

# Staff Report 

DEPARTMENT of COMMUNITY and NEIGHBORHOODS

To: Salt Lake City Planning Commission
From: Cassie Younger, Senior Planner cassie.younger@slcgov.com 801-535-6211
Date: June 14, 2023
Re: PLNPCM2023-00200 Planned Development PLNSUB2023-00254 Preliminary Subdivision

# Planned Development \& Preliminary Subdivision 

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 720 \& 724 S 300 E
PARCEL ID: 16-07-130-041-0000 \& 16-07-130-040-0000
MASTER PLAN: Central Community Plan
ZONING DISTRICT: RMF-35, Moderate Density Multi-Family Residential

## REQUEST: Planned Development \& Preliminary Subdivision

Salt Lake City has received a request from Bogart McAvoy, the property owner, for a Planned Development and Preliminary Subdivision Plat at 720 and 724 S 300 East. The project is located in the RMF-35 zoning district and consists of seven dwelling units, e ach located on its own lot with shared common space. Due to the configuration of the project, all of the lots do not meet typical zoning regulations such as street frontage, width, setbacks, building coverage, and landscaping; therefore, Planned Development approval is required.

## RECOMMENDATION: Approval with Conditions

Based on the information and findings listed in the staff report, it is the Planning Staff's opinion that the request generally meets the applicable standards of approval and therefore recommends the Planning Commission approve the request with the following condition:

1. Submittal of a final plat application and recordation of the final plat.

## ATTACHMENTS:

A. ATTACHMENT A: Vicinity Map
B. ATTACHMENT B: Applicant's Submittal
C. ATTACHMENT C: Property and Vicinity Photos
D. ATTACHMENT D: RMF-35 Zoning Standards
E. ATTACHMENT E: Subdivision Standards
F. ATTACHMENT F: Planned Development Standards
G. ATTACHMENT G: Public Process \& Comments
H. ATTACHMENT H:Department Review Comments

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed Mews residential project consists of seven dwelling units. The dwellings are configured in a townhouse format with three attached dwellingstowards the rearof the property and two separate buildings, each containing two side-by-side units towards the front and sides of the property. The design is meant to mimic the "Mews" cottages in England, a type of close knit cottage style home with shared alleys and pathways.


The dwelling units facing 300 East have front doors and balconies that face the street, keeping eyes and activity towards the street, while garages face inward. A common court in the front yard area with benches and bike parking creates a welcoming and inviting presence along the streetscape. A "T" shaped driveway cuts through the lot that allows access to all the units. The garages face towardseach other rather than towards the street.

All of the units in this development are threebedroom, four bathroom, with two car garages on the first floor. Each unit will be on its own parcel,
 and will have a private backyard, patio, and second story balcony. Each unit is enclosed by a privacy/ retaining wall. A wall also encloses the development which allows screening from adjacent properties.

## Existing conditions and Neighborhood context

The properties at 720 and 724 S 300 E each currently have a duplex on them, one of which is no longer habitable. These parcels are located in the RMF-35 zone, as are the surrounding properties to the north, south, and east. A vacant building that was formerly KoKo Kitchen is directly north, and Marcat townhomes are currently being constructed directly to the south. River rock apartments is directly across the street to the east. A protected bike lane runs in front of the property on 300 East, as are many other major bike routes nearby. The Library Trax Station is
also 6 miles away, which provides this development with manytransportation options for tenants and owners.

## APPROVAL PROCESS AND COMMISSION AUTHORITY

Per section 21A.55.020.A of the Zoning Ordinance, the Planning Commission may approve modifications to the subdivision or zoning standards of a proposed development as part of a Planned Development. This includes the requested modifications on page 1 of this staffreport. The Commission must find that the proposal meets the objectives and standards for a Planned Development as outlined in 21A.55.050 of the Zoning Ordinance.

The Planning Commission may deny an application for a Planned Development if it finds that the proposal does not meet the intent of the base zoning district (RMF-35) or is not consistent with the standards and objectives as outlined in the Planned Development chapter.

The Planning Commission may approve preliminary subdivision plats or report its actions and recommendations to the mayor, who ultimately approves or denies final subdivision plats.

## KEY CONSIDERATIONS

The key considerations listed below were identified through the analysis of the project:

1. How the proposal helps implement city goals and policies identified in adopted plans.
2. Modifications of RMF-35 development standards
3. Request to develop lots without public street frontage

## Consideration 1: How the proposal helps implement city goals and policies identified in adopted plans.

## Plan Salt Lake

Plan Salt Lake is Salt Lake City's guiding plan for the next 20 years of development. It outlines goals and initiatives to guide sustainable growth for our future.

The goals and initiatives outlined in this plan include:

## Growth:

* 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


## Housing

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

This Planned Development provides infill development along transportation corridors and major bike routes and adds additional housing where infrastructure and amenities already exist. This development adds moderate density housing types in an appropriate zone. Therefore, this Planned Development fulfills the goals of Plan Salt Lake.

