

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
City & County Building
451 South State Street, Room 326
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Wednesday, July 27, 2022

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at approximately 5:30 pm. Audio recordings of the Planning Commission meetings are retained for a period of time. These minutes are a summary of the meeting. For complete commentary and presentation of the meeting, please visit <https://www.youtube.com/c/SLCLiveMeetings>.

Present for the Planning Commission meeting were Chairperson Amy Barry, Vice-Chair Maurine Bachman, and Commissioners, Jon Lee, Levi de Oliveira, Adrienne Bell, Aimee Burrows, Rich Tuttle, Andres Paredes, and Mike Christensen. Commissioners Andra Ghent and Brenda Scheer were absent.

Planning Division staff members present were Planning Manager Wayne Mills. Planning Manager Casey Stewart, Principal Planner Diana Martinez, Senior Planner Kristina Gilmore, Senior Planner David Gellner, Senior Planner Nannette Larsen, and Administrative Assistant Aubrey Clark. Senior City Attorney Paul Neilson, Salt Lake City Transportation Engineer Lynn Jacobs, and Project & Policy Manager Ruedi Matthes of the Department of Community and Neighborhoods Tammy Hunsaker, Deputy Director of the Department of Community and Neighborhoods were also present.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Commissioner Jon Lee moved to approve the minutes of June 22.

Commissioner Mike Christensen seconded the motion.

Chair Barry and Commissioners Mike Christensen, Jon Lee, Andres Paredes, Rick Tuttle, and Levi de Oliveira voted “yes”.

Vice-chair Maurine Bachman and Commissioners Adrienne Bell, and Aimee Burrows abstained because of their absence from that meeting.

The motion passed with 6 “yes” votes and 3 abstentions.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

Chair Barry reported that she had received an email asking for an alteration to the agenda, but she had declined the request because she interpreted it as being based upon misunderstandings. Since the role of the Planning Commission is to make recommendations to the City Council, Chairperson Barry did not believe the order of discussion of the Ball Park Small Area Plan, and the petition item seeking project rezoning would be pertinent to final decision-making. She said that the boundaries of the areas addressed in each issue do not appear to overlap.

Vice-Chair Bachman stated that she had nothing to report.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR

Planning Manager Wayne Mills advised that a Planning Commission request for a project evaluating the elimination of drive-throughs in the Sugarhouse Business District would be outlined in the form of an initiation letter “in the next couple of meetings.” Chair Barry thanked him and stated that the request was for evaluation of pedestrian, business-focused areas and so the Downtown area should also be reviewed.

She then added that Director Nick Norris had informed her that he was in the process of scheduling a briefing from a parking enforcement officer to discuss the RV parking problem. The briefing would be a response to Commissioner De Oliveira's concerns about RV parking in his neighborhood.

COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Commissioner Levi De Oliveira said that he had a conversation with the director of the City's 'first-time-home-buyer' program and would like to ask that its director be put on a future agenda to explain this long-running, but little-known program. Planning Manager Wayne Mills agreed to follow-up.

Hearing no further discussion Chairperson Barry opened the public hearing portion of the meeting.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Conditional Use for an ADU at approximately 939 East 1700 South - Morgan Zack, representing the property owners, is requesting Conditional Use approval to build a detached accessory dwelling unit (ADU) at the above-stated address. The request is for the unit to be approximately 640 square feet in size and 12'1" tall and to be located in the northeast corner of the rear yard. The subject property is approximately 0.16 acres (6,969 square feet) in size and is in the R-1-5,000 (Residential District) located within Council District 5, represented by Darin Mano. (Staff contact: Diana Martinez at 801-535-7215 or at diana.martinez@slcgov.com) **Case number PLNPCM2022-00394**

Principal Planner Diana Martinez reviewed the petition as outlined in the staff report. She stated that the existing detached garage would be replaced with a new prefabricated building. The matter is before the Planning Commission because it is in the R-1-5,000 residential district. The staff recommendation is approval. Diana Martinez noted that the stated condition of obtaining a demolition permit for the existing building, in addition to the permit for the new construction, would not be an impediment because the construction permit is "in queue," and the applicant intends to pursue the demolition permit "straight away." Planning manager Casey Stewart explained that demolition permits are often not required for "accessory" structures without sewer or electricity connections "as long as" permit plans reflect the removal of the existing structure.

Applicants Morgan Zack, representative of the prefabricated builder Stack Homes, and Perry Brown, property owner, addressed the Commission. Morgan Zack described her company's prefabricated homes as recycled, single-use, shipping containers that include high quality countertops and other popular features. The homes are built offsite in about 150 days and delivered by semi-trailer. Morgan Zack noted that noise, refuse, and the air pollution from worker travel is minimized. Plans for this project include off-street parking. The ADU will be accessed from an alleyway. The property owners will also undertake improvements to the existing landscaping that will result in an increase of greenspace after the entire project is complete. Perry Brown stated that he wishes to use the ADU as a long-term rental to provide extra income.

PUBLIC HEARING

- Judi Short – spoke in favor of the project on her own behalf because she lives in the “Emerson neighborhood.” She stated that the Sugarhouse Community Council for whom she typically speaks had not yet reviewed this project. She said that she was pleased with the availability of parking from the alley rather than on 1700 South.

Chair Barry closed the public hearing and asked for commissioner comments.

Chair Barry stated that she uses alley parking at her own home and stated that it works well.

MOTION

Commissioner Adrienne Bell stated, “Based on the information in the staff report, the information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, I move that the Planning Commission approve the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Conditional Use Application PLNPCM2022-00394, with the following condition: The applicant obtains a demolition permit for the existing garage prior to obtaining a building permit for the construction of the accessory dwelling unit.”

Commissioner Mike Christensen seconded the motion.

