:05:03 PM](#)**