## Central Community Plan

The Central Community Master Planshows these properties are designated for medium density housing between 15-30 units per acre under the future land use map. Under typical development standards for these housing types, density would be approximately 12 units per acre on . 41 acres. The proposed development provides a development at 17 units an acre, which is more in line with moderate density goals for this neighborhood.

The Central Community Plan's goals also desire development to "provide more three and four bedroom housing units" and "ensure that land-use policies reflect a respect for the eclectic architectural character so that this area does not remain as just an interim zone between Downtown and more desirable neighborhoods to the east and north."
This development creates a unique style of housing that provides three-bedroom housing for families on private lots. The majority of new development in this neighborhood has been large apartment buildings with small units. This project contributes to a diversity of housing types in this neighborhood and meets the goals of the Central Community Master Plan.

## Consideration 2: Request to modify RMF-35 development standards

A typical lot in the RMF- 35 zone would require a minimum of 4,000 SF for a twin home or 3,000 SF for single family attached, with 22-32 feet as a minimum lot width. This development's lots have a smaller lot area and minimum lot width per these development standards, therefore creating a denser development that is typical for this housing type. The Planned Development process does not allow projects to exceed the density of the zone. Because the zone allows for seven multi-family units, it does not exceed the density of the RMF-35 zone, but alters the lot width and minimum for single-family attached and twin home units.
The setbacks along the perimeter of the project meet the setbacks required for a multi-family project, which maintains the space, buffering, and screening towards adjacent properties. The front setback is 20 and offers a shared courtyard and inviting and attractive streetscape. Side and rear setbacks are typical of a multi-family residential development, at 20' in the rear and $10^{\prime}$ on each side. But instead of a large, block shaped building of apartments, this project offers much needed "missing middle housing" - small townhomes that can easily house small families, but on a small private lot with shared amenities. The setbacks adjacent to the surrounding properties are the same if this building were one, large apartment building.

As seen in the visual below, the applicant shows what could be built according to the standards outlined in RMF-35. It visualizes one large multifamily building, compromised of small units, with a lot coverage of 10,470 square feet under existing setbacks and code. Other configurations shown that try to incorporate townhomes do not meet fire code, and therefore are not feasible. The proposed project meets fire code requirements and provides family-oriented housing with private outdoor space and larger units.

The purpose of the Planned Development is to provide a more enhanced product that would be achievable through strict application of zoning. This project meets the intent of this objective by creating an attractive and needed variety of housing within this zone.
Their request to modify these standards through the Planned Development meets the purpose of the Planned Development standards, as outlined in Attachment E. This project meets the goals of the Central Community Master Plan and the objectives of the Planned Development process.


## Consideration 3: Request to have lots without public street frontage

The Preliminary Plat includes seven lots with shared common space in the front yard area along 300 E and a shared private drive.
This plat configuration takes advantage of the depth of the lot to create lots and units in the back of the lot that are hidden from public view, this way providing density without affecting the view from the street. The private driveway provides adequate fire access to all units and shields the parking areas from public view. Staff is in support of this request.


## STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff is of the opinion that the Planned Development proposal meets the intent of the RMF-35 zoning district, the Planned Development objectives and standards of review, and is compatible with the various master plans of the city. The proposal complies with the subdivision standards, except for the modifications being requested as part of the Planned Development. Staff recommends approval of the proposed project.

## NEXT STEPS

## Approval of the Request

If the proposal is approved, the applicant will need to need to comply with the conditions of approval, including any of the conditions required by City departments and the Planning Commission. Final certificates of occupancy for the buildings will only be issued once all conditions of approval are met. The applicant will also need to submit a final plat.

## Denial of the Planned Development Request

If denied, the applicant could develop this property to the standard development standards for RMF35 as outlined 21A.24.130

## ATTACHMENT A: Vicinity Map

## Vicinity Map
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## ATTACHMENT B: Applicant's Submittal
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## THE MEWS

mews：a British term for a yard or cobbled street lined by dwellings

## INTRODUCTION

The Mews，a proposed planned development，will occupy two parcels located at 720 and 724 South on 300 East in Salt Lake City，Utah．These parcels are currently each occupied by a duplex residence，one of which has been abandoned．The new development will place 7 townhomes on the site，each with a dedicated private yard facing out of the property．

The development mimics a typology set forth in British housing，called a ＂mews．＂The townhomes proposed at The Mews add features of this typology to create units with private，secured outdoor space，which is a commodity often lacking in other townhome developments within the city．While other developments reduce or altogether forgo private yard space to maximize unit counts，this development seeks to attract a family－oriented market with its generous unit sizes and private yards．

The Mews has been designed to comply as closely as possible with the applicable zoning setbacks，building heights，and lot coverage，such that only a minimal variance from the zoning code is required to create the development． This preserves the inherent qualities of the area by increasing the density of the site to provide much needed housing without over－developing the site or creating large，imposing buildings which tower over neighboring uses．

## EXISTING CONDITIONS AND PROPOSED USE

The two parcels being developed are located at 720 South and 724 South on 300 East．Both are currently zoned RMF－35．Adjacent parcels to the north and south，and across 300 East to the east are also zoned RMF－35．Adjacent lots at the rear property line，to the west，are zoned SR－3．