Vice-Chairperson Maurine Bachman, Commissioners Andres Paredes, Levi de Oliveira, Aimee Burrows, Jon Lee, Adrienne Bell, Rich Tuttle, Mike Christensen, and Chair Amy Barry all voted “yes.”

The motion passed unanimously.

Mendon Court Preliminary Subdivision and Planned Development at approximately 839 S Mendon Court - Gary Knapp with JZW Architects, representing the property owner, has submitted Planned Development and Preliminary Plat applications to develop the property located at 839 S Mendon Court. The proposed development will consist of 3 single-family attached townhomes, each on their own lot. The subject property is currently undeveloped and is located in the Moderate Density Multifamily Residential (RMF-35) zoning district.

- A. Preliminary Plat:** Each townhome will be subdivided onto its own lot. The applicant is requesting approval for lots without frontage on a public street. **Case number PLNSUB2022-00419**
- B. Planned Development:** Planned Development approval is required for lots without frontage on a public street, to allow an accessory structure in the front yard setback and within 10’ of a principal structure on an adjacent property, exceeding the maximum parking allowed, modified landscape buffers, and a fence over 4 feet in height forward of the primary façade. **Case number PLNPCM2021-01078**

The project is located within Council District 5, represented by Darin Mano. (Staff contact: Krissy Gilmore at 801-535-7780 or kristina.gilmore@slcgov.com)

Senior Planner Kristina Gilmore reviewed the petition explaining that Commission approval is required for multiple items including an increase in the maximum parking allowed (from 7.5 to 10) and the

requirement that all lots have public street frontage. An increase in fence height from four to six feet is requested for the elevation that would otherwise be fronting a public street. In addition, the proposed position of garages would require modifications to some setback, and landscape buffer requirements. The preliminary subdivision approval is required because each townhome will be subdivided onto its own lot. Kristina Gilmore reported that public comment has included two phone calls regarding increased traffic on Lake Street. The Salt Lake City Transportation Division has confirmed that a three-unit increase is within the “capacity” of the street. Two comment letters have also been received, one from a Mendon Court homeowner concerned about a garage interfering with utility access, and the other from the East Liberty Park Community Council requesting the relocation of sewer and water lines so as not to impinge on that same the adjacent property owner, and also requesting open access from Mendon Court to the traffic easement through to Lake Street. Kristina Gilmore said that the second request is a requirement of the easement that the applicant intends to abide by. She stated that staff recommends application approval with the conditions listed in the staff report.

Commissioner Burrows asked whether plans for utility lines had been altered to accommodate the concerns of the homeowner and community council. Kristina Gilmore stated that that was her understanding but that she would ask the applicant to respond.

The applicant Garry Knapp and Michael Colligan addressed the Commission. Garry Knapp explained the utility mapping and stated that a plan was in place to accommodate the concerns of the Mendon Court neighbor by creating an additional water line and meter for the neighbor. He then described Mendon Court as “very tight,” at a 16-foot width. He said that the new configuration with an easement onto Lake Street would benefit the Mendon Court neighbors and solve a current problem of fire truck access that affects both streets.

Mike Colligan repeated Gary Knapp’s comment that the development of this location has been abandoned by previous owners because of multiple design challenges. He said that this development would contribute to the neighborhood, in part, because a three-block area would benefit from improved fire truck access and that allowing for the firetruck access and easement meant that a fourth unit could not be built in the project space.

Chair Barry called for questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Burrows asked about the possibility of providing open-space parking rather than garages in the area of the four stand-alone garages. Gary Knapp said that indications are that buyers strongly prefer enclosed parking for higher security, and other reasons. He said that neighbors had requested fencing along that side of the project, so the garage had a secondary function to act as a fence. Kristina Gilmore added that a modification would have been required for surface parking, as well, because the code does not allow for “front-yard surface-parking.” Chair Barry then asked whether a carport would require the same 10-foot set-back required by a garage. Planning Manager Wayne Mills confirmed that it would.

Commissioner Adrienne Bell asked about the ownership of the detached garages relative to the way in which lots are recorded. She asked whether they were linked to the townhomes across from them and whether one townhome would have two extra garages. Kristina Gilmore reported that the lots are separate and that linkage to owners will be determined during the Final Plat review and approval.

PUBLIC HEARING

- Delano Wing – Lake Street resident. Concerned about existing serious parking problems on Lake Street that sometimes prevent garbage pickup, and which have led to three instances of damage to his parked car. He questions fire truck access to the end of Lake Street. He requests resident parking permits along the lines of those issued to East High School neighbors.
- Arlo Wing – His mother lives on Lake Street and has concerns about one garage unit being too close to her property line. He had not had the opportunity to review the proposed solution to the water line problem but stated that he remains concerned that his mother will be “looking at a wall.” He said that the addition of the garage will create an area in which snow will accumulate leading to problems with run-off including basement flooding. He also asked for information on stormwater runoff plans.

Seeing that no one else wished to speak, Chair Barry closed the public hearing,

Applicant Gary Knapp stated that drainage and sloping are in place to mitigate a “100-year storm.” Mike Colligan said that he agreed that Lake Street has serious parking problems, however, his project would reduce on-street parking by “pulling parking on-site,” which is why the fire department comments were so positive. Gary Knapp added that an on-site fire-truck turnaround had been essential to fire department approval.

Chair Barry then called for Commission discussion.

Commissioner Burrows asked about future approvals required for separate thoroughfares for the remainder of the development including a section with an existing home. Mike Colligan said “one is driving the other;” approval of this phase determines the placement of other access routes. Mike Colligan owns both properties. Gary Knapp then stated that no special variances would be required for such easements. Kristina Gilmore confirmed that the developments on those lots will not require any special permission once the building permit is obtained.