Both of the two parcels pertaining to this project currently have a duplex on the lot．Originally constructed as single family residences，both have undergone additions and renovations to convert them into rental properties． While the additions to the 720 South property are moderate，the additions to the structure on 724 South include a number of interconnected garage and storage spaces which cover a majority of the quarter－acre lot．This larger structure has sat abandoned for over a year，and is designated by the county assessor as a＂salvage＂residence．

The neighboring properties support a variety of uses，including commercial at the north（former site of Koko Kitchen），apartment buildings to the east，and condominiums，single－family residences，duplex residences，and multiplex buildings on all sides．The 300 East right－of－way also has a well－developed biking infrastructure，with bike lanes protected from vehicular travel lanes by a buffering zone of parallel parking stalls．

The proposed use for the site places 7－townhomes along a shared private street．The development takes cues from a British housing typology，called a＂mews．＂Historically，these were stables built along a shared yard or alley which were then converted into dwellings．Modern adaptations of a mews


Project site，located at 720－724 South 300 East SLC，UT



Clockwise, from top Left:
Current site, with two duplex residences
The former Koko Kitchen located at the north of the site.
River Rock Apartments, across the street from site.
Condominium development to south of site.

are now constructed as new blocks of dwellings along a shared street, with private yards serving as an access to each unit. The shared street creates a semi-public shared space for residents which expands the sense of livable area in their housing community, while the yards adjoining each unit provide much-needed private spaces.

The Mews incorporates elements of this typology to create a grouping of townhomes which are not typical for the area, and perhaps not found in the city as a whole. The 7 townhomes are generously sized three-bedroom, four-bathroom units. And, unlike many townhomes which group 5 or even 10 units in a continuous building, these 7 townhomes are split into three buildings, making six of the townhomes a greatly-desired end unit. This design strategy increases the ability to freely place windows and balconies adjacent to interior living spaces, filling the units with natural light and allowing them to live bigger than the limited floorplate.

At the ground level, each end unit fronts onto a private, securable outdoor yard which connects either back to the shared interior street or directly to 300 East. Each unit has a two-car garage which backs onto the shared private drive. This private driveway also connects to a shared courtyard at the front of the site, which serves as an additional public space and provides seating and bicycle storage areas. The development as a whole is meant to be marketed to a family-oriented demographic, which will greatly enjoy and benefit from the dedicated yards, larger unit sizes, and shared courtyard.

## DEVELOPMENT PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES

"Demonstrate how your project meets the purpose and objectives of a planned development as stated in 21A. 55.010 of the Planned Development ordinance."

## Purpose

The RMF-35 Zoning District seeks to "provide an environment suitable for a variety of moderate density housing types, including single-family, twofamily, and multi-family dwellings with a maximum height of thirty five feet." Our approach was to maximize the dwelling density on the property while
providing a residential environment that would appeal to a wide range of residents. Based upon the RMF-35 Zoning, we determined the maximum potential dwelling count to be 7 dwelling units, with a lot size of 17,374 sf. We then diagrammed a series of options for how 7 dwelling units might be achieved, which are included, based upon the RFM-35 required setbacks and lot coverage requirements.

Through site sketches, we identified issues related different approaches to the building massing and its impact how the site would be used to accommodate the required access and parking. With a single, large structure, parking would either need to be situated underneath the building, on the ground floor, making the building prohibitively expensive for so few units. If we used this building typology without parking underneath the building, then the entire rear yard would be need to be paved to accommodate parking. This minimized any potential community outdoor space or amenities.

Looking at a townhouse approach, which we feel is more compatible with the neighborhood and creates a more desirable dwelling unit, we explored a simple plan to place units at the north and south ends of the site with a driveway in the middle. However, in this configuration, the length of the driveway becomes an issue related to fire lane access. Since one building would extend beyond $150^{\prime}$ from the curb, we would be required to provide a turn around on the site, which this site cannot accommodate.

If we separate the units into a three building scheme, we are able to place 7 units on the site while creating several benefits: 1) this arrangement allows for each unit to have a private yard space along the side and rear property line, 2) the arrangement creates the greater ratio of end units, 3) the arrangement places yards adjacent to the SR-1a properties directly to the west, and 4) we do not need a fire lane turn around as the face of the rear building is closer less than 150 from the street curb. While, this new configuration yields buildings that could be considered duplexes and a triplex, the units remain a townhouse typology. For this reason, we are asking to maintain the same unit count to reach maximum dwelling density for this site.


The Central Community master plan for the area proposes the site have a unit density of 15-30 units per acre (Central Community Master Plan (2005), p. 2; see Central Community Future Land Use Map). With 7 townhomes placed on the combined . 41 acres, The Mews achieves a moderate density of approximately 17 units per acre. A sample of five nearby townhouse developments puts this project at the lower range of local townhouse densities, which have calculated densities ranging from approximately 11 to 42 units per acre (see graphics on following pages). The Mews balances unit counts with required zoning setbacks to create a project which meets the recommendations of the local master plan while still preserving the buffers between these new buildings and any current or future uses on abutting properties.