Commissioner Burrows expressed surprise that a property owner would be able to build a road that connects to a public road without using the approval process. Kristina Gilmore added that the Transportation Division and the Engineering Division have reviewed the project.

Chair Barry then expressed a concern that the garages are just six feet from a home. She stated that her opinion might be different if the closest structure on the neighbor’s property were also a garage, rather than a home. Gary Knapp confirmed that the garages are 11 feet tall. Chair Barry said that she would prefer that the garages adhere to the 10-foot set back, however that she realized that would impinge upon the easement. She suggested that carports could be a solution. Following an exchange with Kristina

Gilmore she said that she would agree with an exemption for surface parking. She said that she had no concerns about the rest of the project.

Commissioner Lee asked whether moving the garages into the easement would make the drive aisle unusable. Gary Knapp and Mike Colligan both stated that they had never moved an easement before and were not certain what could be done. Kristie Gilmore then confirmed that, if the garages could be moved to meet the required distance of 10 feet from a neighboring principal structure, the garages would still need the exemption for detached garages in a front yard area.

Chair Barry then responded to clarifying questions from Commissioner Bell regarding the desired outcome. Chair Barry repeated her concern that, even with a six-foot fence, the short distance from the neighboring house of the originally proposed garage would be unacceptable to her if she lived in the neighboring house. Commissioner Andres Paredes commented that some carports are partially enclosed. Commissioners Lee and de Oliveira suggested that surface parking might be a simpler solution.

In response to a question from Vice Chairperson Bachman, Mike Colligan stated that he would like to have a decision that provides the options of surface parking or moving the garages as acceptable solutions—the details of which could be reviewed by staff—because even though he would like to preserve the garages by moving the easement, he was not certain whether it would be possible.

Chair Barry said that the motion would have to include approvals for the necessary exceptions for each option.

MOTION

Commissioner Adrienne Bell stated, “Based on the findings listed in the staff report, the information presented, and input received during the public hearing, I move that the Planning Commission approve the Planned Development (PLNPCM2021-01078) and Preliminary Plat request (PLNSUB2022-00419) for the project located at approximately 839 S Mendon Court, with the conditions listed in the staff report subject to the following modifications that the applicant be allowed to locate surface parking in the general location shown on the site plan where the stand-alone garages are currently proposed, or that the applicant be allowed to locate stand-alone garages in this general location so long as they are ten feet from the adjacent structure. Final site plan approval is delegated to staff.”

Commissioner Mike Christensen stated a concern that moving the garages could impinge upon the fire truck turn-around. Chair Barry responded that staff could review that point.

Commissioner Aimee Burrows seconded the motion.

Vice-Chairperson Maurine Bachman, Commissioners Mike Christensen, Andres Paredes, Levi de Oliveira, Aimee Burrows, Adrienne Bell, Jon Lee, Rich Tuttle, and Chair Amy Barry all voted “yes”. The motion passed unanimously.

1550 S Main Street Assemblage Zoning Map, Master Plan and Zoning Text Amendments and Alley Vacation- Urban Alfandre is requesting that the City amend the zoning map and master plan for multiple property parcels located at approx. 1518, 1530, 1540, 1546 S Main Street and 1515 S Richards Street respectively. All properties are zoned CC – Commercial Corridor with the exception of the parcel

at 1515 S Richards Street which is zoned R-1/5000, Single-Family Residential. The applicant is requesting a change to the future land use map designation in the Central Community Master Plan from Community Commercial to High Mixed Use on these parcels and a zoning change to the FB-UN2 – Form Based Urban Neighborhood Zoning District. An alley that runs through the properties would be vacated as part of this request. The intent of these petitions would be to combine all parcels as well as the alley into one cohesive parcel under the new zoning in order to build a mixed-use/multi-family development on the site. The property area for all parcels and the alley is approximately 2 acres. No specific site development plan has been submitted or is under consideration. The following petitions are associated with this proposal:

- A. Zoning Map Amendment:** Change on parcels from CC & R-1/5000 to FB-UN2. **Case number PLNPCM2021-01191**
- B. Master Plan Amendment:** Change to the future land use map in the Central Community Master Plan. **Case number PLNPCM2022-00065**
- C. Alley Vacation:** Request to vacate and close the platted alley to incorporate the area as private property in the development. **Case number PLNPCM2022-00086**

The properties and alley are located within Council District 5, represented by Darin Mano. (Staff contact: David Gellner at 801-535-6107 or david.gellner@slcgov.com)

Senior Planner David Gellner reviewed the petition for amendments to the zoning map, and master plan for the Central City Community Master Plan and an alley vacation as outlined in the Staff Report. He clarified that the current proposal does not include a text amendment. Two legally conforming duplexes and two single family homes would be removed for a total loss of six housing units as part of the proposal. The developer has chosen replacement of housing as the housing loss mitigation. The mitigation plan has been signed by the Salt Lake City Community and Neighborhoods Director. Heights could reach 50 feet under the new zoning. The alley vacation has met the “signature and policy threshold requirements.” The new FB-UN2 zone would provide for consideration of more design standards than is available in the CC (Corridor Commercial) designation.

David Gellner summarized the comments as supportive of redevelopment but expressing concern about the project height. He said that there are public comments in the staff report. Public comments received after that document was prepared are in the drop box. David Gellner reported that after the applicant withdrew the request for a height exception of 65 feet, there were no additional comments related to height. The plan is being amended to provide consistency between the plan and the property zoning. Staff recommends forwarding a positive recommendation to the City Council with the following conditions: replacement of housing loss, the integration of the vacated alley into future development, and the appropriate consolidation of the rezoned parcels.