Additionally, the splitting of the units into three buildings fits well around the required emergency access and turn-around. This emergency access and turn-around doubles as the shared drive for the development, which provides sufficient room for accessing garages and also a route for waste management collection toward the rear of the site.

Another way The Mews supports the city master plan is through its unit size. The Central City neighborhood planning area states that a goal of its residential areas is to "provide more three and four bedroom housing units" (Central Community Master Plan 2005, p. 5). The Mews will be a development of this type, with each unit having three bedrooms.

## Objectives

In addition to the purposes listed above, the development seeks to specifically address the following objectives:

## Objective A: Open Space and Natural Lands

The existing single-family residence at 724 S 300 E is a sprawling mass of garages and interconnected storage spaces. A bit of an eyesore, this parcel lacks open space since the building's metal-wrapped additions abut nearly every property line around the site.
Next door, though it complies with zoning better, the residence at 720 S 300 E similarly suffers from a lack of yard space because the 724 S
property to the south also wraps around its west property line. Along this western boundary, both properties have created a large, shared concrete parking area. This greatly reduces the usable space of the smaller 720 S parcel, making it more beneficial to develop it in conjunction with a new scheme on the two parcels combined.

The new Mews development places new buildings on the site which comply with prescribed building setbacks to restore open space to the edges of the property. As previously described, the side and rear yards will provide private yard space adjoining each townhouse unit. In addition to these private yards along the side and rear property lines, the required front yard of the property is occupied by open yards and a common plaza area for seating and bicycle parking. This activates the street frontage by creating an attractive frontage for people walking and biking along the 300 East frontage.

## Objective C: Housing

The Mews, with its private yards and shared central street, is a townhouse typology. This is common in the area, but the more recent developments of the same typology are much denser than this proposal, achieving densities around 30 or 40 units per acre, with 5 to 9 units in a single continuous block. The Mews proposes a modest density of approximately 17 units per acre, with either 2 or 3 units in a single building. Thus, both the scale of the individual buildings and the density of the whole development is greatly reduced from other typical townhomes, which relates better to the neighboring duplexes and single-family residences on its block. These units are also better marketed to families because of their three bedroom layouts and private yards.

## Objective D: Mobility

Since The Mews will be located along a street with a well-developed biking corridor, the project dedicates space within the front yard to a shared courtyard with seating and bike racks. These amenities encourage use of the semi-public courtyard space and strengthen the connection to the walking and biking infrastructure throughout the city.

## PLANNED DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

"Demonstrate how your project meets the Standards for Planned Developments as stated in 21A. 55.050 of the Planned Development ordinance"

## Standard A: Planned Development Objectives

Our proposed project seeks a Planned Development approval to maximize the dwelling density for our site, which was calculated for 7 dwelling units. Though site analysis, we determined, that the best way to achieve this is to pursue a townhouse typology, split across three buildings rather than 1 single building mass. This also allows us, as described in the "Objective A: Open Space" section, to prioritize the private yards adjoining each townhouse unit. Each building fully complies with the zoning district's setback, height maximum, and lot coverage requirements.

## Standard B: Master Plan Compatibility

The densities indicated in the Central City Master Plan (2005) show that this site has a target density of 15-30 units per acre. The Mews achieves 17 units per acre, which is towards the lower end of this target. This will help balance densities within the greater area, as other nearby apartment buildings and townhomes have densities exceeding 40 units per acre.

## Standard C: Design And Compatibility

1. Scale, Mass, and Intensity

The cluster of buildings sits within the prescribed building envelope of the RMF-35 zoning. These buildings are similar in height to nearby townhome developments, although each building only has 2 or 3 units. This greatly enhances the product by providing 6 endunits in a 7-townhouse scheme, whereas conventional townhouse developments would only have 2 or 4 end-type units at this same density. Additionally, compliance with zoning setbacks preserves yard spaces around the site, making this development less imposing on adjacent uses and properties.
2. Building orientation and materials

Both buildings which front 300 E have units with entrances facing
the street. The rear building's center unit also faces the street and is distantly visible from the street, as the unit is centered on the shared private drive extending into the site. The remaining four units have ground-floor entrances which are accessible through their adjoining yards, which then connect back to the private street via sidewalks and gates.
Although the RMF-35 has no design treatment requirements for materials, all three buildings have a variety of materials on each facade, as well as pop-out bays to break up the building elevations. Additionally, the community entrance to the development is on 300 east, with community open space (including seating and gardens) that are meant to activate the area.
3. Building setbacks

The proposed setbacks for the development are entirely compliant with the RMF-35 zoning requirements. This creates sufficient space for private amenities on the property, a buffer between the development and adjacent properties, and ample space for maintaining the exterior finishes and servicing utilities on the property.
4. Building facades offer transparency and access and pedestrian interest The RMF- 35 zoning district does not require a minimum amount of glazing, or any architectural design features to engage the street. However, design for The Mews still activate the street facade with ground level entries, pop-out bays and glazing which orient interior living spaces to the street, courtyard spaces along the street, and generous amounts of landscaping to provide pedestrian interest.
5. Lighting design

Lighting will be placed at porch entries, along sidewalks, and along the shared driveway to provide adequate nighttime lighting on the property.
6. Dumpsters screened

Dumpsters for the site have been located behind the southern building, and have also been designed with an enclosure to provide additional screening for the property to the south.
7. Parking areas buffered

All required parking for the development is provided within the
townhome garages (2 parking spaces for each dwelling unit). All garage openings face toward the interior of the site.

## Standard D: Landscaping

Mature trees only exist within the public right-of-way. As there are no existing landscape buffers between the property and any abutting properties, restoring the site's yard setbacks will greatly improve the quality of landscaping around the site.

## Standard E: Mobility:

The drive access to 300 E is located at the center of the site, creating a clear view of the 300 E corridor. The site is designed with dedicated pedestrian access, and provides bike racks at the front of the development within a semi-public courtyard. The site also accommodates a hammerhead turn-around for emergency vehicle access.

## Standard F Existing Site Features

The existing site hosts two structures and a large, concrete parking area, which do not significantly contribute to the character of the neighborhood.

## Standard G: Utilities

The development plans for brand new utilities to site, which will be connected back to city infrastructure.

## LONG TERM MAINTENANCE

"Describe the plan for long term maintenance of all private infrastructure as stated in 21A.55.110 of the Planned Development ordinance"

A: The estimated initial cost for capital improvements to sewer, water, and storm water management is $\$ 297,520.88$. The estimate for on-site paving, fencing, and vehicle driveways is $\$ 233,182.50$. The probable construction cost for landscaping is estimated at $\$ 120,000$. The total estimate for all capital improvements is $\$ 650,703.38$.

B: The properties, including the structures and the site infrastructure, will be maintained through the establishment of a non-profit HOA, which will collect funds and manage an account that will maintain all common areas and improvements

C:The non-profit HOA will notify property owners yearly of estimated yearly expenditures for maintenance, as well as actual expenditures incurred.

D:The HOA will ensure the site remains operational and maintained such that access to the planned development is available to the City for emergency and other services, and to ensure the condition of private infrastructure does not interrupt the operation of public facilities to which the private infrastructure connects or to which it may be adjacent.


Vegetation and sidewalks cross through highly-transparent
fences to visually expand the sense of public space


A courtyard off 300 East serves as a shared amenity


Vegetation and pavers activate the shared street


The development's rear building takes cues from the two front buildings, with this building's center unit engaging directly with the shared driveway.
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## ATTACHMENT C: Property and Vicinity Photos



Subject Property: 720 S 300 E


Subject Property: 724 S 300 E


Property to the north (formerly KoKo Kitchen)


Property to the south


Apartments across the Street to the east on 300 E

Bike lane 300 E



Apartments across the Street to the east on 300 E

## ATTACHMENT D: RMF-35 Zoning Standards

The purpose of the RMF-35 Moderate Density Multi-Family Residential District is to provide an environment suitable for a variety of moderate density housing types, including single-family, twofamily, and multi-family dwellings with a maximum height of thirty five feet (35'). This district is appropriate in areas where the applicable Master Plan policies recommend a density of less than thirty (30) dwelling units per acre. This district includes other uses that are typically found in a multi-family residential neighborhood of this density for the purpose of serving the neighborhood. Uses are intended to be compatible with the existing scale and intensity of the neighborhood. The standards for the district are intended to provide for safe and comfortable places to live and play, promote sustainable and compatible development patterns and to preserve the existing character of the neighborhood.
Due to the nature of this proposal, the seven proposed lots within the project area do not comply with all zoning and subdivision requirements. The table shows that while each of the individual lots do not meet the zoning and subdivision standards, many zoning standards comply when viewing the project as a whole. Dimensions per lot and for the overall development are provided in the table. Approval of this request by the Planning Commission would be for the submitted project configuration.

| Requirement | Standard, <br> Twin Home | Standard, <br> Single- <br> Family <br> Attached | Standard, <br> Multi- <br> Family | Proposed, <br> Per Lot | Proposed, <br> Overall <br> Development | Compliance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Land Use | Residential and other accessory uses |  |  | Residential |  | Complies |
| Maximum Density (for $17,696 \mathrm{SF}$ ) | 4 | 5 | 7 | NA | 7 | Complies. Planned Developments are not allowed to exceed the maximum density of the zone, which in this case is seven dwelling units. |
| Min Lot Width | 25' | Interior: 22' <br> Corner: <br> 32' | 80' | Varying between 29'-39' | 107.25' | Development complies. <br> PD approval required for each lot. |


| Max <br> Building <br> Height | 35' |  |  | $35^{\prime}$ | 35 ' | Complies |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Front Setback | 20' |  |  | Varying between 010' | 20' | Development complies. PD approval required for each lot. |
| Rear Setback | Twenty five percent (25\%) of the lot depth, but not less than twenty feet (20') and need not exceed twenty five feet (25'). |  |  | 10'-30' | 20' | Development complies. <br> PD approval required for each lot. |
| Side Setback | o' on one, 10 ' on the other | None required, but if one is provided it shall not be less than 4 ' | $10^{\prime}$ | 0-5' | $10^{\prime}$ | Development complies. PD approval required for each lot. |
| Building Coverage | 50\% | 60\% | 60\% | 50-70\% | 40\% | Development complies. <br> PD approval required for each lot. |
| Parking \& Access | 2 spaces per DU | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \text { spaces } \\ & \text { per DU } \end{aligned}$ | 2+ bedrooms 1.25 space per DU | 2 per DU | 2 per DU | Complies |
| Landscaping | The front yard, corner side and, for interior multi-family lots, one of the interior side yards shall be maintained as landscape yards. |  |  | Only provides landscaping in rear yard | Front, side, and rear yards are landscaped | PD approval required. |