The Applicants James Alfandre and Stephen Alfandre of Urban Alfandre addressed the Commission. James Alfandre described the project as mitigating the issues of housing shortage, area criminal activity, and pollution. The development should make the area more “walkable” because the project is in an area “rich” with transport options, such as bus, TRAX, and bike lanes. He later suggested that residents would have an option to walk to the downtown area. James Alfandre stated that the rezoning request is consistent with the masterplan because the infill project would be preferable relative to City water services, and it would “revitalize Main Street” --thus discouraging crime.

James Alfandre then made the statement “in mixed use locations minimizing setbacks is good urban design.” He pointed out that “about a 25-foot” setback from the street to the property line already exists, and so should be noted when reviewing the FB-UN2 requirements.

Stephan Alfandre referred to company’s experience with FB-UN2 and described the company as “solely infill developers.” He said that the company’s goal is to “add value” to the community.

PUBLIC HEARING

- Jeff Sandstrom – Ball Park Community Council Board member speaking on behalf of the Council– The Community Council supports area redevelopment and the proposed alley closure but has identified five points of objection to this project in its current form and rezoning. 1. Main Street from 1300 to 1700 South is Corridor Commercial zoning and all existing new developments have complied with zoning requirements regarding height restrictions, setbacks, parking, and green space. 2. The Community Council is concerned that the project’s “entire southern boundary is along single-family homes both on Main Street and Van Buren Ave.” 3. The size and scale of the project is not compatible with the Ball Park Station Area Plan “vision for future land use,” or the “Main Street Area” description. Mr. Sandstrom quoted from the Ball Park Station Area Plan: “small local business, generally pleasant pedestrian and bike environment and medium density residential buildings. New developments should focus on maintaining the scale, walkability, and bikability of the neighborhood.” Other quotes related to reserving current “scale and massing in future development.” He stated that, although the plan had not been formally adopted by the Salt Lake City Council yet, it did reflect a high level of community and professional staff involvement over a long period of time and, therefore, is expected to be adopted. 4. The Community Council objects to a rezoning request made without the Community Council having the opportunity to review a site plan, or developer agreement. 5. The Community Council is concerned because FB-UN2 zoning was described by a former chair of the “Central 9th Community Council” as an “experiment” proven to be “flawed and unhealthy” by discouraging green space and allowing for significant height increases because of the affordable housing overlay. Mr. Sandstrom stated, in summary, that The Ball Park Community Council is currently concerned about setbacks, secure off-street parking, and green space, but acknowledges the drop in maximum height from 65 feet to 50 feet as “a step in the right direction.”
- Jason Scholz –Richards Street resident for five years and duplex owner. In support of removing the Main Street Motel. He objected to changing the Commercial Corridor zoning primarily because it would enable a project that would threaten the neighborhood atmosphere of the area “south of the Ball Park” approximately between Main Street and West Temple. He cited a particular concern about the proposed setback on Andrews Street as inhibiting pedestrians. Other locations were mentioned after the two-minute time limit was exceeded.
- Josh Blankenship – Lives on Kensington Avenue across from condos constructed a few years ago. He said that condo project provides adequate parking and green space and abides by other “existing zoning requirements.” He expressed specific concern about the “monolith style buildings” included in the proposal. He stated that the two-acre project “will overshadow the character and charm” of the neighboring houses to the south and west and north. He also stated his preference for “for-sale” developments is important for the neighborhood that he says is now eighty-percent rental. He said renters can “just walk away” when faced with crime in a neighborhood.
- Cindy Cromer – Not a resident in this neighborhood but owns property in a similar neighborhood. She stated that she has property that has been zoned FB-UN2 for six years and characterized the zone as “dysfunctional,” because it provides “a blank check for the developer.” She said that multiple references to “development agreements” in the staff report refer to agreements that have no community involvement. She reminded the Commission that it holds the authority to initiate a housing mitigation petition, and that removal of the Main Street Motel would destroy six housing units, yet no plan has been made for the relocation of those residents.
- Sach Combs – Ball Park resident for over eighteen years. Expressed opposition to rezoning and support for previous comments, and the area masterplan. He specifically objected to the

applicant's suggestion reducing the setback would "activate the neighborhood." He said the FB-UN2 zoning allows for options without public oversight. He said that this zoning change would set "a bad precedent for future development."

Seeing that there were no further comments, Chair Barry closed the public hearing.

James Alfandre stated a belief that the FB-UN2 is needed to "provide a better design and development." He noted that the initial proposed height had been reduced to satisfy neighbor objections even though the company position is "that more housing is better." He described the height difference as "negligible." He said that FB-UN2 "requires" other "better benefits to the neighbors." He gave the examples of durable materials and residential setbacks. Stephen Alfandre stated that the company is Salt Lake-focused, "We live here." He said that this project would be coordinated with future nearby project plans including commercial space with a goal of "vibrant, beautiful products."

Chair Barry then called for comments from the Commission. She reminded the Commission that the final decision lies with the City Council and the role of the Commission is to make a recommendation.

Commissioner Bell ask for clarification on the difference between setback requirements in the discussed zones. David Gellner replied that no setback requirement would be required for the CC zone, but the FB-UN2 would have a 15-foot setback requirement. He also cited upper building step-backs of one additional foot for every foot of height above 30 feet along a rear, or side, property line if the abutment is to properties where the maximum height is less than 35 feet. Commissioner Bell asked whether any setbacks would be required for a project in the CC zone up to the 45-foot maximum height. David Gellner replied that in some cases there would be landscape requirements.

Commissioner Paredes asked the applicant what they "get from the FBUN2 zone that you don't get from the CC zone." The reply was "better urban design" as well as flexibility for parking and ground floor retail. Stephen Alfandre referred to higher span ceilings on the ground floor as encouraging "better tenants" for commercial and retail space and more parking on-site. He mentioned the 5-foot difference in standard maximum height between the two zones.

Commissioner Bell remarked that she has "never been a fan of the CC zone," because of its lack of flexibility.

David Gellner then confirmed Chair Barry's understanding that the FB-UN2 zone would offer wider setbacks on every elevation except the front. Chair Barry stated that she felt the issue for residents should be whether they prefer wider setbacks on the interior sides and rear, or a wider setback from the street. She stated that her personal preference would be a greater setback from the property line, not the street. Chair Barry stated that, on the issue of greenspace, a CC zone would provide 15 feet in front but the FB-UN2 would provide 10% which would either be a negligible difference, or a possible advantage.

MOTION

Commissioner Adrienne Bell stated, "Based on the information in the staff report, the information presented and the input received during the public hearing, I move that the Planning Commission forward a POSITIVE recommendation to City Council for the proposed Zoning Map and Master Plan Amendments and the Alley Vacation Request for the property parcels located at 1518, 1530, 1540, 1546 S Main Street and 1515 S Richards Street respectively as requested through the following applications and with the recommendations listed below: • Zoning Map Amendment –

PLNPCM2021-01191 – Rezoning subject parcels from CC (Corridor Commercial) & R-1/5000 (Single-family residential to FB-UN2 (Form Based Urban Neighborhood).

- **Master Plan Amendment – PLNPCM2022-00065 – Change to the future land use map in the Central Community Master Plan from Community Commercial to High Mixed Use.**
- **Alley Vacation – PLNPCM2022-00086 – Request to vacate and close the platted alley to incorporate the area into the development as private property.**

Recommendations: 1. The housing being removed from the site must be replaced. 2. The property for the vacated alley be integrated into the future development. 3. The rezoned parcels must be consolidated through the appropriate process.”

Vice-Chairperson Maurine Bachman seconded the motion.

Vice-Chairperson Maurine Bachman and Commissioners Mike Christensen, Levi de Oliveira, Andres Paredes, Rich Tuttle, Aimee Burrows, Jon Lee, Adrienne Bell, and Chair Amy Barry all voted “yes”.

The motion passed unanimously.

Sugar House Circulation Plan Modifications - The Salt Lake City Transportation Division is proposing a modification to the Sugar House Circulation Plan (adopted in 2013) that would adopt the Local Link Project as an addendum. Local Link is a circulation plan that has been jointly produced by Salt Lake City, Millcreek, Holladay, and South Salt Lake City that addresses pedestrian and bicycle connections in and between the participating cities and evaluates transit connections between Sugar House, Millcreek, and Holladay. The Planning Commission is being asked to make a recommendation to the City Council regarding the adoption of the proposed plan. The area covered by the plan is located in City Council District 7, represented by Amy Fowler. (Staff Contact: Lynn Jacobs at 801-535-6630 or lynn.jacobs@slcgov.com)

Transportation Engineer Lynn Jacobs reviewed the multi-year study that supports the modification. He noted the broad-based collaboration and the fact that many roads in Sugar House will require reconstruction in the next few years, and the anticipated future growth in the four areas included. He explained that while the circulation study included all four participating areas equally, the transit study concentrated on movement between Sugar House and Holladay. The link to the two studies is [local linkstudy.com](http://locallinkstudy.com).

Lynn Jacobs identified eight priority principles shared by each community: safety, equity, transparency and engagement, sustainability, choice, connectivity, health, and collaboration. The circulation study resulted in eight project recommendations: fixing the Parley’s Trail alignment through the Sugar House Central Business District to the S-Line; 2700 South street improvements (currently in process); street improvements between the Sugar House Business District and Millcreek City Center (along 900 East, 1300 East and Highland Drive); Improving “active transportation” along 3300 South (a UDOT road in Millcreek); connect the Parley’s Trail alignment through downtown South Salt Lake; 2100 South Street improvement (in progress); a two-way bike line around Sugar House Park; improvements to multiple intersections. Lynn Jacobs said that a future project may be a connection between Sugar House Commons and Parley’s Trail.

Various policy recommendations such as way-finding, traffic calming, and parking have been made for specific locations. The transit study reviewed transit connections between Sugar House, Millcreek and Holladay following the already adopted alignment of the S-Line within Salt Lake City and assumed that those future phases of the S-Line are predetermined. The two proposals are “viable alternatives” for the alignment of the connection of Sugar House, Millcreek and Holladay. Transit modes would include

enhanced bus, streetcar, BRT system, and light rail. He noted that BRT and light rail would require street widening. The study recommendation is to use enhanced buses on Highland Drive until ridership justifies a streetcar or other higher capacity option.

Chair Amy Barry called for commissioner comments.

Commissioner Lee asked about the differences between a bus and a streetcar. Lynn Jacobs responded that, in planning for growth, a streetcar, or something like it will be needed in the future but is not affordable in the near-term.

Chair Barry asked why expanding the McClelland trail had not been recommended. Lynn Jacobs stated that the McClelland Trail is shown in the project recommending connections between Sugar House and Millcreek as currently planned. Chair Barry stated that Parley's trail is included, and she felt that this study would have been an opportunity to create a north-south trail from Elizabeth Park, which is an end point for the McClelland Trail. She stated that the long-discussed "vision of the McClelland Trail," was to connect with Brickyard.

Chair Barry then asked about specific aspects of the Parley's Trail routes stating that, as a frequent bike rider in the Sugar House area, she felt that the Trails should minimize routing along Highland Drive. A discussion of route options followed. Chair Barry stated that work needs to be done on the Parley's Trail alignment.