## ATTACHMENT E: Subdivision Standards

20.16.100: STANDARDS OF APPROVAL FOR PRELIMINARY PLATS:

All preliminary plats for subdivisions and subdivision amendments shall meet the following standards.
The Finding for each standard is the recommendation of the Planning Division based on the facts associated with the proposal, the discussion that follows, and the input received during the engagement process. Input received after the staff report is published has not been considered in this report.

## Standards of Approval

A. The subdivision complies with the general design standards and requirements for subdivisions as established in chapter 20.12 of this title;
Does Not Comply (Modification requested)

Discussion: The applicant is requesting to modify the subdivision and zoning standards through the Planned Development process. The following subdivision modification are proposed for this development: Lots without street frontage, along with the development standards per lot in the RMF-35 zone. Staff supports the request.

Condition(s): Approval of Planned Development
B. All buildable lots comply with all applicable zoning standards;

Does Not Comply (Modification requested)

Discussion: The applicant is requesting modifications of these zoning standards for their seven lots in the RMF-35 zone through the Planned Development process. Staff supports the request.

## Condition(s): Approval of Planned Development

C. All necessary and required dedications are made;

## Not Applicable

Discussion: Dedication of property is not required for this development.

Condition(s): None
D. Water supply and sewage disposal shall be satisfactory to the public utilities department director;

## Complies With Conditions

Discussion: The Department of Public Utilities has reviewed the project and provided requirements necessary to finalize the subdivision. There is no indication that the City would not be able to provide water and sewage disposal to the project.

Condition(s): Compliance with Department of Public Utilities requirements.
E. Provisions for the construction of any required public improvements, per section 20.40.010 of this title, are included;

## Complies

Discussion: The removal of the existing driveways and construction of new driveway will require restriping of the parking protected bike lane and parking spaces. Restriping and road sign modifications, including green marking at driveway and removal of all existing conflicting markings, is the responsibility of the developer and will require aright of way permit. Applicant will need to include detailed signing and striping plans for final subdivision approval.

Condition(s): Repainting of the protected bike lane and on-street parking must be provided to accommodate the new driveway configuration. Other compliance with Department of Transportation is required.
F. The subdivision otherwise complies with all applicable laws and regulations;

## Complies

## Discussion:

The subdivision complies with all applicable laws and regulations with the exceptions that they are asking for in the Planned Development process.

Condition(s): Approval of Planned Development
G. If the proposal is an amendment to an existing subdivision and involves vacating a street, right of way, or easement, the amendment does not materially injure the public or any person who owns land within the subdivision or immediately adjacent to it and there is good cause for the amendment.

## Not Applicable

Discussion: NA
Condition(s): NA

## ATTACHMENT F: 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:

| Standard | Finding | Rationale |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. The planned development shall meet the purpose statement for a planned development (section 21A.55.010 of this chapter) 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 application of the land use regulations. | Complies | This project suits objective (F) in the Planned Development Objectives: Master Plan Implementation: A project that helps implement portions of an adopted Master Plan in instances where the Maser Plan specific guide on the character of the immediate vicinity of the proposal. <br> The Central City Master Plan recommends medium density, as described in the Future Land Use Map as $15-30$ units per acre. The Master Plan also recommends "provide more three and four bedroom housing units". This project implements these housing goals for this area. |
| B. 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. | Complies | As discussed above in Key Consideration \#1, this project meets the intent of the Central Community Master Plan, along with the citywide Plan Salt Lake. This project provides moderate density housing that is compatible with the surrounding housing. It is also an infill development that creates more units on existing infrastructure close to amenities. |
| 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 | Complies | This project provides a more enhanced product than would be achieved through zoning alone. The development provides high quality townhomes, a much-needed housing type in this neighborhood, while providing an attractive stre etscape along 300 E . |


| determining design and compatibility, the <br> Planning Commission should consider: |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |


| $\begin{aligned} & C \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ | Whether dumpsters, loading docks and/or service areas are appropriately screened; and | Complies | Dumpsters are hidden from public view within the private drive. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C7 | Whether parking areas are appropriately buffered from adjacent uses. | Complies | Parking is enclosed within the provided garages. |
| D. Landscaping: The proposed planned development preserves, maintains or provides native landscaping where appropriate. In determining the landscaping for the proposed planned development, the Planning Commission should consider: |  | Complies | The development provides native landscaping that is appropriate for the development. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{D} \\ & \mathbf{1} \end{aligned}$ | Whether mature native trees located along the periphery of the property and along the street are preserved and maintained; | Complies | There is one mature tree on the property which will be removed but many additional trees will be planted in its place. There is one existing tree in the park strip - four are proposed to be planted instead, along with shrubs and ground cover. |
| D | Whether existing landscaping that provides additional buffering to the abutting properties is maintained and preserved; | Complies | The landscape plan shows trees along the perimeter of the site, along with shrubs and a retaining wall as a privacy wall. |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{D} \\ & \mathbf{3} \end{aligned}$ | Whether proposed landscaping is designed to lessen potential impacts created by the proposed planned development; and | Complies | A variety of trees, grasses, shrubs, and flowers are provided in the front yard area and the park strip, as well as around the perimeter of the lot. This not only adds aesthetic appeal but adds screening to the adjacent property owners on all sides. |
| $\begin{aligned} & D \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | Whether proposed landscaping is appropriate for the scale of the development. | Complies | The amount and quality of landscaping provided is appropriate for the scale of the development. |
| E. <br> dev <br> tran <br> effi <br> sur <br> mo <br> con | Mobility: The proposed planned lopment supports Citywide sportation goals and promotes safe and ient circulation within the site and ounding neighborhood. In determining ility, the Planning Commission should ider: | Complies | The project is located walking distance to a TRAX station and is located on protected bike route. The property itself is centrally located related to the city and provides many amenities nearby. |
| E1 | Whether drive access to local streets will negatively impact the safety, purpose and character of the street; | Complies | Two existing driveways will be removed and replaced by just one driveway, so safety and access for these parcels will be improved. |
| E2 | Whether the site design considers safe circulation for a range of transportation options including: <br> a. Safe and accommodating pedestrian environment and pedestrian oriented design; | Complies | a. The project offers an attractive and active streetscape for pedestrians. Both units that face 300 E have pedestrian entrances and balconies, creating an engaging environment. <br> b. This project is located on a prominent bike lane. Bike parking is provided within the common spaces of the project. |


| b. Bicycle facilities and connections where appropriate, and orientation to transit where available; and <br> c. Minimizing conflicts between different transportation modes; |  | c. Bikes, pedestrians, and cars of the tenants and property owners will all have to use the shared private driveway. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E3Whether the site design of the proposed <br> development promotes or enables <br> access to adjacent uses and amenities; | Complies | The site provides adequate access and mobility to other properties and amenities in the area. |
| E4 Whether the proposed design provides adequate emergencyvehicle access; and | Complies | The design complies with fire code and provides adequate emergency access. |
| $\mathbf{E}_{5}$ Whether loading access and service areas are adequate for the site and minimize impacts to the surrounding area and public rights-of-way. | Complies | Loading and service areas are adequate for the site. |
| F. Existing Site Features: The proposed planned development preserves natural and built features that significantly contribute to the character of the neighborhood and/or environment. | Complies | There are no existing features on the site that significantly contribute to the neighborhood or the environment. |
| G. Utilities: Existing and/or planned utilities will adequately serve the development and not have a detrimental effect on the surrounding area. | Complies | Utilities will adequately service the project. When their location is established, utility boxes shall be screened from public view as outlined in 21A.40.160 |

## ATTACHMENT G: Public Process \& Comments

## Public Notice, Meetings, Comments

The following is a list of public meetings that have been held, and other public input opportunities, related to the proposed project since the applications were submitted:

- April 11,2023 - The Central City Community Council was sent the 45 day required notice for recognized community organizations.
- April 11, 2023- Property owners and residents within 300 feet of the development were provided early notification of the proposal.
- May 3, 2023- Applicant presented at the Central City Community Council meeting.
- June 1,2023
- Public hearing notice sign posted on the property
- June 2, 2023
- Public hearing notice mailed
- Public notice posted on City and State websites and Planning Division list serve


## Public Input:

Public Comments are attached in this packet.

| From: | Kyle Deans |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | Younger, Cassie |
| Subject: | (EXTERNAL) Planning Commission |
| Date: | Tuesday, May 16, 2023 12:15:06 PM |

Caution: This is an external email. Please be cautious when clicking links or opening attachments.

1018 E 900 S PLNPCM2022-01120
If the requested zone allows more flexibility in housing types I am in full support the zone change.

Mews Townhome PLNPCM2023-00200 \& PLNSUB2023-00254
I support the zoning modifications the application is requesting.
Main St Apartments PLNPCM2023-00245
While I like the overall concept of having much more density in this neighborhood and the Main St Apartments will be a great addition. I do not support the zoning modifications. Over 200' of facade frontage is unacceptable, the PC and CC has approved these in the past, over objections, and the result has been a wall that is way to long and pedestrian unfriendly.
They need to follow design guidelines that have been set in place by the city. Again there are projects that meant well in the city that look horrible.
I DO NOT SUPPORT EITHER OF THE ZONING MODIFICATIONS.
Kyle Deans
SLC Resident

## ATTACHMENT H: Department Review Comments

This proposal was reviewed by the following departments. Any requirement identified by a City Department is required to be complied with.

## Engineering:

(See attachments for redlines.) It might be helpful to remove the curb and gutter, sidewalk and drive approaches from the plat to provide more space for the survey information, which the plat is for.

I've attached redlines for The Mews at 300 East Subdivision. I'm not sure if this is a condominium or not, but they listed a common area, so I did \#COM address for the common area address. They are required to obtain a new address certificate for this project

## Zoning:

## Fire:

*Approved fire apparatus access roads shall be provided for every facility, building or portion of a building hereafter constructed or moved into; and shall extend to within 150 feet of all portions of the facility and all portions of the exterior walls of the first story of the building as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the building or facility. You must provide a certain distance from property lines or other permanent obstructions to get approved fire access o height of building X. $3+4$-feet. You do not provide this and would need to modify or provide alternate means and methods
*Fire apparatus access roads shall have an unobstructed width of not less than 20 feet for buildings 30 -feet and less, exclusive of shoulders, except for approved security gates in accordance with Section 503.6, and an unobstructed vertical clearance of not less than 13 feet 6 inches. Buildings greater than 30 feet shall have a road width of not less than 26 feet. Fire apparatus access roads with fire hydrants on them shall be 26 -feet in width; at a minimum of 20 feet to each side of the hydrant in the direction or road travel.
*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. Private lane would need to be designed to this is utilized for fire access.
*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 feet 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. Additional fire hydrants may be necessary dependent on total square footage and required fire flows in accordance with IFC appendix B and C
*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. With a building heights of 35 -feet you will need to provide aerial access that meets road width and proximity requirements, which are not shown on your plans or reduce the height of buildings to 30 -feet maximum or less.
*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.

## Urban Forestry:

Urban Forestry has no concerns with this proposal.

## Building:

All new construction within the corporate limits of Salt Lake City shall be per the State of Utah adopted construction codes and to include any state or local amendments to those codes. RE: Title 15A State Construction and Fire Codes Act.

Existing structures on adjacent parcels shall not be madeless complying to the construction codes than it was before the new construction.

## Transportation:

Removing existing driveways and construction of new driveway will require restriping of the parking protected bike lane and parking spaces. Restriping and road sign modifications, including green marking at driveway and removal of all existing conflicting markings, is the responsibility of the developer and will require a right of way permit. Include detailed signing and striping plans for final subdivision approval.

## Public Utilities:

Please include a note on the plat addressing that all common areas will serve as easement for shared private utilities, including water, sewer, storm drain, and surface drainage. CC\&R's must also address utility service ownership and maintenance responsibility from the public main to each individual unit.

See PLNPCM2023-00200 for Planned Development comments and guidance for obtaining a building permit.

Comments have been provided to assist in the future development of the property. The following comments are provided for information only and do not provide official project review or approval. Comments are provided to assist in design and development by providing guidance for project requirements.

- Public Utility permit, connection, survey, and inspection fees will apply.
- All utility design and construction must comply with APWA Standards and SLCPU Standard Practices.
- All utilities must meet horizontal and vertical clearance requirements. Water and sewer lines require 10 ft minimum horizontal separation and 18 " minimum vertical separation. Sewer must maintain 5 ft minimum horizontal separation and 12 " vertical separation from any non-water utilities. Water must maintain 3 ft minimum horizontal separation and 12 " vertical separation from any non-sewer utilities.
- Contact SLCPU Street Light Program Manager, Dave Pearson (801-483-6738), for information regarding street lights.
- CC\&R's must address utility service ownership and maintenance responsibility from the public main to each individual unit.
- Utilities cannot cross property lines without appropriate easements and agreements between property owners.
- Site utility and grading plans will be required forbuilding permit review. Site utility plans should include all existing and proposed utilities, including water, irrigation, fire, sewer, stormwater, street lighting, power, gas, and communications. Grading plans should include arrows directing stormwater away from neighboring property. Please refer to APWA, SLCDPU Standard Practices, and the SLC Design Process Guide for utility design requirements. Other plans such as erosion control plans and plumbing plans may also be required, depending on the scope of work. Submit supporting documents and calculations along with the plans.
- Applicant must provide fire flow, culinary water, and sewer demand calculations to SLCDPU for review. The public sewer and water system will be modeled with these demands. If the demand is not adequately delivered or if one or more reaches of the sewer system reach capacity as a result of the development, a water/sewer main upsizing will be required at the property owner's expense. Required improvements on the public water and sewer system will be determined by the Development Review Engineer and may be downstream of the project.
- One culinary water meter is permitted per parcel and fire services, as required, will be permitted for this property. If the parcel is larger than 0.5 acres, a separate irrigation meter is also permitted. Each service must have a separate tap to the main.
- Site stormwater must be collected on site and routed to the public storm drain system. Stormwater cannot discharge across property lines or public sidewalks.
- Stormwater treatment is required prior to discharge to the public storm drain. Utilize stormwater Best Management Practices (BMP's) to remove solids and oils. Green Infrastructure should be used whenever possible. Green Infrastructure and LID treatment of stormwater is a design requirement and required by the Salt Lake City UPDES permit for Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4). If green infrastructure is not used, then applicant must provide documentation of what green infrastructure measures were considered and why these were not deemed feasible. Please verify that plans include appropriate treatment measures.