Chair Barry then inquired about the section of Richards Street in the Brickyard neighborhood stating that there is a strong need for traffic calming at that location, and she cited other locations around the Brickyard shopping center in need of pedestrian-friendly crossing paths. Lynn Jacobs said that Richards Street is currently Salt Lake City-owned even though it is technically within Millcreek Boundaries. He cited a plan to be implemented in 2024 which would address some of those issues but not extend to 3300 South.

PUBLIC HEARING

- Judi Short – speaking for Sugar House Community Council. The Community Council prefers a 2100 South alignment for the streetcar extension, rather than 1100 East. The Community Council supports many proposed changes including improvements along 2100 South and enhanced buses and commends the participation of Lynn Jacobs. The Council supports expanding bike lanes even if one vehicle lane is sacrificed. The Council supports sidewalks extending to the curb to accommodate both mass transit and snow removal. The Council wants a plan to accommodate traffic diversion during the 1300 East reconstruction of the I-80 bridge. The Community Council recommends formation of a parking authority. The Community Council recommends using the old Deseret Industries location as a hub to accommodate bicyclists with lockers and bike repair and affordable housing on the upper floors.
- Lynn Schwartz – Supports enhanced buses, particularly electric buses. She suggested that tying transportation to light rail assumes that the investment is justified because growth is predictable. She stated dissatisfaction that connections with Murray and South Salt Lake were not included.
- Ann Thurston– Resident of "the northern part of Highland" commended the efforts of Lynn Jacobs but felt that some of the community meetings at which residents voted on preferences did not clearly identify routes. She objects to the idea of "shared lanes" on Highland Drive, but favors other recommendations in the study
- Soren Simonsen – Sugar House long-time Sugar House resident – Commended Chair Barry for her questions and comments. Mr. Simonsen explained that, in 2001, South Salt Lake changed its

position and voted in favor of the current transit corridor because of the implementation of the S-Line. He stated that the S-Line was intended to be a 'circulator' between the two communities. He pointed out the importance of Sugar House Park and added his opposition to the 1100 East S-Line alignment.

Seeing that no one else wished to speak, Chair Barry closed the public hearing and asked for Commissioner comments.

Hearing none, Chair Barry commended the volume of work but noted that the formula used to determine the desired routes was flawed. Lynn Jacobs stated that, while he appreciated the controversy, no consideration was made to change the S-Line alignment because the priority, as stated in the project grant, was looking at ridership patterns and connections between Sugar House, Millcreek and Holladay, and not to revisit the previously adopted S-Line alignment.

Chair Barry stated that the Commission should remember that the Commission vote would be a recommendation to the City Council. In response to Commissioner Bell's question, Chair Barry stated that she did not believe "this plan is ready for the City Council." She cited reasons already given and Lynn Jacobs expressed uncertainty that all concerns would be resolved. Commissioner Bell suggested that a vote for a positive recommendation would be appropriate because issues could not be resolved at this meeting.

MOTION

Commissioner Adrienne Bell stated, "Based on the information in the staff report, the information presented, the input received during the public hearing, and the discussion of the Commission, I move that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council ADOPT the proposed modifications to the Sugar House Circulation Plan."

Commissioner Mike Christensen seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Maurine Bachman, Commissioners Jon Lee, Aimee Burrows, Rich Tuttle, Levi de Oliveira, Andres Paredes, Mike Christensen, and Adrienne Bell, "yes".

Chair Barry voted "no".

The motion passed 8 "yes" 1 "no"

Ballpark Station Area Plan - A request by the Mayor to create a station area plan in the Ballpark Neighborhood. The Ballpark's Station Area Plan is intended to capitalize on the community assets and set a framework to help guide growth related issues and pressures and to keep the neighborhood as the home of baseball in Utah. The Ballpark Station Area Plan will encompass the area that runs roughly between 900 South to 1700 South, and State Street to I-15. The small area plan's boundaries are within both the Central Community and the Downtown Master Plans. The Ballpark Station Area Plan is located within Council District 5, represented by Darin Mano. (Staff contact: Nannette Larsen at 801-535-7645 or nannette.larsen@slcgov.com) **Case number PLNPCM2022-00323**

Senior Planner Nannette Larsen explained that modifications had been made to the Ball Park Station Area Plan following the June 8 work session meeting. She described the process of creating the plan, including public involvement and integration of other area plans. She pointed out that coordination with UDOT will be needed to fully implement a plan for a pedestrian cross walk across State Street. Preference has been given to pedestrian crossings that are also traffic calming rather, than raised crosswalks. The

work session discussion resulted in a review of multiple bike and pedestrian accommodations. She stated that Staff recommends a positive recommendation be forwarded to City Council.

PUBLIC HEARING

- Sach Combs – Ball Park Community Council representative – Long-time resident. The Community Council supports the area plan and Mr. Combs praised the participation of all stake holders. However, the Community Council is asking for an extension of the timeline to allow for comments and adjustments related to trees and greenspace, public safety (street lighting, maintaining alleyways) and ways to encourage owner-occupancy.
- Claudia Johnson – Sugar House resident dissatisfied with the quality of the renderings, and text in the report of the previous agenda item.
- Cindy Cromer – A non-resident who believes that this neighborhood has many similarities with her neighborhood and who has extensive history with small area plans extending back to the 1980s. She noted that the scope of this plan is much larger than most small area plans. She noted that most small area plans begin with a “defining issue.” She stated that a starting point such as the crime issue would cover something that is essential to the “perception” of this neighborhood. She therefore advises against a “festival street” or other public spaces where people who are “not law abiding can gather” as part of the initial effort. She agreed with the community council that increasing home ownership would help, but doubts that increasing connectivity is a good first step. She suggested that a branch library in the neighborhood would add to the problems in the community.
- Janet Yemming – Chair of the Yalecrest Community Council, which is out of area. She praised many elements of the small area plan such as efforts to assist pedestrian and bicycle mobility; “enhancing the social and shopping scene around the park;” future green spaces, and a library and community center. She then stated that the priority should be addressing the crime problem and quoted a statement from the Ball Park Community Council chair Amy Hawkins criticizing the proposed size of new developments allowed in the plan which would displace current residents. and create other problems because their size is out of proportion with the rest of the neighborhood. Janet Yemmings then referred to the new Thriving in Place study and stating that new high-priced development is contrary to that study. She then suggested that the small area plan could be contributing to the problem that it seeks to prevent.
- Jordan Atkin – with TAG SLC – Described his company as a small “infill developer” focusing on middle housing that has “contributed about 400 housing units.” His company supports most of the plan but has concerns about the Jefferson Park area where his company owns land. He disputed the height limitations in that area because adjacent parcels have been approved for greater height. He pointed out the proximity to TRAX Stations.

Seeing that no one else wished to speak, Chair Barry closed the public hearing and asked for Commissioner comments.

Chair Barry asked Nannette Larsen for her response to the public comment that the plan be extended to allow for phased timeline to prioritize certain elements of the small area plan. Susan Lundmark explained

that she was the project lead for the initial phase as the transportation and land use specialist and that Nan took over for the adoption process. She pointed to the existing implementation section in the plan.

Commissioner Andres Paredes asked for clarification of the public comment that height restrictions for neighboring projects were inconsistent. Nan Larsen explained that the restrictions match the zoning designation which differs because of the nature of the Jefferson neighborhood. She noted that 200 West and West Temple are higher traffic areas with a mixed zoning designation. In response to a follow-up question, she also stated that allowing a very tall building on a small parcel of land “could look awkward,” and there are multiple small and narrow parcels in this area of the neighborhood.

Commissioner Lee said that he wondered whether “medium density is enough for Main Street.” He cited the need for more people to make Main Street “more active” and the current problem with deserted buildings, “broken teeth,” on Main Street. He said that perhaps a gradual transition to a higher density might be appropriate.

Commissioner Bell repeated an earlier question asking about delaying the recommendation to give the Community Council more time to review the plan. Nan Larsen responded that that was the prerogative of the Commission.

Chair Barry suggested two approaches, the first would be a time extension to allow for consideration of four recommendations: prioritizing green space, development guidance to increase pedestrian movement safely; preserving alleyways; increasing owner-occupied residences. Nan Larsen said that the Commission could also recommend approval based upon identified conditions.

Commissioner Paredes said that he would like to include increased density on Main Street to the list as suggested by Commissioner Lee.

Susan Lundmark asked for clarification of whether there was an intention to differentiate between Main Street north of 1300 South and Main Street south of 1300 South. She pointed out that south of 1300 South some down-zoning to single family homes has occurred and so consideration had been given to developments adjacent to those homes. Commissioner Lee said that his concern is that many small area plans do not consider rapid growth cycles.

Chair Barry then called for a motion.

MOTION

Commissioner Levi de Oliveira stated, “Based on the analysis in the staff report, information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, I move that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation for the creation of the Ballpark Station Area Plan, PLNPCM2022-00323, with the following modifications: That the staff review the plan to look at increasing density on Main Street.”

Commissioner Jon Lee seconded the motion.

Vice-Chair Maurine Backman, Commissioners Adrienne Bell, Andres Paredes, Rich Tuttle, Levi de Oliveira, Jon Lee, Aimee Burrows, Mike Christensen, and Chair Barry voted “yes.”

The motion passed.

Moderate Income Housing Plan (Growing SLC) Implementation Plan Amendment - The Planning Commission received a briefing on May 25, 2022, regarding new state requirements to include an implementation plan in the City’s Moderate Income Housing Plan, *Growing SLC*. *Growing SLC* is in its

final year and has seen significant success toward the goals and objectives outlined within it. To date, all of the main goals have been completed or seen significant progress toward their completion. Despite this progress, Salt Lake City's housing market has seen record price increases, which have called for further implementation of the goals in the final year. Additionally, HB 462 – Affordable Housing Amendments, which passed in the 2022 legislative session, requires an implementation plan to be adopted by October 1, 2022. To both continue addressing the housing situation and to comply with new requirements, an implementation plan will be presented to the Planning Commission to include the housing-related efforts that are currently being undertaken by the City. The Planning Commission will make a final recommendation to the City Council, who is the final decision maker. (Staff Contact: Ruedi Matthes at (385) 415-4701 RuediGar.Matthes@slcgov.com)

Ruedi Matthes reviewed the project as outlined in the Staff Report. He explained that passage of HB 462 earlier this year created a requirement that city general plans containing a "housing element" must have an implementation plan in place by October first of this year. The proposed amendment to Growing SLC, the City's current five-year housing plan, will meet that implementation requirement. He explained that the implementation plan must include at least four strategies and explained other options for increased funding. At total of twelve strategies are recommended to ensure that the City will not fall short of requirements to fund projects. Ruedi Matthes presented priority strategies and "implementation efforts" including a focus on increasing housing and commercial density, producing new affordable housing, and rehabilitating existing housing stock through zoning changes, RDA programs, and the City's management of affordable Housing funds. He mentioned the mayor's intention to target "deeply affordable housing" with 20.1 million dollars in new City funds for housing. He is also project manager for the City's new housing plan currently under development, Housing SLC, which is not the subject of the agenda item.

PUBLIC HEARING

Judi Short – Speaking for herself she cited a list of housing plans waiting for approval including the "ADU overhaul," rezoning for homeless resource centers, the affordable housing overlay also know as affordable housing incentives, and other related issues including shared housing and off-street parking. She noted that a recent report to the Commission included a consultant remark that Salt Lake City has the worst housing problem in the country. She recommended an emphasis on enforcement to make plans effective. She also made comments beyond the allotted time.

Cindy Cromer – Stated that proper noticing of this agenda item had not been made because incorrect mailing lists were used. She identified districts in which community organizations did not receive notice of the agenda item. She argued against the amendment to the Growing SLC plan as a "way to get funding for unpopular, and as yet, unadopted proposals."

Seeing no further comments, Chair Barry closed the public hearing.

Ruedi Matthes clarified that state funding contingent upon changes to the plan is not for housing; it is primarily for transportation, but also includes American Rescue Plan Act funding. He said that the reason that the state linked transportation funding to a housing bill was to encourage and expand efforts in affordable housing across the state. He said that the 20.1 million dollars dedicated by the City Council is a first step in increasing actual housing funds and "if leveraged properly, can build more than just a couple hundred units."

Chair Barry asked Planning Manager Wayne Mills whether the notification process is a requirement for all agenda items given that the matter before them did not originate in the Planning Division. Senior City Attorney Paul Neilson stated that there was an attempt to follow the early notification process because, even though this item is not, in itself, a masterplan, an amendment to a masterplan would share the same requirement. He regretted errors but a reasonable attempt was made to comply with the ordinance, with no ill-intent. Deputy Director of Community and Neighborhoods, Tammy Hunsaker, emphasized that there was no "ill intent." She reminded the Commission that the implementation plan is an adoption of "a

menu of items that could move forward,” and that those items would then go through further public processes.

Andres Paredes then asked how enforcement can be implemented. Chair Barry agreed that the subject is important, but outside the scope of the Commission. Tammy Hunsaker stated that she did not believe that HB 462 addressed that issue but agreed that the subject was important. Ruedi Matthes agreed.

MOTION

Commissioner Mike Christensen stated, “Based on the findings, analysis, testimony and information presented, I move that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to adopt the Moderate Housing Plan Implementation Plan Amendment to Growing SLC.”

Commissioner Andres Paredes seconded the motion.

Vice-Chairperson Maurine Bachman, Commissioners Andres Paredes, Levi de Oliveira, Aimee Burrows, Jon Lee, Adrienne Bell, Rich Tuttle, Mike Christensen, and Chair Amy Barry all voted “yes.”

The motion passed unanimously.

WORK SESSION

Northpoint Small Area Plan Briefing - The Planning Commission will receive a briefing from Logan Simpson, the project consultant, on the Salt Lake City Planning Division's Northpoint Small Area Plan update process. The Northpoint Small Area Plan will provide guidance on the future development and use of property along 2200 West Corridor in the Northwest Planning Community of Salt Lake City. The project area is located in Council District 1 represented by Victoria Petro-Eschler. (Staff contact: Krissy Gilmore at 801-535-7780 kristina.gilmore@slcgov.com) **Case number PLNPCM2022-00687**

Northpoint Small Area Plan Briefing - The Planning Commission will receive a briefing from Logan Simpson, the project consultant, on the Salt Lake City Planning Division's Northpoint Small Area Plan update process. The Northpoint Small Area Plan will provide guidance on the future development and use of property along 2200 West Corridor in the Northwest Planning Community of Salt Lake City. The project area is located in Council District 1 represented by Victoria Petro-Eschler. (Staff contact: Krissy Gilmore at 801-535-7780 kristina.gilmore@slcgov.com) **Case number PLNPCM2022-00687**

Senior Planner Kristina Gilmore along with Jennifer Gardiner and Olivia Svetco of the consulting firm Logan Simpson introduced the plan that is still in its public comment phase. The final draft of the plan will incorporate Commission and public comments. The process began in June of 2021 and continues to involve residents and property owners in the area. Points of controversy center around development. Points of agreement include ecosystem conservation such as buffers, requiring an EIS for new development, storm water management, the use of native plants and fertilizer prohibitions, and the acquisition of more City land for open-space preservation. Thirty-two hundred west was mentioned as a demarcation line. Much of the area is zoned as industrial and business park with some residential. Olivia Svetco stated a long-term “vision” of industrial or business park with consideration for natural habitat and residents. She referred to a transition of “properties” developing from “residential to industrial”

Consultants are seeking a recommendation regarding the “Swanner Property” development, asking how that area should appear in the plan given that development is pending approval. The question would be whether to portray it as approved, or more in line with the future vision.

Chair Barry stated her opinion that it should be portrayed as clustering away from sensitive lands. She added her opinion that the emphasis on industrial and business park is incompatible with the area. She thought that it could be appropriate to review the actual environmental impacts of industrial development contrasted to residential development. Kristina Gilmore reminded the Commission that the proximity to the airport of much of the area would make it incompatible with residential development. The consultants referred to the plan calling for the prohibition of turf and fertilizer, which are often favored by homeowners. Also, domestic animals, especially cats, were noted as threats to wildlife.

Chair Barry stated that she saw a trend towards business parks in sensitive areas. Consultants responded that the majority of the most environmentally sensitive lands fall within the "entitled area." Chair Barry said that, since that issue is beyond the control of the Commission, she wondered whether some sort of mitigation would be possible.

Commissioner de Oliveira asked how a prohibition of fertilizer could be enforced. Kristine Gilmore stated that she didn't know how it could be enforced. Commissioner de Oliveira commented that once development permission is granted, they're going to do what they want. Commissioner Lee said that land is not being used efficiently because other industrial areas are "just empty."

The meeting adjourned at 9:57 PM.

For Planning Commission agendas, staff reports, and minutes, visit the Planning Division's website at slc.gov/planning/public-meetings. Staff Reports will be posted the Friday prior to the meeting and minutes will be posted two days after they are ratified, which usually occurs at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission.