MEMORANDUM

PLANNING DIVISION
DEPARTMENT of COMMUNITY and NEIGHBORHOODS

To: Salt Lake City Planning Commission

From: Kelsey Lindquist, Planning Manager

Date: September 27, 2023

Re: Pacific Yard Planned Development Modification

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 443 W 700 S (Approximately)
PARCEL IDS: 15-12-129-016-0000
MASTER PLAN: Downtown Plan
ZONING DISTRICT: General Commercial (CG)
PETITION: PLNPCM2021-00822

REQUEST: Urban Alfandre is seeking a modification to the approved Planned Development for Pacific Yard. Pacific Yard previously received Planned Development and Design Review approvals from the Planning Commission on March 23, 2022. The modification includes reducing the size of the approved park strip and landscaping square footage along 400 W, in order to accommodate on street parallel parking. This change is required by ordinance to be reviewed by the Planning Commission as only minor modifications can be approved administratively. This property is located in the CG (General Commercial) zoning district.

ACTION REQUIRED: Review the proposed changes to the design of the project. If the Planning Commission denies the changes, the project will be required to comply with the prior approval.

RECOMMENDATION:
The Planning Commission approve the requested modification, in order to accommodate parallel parking along 400 West.

ATTACHMENTS:

A. Applicant's Submittal Information

B. Memo to Planning Commission March 23, 2022
C. Planning Commission Minutes

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:
The Planning Commission approved a Design Review and Planned Development for
the property located at 720 S 400 W, Pacific Yard, on March 23, 2023. Specifically, the
requested design review and planned development included:

- Design review for an additional 28 feet of building height. The building will
  occupy a 1.25 acre site in the Granary zoned CG (General Commercial). In the
  CG zoning district, new buildings taller than sixty feet (60’) but less than ninety
  feet (90’) may be authorized through the design review process.

- Planned development request to waive front, corner and rear yard setback
  requirements and the front and corner side yard landscaping requirements.
  Additionally, the applicant requested relief of the additional landscaping
  required for buildings granted additional height in the CG zoning district.

The two applications were approved with the following conditions:

1. Final approval of the details for public art, development and site lighting (including
   the mid-block walkway), street lighting, streetscape details, street furniture, midblock
   walkway paving, sidewalk paving and landscaping to be delegated to Planning Staff
   to ensure compliance with the standards for Design Review as well as the Downtown
   Community Plan.

2. Applicant to mitigate the building mass and improve the relationship of building
   height to human scale through adding an awning of 4’ in depth to both the north and
   east elevations, subject to an encroachment agreement approved by all required City
   divisions and departments.

3. Final approval of a tree form with a spreading canopy in the park strip, that will also
   meet the needs of the Urban Forestry Division and relevant utility companies to be
   delegated to Planning Staff.

4. A public easement will be recorded on the property for the midblock walkway. A sign
   will be posted on the midblock walkway stating it is open to the public.

5. A complete lot consolidation application for the three existing parcels shall be
   submitted and approved.

Please note, this project was approved prior to the adoption of the Downtown Building
Heights Ordinance. The new design standards and height allowance for the CG are not
applicable to this modification.
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project includes a 7-story building approximately 88’ in height and includes 292 units and 202 parking stalls. It has a two-story parking garage, wrapped by 12,000 square feet of commercial space on the ground floor. The project incorporates a mid-block walkway along the western property line.

APPLICANT’S REQUESTED MODIFICATIONS

The applicant is requesting modifications to the approved design that are required by ordinance to be reviewed by the Planning Commission. The proposed modification to the approved design includes substantial changes to the 400 W right-of-way. The project was approved with a 21’5” wide park strip and a 13’10” wide sidewalk along 400 W. The enhanced park strip was to offset the potential impact of the additional height to the building. The applicant is seeking to reduce the park strip to 11’ and the sidewalk to 11’. This is approximately a 1,308 square footage reduction in landscaping. It is important to note that the number of proposed street trees has not been reduced with this modification. The reduced landscaping area and sidewalk are to accommodate parallel parking along 400 W. The applicant is seeking to achieve the proposed parallel parking along 400 W to support the proposed ground floor commercial uses.
APPROVED PLAN:

The area highlighted in yellow was the approved 400 W park strip landscaped.
**MODIFIED PLAN:**

The area highlighted in yellow shows the modification to accommodate the proposed parallel parking.

---

**Planned Development**

**21A.55.100: MODIFICATIONS TO DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

Following planned development approval, the development plan approved by the Planning Commission shall constitute the site design in relation to building placement and design, landscaping, mobility and circulation elements, and any elements that were approved as zoning modifications through the planned development process. Modifications to the development plan may be allowed pursuant to this section.

A. New Application Required For Modifications and Amendments: No substantial modification or amendment shall be made in the construction, development or use without a new application under the provisions of this title. Minor modifications or amendments may be made subject to written approval of the Planning Director and the date for completion may be extended by the Planning Commission upon recommendation of the Planning Director.
B. Minor Modifications: The Planning Director may authorize minor modifications to the approved development plan pursuant to the provisions for modifications to an approved site plan as set forth in chapter 21A.58 of this title, when such modifications appear necessary in light of technical or engineering considerations. Such minor modifications shall be limited to the following elements:

1. Adjusting the distance as shown on the approved development plan between any one structure or group of structures, and any other structure or group of structures, or any vehicular circulation element or any boundary of the site;

2. Adjusting the location of any open space;

3. Adjusting any final grade;

4. Altering the types of landscaping elements and their arrangement within the required landscaping buffer area;

5. Signs;

6. Relocation or construction of accessory structures; or

7. Additions which comply with the lot and bulk requirements of the underlying zone.

Such minor modification shall be consistent with the intent and purpose of this title and the development plan as approved pursuant to this chapter, and shall be the minimum necessary to overcome the particular difficulty and shall not be approved if such modifications would result in a violation of any standard or requirement of this title.

C. Major Modifications: Any modifications to the approved development plan not authorized by subsection B of this section shall be considered to be a major modification. The Planning Commission shall give notice to all property owners consistent with notification requirements located in Chapter 21A.10 of this title. The Planning Commission may approve an application for a major modification to the approved development plan, not requiring a modification of written conditions of approval or recorded easements, upon findings that any changes in the plan as approved will be in substantial conformity with the approved development plan. If the commission determines that a major modification is not in substantial conformity with the approved development plan, then the commission shall review the request in accordance with the procedures set forth in this section.

DISCUSSION:

The proposed modification to the Planned Development does not affect the CG zoning requirements. It is important to note that the intention of requiring increased landscaping is
to mitigate the potential impact of additional height approved through Design Review. This specific request sought to mitigate impacts and enhance the overall project by increasing landscaping within large park strips. With that said, the park strip along 400 W will still be landscaped above the required 33% live vegetation requirement and will meet the required street tree plantings. Planning Staff is supportive of the reduction of the vegetated landscaped park strips to accommodate parallel parking along 400 W.

NEXT STEPS:

Modification of Planned Development Approval

If the modification is approved, the applicant may proceed with the project after meeting all standards and conditions required by all City Departments and the Planning Commission to obtain all necessary building permits.

Modification of Planned Development Denial

If the modification is denied, the applicant will be required to develop the property as was originally approved by the Planning Commission or submit a new design that meets zoning standards.
Attachment A: Applicant Submittal Information
LETTER TO: SLC Planning Commission
C/O Kelsey Lindquist
Regarding: Pacific Yard Site Modification Request

We are the architectural team working on a new multifamily housing project called Pacific Yard, which will have ground floor retail spaces at the southwest corner of 400 West and 700 South.

While coordinating with the owner, civil engineer, landscape architect, and the Fire Department, we have been asked to modify the previously approved streetscape along 400 West.

The original design approved during PD approval phase put the firetruck distance from the building along 400 West at 36’1.” The Fire Department has asked us to reduce that distance to 30’ maximum so ladder trucks can effectively access the building from the west side. The north side of the project (along 700 South) has large overhead high voltage power lines that impede fire truck ladder access from anywhere else on the site.

While looking at the requested redesign of 400 West, the owner strongly felt that we needed to provide more on-street parking for the ground floor leasable spaces. The owner is concerned that without adequate on-street parking, the tenant spaces will be hard to lease, resulting in vacant space along the street façade. Pacific Yard will be adjacent to EVO - a newly constructed hotel with gym, retail, and restaurant space. EVO has 45 degree parking along 400 West for its entire street front with very limited landscaping.

Our new proposal is to keep landscaping along 400 west, but cut several parallel parking stalls into that large, landscaped area. These additional parking stalls would serve the ground floor restaurant, while maintaining the originally designed street trees and street activation. The landscape width along 400 West would still be 11’ minimum (up to 19’ maximum). With the 11’ landscaped area and parallel stalls, we are bringing the firetruck distance to 30’ from the building – which meet’s their request. We see this change as an improvement to the accessibility of the site for fire trucks, as well as future restaurant tenants. Our landscaping will still be above and beyond the adjacent recently developed EVO, and no street trees will be removed with the new design.

Dan Teed - Architect
### General Landscape Costs Per SEC Requirements

- **Total Cost**: $54,412.56
- **To Be Proposed By Owner/Contractor**: $543,441
- **Total Shrubbery Provided (Street)**: $4,141
- **Total Shrubbery Provided (Roof)**: 5
- **Total Soil**: 1000

### Landscape Notes

- **No Substantial Changes**: In live vegetation coverage from previously accepted PD Review
- **How Landscaping**: Is to be maintained, no substantial difference in area/reduction in concrete walkway widths for curb plan
- **No Reduction in ROY, tree planting**: More trees provided than required using larger tree species appropriate for urban conditions
- **Minor Adjustments**: Due to architectural changes—no material changes changes are to maintain design intent, such as lining up plants to architectural columns and ensuring tree canopies provide adequate shade

### Site Design

- **All Utilities**: Are shown for reference only. Civil plans shall take precedence
- **Positive drainage**: Is to be maintained away from all structures and repair any damages to utilities
- **Regulations**: For damages to existing infrastructure and new improvements

### Landscaping Notes

- **Vegetated Coverage**:
  - From shrubs: Total Live Vegetation
  - HxW: 3x25
  - Notes: Perimeter

- **Perennial Grasses**:
  - **Beta vulgaris**
  - **Rumex crispus**
  - **Deschampsia cespitosa**
  - **Festuca rubra**

- **Ornamental Grasses**:
  - **Festuca glauca**
  - **Festuca ovina**
  - **Festuca pseudovulgaris**

- **Herbaceous Perennials**:
  - **Poa annua**
  - **Ammi majus**
  - **Astragalus gummifer**

- **Annuals**:
  - **Ipomoea setosa**
  - **Pachyphytum oreganum**
  - **Salpiglossis sinuata**

- **Ground Cover**:
  - **Montia perfoliata**
  - **Moss**
  - **Sagina subulata**

- **Trees**:
  - **Juniperus scopulariun**
  - **Taxodium ascendens**
  - **Larix decidua**

- **Shrubs**:
  - **Berberis thunbergii**
  - **Sambucus nigra**
  - **Rhamnus cathartica**

- **Vines**:
  - **Fallopia japonica**
  - **Clematis vitalba**
  - **Clematis armandii**

- **Baskets**:
  - **Lavandula angustifolia**
  - **Helichrysum italicum**

- **Hedges**:
  - **Buxus sempervirens**
  - **Codiaeum variegatum**

- **Fences**:
  - **Pyracantha coccinea**
  - **Viburnum opulus**

- **PLNPCM2021-00822**

### Additional Notes

- **OFFICE**: 801.521.2370
- **PHONE**: 801.996.3646

---

### Landscape Notes & Legend

- **Sheet**: A
- **Issue Date**: 05/26/23
- **Agency Signature**: 08/22/23
- **Engineer**: 05/26/23
- **Architect**: 12/02/22

---

**NOTES FROM PREVIOUS PD SUBMITTAL:**

- **No substantial changes**: In live vegetation coverage from previously accepted PD Review
- **How landscaping**: Is to be maintained, no substantial difference in area/reduction in concrete walkway widths for curb plan
- **No reduction in ROY, tree planting**: More trees provided than required using larger tree species appropriate for urban conditions

**MINOR ADJUSTMENTS**: Due to architectural changes—no material changes changes are to maintain design intent, such as lining up plants to architectural columns and ensuring tree canopies provide adequate shade
*ALL PLANTING INTENDED TO BE IN FABRICATED STEEL PLANTER POTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>VINES</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>MATURE HxW</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5&quot; CAL.</td>
<td>48&quot;x24&quot;</td>
<td>GREEN LACELEAF JAPANESE MAPLE</td>
<td>6'x6'</td>
<td>LIGHT SHADE - MID BLOCK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>DECIDUOUS SHRUBS</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>MATURE HxW</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MISCANTHUS SINENSIS 'GOLD BAR'</td>
<td>48&quot;x30&quot;</td>
<td>GOLD STRIPED DWARF GRASS</td>
<td>6'x6'</td>
<td>FULL SUN // PART SHADE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>EUONYMUS FORTUNEI 'COLORATA'</td>
<td>24&quot;x60&quot;</td>
<td>WINTERCREEPER</td>
<td>6'x6'</td>
<td>FULL SUN // PART SHADE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>BERBERIS THUNBERGII 'MARIA'</td>
<td>48&quot;x30&quot;</td>
<td>SUNJOY BERRY</td>
<td>6'x6'</td>
<td>FULL SUN // PART SHADE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>ORNAMENTAL GRASSES</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>MATURE HxW</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CLEMATIS 'JACKMANII'</td>
<td>20'x10'</td>
<td>LATE LARGE FLOWERED VINE</td>
<td>20'x10'</td>
<td>VINE - PURPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CLEMATIS PANICULATA</td>
<td>20'x10'</td>
<td>SWEET AUTUMN CLEMATIS</td>
<td>20'x10'</td>
<td>VINE - WHITE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VERTICAL COVERAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>VEGETATED COVERAGE</th>
<th>VEGETATED COVERAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>70x3 = 210</td>
<td>80x8 = 640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3x6 = 18</td>
<td>4x9 = 36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLANTING PLAN - PODIUM LEVEL

This drawing, as an instrument of professional service, is the property of MINT ARCHITECTURE L.L.C. and shall not be used, in whole or part, for any other project without the written permission of an authorized representative of MINT ARCHITECTURE L.L.C. Unauthorized use will be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law. Copyright © 2022 by MINT ARCHITECTURE L.L.C.
## WATER WISE PLANTS FOR SALT LAKE CITY

### DECIDUOUS SHRUBS
- **1,130 QTY**
  - *FLATS ACTOSTAPHYLOS X C. 'PANCHITO' PANCHITO MANZANITA GV310"x30"
  - 2" CAL. EMERALD AVENUE
- **1,310 QTY**
  - *GAURA LINDHEIMBERI WHIRLING BUTTERFLIES P136"x30"
  - 1" IPOMOEA BATATAS 'MARQERITE' SWEET POTATO VINE *MED12"x36"

### PERENNIALS
- **2 GAL. EUONYMUS FORTUNEI 'COLORATA' WINTERCREEPER GV424"x60"
- **3 GAL. RHUS AROMATICA 'AUTUMN AMBER' AUTUMN SUMAC GV118"x36"

### TREES
- **55'x40' STREET TREE PER URBAN**
- **200'x28' STREET TREE PER URBAN**

### STREET LEVEL PLANTING MATERIALS - 704 SOUTH
- **2 GAL. PENNISETUM ALOPECUROIDES 'HAMELN' FOUNTAIN GRASS TW224"x24"

### NOTES
- **EXISTING SITE VEGETATION IN POOR HEALTH**
- **NO SPECIMEN PLANTING FOUND**

### PLANTING PLAN

#### SCALE:
1/5/2022 JAMES@URBANALFANDRE.COM
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84103

---

**PROVIDED LANDSCAPING AREAS:**
- **PRIVATE LANDSCAPE AREA:** 1,600 S.F.

**CITY OF SALT LAKE LANDSCAPE CALCULATIONS:**
- **TOTAL SITE:** 54,475 S.F.

**DROUGHT TOLERANT TREES (17/17)**
- **PROVIDED:** 96% (552/572)
- **REQUIRED:** 80%

**ORNAMENTAL GRASSES**
- **PROVIDED:** 100%
- **REQUIRED:** 80%

---

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**
- **PROPERTY LIMITS**
- **EXISTING CONDITIONS:**
- **REGULATIONS:**
  - **SOILS REPORT**
  - **PH 6 TO 8.5**
  - **CLAY - 20%-70%**
  - **ENGINEERING PLANS**
  - **TAKE PRECEDENCE**
  - **IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY AND LIABILITY OF THE ACTING CONTRACTOR TO PROTECT AND REPAIR ANY ISSUES TO THE OWNER AND/OR LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT PRIOR TO EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW IMPROVEMENTS**

---

**SITE PREPARATION:**
- **MINIMUM OF 12" OF TOPSOIL IS REQUIRED IN ALL PLANTING AREAS**
- **VERIFY ALL PLANS WITH EXISTING CONDITIONS.**
- **CONTRACTOR SHALL REPORT ANY DISCREPANCIES, CHANGES, OR NON-COMPLIANCES TO THE OWNER AND/OR LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT PRIOR TO ISSUING THE ACTING CONTRACTOR TO PROTECT AND REPAIR ANY ISSUES TO EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW IMPROVEMENTS**

---

**PLANTING HOLES**
- **DUG 2X AS WIDE AS ROOTBALL OF SPECIMEN TREE**

---

**PLANTING MATERIALS**
- **TREES**
  - **PERSONAL PLANTING TIPS**
  - **20' FROM AN UNREGULATED INTERSECTION (20' BACK FROM INTERSECTING SIDEWALKS)**
  - **5-10' FROM PROPERTY LINE OF ADJOINING PARCEL**
  - **10' FROM FIRE HYDRANT**

---

**LANDSCAPE PLANTING PLAN**

---

**CONTACT**
- KTGY - ARCHITECTURE + PLANNING
  - **(303) 825-6400**
  - **JRICHARDSON@LANDFORMDESIGNGROUP.COM**
  - **AMILLER@KTGY.COM**
  - **(303) 389.6029**

---

**LICENSED LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT**
- **RICHARDSON JEFFREY**
  - **1/5/2022**
  - **10.26.21 PLANNING DATE:**
  - **1. CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY ALL PLANS WITH EXISTING CONDITIONS.**
  - **2. ALL UTILITIES ARE SHOWN FOR REFERENCE ONLY. CIVIL PLANS SHALL TAKE PRECEDENCE.**
  - **3. PLANTING HOLES SHALL BE DUG 2X AS WIDE AS ROOTBALL OF SPECIMEN TREE.**
  - **4. ENGINEERING PLANS SHALL TAKE PRECEDENCE AND IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY AND LIABILITY OF THE ACTING CONTRACTOR TO PROTECT AND REPAIR ANY ISSUES TO EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW IMPROVEMENTS.**
  - **5. POSITIVE DRAINAGE IS TO BE MAINTAINED AWAY FROM ALL STRUCTURES.**
  - **5.2. CLAY - 20%-70%**
  - **5.4. PH 6 TO 8.5**
  - **SOILS REPORT**
  - **ENGINEERING PLANS**
  - **TAKE PRECEDENCE**
  - **IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY AND LIABILITY OF THE ACTING CONTRACTOR TO PROTECT AND REPAIR ANY ISSUES TO THE OWNER AND/OR LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT PRIOR TO EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW IMPROVEMENTS.”

---

**SCALE:**
1/16" = 1'-0"
Attachment C: Memo to Planning Commission, March 23, 2022


To: Salt Lake City Planning Commission

From: Laura Bandara, Urban Designer

Date: March 23, 2022

Re: PLNPCM2021-00822 and PLNPCM2021-00835 Pacific Yard

Planned Development and Design Review (Continued Item)

ACTION REQUIRED: Consider modifications made to the proposal in response to discussion and comments made at the February 23, 2022, Planning Commission meeting, and make a final decision on the proposal.

REQUEST: KTGY Architects, on behalf of developer Urban Alfandre, is requesting Planned Development approval to waive front, corner and rear yard setback requirements and the front and corner side yard landscaping requirements. Additionally, the applicant is seeking relief of the additional landscaping required for buildings granted additional height in the CG (General Commercial) zoning district.

The applicant is also seeking Design Review for an additional 28 feet of building height at approximately 720 S 400 West. The building will occupy a 1.25-acre site in the Granary zoned General Commercial (CG). In the CG zone, new buildings taller than sixty feet (60’) but less than ninety feet (90’) may be authorized through Design Review.

The proposed 7-story building is 88-feet in height and includes 292 units and 202 parking stalls. It has a two-story parking garage, wrapped by 12,000 square feet of commercial space on the ground floor. The project incorporates a public mid-block pedestrian walkway along the western property line.

RECOMMENDATION: In Planning Staff’s opinion that overall, the project meets the applicable standards and therefore recommends the Planning Commission approve the requests with the following conditions:

1. Final approval of the details for public art, development and site lighting (including the mid-block walkway), street lighting, streetscape details, street furniture, midblock walkway paving, sidewalk paving and landscaping to be delegated to Planning Staff to ensure compliance with the standards for Design Review as well as the Downtown Community Plan.

2. Applicant to mitigate the building mass and improve the relationship of building height to human scale through adding an awning of 4’ in depth to both the north and east elevations, subject to an encroachment agreement approved by all required City divisions and departments.
3. Final approval a tree form with a spreading canopy in the park strip, that will also meet the needs of the Urban Forestry Division and relevant utility companies to be delegated to Planning Staff.

4. A public easement will be recorded on the property for the midblock walkway. A sign will be posted on the midblock walkway stating it is open to the public.

5. A complete lot consolidation application for the three existing parcels shall be submitted and approved.

ATTACHMENTS:

A. Revised Plans
B. Revised Planting Calculations
C. February 23, 2022 Staff Report
D. February 23, 2022 PC Meeting Minutes
E. Public Comment

BACKGROUND:

KTGY Architects, on behalf of developer Urban Alfandre, is requesting Planned Development approval to waive front, corner and rear yard setback requirements and the front and corner side yard landscaping requirements. Additionally, the applicant is seeking relief of the additional landscaping required for buildings seeking additional building height in the CG (General Commercial) zoning district.

The applicant is also seeking Design Review for an additional 28 feet of building height at approximately 720 S 400 West. The building will occupy a 1.25-acre site in the Granary zoned General Commercial (CG). In the CG zone, new buildings taller than sixty feet (60’) but less than ninety feet (90’) may be authorized through Design Review.

The proposed 7-story building is 88-feet in height and includes 292 units and 202 parking stalls. It has a two-story parking garage, wrapped by 12,000 square feet of commercial space on the ground floor. The project incorporates a public mid-block pedestrian walkway along the western property line.

The Planning Commission tabled the Planned Development and Design Review at the February 23, 2022 meeting to allow for revisions to the proposal that address discussion concerning the reduction of setbacks and overall vegetation. The following is a summary of the discussion points and comments made during that meeting.

- Clarification on whether the applicant was asking for a reduction in vegetation required by zoning code.
- Concerns related to the lack of support from the Community Councils
- Evaluate whether the amenities provided to the neighborhood are a better use of the space than landscape yards.
- Evaluate options for better division of the frontage that incorporates some open space.
- The Planning Commission clarified that the applicant was not expected to return to the Community Councils.
A video recording of the Planning Commission meeting can be viewed here -
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7cnfWwNSd2U.

The minutes from the February 23, 2022, can be found in Attachment D.

SUMMARY OF REVISIONS:

In response to the Planning Commission discussion, the applicant has provided multiple planters
placed along the inset building entryways. In addition to the planters, the applicant is providing trellis
structures along the building facades which will have four different species of vines growing to create
additional vegetation along the building frontage.

Additional trees, shrubs, grasses, and vines have also been placed along the midblock walkway. The
proposal includes just under 10,000 square feet of vegetation.

DISCUSSION:

Regarding the concerns raised by the Planning Commission, the applicant has clarified that the
revised proposal includes more vegetation than would be required if relief from the landscape yards
and additional landscaping regulations were denied.

Under Salt Lake City Code requirements for the General Commercial District, the applicant would be
required to provide a total of 12,650 square feet of landscaping on private property, and
approximately 7000 square feet of landscaping in the park strip.

The Salt Lake City Code does not define landscaping as consisting only of vegetation, but as:

The improvement of a lot, parcel, or tract of land with grass, shrubs and trees.
Landscaping may include pedestrian walks, flowerbeds, ornamental objects such as
fountains, statuary, and other similar natural and artificial objects designed and
arranged to produce an aesthetically pleasing effect.” (Chapter 21A.62: Definitions)

As a result, both 21A.48.090 Landscape Yards and 21A.48.060 Park Strip Landscaping specify that
landscaped areas must contain vegetative cover over a minimum of 1/3 of the land area. In the case
of the subject property, this would amount to approximately 4000 square feet of vegetation in the
yards and the park strips.

Salt Lake City Code does not specify an amount of vegetation required to meet additional landscaping
requirements generated by the approval of additional height in the CG zone, although the definition
of landscaping makes clear that at least some vegetation would be required.

Related to the public comments provided by the community councils and the discussion during the
Planning Commission hearing, many of the concerns reference the lack of greenspace in the public
right-of-way in this particular neighborhood. While there is evidence of lack of landscaped rights-of-
way in the Granary neighborhood, this project proposes to increase the amount of landscaping in the
public right-of-way and provides residents landscaped spaces in the building interior and rooftop,
rather than within landscape yards. The applicant is providing vegetation in the public right of way
beyond the minimum requirement.
It is staff's opinion that the revised plans and calculations provided by the applicant address the Community Council's concerns raised during the Planning Commission hearing.

Staff analysis of the request for relief from setback requirements found that the proposal was consistent both with the existing neighborhood pattern as well as the desired urban form for the Downtown area, as described in the Downtown Community Plan.

Staff believes that the request to waive yard setbacks and landscape yards is appropriate, particularly due to its urban context and the neighborhood pattern of buildings along the sidewalk interspersed with parking lots. The existing building on the northeast portion of the site is built to the property line. Creating a street wall with façade transparency and visual interest, as this proposal does, is a pedestrian-oriented gesture that enhances the public realm, all of which is recommended in the Downtown Community Plan.

Staff believes the modification results in a better product related to the materials used and the creation of a pedestrian-oriented street wall, as well as enhancing compatibility with the context. Further, the reduced setbacks are mitigated for residents through the provision of ROW and midblock walkway landscaping, street trees, planters, and various outdoor and indoor amenities in the building interior, including landscaping on rooftop areas.

Based on this analysis, staff finds the proposal complies with the standards of approval in Chapter 21A.55.050 Planned Developments relevant to the discussion of yard setbacks, landscape yards, and additional landscaping required by the CG zone.
## GENERAL LANDSCAPE CALCS PER SLC REQUIREMENTS

### 21A.26.070 CG GENERAL COMMERCIAL LANDSCAPE CALCULATIONS - ADD. HEIGHT

**TOTAL SITE:** 54,475 SF

**TURF:** NO PROPOSED TURF ON THIS PROJECT

### WATER-WISE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SHRUBS PROVIDED (STREET)</td>
<td>688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SHRUBS PROVIDED (ROOF ESTIMATE)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SHRUBS PER SLC BMP MANUAL (80% REQUIRED)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WATER-WISE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL TREES PROVIDED</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL TREES PER SLC BMP MANUAL (80% REQUIRED)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL SHRUBS PROVIDED (STREET)

**688**

**TOTAL SHRUBS PROVIDED (ROOF ESTIMATE)**

**70**

**TOTAL**

**758**

**TOTAL SHRUBS PER SLC BMP MANUAL (80% REQUIRED)**

**6%**

### TOTAL TREES PROVIDED

**37**

**TOTAL TREES PER SLC BMP MANUAL (80% REQUIRED)**

**33**

### TABLE A - REQUESTED RELIEF FROM ADDITIONAL HEIGHT - LANDSCAPE MITIGATION

**HT:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FLOOR LEVELS</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;60' BY RIGHT</td>
<td>60'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ADD. HEIGHT REQUEST:</strong></td>
<td>27'-10&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEVEL 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SQUARE FOOTAGE</th>
<th>40,470</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>10% ADDITIONAL LANDSCAPE:</strong></td>
<td>4,047</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEVEL 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SQUARE FOOTAGE</th>
<th>38,845</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>10% ADDITIONAL LANDSCAPE:</strong></td>
<td>3,885</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REQUIRED ADDITIONAL LANDSCAPE AREA:**

**7,932**

**AREA REQUIRED TO HAVE VEGETATED LANDSCAPE (1/3):**

**2,644**

### TABLE B - REQUESTED RELIEF FROM SETBACK - LANDSCAPE MITIGATION SCHEDULE

**YARD REQUIREMENTS (BY-RIGHT)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL VEGETATED COVERAGE REQUIRED BY-RIGHT:</th>
<th>S.F.</th>
<th>2,638</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>700 SOUTH FRONT YARD - (10' SETBACK)</td>
<td>3,174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/3 Landscaping Required:</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700 &amp; 400 CORNER SIDE YARD - (10x10)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/3 Landscaping Required:</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 WEST SIDE YARD - (10' SETBACK)</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/3 Landscaping Required:</td>
<td>517</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAR YARD - (10' SETBACK)</td>
<td>3,090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/3 Landscaping Required:</td>
<td>1,030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERIOR SIDE YARD (0')</td>
<td>na</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LANDSCAPE MITIGATION REQUIRED:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.F.</th>
<th>QTY AS SHRUBS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2,644</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ESTIMATED VEGETATION LOST FROM EXCEPTION (TABLE A):**

| **ESTIMATED VEGETATION LOST FROM EXCEPTION (TABLE B):** | 2,638 |

**LANDSCAPE MITIGATION (NOT REQUIRED BY CODE):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.F.</th>
<th>QTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AT GRADE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDITIONAL VEGETATION IN ROW</td>
<td>1,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REQUIRED: 1/3 Planting Required:</td>
<td>2,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROPOSED COVERAGE:</td>
<td>4,240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ADDITIONAL AT GRADE SMALL TREES CANOPY:**

**VERTICAL COVERAGE BY VINES:**

**PRIVATE LANDSCAPING / MID-BLOCK BREAK COVERAGE:**

| TOTAL: | 7,820 |

**LANDSCAPE ON STRUCTURE**

| LANDSCAPING VEGETATED COVERAGE | 1,050 |
| TREE CANOPY ON ROOF            | 1,000 |
| TOTAL:                         | 2,050 |

**TOTAL LANDSCAPE MITIGATION PROVIDED:**

**9,870**

**ADDITIONAL LANDSCAPING COVERAGE REQUIRED PER HT:**

SEE TABLE (A)

**ADDITIONAL LANDSCAPING COVERAGE REQUIRED BY LANDSCAPE YARD AREA:**

SEE TABLE (B)

**TOTAL REQUIRED BY-RIGHT:**

**5,282**

**LANDSCAPE MITIGATION PROVIDED:**

**9,870**

**54%**

**WE ARE PROVIDING 53% MORE VEGETATED COVERAGE THAN WHAT WOULD BE REQUIRED BY RIGHT.**
To: Salt Lake City Planning Commission
From: Laura Bandara, Urban Designer, (801) 535-6188, laura.bandara@slcgov.com
Date: February 23, 2022
Re: PLNPCM2021-00822 and PLNPCM2021-00835 Pacific Yard

**Planned Development and Design Review**

**PROPERTY ADDRESS:** 443 W 700 South, 720 S 400 West, 704 S 400 West

**PARCEL ID:** 15-12-129-007, 15-12-129-014, 15-12-129-015

**MASTER PLAN:** Downtown Plan

**ZONING DISTRICT:** General Commercial (CG)

**REQUEST:** KTGY Architects, on behalf of developer Urban Alfandre, is requesting Planned Development approval to waive front, corner and rear yard setback requirements and the front and corner side yard landscaping requirements. Additionally, the applicant is seeking relief of the additional landscaping required for buildings seeking additional building height in the CG (General Commercial) zoning district. The applicant is also seeking Design Review for an additional 28 feet of building height at approximately 720 S 400 West. The building will occupy a 1.25-acre site in the Granary zoned General Commercial (CG). In the CG zone, new buildings taller than sixty feet (60’) but less than ninety feet (90’) may be authorized through Design Review.

The proposed 7-story building is 88-feet in height and includes 292 units and 202 parking stalls. It has a two-story parking garage, wrapped by 12,000 square feet of commercial space on the ground floor. The project incorporates a public mid-block pedestrian walkway along the western property line

**RECOMMENDATION:**

Based on the findings listed in the staff report, it is Planning Staff’s opinion that overall, the project meets the applicable standards and therefore recommends the Planning Commission approve the requests with the following conditions:

1. Final approval of the details for public art, development and site lighting (including the mid-block walkway), street lighting, streetscape details, street furniture, midblock walkway paving, sidewalk paving and landscaping to be delegated to Planning Staff to ensure compliance with the standards for Design Review as well as the Downtown Community Plan.

2. Applicant to mitigate the building mass and improve the relationship of building height to human scale through provision of an awning of 4’ in depth, subject to an encroachment agreement approved by all required City divisions and departments.
3. Final approval a tree form with a spreading canopy in the park strip, that will also meet the needs of the Urban Forestry Division and relevant utility companies to be delegated to Planning Staff.

4. A public easement will be recorded on the property for the midblock walkway. A sign will be posted on the midblock walkway stating it is open to the public.

5. A complete lot consolidation application for the three existing parcels shall be submitted and approved.

ATTACHMENTS:

A. ATTACHMENT A: Vicinity and Zoning Maps
B. ATTACHMENT B: Plan Set
C. ATTACHMENT C: Applicant Narratives
D. ATTACHMENT D: Property & Vicinity Photographs
E. ATTACHMENT E: Master Plan Policies
F. ATTACHMENT F: Analysis of Standards – General Commercial Zoning District
G. ATTACHMENT G: Analysis of Standards – Planned Development
H. ATTACHMENT H: Analysis of Standards – Design Review
I. ATTACHMENT I: Public Process and Comments
J. ATTACHMENT J: Department Review Comments
Rendering of the view from the corner of 400 West and 700 South. 400 West facade is on the left. Note that power lines to remain on 700 South—approximately 40 feet tall—are not shown in the rendering.

This is a Planned Development and Design Review request for a 292-unit mixed use building at approximately 443 W 700 South, 720 S 400 West, and 704 S 400 West. Its five floors of residential units sit atop a two-story parking structure with 202 stalls, fronted by approximately 12,000 square feet of ground floor retail, leasing office and amenity area.

QUICK FACTS

**Height:** 87’ 10” (7 stories)
**Number of Dwellings:** 292 units
**Ground Floor Uses:** Approx. 1300 sq. ft. retail, office, and amenity space
**Upper Floor Uses:** Residential units, 7th floor rooftop deck
**Front, Corner Side, and Rear Setbacks:** 0’ (10’ required, requesting modification)
**Side Setback:** 16’ midblock walkway (None required; midblock walkway required by Downtown Plan)
**Exterior Materials:** Brick, stucco, metal, fiber cement, CMU, glass doors, vinyl windows
**Parking:** 202 stalls

**Review Process & Standards:**
- Planned Development
- Design Review
- General Commercial (CG) zoning
Site Context

Located in Downtown’s Granary, the building is within the National Register Warehouse District of Salt Lake City. According to Planning’s Historic Preservation webpage, the Salt Lake City Warehouse District developed as “a late-1800s to early-1900s working class and industrial neighborhood heavily influenced by the railroad industry.... [Most] historic resources in the district are commercial buildings associated with the warehousing and distribution services that developed following the arrival of freight railroads in Utah in 1869. Residential resources are relatively rare in the district and are largely found as isolated buildings or small clusters of buildings scattered throughout the district; the exception is a somewhat larger concentration of dwellings in the southern portion of the district.”

Location of development site within National Register Warehouse District. The site faces contributing buildings on the north, east, and south, although the existing building on site is non-contributing.
Existing Conditions

The proposed site will consolidate three parcels, two of which are vacant, and one which contains an under-utilized lower scale building. The existing two-story building located on the eastern portion of the site is approximately 180 ft long by 110 feet wide and will be demolished as part of this project. This property and all abutting and adjacent properties are located within the CG (General Commercial) zoning district.

Aerial showing the location of the site. The building footprint extends nearly ½ block on 700 South, and ¼ block on 400 West.

View of existing site from the corner of 400 West and 700 South.

The power lines on 400 West will be buried. The existing power lines on the 700 South façade will remain.

Adjacent Uses

North: 700 South. Across the street is a two-story NR contributing brick warehouse that has recently been adaptively reused as retail and warehouse space for an outdoor gear company.

South: 400 West. The adjacent parcel has a NR one-story contributing brick building, which is setback nearly 73 feet from the street, and sits directly south of the proposal. The parcel has
a central expanse of surface parking and a few more one-to two-story warehouses along the southern and western perimeter, none of which are contributing.

**East:** 400 West. Across the street is a two-story NR contributing brick warehouse. The disused rail line running through the center of the corridor is proposed as a new streetcar route in the Downtown Plan.

**West:** 700 South. 10’ wide RMP easement and two-story windowless warehouse with metal siding and a single garage door.

**Planned Development**
The Planned Development process allows applicants to seek modifications to zoning standards. An applicant must first meet one of several objectives related to City plan policies and goals. The Planned Development process includes standards related to whether any modifications will result in a better final product, whether it aligns with City policies and goals, and is compatible with the area or the City’s master plan development goals for the area. Those standards and the objectives are discussed in Attachment G and in the “Key Considerations” section below.

The Planned Development process is required because the applicant requests that the Planning Commission:

- Waive required 10’ setbacks for front, corner, and rear yards.
- Waive required 10’ front and corner landscape yards.
- Waive 7700 square feet of additional landscaping requirements generated by approvals of additional height.

In lieu of the setbacks and landscape yards, the building will extend to the property line. A request for additional height in the CG zoning district requires a landscaping increase equal to 10% of the area of the approved additional floors. The applicant is requesting 2 additional floors that total 77,000 square feet, increasing the area of landscaping required to 7700 square feet. The applicant seeks relief from both landscape yards and the increased landscaping requirement.
The request is made to achieve transparency and visual interest to support the retail, office, and resident amenity uses on the ground floor, and to retain compatibility with the neighborhood pattern in the Granary’s warehouse district, where many buildings have no setbacks, as well as to incorporate additional area for development.

**Design Review**

The Design Review process allows for additional height and flexibility in meeting certain measurable design related zoning standards if the proposed alternative design still generally meets the intent of those standards. When large developments or requests for additional height are considered, proposals shall comply with all Design Review standards. The Design Review process includes standards of review primarily related to ensuring a development is pedestrian-oriented, human-scale and incorporates sufficient transparency and visual interest to maintain pedestrian engagement. The full list of standards is reviewed in Attachment H.

The applicant suggests that the request for additional height will realize the Downtown Community Plan’s Urban Design Framework which follows the City’s Urban Design Element (1990) and recommends heights of 6-12 stories west and south of the Central Business District.

The CG zone has no façade design requirements, save for the requirement for a door on each building façade. The Design Review requirements produced by the request for additional height, therefore result in a more transparent and visually interesting ground floor than would be required by-right. The building incorporates large commercial windows articulated by framed bays on the 400 West façade and on two-thirds of the 700 South façade.
Materials change from brick, to stucco, to metal change along the façade, and 3 colors of brick are included. On the 700 South façade the ground floor has two breaks in vertical plane, which are intended to provide the appearance of two buildings – the eastern portion is 212 feet wide, and the western portion is 108’ long. A projecting brickwork pattern and public art located along the mid-block walkway enlivens the façade of the parking structure.

The width of the building is reduced through vertical emphasis and include color and material changes, as required by the standards for Design Review. The proposal also includes articulation intended to make the 330-foot-wide building appear like two adjoining buildings. There are other long warehouse buildings in the surrounding context, but none above two stories. The CG zoning district does not limit building length, so while a ½ block building width is considerable, and staff believes that further articulation would improve its relation to human scale, it is generally compliant with the standards for Design Review.

**KEY CONSIDERATIONS:**

The below considerations were identified through analysis of the proposal.

1. **Master Plan**
2. **Request for Additional Height**
3. **Request for 10’ Setback and Landscape Yard Relief**
4. **Request for Additional Landscaping Relief**
5. **Mid-Block Walkway**

**Consideration 1: Master Plan**

The Downtown Plan envisions the creation of the “premier center for sustainable urban living, commerce, and cultural life in the Intermountain West,” that is livable, walkable, provides housing choice and affordability, and incorporates a mix of public and private amenities.

The subject property is in the Granary District of the Downtown Community Plan, envisioned as a unique place in the downtown where “The Granary’s historic grit and modern refinement come together.” It is intended to provide mix of housing options include townhouses, adaptive reuse of historic buildings, and mid-rise development.

The plan proposes that existing buildings be repurposed for creative industries and supports office, retail, and restaurant uses. The Plan envisions unique public spaces within large rights of way that incorporate disused rail infrastructure, and the development of a thriving employment center in the area.
Subject property

The project meets 7 of the Downtown Plan’s 48 goals. The proposal is consistent with many of the initiatives in the Downtown Plan, which calls for mid-rise development in the Granary, and building design that is compatible with the character of the neighborhood. For details, see Attachment E: Master Plan Policies

Consideration 2: Request for Additional Height

The General Commercial (CG) zoning district allows for buildings up to 60 feet in height. Buildings between 60 and 90 feet in height are permitted through the Design Review process. The applicant is requesting an additional 27’ 10” in height through this process.

The architectural style responds to the National Register Warehouse District character of the area and is generally compatible with the area. The existing height of the area, however, and the proposed height of the structure are different. The proposal includes a building that is 88 feet tall while the Granary typically includes building between 14 and 30 feet in height. While this building will be significantly taller than the existing context, the applicant and the City acknowledge that additional development is likely to occur, and when compliant with the standards of the design review process, 90’ buildings are permissible in the CG zone.
Staff has concerns regarding the building height in relation to human scale related to Design Review Standard D and Standard G.1.a, as detailed in Attachment H. The Granary, in general, is comprised of buildings and streets that lack human-scale features. The building has a 10’ step back at the second story on the rear façade, this does not adequately relate to human scale, as it is not visible or perceptible from the street-facing façades. Staff asked the applicant to consider adding step backs to the street facing facades above the second story to better comply with the intent of this standard and to address concerns raised by Community Council members.

In the absence of step backs along the street facing facades, a condition of approval to provide an awning of 4’ in depth that provides a greater sense of enclosure paired with an appropriate tree form and scale to further mitigate the building’s mass may improve the relationship of building height to human scale.

**Consideration 3: Request for 10’ Yard Setback and Landscape Yard Relief**

The property is in the General Commercial (CG) zoning district. The CG zone includes a requirement for 10’ front, corner, and rear yard setbacks, and 10’ landscape yards in the front and corner side. The intent of this is to both provide area for aesthetic landscaping improvements along the street but to also provide some separation from the public way and the uses allowed in this zone. The applicant has proposed to modify the setback to build commercial space along the property line.

The CG zone requires landscape yards to mitigate impacts from large buildings. Through the Planned Development process, the applicant is requesting relief from all landscaping required in the CG zone, namely 10’ front and corner landscape yards, (approximately 5000 square feet of landscaping).

Regarding compatibility with directly adjacent properties where the setback is being modified, staff evaluated how the development interfaces with the abutting property to the south and the street front along 400 West and 700 South. Photos of those interface areas are available in Attachment D.

Where the development interfaces on the south, the proposal sits on the property line, and proposes a blank wall with a 10-foot step back at approximately 30 feet from the ground. The existing one-and-one-half story building on the lot to the south is setback approximately 5 feet
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from the shared property line and has a windowless wall facing the proposal. The existing building to the south is setback nearly 74 feet from 400 West, and most of the parcel is used for surface parking. On the subject property, the existing building (to be demolished) is adjacent to the sidewalk on 400 West and 700 South, as are many nearby buildings.

The predominant neighborhood pattern is warehouse buildings set at the property line, with surface or vacant lots interspersed. Proposed site in yellow.

Staff believes that the request to waive yard setbacks and landscape yards is appropriate, particularly due to its urban context and the neighborhood pattern of buildings along the sidewalk interspersed with parking lots. The existing building on the northeast portion of the site is built to the property line. Creating a street wall with façade transparency and visual interest, as this proposal does, is a pedestrian-oriented gesture that enhances the public realm, all of which is generally desired Downtown. Staff believes the modification results in a better product related to the materials used and the creation of a pedestrian-oriented street wall, as well as enhancing compatibility with the context. Further, the reduced setbacks are mitigated for residents through the provision of a range of outdoor roof decks and indoor amenities in the building interior.

**Consideration 4: Request for Additional Landscaping Relief**

The CG zone requires additional landscaping when additional height is requested. Through the Planned Development process, the applicant is also requesting relief from the required additional landscaping which is approximately 7700 square feet generated by the request of additional floors.

As the applicant is requesting relief from all required landscaping on the property, to create a more enhanced pedestrian experience for the ground floor commercial uses. Thus, Staff finds that an enhanced landscaped park strip will help provide mitigation for the additional height being sought for this project.
While the proposed park strip landscape is limited in its ability to lessen impacts of the 700 South façade it can provide greenery and create a sense of human scale. As stated above, the applicant is burying the power lines along 400 West but leaving the power lines along 700 South. This limits the height for proposed street trees. With this issue in mind and attempting to create a human scale space on the sidewalk, staff is recommending a condition of approval for a tree form with a spreading canopy in the park strip, that will also meet the needs of the Urban Forestry Division and relevant utility companies.
Section through building at 400 West and 700 South to demonstrate scale relationship between proposed park strip landscaping and the development proposal.

**Consideration 5: Mid-Block Walkway**

A midblock walkway is required on the western property boundary by the Downtown Plan. The applicant’s second submission proposed a 10-foot-wide midblock walkway that occupied an existing utility easement. However, after further discussion the applicant revised the width to 16-feet wide. The walkway is located alongside the parking garage, to the west of the proposal. As the block redevelops, the north-south midblock walkway will meet an east-west running walkway at the approximate center of the block and is intended to provide a unique pedestrian privately-owned public space.

To comply with Design Review standards, the applicant has agreed to incorporate seating and public art along the parking garage wall to make the walkway more engaging. The design of the midblock walkway meets Design Review standards for public art, seating, and amenities. The proposal includes an interactive 15’ x 9’ chalk board at the northern portion of the walkway, and five 8’ x 8’ panels with artwork along the rest of the western façade, and overhead fairy lights above the walkway.
The midblock walkway proposal was added to the plan set after the initial submission and still requires concept refinement and design details. As a condition of approval Planning Staff recommends that final approval of the details for public art, signage, midblock walkway lighting, seating, paving patterns, and landscaping to be delegated to Planning Staff. Planning Staff will work with the applicant to address spatial constraints using urban design principals to the greatest extent possible.

**DISCUSSION:**

The requested modifications have been reviewed against the Planned Development standards in Attachment G and the proposal generally meets those standards as discussed in those attachments and in the considerations section above. The proposal provides a mixed-use development and the modifications to the front and corner yard setbacks are compatible with the existing neighborhood development pattern and the greater design considerations given the associated facades results in a better product.

The requested modifications have been reviewed against the Design Review standards Attachment H, and while it meets most of those standards, Staff has concerns regarding the proposal in relation to the standards regarding human scale and has recommended a condition to help with this issue. The ½ block long, 88-foot-tall building incorporates shallow horizontal massing changes that create visual interest but do not introduce human scale along the ground-floor street facade.

Otherwise, the proposal generally meets the Design Review standards. As the applicant is generally meeting the applicable standards, Staff is recommending approval of the development with the conditions noted on the first page of the report.
NEXT STEPS:

**Planned Development Approval**
If the proposal is approved, the applicant will be able to build their proposal as proposed. The final plans submitted for building permits will be reviewed to ensure that they substantially comply with the approved plans and all conditions of approval. The buildings will need to comply with all other zoning and code requirements.

**Planned Development Denial**
If the Planned Development is denied, the applicant will not be able to build their proposal as proposed. Any proposed development would need to comply with the front, corner side, and rear yard setback requirements of 10’ and would need to provide landscape yards and additional landscaping as required in the Commercial General zoning district.

**Design Review Approval**
If the proposal is approved, the applicant will be able to build their proposal as proposed. The final plans submitted for building permits will be reviewed to ensure that they substantially comply with the approved plans and all conditions of approval. The buildings will need to comply with all other zoning and code requirements.

**Design Review Denial**
If the proposal is denied, the applicant will not be able to build their proposal as proposed. Any proposed development would need to be at or under the 60’ height limit.
The Downtown Plan puts forth 10 principles to support the Downtown Plan’s vision of creating the “premier center for sustainable urban living, commerce, and cultural life in the Intermountain West.” These 10 principles are elaborated through a framework of goals and initiatives to guide implementation.

The proposal incorporates several initiatives intended to realize 7 of the Plan’s 48 goals.

**Principle: Housing Choice**

**Goal 4:** Increased residential density—The project will add 292 residential units to a part of downtown that currently lacks significant residential development.

**Principle: Vibrant and Active**

**Goal 3:** Active public realm—The proposal includes a high amount of transparency for ground floor uses and a mix of uses.

Active ground floor uses are prioritized over parking on the 400 West façade and on 2/3rds of the 700 South façade.

**Principle: Arts and Culture**

**Goal 1:** Public art—The proposal includes interactive art areas on the midblock walkway.

**Goal 2:** Distinctive, imageable downtown with identifiable subdistricts—The building identifiable incorporates the architectural style of the Granary warehouse, while incorporating transparency and visual interest to create activation at the ground floor.

**Principle: Walkable**

**Goal 1:** Midblock Walkways—Mid-block walkways are intended to facilitate pedestrian movement throughout Downtown. The midblock walkway’s proposed location on western boundary of the site is consistent with the midblock walkway network as shown in the Downtown Community Plan.

**Principle: Welcoming and safe**

**Goal 1:** 24/7 Public realm—The proposal incorporates a high degree of ground-level transparency, non-reflective glass, architectural design features, and incorporates clear windows and doors, and balconies facing public spaces.

**Principle: Beautiful**

**Goal 1:** Character-contributing buildings—Building design is responsive to district character, neighboring buildings, and glass and visual interest at the ground level is responsive to the pedestrian.
Downtown Plan: Granary District Initiatives

The development is in the Granary area of the Downtown Community Plan, which calls for mid-rise development.

There are 25 Granary District initiatives described in the Downtown Community Plan, of which this proposal meets 3:

- contains a rooftop patio,
- utilizes on street parking to count toward parking requirements, and
- rebuilds a 165 linear foot segment of 400 West with adequate curb, gutter, park strip, and sidewalk.

Pending further information, this proposal has the potential to meet two additional initiatives

- develop a small neighborhood service node (ground floor commercial space is provided).
- create an active public space along the required midblock walkway.

Growing SLC

The City’s Housing Plan (“Growing SLC”) also includes policies that relate to the proposal, including:

**GOAL 1: INCREASE HOUSING OPTIONS: REFORM CITY PRACTICES TO PROMOTE A RESPONSIVE, AFFORDABLE, HIGH-OPPORTUNITY HOUSING MARKET**

1.1.2 Develop in-fill ordinances that promote a diverse housing stock, increase housing options, create redevelopment opportunities, and allow additional units within existing structures, while minimizing neighborhood impacts.

**Staff Discussion:** In relation to the above, the proposal utilizes the Planned Development and design review process as an in-fill tool to provide more housing options.

Plan Salt Lake

The City’s general citywide plan “Plan Salt Lake” also includes policies related to the proposal, including:

**2/ Growth (Policies)**

6. Accommodate and promote an increase in the City’s population

**Staff Discussion:** The proposal introduces in-fill development on three existing lots, two of which are vacant, and one with an under-utilized lower scale building and that helps accommodate a growing City population. The building provides a mix of nearly 300 one and two-person apartments in an area that currently has little residential development.

In relation to the Downtown Plan, the proposal is utilizing the Planned Development process, which allows for some design flexibility, while also maintaining compatibility with the
surrounding neighborhood. The request for reduced yard setbacks is premised on maintaining continuity with the existing development pattern to create a pedestrian-oriented street wall.

The Design Review process provides for ground-level pedestrian engagement and orientation in a base zone with very few design standards, as well as strategies to mitigate the ½ block width of the building. The design review request is for additional height, which implements several goals and initiatives of the Downtown Plan, related to the provision of commercial space and ground-level transparency and visually interesting facades, as well as an architecturally compatible response to the character of the Granary District.
GENERAL NOTES

1. ANY AND ALL RESPONSIBILITY OF THIS PLAN ARE TO BE RECIPROCATED TO THE ENGINEER(s) RESPONSIBLE TO ENSURE CORRECT CONSTRUCTION.

2. ALL CONSTRUCTION DRAWINGS ARE TO SCALE, AND SHOULD BE CONFIRMED BY THE CONTRACTOR.

3. THE DRAWING SET TO SCALE TO BE PRINTED ON A 24" X 36" SIZE OF PAPER FOR 36" X 72" PAPER SIZE. DRAWING SIZES ARE TO BE PRINTED TO SCALE, THERE MAY BE TEXT OR DETAIL THAT MAY BE OVERLOOKED DUE TO THE SMALL SIZE OF THE DRAWING.

NOTICE

THE DRAWING SET IS TO BE PRINTED ON A 24" X 36" SIZE OF PAPER FOR 36" X 72" PAPER SIZE. DRAWING SIZES ARE TO BE PRINTED TO SCALE, THERE MAY BE TEXT OR DETAIL THAT MAY BE OVERLOOKED DUE TO THE SMALL SIZE OF THE DRAWING.

ENGINEER'S NOTES TO CONTRACTOR

1. UNAUTHORIZED CHANGES OR DEVIATIONS FROM THE PLANS Must Not Be Made By Or On Behalf Of The Contractor, Or ANYONE WORKING FOR THE CONTRACTOR. ALL CHANGES Must Be IN WRITING AND Must Be APPROVED BY THE PREPARER OF THESE PLANS.

2. ANY AND ALL DISCREPANCIES IN THESE PLANS Are TO BE BROUGHT TO THE ENGINEER’S ATTENTION PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION.

3. ALL CONSTRUCTION SHALL ADHERE TO SALT LAKE CITY AND APA STANDARD PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS.

4. ALL UTILITIES AND ROAD IMPROVEMENTS SHOWN ON THE PLANS. THE CONTRACTOR FURTHER ASSUMES ALL LIABILITY AND RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE INSTALLATION, MAINTENANCE, AND/OR REPLACEMENT OF ALL UTILITIES SHOWN ON THESE PLANS, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO THE UTILITY LINES, CONDUITS, OR STRUCTURES ShOWN ON THESE DRAWINGS. IF UTILITY LINES ARE ENCOUNTERED DURING CONSTRUCTION THAT ARE NOT IDENTIFIED BY THESE PLANS, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY ENGINEER IMMEDIATELY.

5. CONTRACTOR AGREES TO BE HELD LIABLE FOR ANY AND ALL DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN THE EXISTING CONDITIONS AND THE PLANS. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE ENGINEER IMMEDIATELY OF ANY SUCH DISCREPANCIES.

6. THE EXISTENCE AND LOCATION OF ANY UNDERGROUND UTILITY PIPES, CONDUITS OR STRUCTURES SHOWN OR NOT SHOWN ON THESE DRAWINGS, THE CONTRACTOR FURTHER ASSUMES ALL LIABILITY AND RESPONSIBILITY FOR THESE UTILITIES.

7. CONSTRUCTION DRAWINGS ARE TO BE PRINTED ON A 24" X 36" SIZE OF PAPER FOR 36" X 72" PAPER SIZE. DRAWING SIZES ARE TO BE PRINTED TO SCALE, THERE MAY BE TEXT OR DETAIL THAT MAY BE OVERLOOKED DUE TO THE SMALL SIZE OF THE DRAWING.

CONTACTS

JAMES ALFANDRE
URBAN ALFANDRE
650 S 500 W, UTAH 84101
(801) 352-0075
www.focusutah.com

ENGINEER & SURVEYOR
FOCUS ENGINEERING & SURVEYING, LLC
6949 S. HIGH TECH DRIVE SUITE 200
MIDVALE, UTAH 84047  PH: (801) 352-0075

PROJECT MANAGER: CAMERON TAYLOR
SURVEY MANAGER: EVAN WOOD
(801) 352-0075
6949 S. HIGH TECH DRIVE SUITE 200
MIDVALE, UTAH 84047

PREPARED FOR:
JAMES ALFANDRE
LOCATED IN:
SALT LAKE CITY
700 SOUTH

PACIFIC YARD

SALT LAKE CITY

COVER SHEET
There are no existing trees on this site.
BRICK DETAILING - We are showing a brick pattern that wraps the corner on the ground level to bring the pedestrian’s interest into the alley. To make a clear connection between the base and the middle of the building, the brick detail is simplified on the upper stories.

INTERACTIVE ART - As the pedestrian moves around the corner, they are drawn in by the colorful angled walls visible from the street. And just around the corner is an interactive art display to help foster a sense of community.

FRAMED ART DISPLAY - Every other bay is to have a screened opening into the garage, or a framed mural.

WALKWAY SEATING - Seating with integrated landscaping helps to soften the industrial inspired facade.

SCONCE UP/DOWN LIGHTING - Sconces that light up and down, are shown at every bay to create a safe and inviting atmosphere.
INTERACTIVE ART: As the pedestrian moves around the corner, they are drawn in by the colorful angled walls visible from the street. And just around the corner is an interactive art display to help foster a sense of community.

BRICK DETAILING: We are showing a brick pattern that wraps the corner on the ground level to bring the pedestrian's interest into the alley. To make a clear connection between the base and the middle of the building, the brick detail is simplified on the upper stories.

SCONCE UP/DOWN LIGHTING: Sconces that light up and down, are shown at every bay to create a safe and inviting atmosphere.

WALKWAY SEATING: Seating with integrated landscaping helps to soften the industrial inspired facade.

FRAMED ART DISPLAY: Every other bay is to have a screened opening into the garage, or a framed mural.
PUBLIC R.O.W. TREE PLANTING - TIE INTO EXISTING SYSTEM IF AVAILABLE - OR - PROVIDE SEPARATE VALVE ON PRIVATE SYSTEM
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1. INSTALL PER LOCAL CODES AND MANUFACTURER'S SPECIFICATIONS.

2. BACKFLOW PREVENTER DEVICES SHALL BE PLACED A MINIMUM OF TWO (2') FEET FROM THE EQUIPMENT AS THEY GO THROUGH THE CONCRETE SLAB.

3. WALL MOUNT IRIGATION CONTROLLER

4. GROUND CONTROLLER PER LOCAL CODE AND MANUFACTURER'S SPECIFICATIONS.

5. PROVIDE LOCK AND KEY FOR ENCLOSURE.

6. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL CONFORM TO ALL LOCAL AND STATE REGULATIONS TO INSTALL THE IRRIGATION SYSTEM AND IT'S COMPONENTS PER THE MANUFACTURER'S SPECIFICATIONS AS SHOWN ON THE PROJECT SHEETS.

7. THE CONTRACTOR MUST VERIFY THE LOCATION OF ALL UNDERGROUND UTILITIES PRIOR TO INSTALLATION OF PLANT MATERIAL WITH THE OWNER'S REPRESENTATIVE.

8. IT IS THE CONTRACTOR'S RESPONSIBILITY TO CONDUCT A THOROUGH SITE INSPECTION AND REVIEW OF ALL SITE INFORMATION AVAILABLE TO THE CONTRACTOR TO ENSURE ADEQUATE VERTICAL SEPARATION BETWEEN ALL IRRIGATION DISTRIBUTION LINES AND ALL UTILITIES (EXISTING OR PROPOSED) CONDUIT, STORM WATER COMPONENTS, DRAINS, ETC.

9. PLANT MATERIAL LOCATIONS TAKE PRECEDENTS OVER IRRIGATION LINES. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL ADJUST ALL VALVE BOXES TO BE FLUSH FINISH GRADE AS PER THE CONTRACTOR.

10. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE ALL LABOR, MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT NECESSARY TO INSTALL THE IRRIGATION SYSTEM AND IT'S COMPONENTS.

11. PROVIDE WATERPROOF SEALANT FOR ALL CONDUIT AND WIRE ACCESS POINTS.

12. PROVIDE LOCK AND KEY FOR ENCLOSURE.

13. INSTALL SENSOR PER MANUFACTURER'S SPECIFICATIONS.

14. INSTALL SENSOR MODULE IS PROVIDED IN THE CONTROLLER.

15. INSTALL SENSOR LOCATED IN WALL BOX NEXT TO CONTROLLER.

16. PROVIDE WIRELESS RAIN SENSOR, LOCATED WITHIN 25' OF THE CONTROLLER.

17. ONE WAY VALVES ARE REQUIRED TO FLOW SINGLE DIRECTION IN ALL SYSTEM TUBING.

18. PLANT MATERIAL LOCATIONS TAKE PRECEDENTS OVER IRRIGATION LINES. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL ADJUST ALL VALVE BOXES TO BE FLUSH FINISH GRADE AS PER THE CONTRACTOR.

19. PROVIDE 1/4" DISTRIBUTION TUBING NOT TO EXCEED 8' IN LENGTH.

20. ALL PLANT MATERIAL SHALL BE IRRIGATED W/ RAIN BIRD XB BARBED PRESS-ON TYPE DIFFUSER.

21. PROVIDE 1" SCH. 80 PVC BALL VALVE.

22. PROVIDE 1" SCH. 80 PVC GAP PLANTER WITHIN 18" OF THE PLANTS.

23. PROVIDE 1" SCH. 80 PVC GAP PLANTER WITHIN 12" OF THE PLANTS.

24. PROVIDE 1" SCH. 80 PVC GAP PLANTER WITHIN 8" OF THE PLANTS.

25. PROVIDE 1" SCH. 80 PVC GAP PLANTER WITHIN 4" OF THE PLANTS.

26. PROVIDE 1" SCH. 80 PVC GAP PLANTER WITHIN 2" OF THE PLANTS.

27. PROVIDE 1" SCH. 80 PVC GAP PLANTER WITHIN 1" OF THE PLANTS.

28. PROVIDE 1" SCH. 80 PVC GAP PLANTER WITHIN 0.5" OF THE PLANTS.

29. PROVIDE 1" SCH. 80 PVC GAP PLANTER WITHIN 0.25" OF THE PLANTS.

30. PROVIDE 1" SCH. 80 PVC GAP PLANTER WITHIN 0.125" OF THE PLANTS.

31. PROVIDE 1" SCH. 80 PVC GAP PLANTER WITHIN 0.0625" OF THE PLANTS.

32. PROVIDE 1" SCH. 80 PVC GAP PLANTER WITHIN 0.03125" OF THE PLANTS.

33. PROVIDE 1" SCH. 80 PVC GAP PLANTER WITHIN 0.015625" OF THE PLANTS.

34. PROVIDE 1" SCH. 80 PVC GAP PLANTER WITHIN 0.0078125" OF THE PLANTS.

35. PROVIDE 1" SCH. 80 PVC GAP PLANTER WITHIN 0.00390625" OF THE PLANTS.

36. PROVIDE 1" SCH. 80 PVC GAP PLANTER WITHIN 0.001953125" OF THE PLANTS.

37. PROVIDE 1" SCH. 80 PVC GAP PLANTER WITHIN 0.0009765625" OF THE PLANTS.

38. PROVIDE 1" SCH. 80 PVC GAP PLANTER WITHIN 0.00048828125" OF THE PLANTS.

39. PROVIDE 1" SCH. 80 PVC GAP PLANTER WITHIN 0.000244140625" OF THE PLANTS.

40. PROVIDE 1" SCH. 80 PVC GAP PLANTER WITHIN 0.0001220703125" OF THE PLANTS.

41. PROVIDE 1" SCH. 80 PVC GAP PLANTER WITHIN 0.00006103515625" OF THE PLANTS.

42. PROVIDE 1" SCH. 80 PVC GAP PLANTER WITHIN 0.000030517578125" OF THE PLANTS.

43. PROVIDE 1" SCH. 80 PVC GAP PLANTER WITHIN 0.0000152587890625" OF THE PLANTS.

44. PROVIDE 1" SCH. 80 PVC GAP PLANTER WITHIN 0.00000762939453125" OF THE PLANTS.

45. PROVIDE 1" SCH. 80 PVC GAP PLANTER WITHIN 0.000003814697265625" OF THE PLANTS.

46. PROVIDE 1" SCH. 80 PVC GAP PLANTER WITHIN 0.0000019073486328125" OF THE PLANTS.

47. PROVIDE 1" SCH. 80 PVC GAP PLANTER WITHIN 0.00000095367431640625" OF THE PLANTS.

48. PROVIDE 1" SCH. 80 PVC GAP PLANTER WITHIN 0.000000476837158203125" OF THE PLANTS.

49. PROVIDE 1" SCH. 80 PVC GAP PLANTER WITHIN 0.0000002384185791015625" OF THE PLANTS.

50. PROVIDE 1" SCH. 80 PVC GAP PLANTER WITHIN 0.00000011920928955078125" OF THE PLANTS.

51. PROVIDE 1" SCH. 80 PVC GAP PLANTER WITHIN 0.000000059604644775390625" OF THE PLANTS.

52. PROVIDE 1" SCH. 80 PVC GAP PLANTER WITHIN 0.0000000298023223876953125" OF THE PLANTS.

53. PROVIDE 1" SCH. 80 PVC GAP PLANTER WITHIN 0.00000001490116119384765625" OF THE PLANTS.

54. PROVIDE 1" SCH. 80 PVC GAP PLANTER WITHIN 0.000000007450580596923828125" OF THE PLANTS.

55. PROVIDE 1" SCH. 80 PVC GAP PLANTER WITHIN 0.0000000037252902984619109375" OF THE PLANTS.

56. PROVIDE 1" SCH. 80 PVC GAP PLANTER WITHIN 0.0000000018626451492309554688" OF THE PLANTS.
WATER WISE PLANTS FOR SALT LAKE CITY

September 27, 2023

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>DECIDUOUS SHRUBS</th>
<th>EVERGREEN SHRUBS</th>
<th>GROUNDCOVERS / VINES</th>
<th>SEDUM ACRE 'OCTOBERFEST' OCTOBERFEST SEDUM GV14&quot;x18&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15 2 GAL. EUONYMUS FORTUNEI 'COLORATA' WINTERCREEPER GV424&quot;x60&quot;</td>
<td>15 2&quot; CAL. EMERALD AVENUE</td>
<td>11 2&quot; CAL. TRIUMPH ELMULMNUS X 'TRIUMPH' 55'x40' STREET</td>
<td>15 1 GAL. IPOMOEA BATATAS 'MARQERITE' SWEET POTATO VINE *MED12&quot;x36&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>BOTANICAL NAME</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>ZONE</th>
<th>MATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 GAL. | 5 GAL. | 3 GAL. | 2" CAL. EMERALD AVENUE | 2" CAL. TRIUMPH ELMULMNUS X 'TRIUMPH' 55'x40' STREET | 1 GAL. IPOMOEA BATATAS 'MARQERITE' SWEET POTATO VINE *

LARGE SPECIES HANDBOOK

EXISTING SITE VEGETATION IN POOR HEALTH

NO EXISTING TREES WITHIN THE PUBLIC ROW

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

1. CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE AND INSTALL 6 TREES REQUIRED

1. MINIMUM OF 12" OF TOPSOIL IS REQUIRED IN ALL PLANTING AREAS

1. CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY ALL PLANS WITH EXISTING CONDITIONS.

1. ALL IMPROVEMENTS SHALL CONFORM TO THE GOVERNING (SALT LAKE CITY) REGULATIONS:

1. CONTRACTOR SHALL REPORT ANY DISCREPANCIES, CHANGES, OR ISSUES TO THE OWNER AND/OR LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT PRIOR TO LOCATION OF ALL UTILITIES. CONTRACTOR IS LIABLE FOR DAMAGES TO EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW IMPROVEMENTS TO TAKE PRECEDENCE AND IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY AND LIABILITY OF THE ACTING CONTRACTOR TO PROTECT AND REPAIR ANY STRUCTURES OR ARES
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STAKE TREES ONLY WHEN NEEDED.

NOTES:

1. STAKE TREES ONLY WHEN NEEDED.
2. TIGHTEN RUBBER TIES UNTIL TREE STANDS UPRIGHT.
3. REMOVE STAKES AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

RACKS NOT PERMITTED:
The following do not meet the bicycle parking rack requirements. Please contact the City's bicycle parking ordinance Salt Lake City Code, Section 21-4-400A for information.

Future ownership and maintenance
Racks installed on public property or property must be donated to Salt Lake City. The City will purchase racks at its cost if a question arises about the rack. The owner should be given the opportunity to choose to purchase a custom replacement rack. This replacement must be donated to the City, and be installed by the City. Otherwise, Salt Lake City will replace the damaged rack with a standard rack.

Questions? Contact the Salt Lake City Division of Transportation, Design Section at 801-535-8500.
KEYNOTES - SDP

1. BRICK - RUNNING - COLOR 1
2. BRICK - RUNNING - COLOR 2
3. BRICK - RUNNING - COLOR 3
4. STUCCO - COLOR 1
5. STUCCO - COLOR 2
6. STUCCO - COLOR 3
7. FIBER CEMENT PANELING - COLOR 1
8. METAL AWNING
9. VINYL WINDOW
10. STOREFRONT
11. CMU - COLOR 1
12. DECORATIVE METAL SCREEN
13. STANDING SEAM METAL PANEL
14. GLASS OVERHEAD DOOR
15. EXPOSED STRUCTURAL STEEL
16. GARAGE PEDESTRIAN ENTRY
17. BUILDING ENTRY
18. BUILDING SIGNAGE LOCATION MOUNTED ON AWNING
19. EXTERIOR WALL MOUNT DOWN LIGHT
20. BRICK - RUNNING - COLOR 4
21. ART DISPLAY
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ATTACHMENT C: Applicant Narratives
January 6, 2022

RE: Planned Development Application for Pacific Yard (704 S 400 W)

To Whom it May Concern,

We are pleased to submit this Planned Development application for Pacific Yard.

Pacific Yard “will result in a more enhanced product than would be achievable through strict application of land use regulations, while enabling the development to be compatible with adjacent and nearby land developments” in the following ways:

- Requested reduced setbacks and landscape buffers will keep with the stabilized neighborhood pattern
- Highly activated ground floor will provide more commercial and retail for the neighborhood which achieves Downtown Plan goals of creating a more liveable city through increased walkability and access to services
- Increase the Granary’s housing stock will achieve Downtown Plan goals of housing choices
- Incorporating a mid-block walkway achieves one of the Downtown Plan’s ‘Catalytic Goals’ for pedestrian connectivity and enhances public realm.

Project Narrative: The proposed planned development is called Pacific Yard — a redevelopment project at the corner of 700 South and 400 West in the heart of the Granary District. Pacific Yard consists of efficient studios, one and two-bedroom residential units and 4,000 square feet of ground floor commercial space.

The Granary District is a neighborhood that grew up around the railroad and manufacturing and now a hub for entrepreneurship, art, food and beverage and residences.

Pacific Yard creates a new project that reflects the over-scaled feel in the Granary by creating a warehouse experience on the ground level to interact with the streetscape in a way typically found in the neighborhood, while incorporating human-scaled elements.

Pacific Yard is currently comprised of three separate parcels which will be consolidated into one parcel before the building permit process. It is also incorporating a midblock walkway on the western property line.
Zoning Requests:

Urban Alfandre is requesting relief from the City’s zoning ordinance through the planned development process for:

1. 21A.26.070 (D): MINIMUM YARD REQUIREMENTS: We are requesting no Front Yard, Corner Yard, or Rear Yard setbacks.

   The stabilized neighborhood pattern includes buildings with no setbacks that are set right up to the sidewalk, creating a pedestrian scaled, cohesive street wall, as seen below.

(existing development pattern highlighted in yellow with no setbacks)
Our intent is to activate our public street frontages with provide as much retail, lobby and co-working space and continue the stabilized neighborhood pattern of no setbacks.

2. **21A.26.070 (D): LANDSCAPE YARD REQUIREMENTS:** Our plan to reduce setbacks to mimic current development patterns in the neighborhood won’t allow us to provide these landscape buffers. We do plan on creating an enhanced streetscape experience with urban landscaping and a corner patio, that is private, but will provide relief for residents and customers, and a pleasant pedestrian experience.

We also believe that reducing the landscape buffer to create a more active street wall, as a priority of Salt Lake City’s Urban Design Standards, is a better environment for the pedestrian allowing for more interaction with the commercial and retail ground floor uses. Reducing these setbacks and landscape buffer also helps to minimize the effect of the large rights-of-way of 700 S and 400 W to create a better public realm and comfortable pedestrian scale, “…which will result in a more enhanced product than what would be achievable through strict application of land use regulations, while enabling the development to be compatible with adjacent and nearby land developments.”

Please reference Landscape Planting sheet (L301) for proposed species of plants and locations.

3. **21.A.44: PARKING:** We would like to comply with the Master Plan by leveraging the large amount of on-street parking available in the Granary’s wide, vacant streets to reduce the parking ratio at Pacific Yard to .78:1, or 227 total units. Per code, we are required to have 208 units, so we do comply with the parking standard, but are providing Transportation Demand Strategies as noted below.
There are preliminary plans for a TRAX extension to run right in front of Pacific Yards. It is likely by the time this project is delivered, the TRAX station is steps away, thus allowing for a lower parking ratio than the current zone requires.

Pacific Yard is complying with the following Transportation Demand Strategies:
1. At least 50% required bicycle parking provided in the form of secured long term bicycle parking located in the interior of the building and made available to residents of the development.
2. Providing an on site business center (co-working) or satellite office facility designed to facilitate telecommuting.
3. Providing an on premises gym for residents or employees with at least 400 square feet of space dedicated to workout equipment.

We also plan on having easily accessible bike parking for the residents of Pacific Yard, and customers of the commercial spaces by providing secure bike parking within the building for residents and coordinating bike parking areas, with Salt Lake City Corp, in the public right-of-way.

4. 21.A.55.040 A.3: The proposed planned development is compatible with other property in the neighborhood by eliminating the setbacks required by the current zoning in order to keep with the stabilized neighborhood pattern of zero setbacks as shown below:

The existing building on the Pacific Yard site, along with the adjacent properties, was built decades ago with zero lot lines and no setbacks. This Planned Development request is compatible with these existing development patterns of adjacent properties and most other properties in the neighborhood. Building Pacific Yard with setbacks required in the current zoning would create an uneven street wall and increase the unfriendly scale of the wide street. The requested reduced setbacks would provide a better built product than what is allowed under the current zone.
(Existing building on the Pacific Yard site)

(Adjacent building with zero lot lines and no setbacks)
A) **Planned Development Purpose and Objectives:**

We believe Pacific Yard meets the following City objectives for this Planned Development through the following ways:

**C. Housing (2):** Our proposal includes housing types that aren’t commonly found in the existing neighborhood. Pacific Yard will be the first residential project west of 300 West in the Granary District and because of this, will kick-off the neighborhood’s housing stock. The scale of the Granary is large, and Pacific Yard will incorporate the existing over-scaled feel of the neighborhood, while adding human-scaled elements through...
façade break-up, building step-backs and ground floor activation, to enhance the public realm and pedestrian experience.

E. Master Plan Implementation (1): Pacific Yard is consistent with the guidance of Downtown master plan related to building scale, building orientation, site layout or other similar character defining features through the following ways:

- Providing a mid-block walkway, deemed as a ‘Catalytic Project’ by the downtown master plan.
- Helping to “rebuild 400 West into a multi-modal street …” by adding in front of our project “…adequate curb, gutter, park strip and sidewalk”
Pacific Yard’s ground floor activation will continue to promote redevelopment opportunities along 400 West corridor, “further linking the granary to the rest of downtown.”

B) **Master Plan Compatibility**

Pacific Yard is very consistent with the Downtown master plan through the following ways:

- Providing “mid-rise housing and small local-serving retail” to help “make the Granary a complete neighborhood.”
- Creating a “Vibrant & Active” district “further linking the Granary to the rest of downtown” by redeveloping a vibrant, mixed-use project along 400 West that “support a true mix of housing options…”

C) **Design And Compatibility**

1. The scale, mass and intensity of Pacific Yard is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and the Downtown master plan in the following ways:

- The Granary is full of large warehouses and large parcels on very wide streets, which has created an over-scaled feel that has become a defining characteristic for this part of town. Pacific Yard’s goal is to keep with the over-scaled feel by mimicking the size and scale of surrounding buildings, and add human-scaled design elements to enhance the public realm and pedestrian experience. This is done in the following ways:
  - Designing a ground level that mimics surrounding architecture to add continuity to the neighborhood, while enhancing the walkability by adding retail and commercial uses to the ground level.
  - Reducing setbacks to keep with the stabilized neighborhood pattern of zero lot lines and no setbacks
  - Breaking up the 700 South façade to create the look of two separate buildings — this was carefully designed to keep the over-scaled feeling, while adding visual interest by breaking up the façade to enhance the pedestrian experience.
  - Creating a new mid block walkway which a defined in the Downtown master plan as a ‘Catalytic Project’.

2. Pacific Yard’s building orientation and building materials are compatible with the neighborhood and the policies stated in the Downtown master plan related to building and site design in the following ways:

- ‘SAFETY AND SECURITY’ “Residential developments should be designed to be safe and secure. Transitions between the public and private realms, orientation to the street and sidewalk, and clear views from inside to out help the pedestrian realm feel safe. Building occupants should be able to see into public and semi-public spaces; and landscaping and lighting should enhance security (Downtown Plan pg. 17)”
  - Pacific Yard draws inspiration from surrounding warehouses and buildings to inform architecture on the ground level and above in the new
project to create continuity, but also differing architectural elements to create visual interest.

- Pacific yard is designed to be safe and secure by using the safety and security elements found in transitions between the public and private realms, orientation to the street and sidewalk, and clear views from inside to out to help the pedestrian realm feel safe. Building occupants are able to see into public and semi-public spaces and landscaping and lighting enhances security by creating a well manicured safe place both night and day.

- ‘RELATIONSHIP TO STREET’ “ground floor active uses or ground floor residential units with noticeable feature changes above the ground floor are encouraged this introduces vertical expression into the street base, with many doors on the street and privacy and security for bedrooms and balconies on the second floor and above. (Downtown Plan pg. 17)”

  - Pacific Yard follows this by creating active uses on the ground floor which create a strong base with noticeable feature changes above the ground floor, including massing and color changes, to introduce vertical expressions, with many doors on the street and privacy and security for bedrooms and balconies on the 2nd floor and above, including a rooftop deck on the top floor at the major corner to add varied height and interest and outdoor gathering space above the ground floor.

3. Building setbacks:

   a. Maintain the visual character of the neighborhood or the character described in the applicable Master Plan: Pacific Yard maintains the visual character of the neighborhood by requesting no setbacks and no landscape buffer, which is what is currently found in the neighborhood as seen in the below diagram:
b. Pacific Yard provides sufficient space for private amenities

c. Pacific Yard is set back 10 feet from adjacent property lines to minimize impacts related to privacy and noise and also to meet building code to allow proper glazing along those property lines to bring in more natural light into those residential units

d. Pacific yard provides adequate sightlines to streets, driveways and sidewalks.

e. Pacific yard provides sufficient space for maintenance. We have designed this space to be located in the parking podium so it can't be seen from the street.

D) Landscaping

1. There are no mature trees located on the periphery of the property.

2. There is no existing buffer landscaping.

3. The proposed landscaping is in response to the design of Pacific Yard and its intention to mimic existing setback in the neighborhood and achieve Master Plan goals. We are asking for reduced setbacks which limits landscaping and landscaping buffers, but in return, provide an engaging street presence and transparent and active ground floor to keep with the stabilized neighborhood pattern of no setbacks, while achieving the Downtown Master Plan goals of ‘Safety and Security’ and ‘Relationship to Street’ as noted above. In addition, housing and commercial to support a 24/7 atmosphere and support downtown.

4. The landscaping that we are incorporating into Pacific Yard, including a roof top deck, and planters along the ground floor is appropriate for this urban, mixed-use location.
E) Mobility

1. Pacific Yard is designed to provide a safe and accommodating pedestrian environment and pedestrian oriented design through activating the ground floor with well-designed and pedestrian scaled commercial and habitable space which brings more services to the neighborhood and reduces car trips.

2. The site design and architecture of Pacific Yard is done in such a way to promote access to adjacent uses and encourage walkability through the design and programming of a vibrant streetscape.

F) Existing Site Features

1. N/A to Pacific Yard

G) Utilities

1. We will ensure existing and/or planned utilities will adequately serve the development and not have a detrimental effect on the surrounding area. We have completed a DRT and have incorporated those comments and other comments set by Laura into this design to be compatible with city comments up to this point.

Elevations, renderings, preliminary plans and context images are included for review.
Kindest regards,

James Alfandre
Founding Principal
Urban Alfandre, LLC
650 South 500 West #188
Salt Lake City, UT 84103
January 6, 2022

RE: Design Review Application for Pacific Yard

To Whom It May Concern:

We are pleased to submit this Design Review application for the Pacific Yard.

Project Description:

The Design Review request is for Pacific Yard – a mixed-use redevelopment project at the corner of 700 South and 400 West in the heart of the Granary District. Pacific Yard consists of efficient studios, one and two-bedroom residential units and 4,000 square feet of ground floor commercial space.

The Granary District is a neighborhood that grew up around the railroad and manufacturing and is now a hub for entrepreneurship, art, and food and beverage start-ups.

Pacific Yard creates a new project that is compatible with the existing neighborhood patterns of large warehouse buildings and large parcels, while adding human-scaled design elements to enhance the public realm and pedestrian experience. In order to achieve this, we are asking for a reduction in setbacks and the landscape buffer to keep with the stabilized neighborhood pattern, and to achieve the Downtown Plan goals and objectives.

James Alfandre, a principal at Urban Alfandre, part of the applicant group, has a deep history in the Granary District neighborhood. He spearheaded Granary Row, a pop-up shipping container installation on the same block as Pacific Yard from 2011-2012 and has been heavily involved in this neighborhood as an advocate to keep and preserve its warehouse aesthetic and architecture of this part of town. The Granary District only wants to become a thriving
version of what it already is, and the addition of Pacific Yard helps in this effort.

Building Materials: Pacific Yard is Type IIIA construction and the primary exterior construction materials are:

- Brick
- Glass
- Storefront glass
- Metal Panel

Pacific Yard consists of 292 residential units and 6,060 square feet of ground floor retail space. The residential units average 576 square feet and consist of one-bedroom with two-bedroom units. The overall unit density is 225 units per acre.
We intend to meet the design standards listed in 21A.59.050 as described below:

The standards in this section apply to all applications for design review as follows:

A. **Any new development shall comply with the intent of the purpose statement of the zoning district and specific design regulations found within the zoning district in which Pacific Yard is located as well as the City's adopted "urban design element" and adopted master plan policies and design guidelines governing the specific area of the proposed development.**

   a. The purpose of the CG General Commercial District is to provide an environment for a variety of commercial uses, some of which involve the outdoor display/storage of merchandise or materials. This district provides economic development opportunities through a mix of land uses, including retail sales and services, entertainment, office, residential, heavy commercial and low intensities of manufacturing and warehouse uses. This district is appropriate in locations where supported by applicable master plans and along major arterials. Safe, convenient and inviting connections that provide access to businesses from public sidewalks, bike paths and streets are necessary. Access should follow a hierarchy that places the pedestrian first, bicycle second and automobile third. The standards are intended to create a safe and aesthetically pleasing commercial environment for all users.

   b. This project implements the following catalytic projects that have been identified in the Downtown master plan:
      1. “Adding greater depth and choice of the retail, visitor, cultural, and residential offering.”
         a. Pacific Yard will provide 4,000 square feet of brand new neighborhood commercial and retail space and will add 292 new
housing units to this part of the Granary District, which currently has little to no housing options.

2. “Creating a clear mid-block pedestrian system that breaks up the large blocks.”
   a. Pacific Yard incorporates a well-designed mid-block walkway along its western property line.

3. “Celebrating the assets of each district.”
   a. Pacific Yard celebrates the over-scaled, warehouse aesthetic of the Granary by incorporating architectural and proportion design elements such as:
      i. Architectural features on the ground level that are found in existing warehouse buildings in the neighborhood
      ii. Large massings with large windows with nice reveals and mullions and durable brick material
      iii. Minimizing façade lengths visually through design and color changes in brick, windows and balconies

4. “Growing the downtown population, supporting an active place 24/7.”
   a. Pacific Yard adds much needed housing to the Granary District in a mixed-use application that also promotes activity 24/7.

5. “Creating a pleasing and welcoming public realm.”
   a. Pacific Yard turns an abandoned single-use commercial building into a well-designed, mixed-use building that activates the street and creates a pleasing and welcoming public realm through attractive building materials, design features like large warehouse-like windows and brick detailing and fenestrations which create visual interest for the pedestrian while creating transparent, active ground floor uses to engage the pedestrian, while adding much needed services to the neighborhood to allow more walkability and reduce car trips.
   b. In return for reducing setbacks and landscape buffers, Pacific Yard provides a better product than would be allowed by the current code, through adding ground floor active commercial uses and creating a vibrant, pedestrian-oriented experience that follows the established neighborhood development patterns for setbacks and landscape buffers. Pacific Yard also implements the Downtown master plan by “…active ground floor uses should be prioritized over parking uses. Structured parking should be designed to accommodate, where feasible, street-level businesses and other active uses.”
c. Pacific Yard follows the recommendation of Salt Lake City’s Urban Design Guidelines by creating “a strong street wall [which] helps facilitate pedestrian circulation as well as provide a sense of space and scale unique to” the Granary District’s large, over-scaled feel…” and can be accomplished by “buildings abutting front and side property lines”

B. Development shall be primarily oriented to the sidewalk, not an interior courtyard or parking lot.

a. Primary entrances shall face the public sidewalk.
   i. Pacific Yard’s architecture has been developed to emphasize the ground floor as the focal point with most entrances, including all of the 4,000 square feet of retail, facing the public sidewalk.

b. Building(s) shall be sited close to the public sidewalk, following and responding to the desired development patterns of the neighborhood.
   i. Pacific Yard seeks to reduce setbacks to keep with the stabilized neighborhood patterns, especially along 400 West which will create a cohesive urban wall and public realm “… further linking the Granary to the rest of downtown.”
c. **Parking shall be located within, behind, or to the side of buildings.**
   i. All parking for Pacific Yard is located behind or underneath the building and not within public street view.

C. **Building facades shall include detailing and glass in sufficient quantities to facilitate pedestrian interest and interaction.**
   a. **Locate active ground floor uses at or near the public sidewalk.**
      i. The retail space, lobby and co-working all front the public sidewalk to create an active, vibrant atmosphere.

   b. **Maximize transparency of ground floor facades.**
      i. All ground floor facades are easily viewed and accessible.

   c. **Use or reinterpret traditional storefront elements like sign bands, clerestory glazing, articulation, and architectural detail at window transitions.**
      i. Pacific Yard uses the following architectural elements to reinterpret traditional storefront elements:
d. **Locate outdoor dining patios, courtyards, plazas, habitable landscaped yards, and open spaces so that they have a direct visual connection to the street and outdoor spaces.**

   i. The rooftop deck and dining patio are located at the main public street intersection at 400 West and 700 South, creating a strong visual connection to the street and outdoor spaces.

D. **Large building masses shall be divided into heights and sizes that relate to human scale.**

   a. **Relate building scale and massing to the size and scale of existing and anticipated buildings, such as alignments with established cornice heights, building massing, stepbacks and vertical emphasis.**

   i. The scale of the building is related to the zoning in the neighborhood. All of the adjacent properties are the same zone with a height of 90’ and the Downtown master plan calls for “tall buildings on the corners with shorter buildings around them is an historical pattern designed to emphasize nodes formed at the intersections of main streets – west and south of the CBD is encouraged to be six to twelve stories.” With all the development that is coming to the neighborhood, the scale of this building will not be incompatible with its surroundings and achieves master plan goals of increasing height on prominent corners intersections.

   The scale of this building, with reduced setbacks, and a reduced landscape buffer, is more compatible with existing development patterns in the neighborhood than if this building was built per the existing code. In addition, for reduced setbacks and landscape buffer, a more active and enhanced urban wall will be added to the public realm creating a more engaging and vibrant pedestrian experience while bringing more
amenities and services within walking distance for residents of the Granary District.

As shown in the above rendering, even though we are requesting a reduced landscape buffer, Pacific Yard will still have a robust landscape buffer on the street side, helping to create a nice buffer and scale, while reducing the heat island effect and creating a strong street wall, which is called out as an important feature in Salt Lake City’s Urban Design Guidelines.

The reduced setback request is also compatible with the existing development pattern of the neighborhood as seen below and provides a better design and implementation of city and master plan goals (street wall, keeping with stabilized neighborhood pattern, more active and engaging ground floor), than if built under the current zoning code.
Pacific Yard steps back 1’ from the second floor to reduce the feel of scale and massing for existing and anticipated buildings, as seen below.

Pacific Yard reinterprets the ground floor uses and design of the Evo Building, an adjacent warehouse that has been restored, and uses warehouse inspired proportions found in the neighborhood, such as
window sizes and reveals, fenestrations and building materials, to create an interesting pedestrian experience, including active, transparent space to engage the pedestrian.

Pacific Yard also incorporates a design to make the longest façade along 700 S look like it is multiple buildings to break up the façade to create a better pedestrian scale, public realm and more interesting urban wall. The
westernmost part of the north façade mimics light industrial warehouse buildings found throughout the neighborhood while adding unique design elements of brick detailing to the ground floor to enhance interest and pedestrian pleasantry. Balconies are added and different color brick to create a strong divide of facades to “reduce the visual width.”

b. *Modulate the design of a larger building using a series of vertical or horizontal emphases to equate with the scale (heights and widths) of the buildings in the context and reduce the visual width or height.*
Pacific Yard was designed for the pedestrian experience, with an industrial aesthetic to create a vibrant streetscape while being sensitive to the surrounding architecture. We use larger proportions and windows to create a simple, yet elegant design to minimize the scale of the overall structure. We also broke the building up into two separate facades on the longest façade on 700 S to create a look of multiple buildings to help with pedestrian interest and a more engaging public realm as seen below:
c. **Include secondary elements such as balconies, porches, vertical bays, belt courses, fenestration and window reveals.**
   
i. Pacific Yard incorporates balconies, a roof-top deck, carefully designed window massing and fenestrations, and strong window reveals.

d. **Reflect the scale and solid-to-void ratio of windows and doors of the established character of the neighborhood or that which is desired in the master plan.**
   
i. Solid/void of Pacific Yard, as seen below, reflects the scale of typical scale/void found in the neighborhood.
E. Building facades that exceed a combined contiguous building length of two hundred feet (200') shall include:

a. Changes in vertical plane (breaks in facade);
   i. Pacific Yard has changes in both horizontal and vertical planes as seen below:

b. Material changes; and
   i. The building intergrades variety of materials, including modular brick, architectural metal, concrete banding, and large warehouse windows.

c. Massing changes.
   i. Massing is articulated in both horizontal and vertical elements with the rooftop deck and as seen below:
F. If provided, privately-owned public spaces shall include at least three (3) of the six (6) following elements:

i. Sitting space of at least one sitting space for each two hundred fifty (250) square feet shall be included in the plaza. Seating shall be a minimum of sixteen inches (16") in height and thirty inches (30") in width. Ledge benches shall have a minimum depth of thirty inches (30");

ii. A mixture of areas that provide seasonal shade;

iii. Trees in proportion to the space at a minimum of one tree per eight hundred (800) square feet, at least two inches (2") caliper when planted;

iv. Water features or public art;

v. Outdoor dining areas; and vi. Other amenities not listed above that provide a public benefit.

b. Pacific Yard includes numbers i, ii and iv in the only privately-owned public space in the project, which is the mid-block walkway.

Mid-block walkways: the Pacific yard mid-block walkway achieves the midblock walkway principles found in the downtown masterplan including:
1. Pedestrian Priority - prioritizing pedestrians in the public realm
   a. Pacific Yard creates a welcoming and prioritized pedestrian experience with public art, seating, durable materials, shade and overhead lights.

2. Experience: the pedestrian experience is supported by an environment that is accessible, comfortable, connected, convenient engaging and vibrant.
   a. Pacific Yard’s mid-block walkway achieves this desired experience.

3. Connection: This midblock walkway will connect with the other future midblock walkway network.

Please see midblock walkway sheet in the submitted landscape plans for more renderings.

G. Building height shall be modified to relate to human scale and minimize negative impacts. In downtown and in the CSHBD Sugar House Business District, building height shall contribute to a distinctive City skyline.
   a. Human Scale:
      i. Utilize step backs to design a building that relate to the height and scale of adjacent and nearby buildings, or where identified, goals for future scale defined in adopted master plans.

1. Pacific Yard follows the master plan of the neighborhood and future land use goals of providing a vibrant living environment that supports downtown and a 24/7 environment. It also creates density on a main arterial and street that has been designated as a likely TRAX expansion line to connect the Granary to downtown.
2. Pacific Yard also utilizes stepbacks to relate to scale and to enhance the priority of scale on the ground level as seen below:
ii. For buildings more than three (3) stories or buildings with vertical mixed use, compose the design of a building with distinct base, middle and top sections to reduce the sense of apparent height.

1. Pacific Yard has a distinct base of a reinterpreted warehouse, typically found in the surrounding neighborhood, on the ground floor, a distinct middle of white brick volumes and top varying white brick volumes extending to the top of the building, offset with dark metal top and base. The offset of brick and metal volumes was used to break up the larger scale of the building while still having a distinct base to enhance the pedestrian scale on the street level.

2. Pacific Yard is requesting height over 60’ and to reduce the feel of the extra height, we are modulating the building into distinct but different bases, middles and tops, and removing a story at the corner of the building for a rooftop deck, to create a sense of reduced scale and differentiation to minimize the effect of extra height above 60’ as seen below.
b. **Negative impacts:**
   
   i. **Modulate taller buildings vertically and horizontally so that it steps up or down to its neighbors.**
      
      1. Pacific Yard steps back from neighbors and the street from the second level to enhance the ground floor scale for the pedestrian and to push the upper units back to be more welcoming to our neighboring properties.

   ii. **Minimize shadow impacts of building height on the public realm and semipublic spaces by varying building massing. Demonstrate impact from shadows due to building height for the portions of the building that are subject to the request for additional height.**
      
      1. The shadow studies impact the public street and have little impact on adjacent properties all of which have plans for redevelopment to a much larger scale.

   iii. **Modify tall buildings to minimize wind impacts on public and private spaces, such as the inclusion of a wind break above the first level of the building.**
      
      1. Pacific Yard has designed the building with stepbacks and setbacks and landscaping to minimize wind impacts in public and private spaces.

   c. **Cornices and rooflines:**
      
      i. **Cohesiveness: Shape and define rooflines to be cohesive with the building’s overall form and composition.**

      1. Rooflines are defined to be cohesive with the building’s overall form and composition. A rooftop deck was incorporated into
the design to add an outdoor experience for views and relaxation for residents, which also breaks up the roofline.

ii. Complement Surrounding Buildings: Include roof forms that complement the rooflines of surrounding buildings.
   1. The context of the roof massing complements surrounding buildings and adds a rooftop courtyard to provide interest and activation to the street.

![Existing warehouse façade and roofline inspiration](image)

iii. Green Roof And Roof Deck: Include a green roof and/or accessible roof deck to support a more visually compelling roof landscape and reduce solar gain, air pollution, and the amount of water entering the storm water system.
   1. Pacific Yard includes a rooftop deck that supports a more visually compelling roof landscape.
H. *Parking and on site circulation shall be provided with an emphasis on making safe pedestrian connections to the sidewalk, transit facilities, or midblock walkway*
   i. The parking entrance is removed from the corner and pedestrian activation to create a safer and better connection to the sidewalk.

I. *Waste and recycling containers, mechanical equipment, storage areas, and loading docks shall be fully screened from public view and shall incorporate building materials and detailing compatible with the building being served. Service uses shall be set back from the front line of building or located within the structure. (See subsection 21A.37.050K of this title.)*
   i. All of the above-mentioned equipment is screened from public view.

J. *Signage shall emphasize the pedestrian/mass transit orientation.*
   a. *Define specific spaces for signage that are integral to building design, such as commercial sign bands framed by a material change, columns for blade signs, or other clearly articulated band on the face of the building.*
      i. Design will comply with this standard by incorporating pedestrian-focused signage for the ground floor commercial and lobby entrances

   b. *Coordinate signage locations with appropriate lighting, awnings, and other projections.*
      i. This is accounted for in the overall design and strategy of Pacific Yard to create an enhanced pedestrian experience with vibrant street activation.
K. Lighting shall support pedestrian comfort and safety, neighborhood image, and dark sky goals.
   a. Provide streetlights as indicated in the Salt Lake City Lighting Master Plan
      i. Streetlights will be provided according to the lighting Master Plan.

   b. Outdoor lighting should be designed for low-level illumination and to minimize glare and light trespass onto adjacent properties and up lighting directly to the sky.
      i. The outdoor lighting design will meet these requirements as noted above and will be designed accordingly by our electrical engineer once we move into the design development process.

   c. Coordinate lighting with architecture, signage, and pedestrian circulation to accentuate significant building features, improve sign legibility, and support pedestrian comfort and safety.
      i. Lighting will be emphasized at the building entrances, but otherwise will be low level compatible with residential living requirements.

L. Streetscape improvements shall be provided as follows:
   a. One street tree chosen from the street tree list consistent with the City’s urban forestry guidelines and with the approval of the City’s Urban Forester shall be placed for each thirty feet (30’) of property frontage on a street. Existing street trees removed as the result of a development project shall be replaced by the developer with trees approved by the City’s Urban Forester.
      i. Pacific Yard incorporates two of the largest trees with more spreading canopies from the SLC Urban Forestry List to comply with this standard and help reduce the sense of scale from the large building we are proposing to the wide streets to create a better scale for the pedestrian as seen below:
b. **Hardscape (paving material) shall be utilized to differentiate privately-owned public spaces from public spaces.** Hardscape for public sidewalks shall follow applicable design standards. Permitted materials for privately-owned public spaces shall meet the following standards:

i. *Use materials that are durable (withstand wear, pressure, damage), require a minimum of maintenance, and are easily repairable or replaceable should damage or defacement occur.*

ii. *Where practical, as in lower-traffic areas, use materials that allow rainwater to infiltrate into the ground and recharge the water table.*

iii. *Limit contribution to urban heat island effect by limiting use of dark materials and incorporating materials with a high Solar- Reflective Index (SRI).*

iv. *Utilize materials and designs that have an identifiable relationship to the character of the site, the neighborhood, or Salt Lake City.*

v. *Use materials (like textured ground surfaces) and features (like ramps and seating at key resting points) to support access and comfort for people of all abilities.*

vi. *Asphalt shall be limited to vehicle drive aisles. (Ord. 14-19, 2019)*

Pacific Yard achieves these standards in the mid-block walkway design. More details can be found in the mid-block walkway section of the submitted landscape plans.
Kindest regards,

James Alfandre
Founding Principal
Urban Alfandre, LLC
650 South 500 West #188
Salt Lake City, UT 84103
ATTACHMENT D: Property & Vicinity Photographs

View of existing site from 700 South looking south. Note: existing power lines to remain.

Existing National Register Warehouse District contributing warehouse across the street from the Pacific Yard proposal.
View of existing site and adjacent parcel from 400 West looking west.
ATTACHMENT F: Analysis of Standards – General Commercial Zoning District
# General Commercial Zoning District Standards (21A.26.070)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lot Area</strong></td>
<td>10,000 square feet minimum</td>
<td>54,432 square feet</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lot Width</strong></td>
<td>60 feet minimum</td>
<td>330 feet wide</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Front/ Rear/ Corner Side Yard</strong></td>
<td>10 feet</td>
<td>0 feet</td>
<td>Does not comply, modification requested. See Consideration 3: Request for 10’ Yard Setback and Landscape Yard Relief.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interior Side Yard</strong></td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>16-foot midblock walkway</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maximum Height</strong></td>
<td>60 feet. Additional height limited to 30 feet when approved through the Design Review process.</td>
<td>87 feet 10 inches (91 feet 4 inches at stairwell tower, height exception permitted per 21A.36.020C)</td>
<td>Does not comply, modification requested. See Consideration 2: Request for Additional Height.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape Yard - Front</strong></td>
<td>10 feet</td>
<td>0 feet</td>
<td>Does not comply, modification requested. See Consideration 3: Request for 10’ Yard Setback and Landscape Yard Relief.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscape Yard - Corner</strong></td>
<td>10 feet</td>
<td>0 feet</td>
<td>Does not comply, modification requested. See Consideration 3: Request for 10’ Yard Setback and Landscape Yard Relief.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Landscaping - Other</strong></td>
<td>7700 square feet additional landscaping required. In the CG zone, increased landscaping shall be provided equal to ten percent (10%) of</td>
<td>0 feet</td>
<td>Does not comply, modification requested. See Consideration 4:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*See Consideration 3: Request for 10’ Yard Setback and Landscape Yard Relief.*
the area of the additional floors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Design Standard (21A.37)</strong> requirements in the CG zone</th>
<th>D. Building entrances (at least 1 per street facing façade)</th>
<th>D. Both street facing façades on the building include two entrances.</th>
<th>Complies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Parking lot lighting must be shielded from adjacent residential properties.</td>
<td>I. Parking lot is interior to building. There are no adjacent residential properties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The below include general zoning standards. Not all applicable standards are listed here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Off-Street Parking Spaces Required (21A.44.030)</td>
<td>Minimum – 0.5 spaces/studio, one space per 1-bedroom and two spaces per 2-bedroom unit (233 spaces). Retail goods establishment – 2 spaces per 1000 sq. feet usable floor area (12 spaces) 245 stalls total required</td>
<td>202 total off-street stalls provided in parking structure Applicant has provided off-street parking reductions and Transportation Demand Management strategies to decrease parking minimums.</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Street Parking (21A.44.040.B.6)</td>
<td>On street parking in CG zone is allowed to satisfy some of the off-street parking required, when provided on street frontage adjacent to use. 25 on street parking spaces present along 700 South façade.</td>
<td>227 total parking stalls provided (202 in structure + 25 on-street)</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Transportation Demand Management Standards (21A.44.050) | B2. Electric vehicle parking - 1 stall per 25 vehicles | B3. Bicycle parking - 5% of total parking provided | • 8 electric vehicle stalls provided  
• 10 bike racks provided, 11 are required. These are located on the ground floor at the west end of the 700 South facade, with a separate entrance. | Complies |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Transportation Demand Management Parking Incentives | The min. number of off-street parking spaces ... can be reduced to 75% of the min. requirement ... provided the applicant fulfills at least:  
• two (2) of the minor transportation demand management strategies. | 185 stalls total required when 2 minor TDM strategies are met.  
Minor TDM Strategies fulfilled:  
(1) Permanently sheltered, covered or secure facilities for required bicycle parking.  
(2) More information needed. | Complies.  
Currently the proposal shows only 1 minor TDM strategy, a second strategy will need to be included and verified during building permitting. | |
| Mechanical Equipment | Must be on roof or in rear yard/must be screened | Located in the interior of the development, screened by solid walls. | Complies |
**ATTACHMENT G: Analysis of Standards – Planned Development**

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Finding</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The planned development shall meet the purpose statement for a planned development (section 21A.55.010) 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    | Development proposals are required to meet at least one of six possible objectives to qualify for the Planned Development review process. The applicant has noted in their narrative that they believe their development meets objectives C and F. Those objectives are copied below along with “strategies that are intended to be used to determine if an objective has been accomplished” as noted in the ordinance: **C. Housing: Providing...types of housing that helps achieve the City's housing goals and policies:**

2. The proposal includes housing types that are not commonly found in the existing neighborhood but are of a scale that is typical to the neighborhood.

**F. Master Plan Implementation: A project that helps implement portions of an adopted Master Plan in instances where the Master Plan provides specific guidance on the character of the immediate vicinity of the proposal:**

1. A project that is consistent with the guidance of the Master Plan related to building scale, building orientation, site layout, or other similar character defining features.

Item C.2: the proposal does help achieve the City’s housing supply goals by providing a housing type that isn’t generally supplied in the neighborhood, although the scale is not typical of the neighborhood. The scale is reflective of...
what is desired in the Downtown Plan and other recently approved development in the Granary.

Item F: As discussed in Attachment E: Master Plan Policies, the Downtown Plan calls for mid-rise development in the Granary, and the building design is generally responsive to the character of the neighborhood.

Regarding the modifications resulting in a more enhanced product, the applicant’s requested setback modifications proposed to locate commercial areas adjacent to the sidewalk. By incorporating transparency and visual interest into the street facades, the proposed modification will result in a more enhanced product than would strict application of CG zoning regulations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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.</th>
<th>Complies</th>
<th>As noted in Growing SLC and Plan Salt Lake, the proposed development aligns with policies related to compatible in-fill development and housing. Additionally, the proposal is consistent with many of the initiatives in the Downtown Plan, which calls for mid-rise development in the Granary, and building design that is compatible with the character of the neighborhood. For details, see Attachment E: Master Plan Policies.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. Design and Compatibility: The proposed planned development is compatible with the area the planned development will be located and is designed to achieve a more enhanced product than would be achievable through strict application of land use regulations. In determining design and compatibility, the Planning Commission should consider:</td>
<td>Complies</td>
<td>The proposed development is generally compatible with the area. The existing height of the area and the proposed height of the structure are starkly different. The proposal includes a building that is 88 feet tall. The Granary typically includes building between 14 and 30 feet in height. While this building will be significantly taller than the existing context, the applicant and the City acknowledge that additional development is likely to occur, and when compliant with the standards of the design review process, 90’ buildings are permissible in the CG zone. The proposal provides a more enhanced product than would be achieved through strict application of the land use regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Whether the scale, mass, and intensity of the proposed planned development is</td>
<td>Complies</td>
<td>The scale, mass and intensity of the building is generally compatible with the Granary. The proposed height of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Whether the building orientation and building materials in the proposed planned development are compatible with the neighborhood where the planned development will be located and/or the policies stated in an applicable Master Plan related to building and site design;</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| C3   | Whether building setbacks along the perimeter of the development:  
C.3.a. Maintain the visual character of the neighborhood, or the character described in the applicable master plan.  
C.3.b. Provide sufficient space for private amenities.  
C.3.c. Provide sufficient open space buffering between the proposed development and neighboring properties to minimize impacts related to privacy and noise.  
C.3.d. Provide adequate sight lines to streets, driveways, and sidewalks.  
C.3.e. Provide sufficient space for maintenance. | Complies | C.3.a. The proposal maintains the visual character of the neighborhood as it is in an area of the Granary with no or small building setbacks interspersed with surface parking lots.  
C.3b. The development provides a range of outdoor and indoor amenities in the building interior and via a mid-block walkway that will be open to the public.  
C.3c. The development is buffered on the west by a 16’ wide alley, and its north and east boundaries front the public ROW. There is no buffer on the south, where a 25’ tall blank wall with a 10’ step back is proposed on the property boundary. The buildings to the south are approximately 5 feet south of the property line and have blank walls fronting the proposal. Impacts related to privacy and noise appear negligible.  
C.3d. Transportation and Engineering did not offer any concerns about the provided sight lines.  
C.3e. The development has placed electrical meters along the midblock walkway, and a transformer on the 400 |
### C4
- **Question:** Whether building facades offer ground floor transparency, access, and architectural detailing to facilitate pedestrian interest and interaction;
- **Decision:** Complies
- **Reason:** Although there are no ground floor transparency or detailing requirements for this zone, the building goes above and beyond by including multiple entrances and high level of ground floor glass. Further, the building includes various architectural details to facilitate pedestrian interest and interaction, including multiple material and color changes, façade articulation, art, architectural detailing on windows, balconies, and awnings.

### C5
- **Question:** Whether lighting is designed for safety and visual interest while minimizing impacts on surrounding property;
- **Decision:** Complies, with a condition.
- **Reason:** Some uplighting is shown on the midblock walkway, and details to demonstrate the lighting impacts and safety of the proposal have not been provided.

**Condition:** Final approval of the details for development and site lighting, street lighting, and mid-block walkway lighting shall be delegated to Planning Staff to ensure compliance with the standards for Design Review as well as the Downtown Community Plan.

### C6
- **Question:** Whether dumpsters, loading docks and/or service areas are appropriately screened; and
- **Decision:** Complies
- **Reason:** The development includes trash areas in the parking garage that are screened with a solid wall. Loading areas are in the building interior.

### C7
- **Question:** Whether parking areas are appropriately buffered from adjacent uses.
- **Decision:** Complies
- **Reason:** Parking is accessed through a single entrance of the west of the site and all stalls are internal.

### D. Landscaping
- **Proposed Development:** 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:
- **Decision:** Complies, with a condition.
- **Reason:** Staff is recommending that the Planning Commission impose the following condition: Final approval a tree form with a spreading canopy in the park strip, that will also meet the needs of the Urban Forestry Division and relevant utility companies to be delegated to Planning Staff.

### D1
- **Question:** Whether mature native trees located along the periphery of the property and along the street are preserved and maintained;
- **Decision:** Not applicable
- **Reason:** There are no trees on the property or on the street.

### D2
- **Question:** Whether existing landscaping that provides additional buffering to the abutting
- **Decision:** Not applicable
- **Reason:** There is no existing landscaping beyond a few volunteer shrubs, and these do not provide a buffer.
| D3  | Whether proposed landscaping is designed to lessen potential impacts created by the proposed planned development; and | Complies, with a condition. | The proposed park strip landscape is limited in its ability to lessen impacts of the 700 South façade. The power lines will remain in place, creating challenges to grow and maintain appropriately scaled trees that might otherwise provide a human-scale sense of enclosure over the public sidewalk.

As a condition of approval, staff proposes to work with the applicant to find a tree form with a canopy that can mediate between the 90-foot building and the right of way to introduce human-scale spaces on the sidewalk, that will also meet the needs of the Urban Forestry Division and relevant utility companies.

See additional discussion under Consideration 3: Landscape Yard and Additional Landscaping Modification. |
| D4  | Whether proposed landscaping is appropriate for the scale of the development. | Complies, with a condition. | The proposed park strip landscape is limited in its ability to provide an appropriate scale along the 320 foot long, 88 feet tall façade along 700 South. The overhead power lines will remain in place, creating challenges to grow and maintain appropriately scaled trees that might otherwise provide a human-scale sense of enclosure over the public sidewalk. Section drawings show columnar trees, while renderings show pyramidal forms, neither of which is appropriately scaled.

As a condition of approval, staff proposes to work with the applicant to find a tree form to mediate between the 90-foot building and the right of way to introduce human-scale spaces on the sidewalk, that will also meet the needs of the Urban Forestry Division and relevant utility companies.

See additional discussion under Consideration 3: Landscape Yard and Additional Landscaping Modification. |
| E. Mobility: The proposed planned development supports Citywide transportation goals and promotes safe and efficient circulation within the site | Complies | The proposal includes direct connections to the sidewalk and implements design |
and surrounding neighborhood. In determining mobility, the Planning Commission should consider:

| E1 | Whether drive access to local streets will negatively impact the safety, purpose, and character of the street; | Complies | Transportation expressed no concerns about drive access. |
| E2 | Whether the site design considers safe circulation for a range of transportation options including: Safe and accommodating pedestrian environment and pedestrian oriented design; Bicycle facilities and connections where appropriate, and orientation to transit where available; and Minimizing conflicts between different transportation modes; | Complies | The site is designed so that there is direct pedestrian access to the sidewalk. A north-south running mid-block walkway is provided along the west property boundary that will eventually connect with an east-west running walkway described in the Downtown Plan. Residents can store bicycles in a dedicated bicycle storage area or in their units. Conflicts were evaluated between pedestrians and cars regarding sight lines and city required “sight distance triangles” where driveways intersect with sidewalks. There is adequate visibility between transportation modes. |
| E3 | Whether the site design of the proposed development promotes or enables access to adjacent uses and amenities; | Complies | The layout of the development includes direct access to the public sidewalk to access nearby adjacent uses and amenities. |
| E4 | Whether the proposed design provides adequate emergency vehicle access; and | Complies | The building is directly adjacent to a public street, which allows for direct emergency access. |
| E5 | 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 access is provided within the parking structure and meets the off-street requirements in 21A.44.070. |

**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 | The proposal does not include the preservation of an existing building. The building is compatible with the historically significant NR warehouse district and borrows from its architectural style and character. |

**G. Utilities:** Existing and/or planned utilities will adequately serve the development and not have a detrimental effect on the surrounding area.

| Complies | Public utility connections will be fully evaluated during the building permits review phase of the development, and upgrades, if necessary, will be required by that department to serve the property so that there will not be any detrimental impact on other property utility services. The electrical meters are proposed to be |
located on the property facing the midblock walkway. As the midblock walkway is private property (with a public easement) it is allowed in this location. The proposal includes a single-phase transformer on south end of the 400 West façade. To reduce the visual impact of the equipment, it will be screened by a material compatible with the building façade, in accordance with 21A.40.160.

There were concerns from the Department of Public Utilities that the reduced setback may limit the ability to adequately provide private utility connections and that the number of units may require offsite improvements to water and sewer lines, and/or storm drains. The applicant will need to address all utility requirements during the building permit issuance.
### ATTACHMENT H: Analysis of Standards – Design Review

**21A.59.060: Standards for Design Review:** In addition to standards provided in other sections of this title for specific types of approval, the following standards shall be applied to all applications for design review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Finding</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Any new development shall comply with the intent of the purpose</td>
<td>Complies</td>
<td>The purpose of the CG General Commercial District is to provide an environment for a variety of commercial uses, some of which involve the outdoor display/storage of merchandise or materials. This district provides economic development opportunities through a mix of land uses, including retail sales and services, entertainment, office, residential, heavy commercial and low intensities of manufacturing and warehouse uses. This district is appropriate in locations where supported by applicable master plans and along major arterials. Safe, convenient, and inviting connections that provide access to businesses from public sidewalks, bike paths and streets are necessary. Access should follow a hierarchy that places the pedestrian first, bicycle second and automobile third. The standards are intended to create a safe and aesthetically pleasing commercial environment for all users. The proposal is consistent with most aspects of the purpose of the zoning district. It provides a new residential development with a 6000 square foot retail component on the first floor. The project meets 7 of the Downtown Plan’s 48 goals. The project is located within the Granary and includes a rooftop patio in accordance with the Downtown Community Plan. The project also proposes to create adequate curb, gutter, park strip and sidewalk on 3% of the 400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
West corridor identified as having very poor to marginal pavement conditions (Downtown Plan, p. 123). Additional elements related to compliance with adopted master plan policies are described in Attachment E.

### B. Development shall be primarily oriented to the sidewalk, not an interior courtyard or parking lot.

1. Primary entrances shall face the public sidewalk (secondary entrances can face a parking lot).
2. Building(s) shall be sited close to the public sidewalk, following and responding to the desired development patterns of the neighborhood.
3. Parking shall be located within, behind, or to the side of buildings.

Complies

- B.1. Primary entrances to the building are located on the ground floor facing the public sidewalk.
- B.2. The building is sited adjacent to the sidewalk.
- B.3. Parking is located within the building.

### C. Building facades shall include detailing and glass in sufficient quantities to facilitate pedestrian interest and interaction.

1. Locate active ground floor uses at or near the public sidewalk.
2. Maximize transparency of ground floor facades.
3. Use or reinterpret traditional storefront elements like sign bands, clerestory glazing, articulation, and architectural detail at window transitions.
4. Locate outdoor dining patios, courtyards, plazas, habitable landscaped yards, and open spaces so that they have a direct visual connection to the street and outdoor spaces.

Complies

- C.1. Active uses include a retail area, restaurant, amenity area, and leasing office located on the ground floor adjacent to the public sidewalk. A projecting brickwork pattern and public art located along the mid-block walkway enlivens the façade of the parking structure.
- C.2. The proposed project includes large commercial windows on the 400 West façade and on two-thirds of the 700 South façade.
- C.3. The street façade includes sign bands and clerestory windows, articulated by framed bays.
- C.4. Ground floor outdoor dining is located at the northeast corner of the building. A roof deck on the seventh floor provides city views to the north and east.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. Large building masses shall be divided into heights and sizes that relate to human scale.</th>
<th>Complies with a condition.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Relate building scale and massing to the size and scale of existing and anticipated buildings, such as alignments with established cornice heights, building massing, step-backs, and vertical emphasis.</td>
<td>D.1. The surrounding existing buildings are between one and two stories, and the anticipated height in the CG zone is 5-stories (60 feet) by-right, or 7-stories (90-feet) with Design Review. On the 700 South and 400 West façades, the base of the 6th floor balconies roughly aligns with the anticipated height of 60 feet. The second story banding along the midblock walkway façade relates to the existing building to the south. Vertical emphasis created by building articulation and color and material changes divides the building into thirds. A step-back is present on the south façade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Modulate the design of a larger building using a series of vertical or horizontal emphases to equate with the scale (heights and widths) of the buildings in the context and reduce the visual width or height.</td>
<td>D.2. The width of the building is reduced through vertical emphasis and color and material changes, as well as articulation intended to make the 330-foot-wide building appear like two adjoining buildings. Material changes from metalwork on brick to brick run east to west. There are other long warehouse buildings in the context, but none above two stories. The design is less successful in relating building height to human scale. In the absence of the applicant applying step backs to this project, an awning that provides a greater sense of enclosure paired with an appropriate tree form and scale may improve the relationship of building height to human scale. Staff is recommending a condition of deeper awnings along the 700 S and 400 W elevations, subject to an encroachment agreement approved by all required City divisions and departments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Include secondary elements such as balconies, porches, vertical bays, belt courses, fenestration and window reveals.</td>
<td>D.3. The building includes secondary elements on all street facing facades, and above the 3rd story on the rear (south) face. Window reveals above the second story help reduce the massing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reflect the scale and solid-to-void ratio of windows and doors of the established character of the neighborhood or that which is desired in the master plan.</td>
<td>D.4. The building includes ground floor transparency and adapts the solid-to-void ratio of surrounding warehouses to a residential mixed-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### E. Building facades that exceed a combined contiguous building length of two hundred feet (200’) shall include:

1. Changes in vertical plane (breaks in façade);
2. Material changes; and
3. Massing changes.

#### Complies

The 700 South building façade is 320’ long:

1. On the 700 South façade the ground floor has two breaks in vertical plane, which are intended to provide the appearance of two buildings – the eastern portion is 212 feet wide, and the western portion is 108’ long. The upper floors have 3 breaks in the façade.
2. Brick, stucco, and metal change along the façade.
3. Massing changes are suggested through building articulation and changes in color and material.

### F. If provided, privately-owned public spaces shall include at least three (3) of the six (6) following elements:

1. Sitting space of at least one sitting space for each two hundred fifty (250) square feet shall be included in the plaza. Seating shall be a minimum of sixteen inches (16”) in height and thirty inches (30”) in width. Ledge benches shall have a minimum depth of thirty inches (30”).
2. A mixture of areas that provide seasonal shade.
3. Trees in proportion to the space at a minimum of one tree per eight hundred (800) square feet, at least two-inch (2”) caliper when planted;
4. Water features or public art;
5. Outdoor dining areas; and
6. Other amenities not listed above that provide a public benefit.

#### Complies, with a condition.

The provided mid-block walkway is a privately owned, public space. These elements are included:

F.1. Sitting space is provided.
F.4. Public art will be featured along the walkway. The proposal includes an interactive 15’ x 9’ chalk board at the northern portion of the walkway, and five 8’ x8’ panels with artwork along the rest of the western façade.
F.6. The proposal includes overhead lights over the walkway.

The midblock walkway proposal was added to the plan set after the first submission, and still requires concept refinement and design details.

Staff requests that final approval of the details for public art, mid-block walkway lighting, furniture, midblock walkway paving, and landscaping to be delegated to Planning Staff to ensure compliance with the standards for Design Review as well as the Downtown Community Plan.
G. Building height shall be modified to relate to human scale and minimize negative impacts.

1. Human scale:

   a) Utilize step backs to design a building that relate to the height and scale of adjacent and nearby buildings, or where identified, goals for future scale defined in adopted master plans.

   b) For buildings more than three stories or buildings with vertical mixed use, compose the design of a building with distinct base, middle and top sections to reduce the sense of apparent height.

Complies, with a condition.

1.a. Although the building has a 10’ step back at the second story on the rear façade, this does not adequately relate to human scale and modify negative impacts. The step back is not visible or perceptible from the 700 South façade, which is nearly ½ block long. In addition, it is not sufficiently perceptible to pedestrians walking along the 400 West façade as human scale is experienced as one moves parallel to the building, not perpendicular to it. Staff asked the applicant to consider adding step backs to the street facing facades above the second story to better comply with the intent of this standard and to address concerns raised by Community Council members.

   Note that because the CG zone height is 60’ by-right, any requirement for a step back would need to begin at 60 vertical feet from the sidewalk, which would not improve the buildings relationship to human scale. The incorporation of step backs at the second story would provide human scale.

   In the absence of this, a condition of approval to provide a 4’ awning that provides a greater sense of enclosure paired with an appropriate tree form and scale may improve the relationship of building height to human scale. See Consideration 2: Request for Additional Height, above for further discussion.

   1.b. The storefront windows and patterned bricks create a base, the middle is created color changes in the brick and fenestration, and the top is created via both color and material changes.

2a. The building incorporates modulation through articulation and material changes, but section drawings do not demonstrate
2. **Negative impacts:**

   a) Modulate taller buildings vertically and horizontally so that it steps up or down to its neighbors.

   b) Minimize shadow impacts of building height on the public realm and semi-public spaces by varying building massing. Demonstrate impact from shadows due to building height for the portions of the building that are subject to the request for additional height.

   c) Modify tall buildings to minimize wind impacts on public and private spaces, such as the inclusion of a wind break above the first level of the building.

3. **Cornices and rooflines:**

   a) Cohesiveness: Shape and define rooflines to be cohesive with the building’s overall form and composition.

   b) Complement surrounding buildings: Include roof forms that complement the rooflines of surrounding buildings.

   c) Green roof and roof deck: Include a green roof and/or accessible roof deck to support a more visually compelling roof landscape and reduce solar gain, air pollution, and the amount of water entering the stormwater system.

---

**H. Parking and on-site circulation**

shall be provided with an emphasis on making safe pedestrian connections to the sidewalk, transit facilities, or midblock walkway.

**Complies**

Primary entrances are located on the sidewalk. Pedestrian-only midblock walkway runs north/south adjacent to the parking garage on the west side of the site.

---

**I. Waste and recycling containers, mechanical equipment, storage areas, and loading docks** shall be fully screened from public view and shall incorporate building materials and detailing compatible with the building being served. Service uses shall be set back from

**Complies**

Waste containers, mechanical equipment, and storage areas and loading docks are incorporated within the building, as are service uses.
the front line of building or located within the structure.

### J. Signage shall emphasize the pedestrian/mass transit orientation.

1. Define specific spaces for signage that are integral to building design, such as commercial sign bands framed by a material change, columns for blade signs, or other clearly articulated band on the face of the building.
2. Coordinate signage locations with appropriate lighting, awnings, and other projections.
3. Coordinate sign location with landscaping to avoid conflicts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J.1. Spaces for signage are incorporated into a metal band on the building face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.2 Sign bands and blade signs are incorporated and coordinated with projections and landscaping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.2 Coordination of the signs with landscaping will be determined during the building permit process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### K. Lighting shall support pedestrian comfort and safety, neighborhood image, and dark sky goals.

1. Provide streetlights as indicated in the Salt Lake City Lighting Master Plan.
2. Outdoor lighting should be designed for low-level illumination and to minimize glare and light trespass onto adjacent properties and uplighting directly to the sky.
3. Coordinate lighting with architecture, signage, and pedestrian circulation to accentuate significant building features, improve sign legibility, and support pedestrian comfort and safety.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complies, with a condition.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some uplighting is shown on the midblock walkway, and details to demonstrate the illumination quality of the proposal have not been provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition: Final approval of the details for development and site lighting, street lighting, and mid-block walkway lighting to be delegated to Planning Staff to ensure compliance with the standards for Design Review as well as the Downtown Community Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### L. Streetscape improvements shall be provided as follows:

1. One street tree chosen from the street tree list consistent with the city’s urban forestry guidelines and with the approval of the city’s urban forester shall be placed for each thirty feet (30’) of property frontage on a street. Existing street trees removed as the result of a development project shall be replaced by the developer with trees approved by the city’s urban forester.

2. Hardscape (paving material) shall be utilized to differentiate privately-owned public spaces from public spaces. Hardscape for public sidewalks shall follow applicable design standards. Permitted materials for privately-owned public spaces shall meet the following

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complies, with a condition.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1. Street trees are limited by overhead power lines to remain in their ability to provide an appropriate scale along the 320 foot long, 88 feet tall façade along 700 South. The overhead power lines will remain in place, creating challenges to grow and maintain appropriately scaled trees that might otherwise provide a human-scale sense of enclosure over the public sidewalk. Section drawings show columnar trees, while renderings show pyramidal forms, neither of which is appropriately scaled. Staff is recommending the following condition: Final approval a tree form with a spreading canopy in the park strip, that will also meet the needs of the Urban Forestry Division and relevant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standards:

a) Use materials that are durable (withstand wear, pressure, damage), require a minimum of maintenance, and are easily repairable or replaceable should damage or defacement occur.
b) Where practical, as in lower-traffic areas, use materials that allow rainwater to infiltrate into the ground and recharge the water table.
c) Limit contribution to urban heat island effect by limiting use of dark materials and incorporating materials with a high Solar-Reflective Index (SRI).
d) Utilize materials and designs that have an identifiable relationship to the character of the site, the neighborhood, or Salt Lake City.
e) Use materials (like textured ground surfaces) and features (like ramps and seating at key resting points) to support access and comfort for people of all abilities.
f) Asphalt shall be limited to vehicle drive aisles.

Utility companies to be delegated to Planning Staff.

L.2.a. Materials include concrete, unit pavers, metal, and wood.
L.2.b. Pervious pavers may be practical along the midblock walkway, pending input from Public Utilities related to the floodplain.
L.2.c. Staff to request SRI values of materials during the building permit phase.
L.2.d. Streetscape improvements reflect Salt Lake City character. The midblock walkway proposal was added to the plan set after the first submission, and still requires concept refinement and design details to determine relationship to the neighborhood.
L.2.e Seating is incorporated into midblock walkway.
L.2.f. Asphalt is not shown on site plans. Proposed drive aisle is concrete.

Condition: Final approval of the details for streetscape improvements to be delegated to Planning Staff to ensure compliance with the standards for Design Review as well as the Downtown Community Plan.
The following is a list of public meetings that have been held, and other public input opportunities, related to the proposed project:

- **Early Notification**
  - Early notification regarding the project with a link to the upcoming online open house was mailed out December 1, 2021.
  - Notices were mailed to property owners/residents within ~300 feet of the proposal and e-mailed directly to the local community council contacts (Ballpark and Downtown Community Councils). Ballpark CC forwarded the notice to Central Ninth CC and noted to staff that the proposal would likely be of interest to them.

- **Planning Division Online Open House – January 24, 2022**
  - An online open house was held on the Planning Division website between January 24 and February 16th.

- **Community Council Engagement**
  - Central 9th Community Council hosted a joint community council presentation with Ballpark and Downtown Community Council members in attendance. Staff attended the C9CC meeting on January 10th, 2021.
    - Community members had concerns about the scale of the building, which is ½ block long.
    - There were concerns about the midblock walkway, and whether or not it would realize the City’s intent for these privately-owned public spaces.
    - There were questions about what would be required for lighting along the midblock walkway.
    - Community members expressed concern about whether the level of design and the scale of the building were equivalent to the extent of area and height requested by the applicant.
    - Community members asked if there was any reuse component to the proposal, either of structure or materials. The applicant explained the were not.
    - Community members questioned the number of parking stalls provided.

- **Public Hearing Notices for Planning Commission Meeting**
  - Public hearing notice mailed on February 10, 2022
  - Public hearing notice posted on February 11, 2022
• Public notice posted on City and State websites and Planning Division list serve on February 10, 2022

Public Input:
Staff received two letters from residents objecting to the proposal, along with a letter expressing concerns regarding mitigation measures and façade length from the Ballpark Community Council. The Vice Chair of the Central 9th Community Council objected to the “uninterrupted façade” and wanted to see higher urban design quality provided in relation to the request for relief from the applicant. Those letters are attached. No other formal input was received.
The thing that bothers me about this project is the uninterrupted façade.

An important urban design principle is that there should be variety and interest for pedestrians and opportunities to step off the sidewalk at reasonable intervals. With our super long block faces this is even more crucial. As nice as this building appears, for the pedestrian walking along it, the experience is relentless. There may be nice things to look at through the window, but there is no guarantee of that, so the best thing to do is to break the building up into separate masses, perhaps by introducing one or two courtyards at the sidewalk that allow the public to interact with the space and offer an amenity, these are also nice amenities for the commercial spaces at ground level. This open space can be used by the public even though it is on private property and allows the opportunity to introduce trees and vegetation.

Although not as important, it also impacts the way cars move along the street, when buildings are designed like this, it raises the perceived design speed of a road and makes the street more comfortable to drive at higher speeds. Changes in height, form, increased pedestrian activity, increased tree canopy, all work together to lower traffic speed and make streets more “sticky” which is a good thing for neighborhoods.

Midblock connections where possible are another way to break down the scale of these buildings and provide more human scale.

We need to begin insisting that when a developer is seeking relief from requirements that they offer something in return, “a gift to the street” as Kort Utley at the RDA puts it so succinctly and eloquently. I’d like for us as community organizations to work with the Planning Department to come up with a strategy to make it part of granting a request like this that higher urban design standards are required when ‘variances’ are granted.

Jesse J Hulse
Principal, Atlas Architects Inc
Vice Chair, Central 9th Community Council
Hi Laura,

Thanks for making us aware of this newly proposed development from Urban Alfandre. Ballpark has a full agenda for our December meeting: reviewing the complete draft of the Ballpark Station Area Plan, which may get a bit zesty. But we would like to hear more about this development and what the developer is proposing to mitigate not following (for example) the set-back requirements. Additionally, is there a maximum façade length for this zone that isn’t being addressed?

Our next Ballpark Community Council meeting is scheduled for Thursday, January 6th, which falls within the 45-day period for feedback. I believe the residents and stakeholders in the Central 9th community will also be interested in learning the details about this proposal, so I've copied Paul Johnson and Jesse Hulse on this email. While it may not meet the formal 600 feet requirement, I'd like to offer their community the opportunity to host a presentation at their January meeting, if they feel it's more appropriate. Bryan, Christian, and Tom, if you have an opinion from the Downtown Community Council, please weigh in on this discussion. 700 South is technically Ballpark's northern border, but in my experience from the past 6 years, it tends to fall in a sort of 'no man's land' between community organizations.

Best regards,

Amy J. Hawkins, PhD
Chair, Ballpark Community Council
facebook.com/BallparkCC/

---

As per official University of Utah guidance, please note: I am Amy J. Hawkins; I am a Ph.D.-trained researcher and full-time faculty member at the University of Utah School of Medicine in the Department of Biochemistry, but I am writing on my personal behalf and not on behalf of the university.

On Wed, Dec 1, 2021 at 2:56 PM Bandara, Laura <Laura.Bandara@slcgov.com> wrote:

Greetings,

You are receiving this email because the Planning Division received a request for Design Review and a Planned Development at approximately 704 S 400 West, and we are soliciting comments from the Downtown Community Council and the Ballpark Community Council, the recognized organizations for this area.

More information about the request as well as the plans submitted by the applicant are attached. The recognized community organization chair has 45 days from the date this notice was sent to provide comments from your organization. Because the proposal is within 600 FT of two community council districts, a city online open house will be held at a date to be determined. You will be notified when the open house is live on our webpage.

Please see attached information for further details. Feel free to contact me with any
From: george chapman
Sent: Tuesday, January 25, 2022 8:15 AM
To: Bandara, Laura
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Comments on Petition Number: PLNPCM2021-00835 and PLNPCM2021-00822

400 West is proposed for rail extension and therefore on street parking may removed. 202 spaces for 292 apartments limits the City's plans for 400 West and hurts other residential and business owners to use on street parking. This project should not be approved.
George Chapman SLC
Good morning Laura,

I strongly oppose the approval of this project with the proposed decreased setbacks and decreased landscaping required. This project is close to the condo I happily own in the Granary. I understand it must be a challenge to navigate urban planning between a developer who wants to squeeze every square foot into a project and also the city that needs more taxes... BUT shortsighted city planning makes for neighborhood degradation in 20 years.

I remember sitting in on many neighborhood recommendation groups for this area years ago and the main priorities were increased setbacks, more landscaping and aesthetic concerns over too much concrete. Please help make our neighborhood better and insist on those setbacks etc!

Thank you,
Concerned resident of the Granary.
Heather Knowlton

Sent from my iPad
ATTACHMENT J: Department Review Comments

Engineering (Scott Weiler at scott.weiler@slcgov.com or 801-535-6159)
No objections.

Public Utilities (Jason Draper at jason.draper@slcgov.com or 801-483-6751)
Public Utilities Comments:

Public Utilities has no issues with the proposed special exceptions for building height or grade changes. However, reduced setbacks should be evaluated a limited to ensure that there is adequate room for utility boxes, meters, valves, cleanouts, etc. Private infrastructure cannot be allowed in the public way. A portion of the building should be set back to provide a location for these utilities.

- The site will need to retain the 80th percentile storm. This is the first 0.5” of rain – this would be about 17,650 gallons. The site must also detain the additional flows to discharge rate of 0.2 cfs per acre.
- The stormwater must be treated for the 2-year rate.
- Please provide water and sewer demands for evaluation
- All improvements must meet public utilities standards, policies, and ordinances.
- The number of units may require water, sewer or storm drain offsite improvements.
- Disturbances greater than 1 acre require a SWPPP document to be completed.
- The site is in the 1% and 0.2% Special Flood Hazard Areas. A Floodplain Development Permit will be required.
- All improvements must meet the Flood Protection standards and ordinances.
- No residential units can be built with a floor elevation below 1 foot above the Base Flood Elevation.
- All improvements below the Base Flood Elevation must meet water proofing requirements. Below grade parking must be at an elevation to provide safe evacuation in flood events.
- Water system demands and requirement will need to be provided to model the system for capacity.
- If a new hydrant is required on 400 West, the water main will need to be replaced. If the existing water line velocity is exceeded under the demands of the new building, the main in 400 West will need to be replaced.

The following comments are provided for information only to assist the applicant in obtaining a building permit 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.
• Please provide sewer and water demands for the proposed project. System improvements may be required depending on demand.
• Contact SLCPU Street Light Program Manager, Dave Pearson (801-483-6738), for information regarding streetlights.
• Utilities cannot cross property lines without appropriate easements and agreements between property owners.
• Site utility and grading plans will be required for building permit review. 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.
• All unused water and sewer services must be capped at the main.
• One culinary water meter is permitted per parcel. If the parcel is larger than 0.5 acres, a separate irrigation meter is also permitted. Fire lines will be permitted, as necessary. 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.
• A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Technical Drainage Study are submitted for review.

Planning Staff Note: The above are preliminary comments from public utilities regarding the proposed utility lines. There were concerns from Public Utilities that the reduced setback may limit the ability to adequately provide the private utility connections and that the number of units may require water, sewer or storm drain offsite improvements. The applicant will need to resolve all utility concerns prior to building permit issuance. If the code requirements result in substantive changes to the proposal, it may need to come back to the Planning Commission for re-review.

Transportation (Michael Barry at michael.barry@slcgov.com or 801-535-7147)

The parking calculations on sheet 9 of 18, “A-01 First Floor Plan”, of “2021-1029_704 S 400 W-Design Review Drawings (24x36)” show the minimum parking required as 215 parking spaces and the parking provided as 208 parking spaces. The applicant should check/verify the parking calculations. The applicant could be eligible for on street parking credit per 21A.44.040.B.6. As a standard comment, on street parking is always subject to change by the city at any time and the angled parking and parallel parking spaces on the adjacent streets are not guaranteed to remain forever. I am not aware of any changes proposed to these block faces but just wanted the developer to be aware. The plans should show the required ten-foot (10’) sight distance triangle at the egress of the parking structure per 21A.40.120.E.5.a.

Fire (Doug Bateman at douglas.bateman@slcgov.com)

• Buildings that have occupied floor greater than 75-feet in height from lowest level of fire department access shall provide high rise requirements in chapter 4 of IBC
• *Fire Department access roads shall meet definition of approved and be installed within 150-feet of all ground level exterior walls. This proposal will require an Alternate means and methods application for increase sprinkler density of gpm per sq ft for the occupancy requirement and automatic smoke detection in public and common spaces.

• *Fire Department Connection located on street address side of building and hydrant located within 100-feet of FDC.

• *Hydrant to be located within 600-feet of all ground level exterior walls

• Aerial apparatus access road to be provided that meets requirements of minimum roads of 26-feet in width, no overhead obstructions (power lines) and is located no closer than 15-feet and no farther than 30-feet from one entire side of the building.

**Planning Staff Note:** Fire reviewed the development for adequate “aerial fire apparatus access” (sufficient area for fire truck access to fight building fires) due to the building exceeding 30’ in height. Applicant stated they have plans to underground utility lines on east façade where the aerial fire access is proposed.

**Building Code** (Bryan Romney at bryan.romney@slcgov.com)


• Architect’s seal required on all architectural plans and specifications.

• Provide public toilet facilities as per 2018 IBC Chapter 29.

• Provide Code Analysis which will allow an assembly occupancy on 7th floor level.

• Clarify whether there is an Occupied Roof.

**Urban Forestry** (Rick Nelson at rick.nelson@slcgov.com)

• There are currently no city trees in the ROW that would need protection.

• We will expect that the plans address the required one tree for every 30’ of frontage as is in the city code.

• Attention should be given to the location of underground and overhead utilities to guide the selection of appropriate species.

• If the powerlines are moved underground, then our preference is to plant larger species.
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: Vice-Chairperson Maurine Bachman, Commissioners Andra Ghent, Jon Lee, Andres Paredes, Mike Christensen, Brenda Scheer, Adrienne Bell, and Aimee Burrows. Chairperson Amy Barry was excused.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Planning Manager John Anderson, Planning Manager Kelsey Lindquist, Senior City Attorney Hannah Vickery, Associate Planner Grant Amann, Principal Planner Katia Pace, Senior Planner Kristina Gilmore, Senior Planner Eric Daems, Urban Designer Laura Bandara, Principal Planner Amanda Roman, Administrative Secretary David Schupick, and Administrative Secretary Aubrey Clark.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR & VICE-CHAIR

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR FEBRUARY 9, 2022

Brenda abstained. All other Commissioners voted “yes”. The motion passed.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

ADU Conditional Use at Approximately 1532 South Green Street - Dorian Rosen, the property owner, has requested conditional use approval for a detached accessory dwelling unit (ADU) to be situated in the rear, west side of the property located at the above-stated address. The ADU will be 14’8” tall and 650 square-feet. To meet the requirements to allow the ADU to reach the maximum 650 square feet a 425 square foot addition to the main dwelling will be built. The subject property is zoned R-1 /5,000 (Single-Family Residential) and is located within Council District 5, represented by Darin Mano. (Staff contact: Grant Amann at 801-535-6171 or grant.amann@slcgov.com) Case number PLNPCM2021-01273

Associate Planning Grant Amann reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff report. He stated that Staff recommends approval with conditions listed in the staff report. He reviewed the ADU size, parking location, ADU access, and neighborhood compatibility.

Commissioner Aimee Burrows shared concern about condition number 3 being added in. She felt that it should not be added into the conditions because it is already part of City code.

The Commissioners discussed how it was handled on previous cases.
The Applicant Dorian Rosen stated that he was available for any questions but did not have a presentation.

Commissioner Ghent asked the applicant if he was aware of the City not permitting rentals under 30 days. The applicant stated that he was aware.

PUBLIC HEARING

Commissioner Bachman opened the public hearing.

Seeing that no one wished to speak, Commissioner Bachman closed the public hearing.

MOTION

Commissioner Brenda Scheer stated, Motion to Approve with Modifications Recommended by the Planning Commission: 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 Conditional Use petition (PLNPCM2021-01273) as proposed, with the conditions listed in the staff report, with the following modifications: removal of condition 3.

Commissioner Andra Ghent seconded the motion. Commissioners Andres Paredes, Mike Christensen, Adrienne Bell, Jon Lee, Andra Ghent, Aimee Burrows, and Brenda Scheer voted “yes”. The motion passed unanimously.

Green Street Alley Vacation - Sara Koenig, the property owner at approximately 1343 S Green Street, is requesting Salt Lake City to vacate a "T" shaped alley running between 1300 South and Harrison Avenue and Green Street and 700 East. The alley exists on paper only and the abutting property owners have incorporated the alley into their properties. The property abutting this alley is zoned R-1/5,000 (Single-Family Residential District) and is located within Council District 5, represented by Darin Mano. (Staff contact: Katia Pace at 801-535-6354 or katia.pace@slcgov.com) Case number PLNPCM2020-00903

Principal Planner Katia Pace reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report. She stated that Staff recommends a positive recommendation to City Council.

Commissioner Aimee Burrows asked for clarification on if the property owners will have to buy the land or if it will be deeded to them. Katia Pace stated that it will be deeded to them, based on single family residential zoning. Commissioner Burrows stated that she remembers another case in which the property owners had to purchase the land. Katia Pace stated that is the case for multifamily zoning districts or commercial properties. Commissioner Burrows asked if encroachment is a reason for vacant use of the alley. Katia Pace stated that in the past it functioned as an alley but since the demolition of the properties on the east side for the expansion of 700 East, it no longer functioned as an alley. Commissioner Burrows asked for clarification that the lack of use then caused the encroachment. Katia Pace stated that was correct. Commissioner Burrows asked if all the property owners have signed onto the project. Katia Pace stated that the applicant was looking for a building permit on top of the alley, and at that moment found the property was not theirs but the city’s property. She also stated that the five property owners have signed the form and the approval of the church for this application.

Nicholas Lumby stated that he did apply for the application when he found out the land was not part of his property. He stated that one of his neighbors had tried to get the alley vacated before in the past.
When speaking with other neighbors he found that they were all under the impression that the fence line was the end of their property line.

PUBLIC HEARING

Vice-Chairperson Maurine Bachman opened the public hearing.

- Cindy Cromer stated disapproval for the project.

Vice-Chairperson Maurine Bachman closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Brenda Scheer stated concern of how the property is being deeded and not paid for since in the past property owners have had to pay.

MOTION

Commissioner Brenda Scheer stated, Based on the findings and analysis in the staff report, testimony, and discussion at the public hearing, I move that the Planning Commission forward a favorable recommendation to the mayor to declare the alley surplus property and for the City Council to vacate the alley with the following condition:

1. That the alley is deeded the entire 10-foot width to the west abutting property owners.

Commissioner Mike Christensen seconded the motion. Commissioners Andra Ghent, Jon Lee, Andres Paredes, Mike Christensen, Brenda Scheer, Adrienne Bell, and Aimee Burrows all voted “yes”. The motion passed unanimously.

Dooley Court Planned Development and Preliminary Subdivision at approximately 122 S Dooley CT and 126 S Windsor Street - Warren Crummett, the property owner, is requesting planned development and preliminary subdivision approval to divide an existing lot into two lots for a new twin home. The proposal includes retaining the existing single-family home on-site and building a new twin home on the newly created lots. Planned Development approval is requested to modify the required twin home lot area from 1,500 square feet to approximately 1,367 square feet and for an approximate 2-inch reduction to the front yard setback in the southwest area of the lot fronting Dooley Court. The project is located in the SR-3 (Special Development Pattern Residential) zoning district.

a. Planned Development – Planned Development request to waive lot area and setback requirements in the SR-3 zone. Case number PLNPCM2021-00958
b. Preliminary Subdivision – Creation of two new lots to accommodate a twin home. Case number PLNSUB2021-01151

The subject property is within Council District #4, represented by Ana Valdemoros. (Staff contact: Krissy Gilmore at 801-535-7780 or kristina.gilmore@slcgov.com)

Senior Planner Krissy Gilmore reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report. She stated that Staff recommends approval with the conditions listed in the Staff Report.
Commissioner Burrows asked if a 2-inch setback modification request is common. Staff clarified that it is not, but felt it was best to include it in the application to be safe.

The Applicant Warren Crummett stated that he is passionate about this project because it addressed the missing middle type housing that is needed.

PUBLIC HEARING

Commissioner Bachman opened the public hearing.

- Frederick Stagbrook – Central Community Council – in opposition to the petition
- Cindy Cromer – in opposition to the petition
- Jen Colby – in opposition to the petition
- Keenan Wells – in opposition to the petition
- Email read into the record from Steve Wilson – in opposition to the petition

Seeing that no one else with to speak, Commissioner Bachman closed the public hearing.

The applicant addressed some of the concerns brought up during the public hearing.

Commissioners, Staff, and the Applicant discuss:

- The size of other lots on the block. Staff clarifying that they are around 1500 square feet.
- Whether there are other twin homes on the neighborhood. There are not but there is a duplex nearby.
- Whether the lot would meet the lot size requirements for a single-family home. It would.
- Who would complete the new construction? The applicant has hired an architect.

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 petition (PLNPCM2021-00958) and Preliminary Subdivision Plat (PLNSUB2021-01151) as proposed, subject to complying with the conditions listed in the staff report.

Commissioner Mike Christensen seconded the motion. Commissioners Brenda Scheer, Aimee Burrows, and Andres Paredes voted no. Commissioners Andra Ghent, Jon Lee, Adrienne Bell, and Mike Christensen voted “yes”. The motion passed with 3 “no” and 4 “yes”.

Glendale Townhomes at approximately 1179 S Navajo Street - Pierre Langue of Axis Architects, representing the property owners, is requesting approval from the City to redevelop the property with 57 townhomes, 24 of which would include a live/work option. The buildings would be three stories tall with internal garages for each unit. Currently, the land is occupied by Tejedas Market and is zoned CB (Community Business). This type of project must be reviewed as a Planned Development as four of the buildings would not have frontage on a public street. The subject property is located within Council District 2, represented by Alejandro Puy. (Staff contact: Eric Daems at 801-535-7236 or eric.daems@slcgov.com) Case number PLNPCM2021-00378
Senior Planner Eric Daems reviewed the petition as outlined in the staff report. He stated that Staff recommends approval with the condition listed in the staff report.

Commissioner Mike Christensen asked how many housing units could be built on this property. Eric Daems stated that there is not a standard set yet, but it is based off setback, building height, and parking. John Anderson stated that as the building grows larger it will have to come to the planning commission to go through design review.

Pierre Langue stated he is the architect on the project. He stated that they worked based off the area, and the density of the area is not enough demand for a retail space. He stated they developed more streets to allow access. He also stated that the public amenities with this project will be beneficial for people in the area. Pierre Langue stated that they implemented a lot of guest parking.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

Vice-Chairperson Maurine Bachman opened the public hearing.

- Kellie Tuiono stated her disapproval for the project.
- Kristen Prosser stated her disapproval for the project.
- Pachuco Lautaro stated his disapproval for the project.
- Susie Estrada stated her disapproval for the project.
- Violeta Rio stated her disapproval for the project.

Vice-Chairperson Maurine Bachman closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Brenda Scheer stated her empathy for the public and their comments. She did state that the Planning Commission cannot consider gentrification, traffic, who benefits, or what the community needs are in their decision. She stated that they must base their decision on if it matches the criteria.

Commissioner Aimee Burrows stated that she has read the public comments and that she shares concerns that the community garden will not replace the grocery store as a food resource. She stated that the planning commission cannot require a grocery store.

**MOTION**

Commissioner Mike Christensen stated, Based on the findings listed in the staff report, the information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, I move that the Planning Commission approve the Planned Development request for the Glendale Town homes project located at 1179 South Navajo Street for petition PLNPCM2021-00378, subject to complying with the following condition listed in the staff report:

1. The final approval for site and building lighting for the development be delegated to staff to review in accordance with adopted standards and ordinances.

Commissioner Brenda Scheer seconded the motion. Commissioners Andra Ghent, Jon Lee, Andres Paredes, Mike Christensen, Brenda Scheer, Adrienne Bell, and Aimee Burrows all voted “yes”. The motion passed unanimously.

**PUBLIC HEARING**
MOTION

A break was taken. The meeting reconvened at 7:45 PM.

Pacific Yard Design Review & Planned Development - KTGY Architects, representing Urban Alfandre, are requesting a Planned Development and Design Review approval for a mixed-use multifamily building at approximately 443 W 700 South, 720 S 400 West, and 704 S 400 West. The proposed 7-story building is 88-feet in height and includes 292 units and 202 parking stalls. It has 12,000 square feet of commercial space on the ground floor. The applicant is requesting relief from all required setbacks and landscaping through the Planned Development process and requesting an additional 28 feet of building height through Design Review. The project site is in the General Commercial (CG) zoning district. In the CG zone, new buildings taller than sixty feet (60') but less than ninety feet (90') may be authorized through Design Review. The proposed project incorporates a public mid-block pedestrian walkway along the western property line

a. Planned Development – Planned Development request to waive setback and landscaping requirements in the CG zone. Case number PLNPCM2021-00822


The property is located within Council District 4, represented by Ana Valdemoros. (Staff Contact: Laura Bandara at 801-535-6188 or laura.bandara@slcgov.com)

Urban Designer Laura Bandara reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report. She stated that Staff recommends approval with the conditions listed in the staff report.

Commissioner Bell asked about the midblock walkway and where the second half of it is proposed. Staff clarified where it would be located to the south and the developer of that property would be responsible for its creation.

Commissioner Scheer asked what concessions were being provided for no open space. Staff clarified that it would be the midblock walkway and street engagement, in compliance with the Downtown Plan.

The applicant James Alfandre reviewed the work that Urban Alfandre have done to integrate into their neighborhood. He stated that they wish to increase housing stock in the Granary District and provide a walkway and missing or mid-rise housing and small local service retail to help make the granary a complete neighborhood. He reviewed the proposed project and why they are requesting the reduced setbacks and shared examples from the area that are similar to their request.

Commissioner Bell asked if the applicant was comfortable with the conditions in the staff report. The applicant stated that they were committed to those conditions.

Commissioner Scheer asked if the applicant they had presented their project to the community councils. The applicant stated that they presented to the local community councils back on January 10th and were only asked what the City regulations were on façade length. Commissioner Scheer asked if the applicant went before the community councils in advance to get their input on the design of the project. The applicant stated that they went to the community council meeting as previously mentioned.
Commissioner Ghent asked for clarification on what was being asked for by the applicant versus what is being asked for by the community councils since there is so much dialog in the emails that came in after the staff report was completed and she got lost in the back and forth. She shared her concern about the back and forth and lack of support from the Community Councils. The applicant said that they were also confused because the Councils did not bring up their concerns during the joint Community Council meeting.

Commissioner Burrows asked if the trees that they are adding are already required. The applicant confirmed that the trees are required. He stated that they are asking for ground floor commercial space in lieu of the 10-foot landscaping buffer which is not required by zoning. He said that they want to create better street engagement and pedestrian experience.

Commissioner Ghent asked for clarification on whether the applicant is asking for less vegetation than what code requires. The applicant said that is correct. Commissioner Ghent asked if the vegetation could be made up by adding it to the roof or another location. The applicant stated that is something that they would be willing to look into.

Planning Manager John Anderson clarified to the Commission that while it wouldn't meet the minimum standard of landscaping the Commission could decide if that was a good trade, they could make that decision through this process.

Commissioner Jon Lee stated that he felt it was a good compromise and didn’t feel more greenery should be added when we are in a water shortage. He explained his view of the setback creating better street engagement.

Commissioner Christensen agreed with Jon Lee.

PUBLIC HEARING

Commissioner Bachman opened the public hearing.

- Amy Hawkins – Chair Ballpark Community Council – has serious concerns about the proposal. They want to see more green space.
- Emailed comment was read into the record from Geoffrey S. Kaessner – In favor of the petition

Seeing that no one else wished to speak, Commissioner Bachman closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Ghent says she agrees that the setbacks are not useful. She has concerns of creating a heat island. She wondered if a rooftop garden would create a significant cost to the developer and how much it would raise the rents. The applicant stated that he didn’t know off the top of his head what it would cost.

Commissioner Burrows asked what the Commission thought of the tabling the item to give them a chance to talk to the Community Councils and planning to build something the Commission would approve.

Commissioner Scheer stated her concern regarding what the community is getting in exchange for less green space.

Planning Manager John Anderson interjected that he wanted the Commissioners to be cautious using the terms “What are we getting?”, stating that they need to look at the project and say whether or not it meets the standards.
Planning Manager Kelsey Lindquist reminded the Commission that other design review applications have come before the Planning Commission and have met design review standards without including a commercial component on the ground floor.

Commissioner Burrows felt like the design was not finished.

Commissioner Lee says this is an opportunity to decide as to whether this is a better use of the space. He feels there are amenities be added that would be a good addition to the neighborhood.

Commissioner Burrows stated that she is concerned because three Community Councils had the concern of losing that green space, not just one person.

Commissioner Scheer stated that she agrees with Jon Lee in regard to the 10-foot setback but does not want all of the open space requirements to be eliminated. She also stated that she is hoping for a better division of the frontage. She would like to see a little garden in the middle or a park in the back of the walkway.

Commissioner Ghent said that plants adapted to the environment could be planted. She doesn’t feel she has enough experience to gauge whether the setbacks and added vegetation would improve air quality.

Urban Designer Laura Bandara let the Commission know that the 700 South Façade is north facing so it will be in the shade much of the year. She also clarified that the minimum landscaping required by code is 1650 square feet in the landscape yard area if they did it to code.

Commissioner Burrows said that they are not satisfied with the current design review the way it is proposed. She would like to make a motion to table.

MOTION

Commissioner Aimee Burrows motioned to table the petition asking that the applicant explore solutions on the setbacks and landscaping and vegetation relief with input from the public.

Planning Manager Kelsey Lindquist asked for clarification on the motion and whether the Commission is expecting the applicant to return to the community councils. The commission clarified that was not an expectation of the applicant.

Commissioner Mike Christensen seconded the motion. Commissioner Brenda Scheer, Aimee Burrows, Andra Ghent, Mike Christensen, and Andres Paredes voted “yes”. Commissioner Jon Lee and Adrienne Bell voted “no”. The motion to table passed with 2 “no” and 5 “yes” votes.

Hoyt Place Zoning Map Amendment at approximately 858 W & 860 W Hoyt Place - Bert Holland, representing Hoyt Place Development LLC, is requesting a zoning map amendment for the properties located at the above-stated address. The proposal would rezone the properties from R-1/5,000 Single Family Residential to SR-3 Special Development Pattern Residential District. The two lots are approximately .39 acres or 16,988 square feet. Future development plans were not submitted with this application. The property is located within Council District 2, represented by Alejandro Puy. (Staff contact: Amanda Roman at 801-535-7660 or amanda.roman@slcgov.com) Case number PLNPCM2021-01073
Principal Planner Amanda Roman reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report. She stated that Staff recommends a positive recommendation to City Council.

Commissioner Aimee Burrows asked if this rezone would prevent demolition of homes. Amanda Roman clarified that when it is brought to City Council, the applicant will enter into a development agreement with the city that will require them to maintain at least the same number of housing units. Amanda Roman also stated that she is not sure if that agreement will state that they cannot demolish and then rebuild the existing structures, but the applicant will be tied into their “replacement” housing choice as outlined in their housing mitigation plan. Aimee Burrows asked for clarification on if they will not necessarily be required to keep the two old existing houses. Amanda Roman stated that she doesn’t believe so. John Anderson stated that it is hard to require that outside of the historic districts.

Bert Holland stated that he has already begun renovation and has families eager to move in. He also stated that he has already attracted a high number of diverse buyers seeking single-family workforce housing.

PUBLIC HEARING

Vice-Chair Maurine Bachman opened the public hearing. Seeing that no one wished to speak, Vice-Chair Maurine Bachman closed the public hearing.

MOTION

Commissioner Brenda Scheer 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 the City Council to approve PLNPCM2021-01073.

Commissioner Mike Christensen seconded the motion. Commissioners Andra Ghent, Jon Lee, Andres Paredes, Mike Christensen, Brenda Scheer, Adrienne Bell, and Aimee Burrows all voted “yes”. The motion passed unanimously.

Historic Carriage House Zoning Text Amendment – Stephen Pace, the applicant, is requesting a zoning text amendment to permit the restoration or reconstruction of a historic carriage house for the purposes of creating a dwelling unit. The dwelling unit, located within the reconstructed or restored historic carriage house, would not be required to meet density, lot coverage, setbacks of the applicable base zoning district, or the accessory structure footprint or height limitations. The proposed language requires eligible properties to be both a Salt Lake City Landmark and listed as a National Register Site of Historic Places and located in one of the following zoning districts: RMF-35 (Moderate Density Multi-Family Residential), RO (Residential Office), I (Institutional) or SR-1A (Special Development Pattern Residential). (Staff contact: Kelsey Lindquist at 385-226-7227 or kelsey.lindquist@slcgov.com) Case number PLNPCM2020-00106

Planning Manager Kelsey Lindquist reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report. She stated that Staff recommends denial of the proposal because it does not meet the standards. She reviewed the text amendment background stating that the proposal originally went before the Historic Landmark Commission and received a negative recommendation. She shared some of the conflicts including the existing ADU ordinance which requires an owner occupancy requirement, but the applicant does not live on site. She listed other compliance issues as all principal structures require street frontage, lot minimums, and lot and bulk requirements. She stated that Staff has tried to work with the applicant on language solutions but was ultimately unsuccessful. Staff forwarded the amendment to the Historic Landmark Commission for review to receive direction for the applicant on the proposed language, but
the Commission forwarded a negative recommendation against the proposal. She stated that the HLC did not discuss potential solutions to improve the language. She said that the applicant, since going before the HLC in July of 2020, has yet to put the proposed language in an ordinance format, address Staff concerns about enforceability and administration, and requested to continue to the planning commission for recommendation to the City Council. She reviewed the criteria that included in the ordinance format as: purpose statement, definition of terms, applicability, process, and standards/criteria. She noted that the existing language does not include much of the criteria which is crucial for Staff and City Council. She reviewed the purpose of the text amendment and incentive to the text amendment. She reviewed the other eligible properties that the text amendment could affect.

The applicant Stephen Pace shared a photo slide of the Beer estate. He stated, “Just above the left center of the photograph is the white topped buildings or carriage house and a 30-year-old older building referred to as the harness shop from 1867 you can see from the photograph that there I guess were no drones or aerial photographs being taken in salt lake but you can date it you know very securely. The city and county building is finished on the upper left-hand corner The catholic cathedral is under construction in the upper middle of the picture and so on so. If we could go one more okay this is working this is the block that’s under this is the block that's under consideration we heard our stuff earlier in the evening that about the problems with people misunderstanding alleyways in the avenues this block is an excellent example if you look down on the lower right hand corner at property 225 of third avenue you can see that there's about six feet of that house that is on the neighbor's property and then if you look at 223 fourth avenue there’s about a similar six feet of that house but or that apartment building that is on 225's property and the same thing with 217 and so on now these are not maps are not absolutely accurate but I had the properties surveyed and I know they're darn close if you go up to 222 which is the carriage house address you can see that there's a white roof building almost dead center in the photograph that I guess I own about six feet of that neighbor's garage and the whopper is if you go up to the northwest corner 4th avenue and a street you can see a under some trees there is a fake looking anyway carriage house built in 1990 with the Salt Lake City building permit where Salt Lake City gave the builder permission to just take the city land so about two-thirds of the garage there on the corner of that lot does not belong to the belongs to Salt Lake City and it was given away. I raised that issue with the city saying well if you're willing to part with that ground I’d like to get a few hundred feet can I do that oh no and the city the chief of staff then decided that they were going to start sending out bills to the people that owned that carriage house for a couple thousand dollars that take carriage house a couple of thousand dollars a year and I said you don't want to do that that's a hornet's nest and they sent out the first set of bills and then they chickened out they did not have the they just canceled the bills and decided that well we'll go we'll just give away the property because of our mistake so on the next page then this is the beer mansion the photograph that you were shown earlier by Miss Lindquist is about a 500 foot footprint of image of the carriage house or I'm sorry of the harness shop house which has nothing to do with the you know pretty imposing structure you can see there the cladding designed to serve the or cladding designed together with the carriage house to serve the William Beer family next slide these two buildings then the one in front outlined in red is the harness shop house about just about exactly 500 square feet of footprint and behind it outlined in blue is the carriage house as it was built in and this is the 1905 photo next one please so to give you a feeling for what that looks like if you take the 222 fourth avenue this is just about dead center in the photograph or in the map the Sanborn Fire Map you can see a square darkish building yeah that has if well an analogy would be that if you were looking if you were taking god's view of the Washington monument looking down on the Washington monument you would see almost exactly that same profile a pyramid top that the only way you can get a building shaped like that fire like the fire map shows is for a ride a pyramid but instead of sitting on a 500 foot limestone base I believe it is for the Washington monument it's only on a 10-foot brick base so then we scanned that into the go ahead from the tower on 8th street and 6th avenue and so here is what the carriage house behind once again behind the harness shop house looks like in you know to within probably an inch maybe an inch and a half of resolution there's enough photographic evidence of remaining materials on site that we basically know
that what the building looked like was a 10 foot brick or a 10 foot high 35 foot wide brick cube with a pyramid on top of it and it's a right angle pyramid with all the faces looking to look the same now for some context most of what we talked about with the historic landmarks commission I had assumed an error that they were people a little closer to their high school geometry than they evidently were and that they would understand what we were proposing it's the Washington monument with a pyramid and a drip edge on it and that's what we're proposing to build or to rebuild and it's a design that is I believe about 4 500 years old it ain't new Greeks had it the Egyptians have it it's been around for a long time we got a lot of pushback from the landmarks commission with people saying that your design is speculative it's conjectural you don't know what the building looked like that was probably the biggest single thing we talked about in the landmarks commission hearing it turns out though that with the stuff that miss Lindquist has published last week the mention of concept of improper design conjectural design and so on that's all banished that's all gone someplace else so the city doesn't so what the main thing the city believed or that the landmark commission believed just was not true and it's disappeared from the record.”

Vice-Chair Bachman interject to let the applicant know that he had one minute of presentation time remaining.

The applicant stated “Okay well let's see is there um we're looking here if I just let me summarize it let's go to the last page okay let's look at this one I looked at four almost 400 dwelling units that have gone through landmark sites since January 2019 actually they went back a year past that so that's four years worth of data that produced 111 applications for dwelling unit review the pages of text that generated was just under eight thousand now the champion in terms of pages that were submitted to the landmarks commission is the beer carriage house which has 179 pages of stuff to go through the winner and still champion based on the planning commission submission is that it's now grown to 187.”

Vice-Chair Bachman asked Mr. Pace to wrap up his presentation.

Mr. Pace stated, “well yeah what I'd like to do would be to come back and talk since I've got 187 pages that I've got a report on here and we only talked about three pages three of those pages at the landmarks mission hearing I would like to be rescheduled to give to do justice to this and talk about what we've proposed what we haven't proposed and what the city has the planning staff has substituted for it's ill-considered and withdrawn older proposals.”

Vice-Chair Bachman asked Mr. Pace if he would like to withdraw his application.

Mr. Pace said no.

Vice-Chair Bachman asked if the Commissioners had any questions for Mr. Pace.

Commissioner Scheer asked if Mr. Pace understood that the text amendment that he was proposing would only affect him and a few other properties. The applicant stated yes it would affect 4 other properties. Commissioner Scheer stated that the text amendment which he has submitted has some deficiencies. She stated that the slides of the property that Mr. Pace shared had nothing to do with the text amendment he was requesting.

PUBLIC HEARING

Vice-Chair Bachman opened the public hearing. Seeing that no one wished to speak, Vice-Chair Bachman closed the public hearing.
Commissioner Burrows asked if City Council voted on the text amendment after it was forwarded with a negative recommendation from the Historic Landmark Commission. Planning Manager Kelsey Lindquist said that it had not been voted on, HLC being the first step in the process and Planning Commission being the second step.

MOTION

Commissioner Andra Ghent 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 negative recommendation to the City Council for the requested zoning text amendment for carriage house reconstruction.

Commissioner Aimee Burrows seconded the motion. Commissioners Brenda Scheer, Aimee Burrows, Andra Ghent, Jon Lee, Adrienne Bell, Mike Christensen, Andres Paredes voted “yes”. The motion passed with a negative recommendation forwarded to the City Council.

The meeting adjourned at 9:31 PM.
3. Pacific Yard Design Review & Planned Development

Why do we give people exceptions to set backs, planting, trees, shade, reduced carbon. Who wants to suffocate in the heat and smog of this city.

The applicant is requesting relief from required setbacks and landscaping through the Planned Development process and requesting an additional 28 feet of building height through Design Review.

I don’t care if it does have a walkway. Need wide parking strip with trees and benches and places for people to sit. Let us make the city livable, not just profitable. Where are the people in this building going to sit outside, park a bike, ride a trike. Wide sidewalks too.

Suzanne S. Stensaas
Laura, I agree with Suzanne. I know it is hard to be the first developer to build a new building in what looks like a neighborhood that has been fairly static. But if he gets an exception to all these requirements, everyone else will want the same thing, and the neighborhood will look just as stark as it does now, except 75 feet taller. Not a pretty picture. The setback needs to be equal to the average of the buildings on the block face. There don't seem to be any compelling reasons to grant these exceptions. And this is a great time to ask for more trees than the minimum.

I don't know what else is already approved for this area, this development shouldn't be allowed to change the standard set in the zoning ordinance. I'd prefer the sidewalks to be a minimum of ten feet wide.

Judi Short, Land Use Chair
Sugar House Community Council

On Thu, Mar 10, 2022 at 2:51 PM Suzanne Stensaas wrote:

3. Pacific Yard Design Review & Planned Development

Why do we give people exceptions to set backs, planting, trees, shade, reduced carbon. Who wants to suffocate in the heat and smog of this city.

The applicant is requesting relief from required setbacks and landscaping through the Planned Development process and requesting an additional 28 feet of building height through Design Review

I don’t care if it does have a walkway. Need wide parking strip with trees and benches and places for people to sit. Let us make the city livable, not just profitable. Where are the people in this building going to sit outside, park a bike, ride a trike. Wide sidewalks too.
Attachment D: Minutes from March 23, 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-Chairperson Maurine Bachman, Commissioners Adrienne Bell, Jon Lee, Brenda Scheer, and Aimee Burrows. Commissioners Andra Ghent, Andres Paredes, and Mike Christensen were excused.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Planning Director Nick Norris, Planning Manager John Anderson, Senior City Attorney Paul Nielson, Principal Planner Diana Martinez, Urban Designer Laura Bandara, Senior Planner Daniel Echeverria, Associate Planner Brooke Olson, Planning Manager Wayne Mills, Administrative Assistant David Schupick, and Administrative Assistant Aubrey Clark.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR MARCH 9, 2022

Commissioner Maurine Bachman motioned to approve the minutes. Commissioner Aimee Burrows seconded the motion. Commissioners Aimee Burrows, Jon Lee, Brenda Scheer, and Maurine Bachman voted “yes”. Commissioner Adrienne Bell abstained. The motion passed.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR & VICE-CHAIR

Chairperson Amy Barry stated that she has nothing to report. Vice-Chairperson Maurine Bachman that she has nothing to report.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR

Planning Director Nick Norris gave a reminder to turn off and on the microphones for the in-person meeting. He also stated that the City Council did adopt an ordinance that removes, at least for the time being, homeless resource centers from the land use tables while working on updating the regulations and processes. He stated that the City Council also adopted as part of the ordinance, a provision that reinstates the rules if the city doesn’t have something in place by a deadline within the next calendar year. Nick stated that the planning division has been working to understand the impacts that the homeless resource centers have on city resources to help update regulations. The City Council also had a briefing on two zoning changes. One was to increase height for stealth towers in the public land zoning district. They also had a briefing on the proposed rezone for the western garden site just West of Trolley Square on 600 East. He also stated on April 5th the city council will be having a briefing from the Community and Neighborhoods Department with various proposals that are in front of the council regarding housing and will provide an update after that. Also, he stated that he hopes within the coming months an update with the commission and to review the policies and procedures to help address any potential future hybrid or virtual meetings.

PUBLIC HEARINGS
ADU Conditional Use at approximately 991 South 1000 East - Margy Maher of Brach Design, representing the property owners, is requesting Conditional Use approval for a 22'4.5"-foot tall, 450-square-foot detached accessory dwelling unit (ADU) that will be located in the rear yard of the property at the above-stated address. The subject property is approximately 0.12 acres (5,227 square feet) in size and is in the R-1-5,000 Single Family Zoning District. The property is located within District 5, represented by Darin Mano. (Staff contact: Diana Martinez at 801-535-7215 or diana.martinez@slcgov.com) Case number PLNPCM2021-01285

Principal Planner Diana Martinez reviewed the petition as outlined in the staff report. She stated that a new home and new garage with an ADU will be constructed in place of the existing structure. She stated that the new garage will have an ADU on top of it. She stated that Staff recommends approval of the application request.

Commissioner Scheer asked what would happen to the ADU if the existing home was not torn down and wondered if a condition needed to be added that the main dwelling is rebuilt. Planner Diana Martinez clarified that even if the existing home remained, the ADU would still meet the setback requirements, but the height requirement would be an issue. She stated that she didn’t know the height of the existing structure but guessed it was 25 to 26 feet. Commissioner Scheer wondered if the Commission should add a condition that the primary dwelling be rebuilt at a higher height.

Director Nick Norris stated that he would do some research and answer any questions after the public hearing.

The Applicants Margy Maher and Dave Brock shared a presentation of the proposed project. Margy Maher reviewed the proposal. Margy Maher stated that they aimed to keep the ADU as small as possible, keeping it shorter than the new house that would be designed next to it.

PUBLIC HEARING
Chairperson Amy Barry opened the public hearing.

- Neil Ellis – He is concerned with the height of the project and wondered how the proposed 26ft height is in unison with the rest of the neighborhood. He is also concerned who will be living in on site in the main house and ADU.

Seeing that no one else wished to speak, Chairperson Amy Barry closed the public hearing.

Chairperson Barry reviewed the City’s code, clarifying that the property owner is required to live on site when an ADU is built. She also stated that the ordinance does not regulate who the who they may rent to but clarified that it does restrict Airbnb type rentals.

Planning Director Nick Norris reviewed the height regulations stating that the principal structure in this zone can be up to 28 feet with a pitched roof measured at its highest point, or 23 feet for a flat roof structure. He clarified that an ADU is not allowed to be taller than the principal structure and if the minimum setbacks are met the height of the ADU can be 17 feet with an increase in height of up to 23 feet with every increased foot of setbacks from the property line.
Commissioner Burrows clarified that when there is a restriction on an Airbnb type rental it means that the ADU or principal structure cannot be rented for less than 30 days. She also clarified that the requirement for the ADU or primary structure has to be occupied by the owner is part of the title and transfers with ownership should the property sell. She then asked if the proposed garage would have the same setback as the current garage. Planner Diana Martinez stated that it would be in about the same.

Chair Barry asked Director Nick Norris if he found an answer to Commissioner Scheer’s earlier question as to whether a condition should be imposed. Direct Nick Norris replied that a condition is probably warranted because an approval for the proposed height of the ADU cannot be made based on the height of the existing structure. He said that the Commission can, and probably should, add a condition that says the building permit for the ADU as proposed cannot be issued unless it is issued with an associated building permit to increase the height of the principal building.

**MOTION**

Commissioner Brenda Scheer Stated, Based on the information in the staff report, the information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, I move that the Commission approve the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Conditional Use application PLNPCM2021-01285. With the addition of the following condition.

1. That the ADU cannot be permitted without an associated permit for the primary dwelling unit that is at least as tall or taller than the ADU proposed.

Commissioner Adrienne Bell seconded the motion. Commissioners Jon Lee, Maurine Bachman, Adrienne Bell, Aimee Burrows, and Brenda Scheer voted “yes’. The motion passed unanimously.

**Pacific Yard Design Review & Planned Development** - KTGY Architects, representing Urban Alfandre, are requesting a Planned Development and Design Review approval for a mixed-use multifamily building at approximately 443 W 700 South, 720 S 400 West, and 704 S 400 West. The proposed 7-story building is 88-feet in height and includes 292 units and 202 parking stalls. It has 12,000 square feet of commercial space on the ground floor. The applicant is requesting relief from required setbacks and landscaping through the Planned Development process and requesting an additional 28 feet of building height through Design Review. The project site is in the General Commercial (CG) zoning district. In the CG zone, new buildings taller than sixty feet (60’) but less than ninety feet (90’) may be authorized through Design Review. The proposed project incorporates a public mid-block pedestrian walkway along the western property line.

a. Planned Development – Planned Development request to waive setback and landscaping requirements in the CG zone. **Case number PLNPCM2021-00822**
b. Design Review – Design Review request for 28 feet of additional height. **Case number PLNPCM2021-00835**
The Planning Commission reviewed this item at the February 23rd public hearing and the item was tabled to allow for revisions to the proposal. The property is located within Council District 4, represented by Ana Valdemoros. (Staff Contact: Laura Bandara at 801-535-6188 or laura.bandara@slcgov.com)

Urban Designer Laura Bandara reviewed the petition as outlined in the staff report. She stated that Staff recommends approval of the application request.

James Alfandre gave a formal presentation. He described how they found creative ways to implement more vegetation. He also stated that they are adding more public space than required.

Commissioner Aimee Burrows asked for clarification on whether the project had gone back to the Community Councils or if there were any new public input. James Alfandre stated that they were not required to go back to the Community Councils, they were only given the task of finding more ways to provide vegetation coverage. Laura Bandara stated that there were two new public comments from people who live in Sugar House.

PUBLIC HEARING

Chairperson Amy Barry opened the public hearing.
Seeing that no one wished to speak, Chair Barry closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Aimee Burrows stated that she has read two public comments that they both are not satisfied with the updates.

MOTION

Commissioner Adrienne Bell stated, Based on the analysis and findings in the staff report that the standards for Planned Development have been substantially met, testimony and the proposal presented, I move that the Planning Commission approve the request for Planned Development for new mixed-use construction in the CG zoning district at approximately 43W 700 South, 720 S 400 West, and 704 S 400 West with the following conditions:
1. Final approval of the details for public art, development, and site lighting (including the mid-block walkway), street lighting, streetscape details, street furniture, midblock walkway paving, sidewalk paving and landscaping to be delegated to Planning Staff to ensure compliance with the standards for Design Review as well as the Downtown Community Plan.
2. Applicant to mitigate the building mass and improve the relationship of building height to human scale through provision of an awning of 4’ in depth, subject to an encroachment agreement approved by all required City divisions and departments.
3. Final approval a tree form with a spreading canopy in the park strip, that will also meet the needs of the Urban Forestry Division and relevant utility companies to be delegated to Planning Staff.
4. A public easement will be recorded on the property for the midblock walkway. A sign will be posted on the midblock walkway stating it is open to the public.
5. A complete lot consolidation application for the three existing parcels shall be submitted and approved.

Commissioner Jon Lee seconded the motion. Vice-Chairperson Maurine Bachman, Commissioners Adrienne Bell, Jon Lee, Brenda Scheer, Adrienne Bell, and Aimee Burrows all voted “yes”. The motion passes unanimously.

Commissioner Adrienne Bell stated, Based on the analysis and findings in the staff report that the standards for Design Review have been substantially met, testimony and the proposal presented, I move that the Planning Commission approve their quest for Design Review for additional height for new mixed-use construction in the CG zoning district at approximately 43 W 700 South, 720 S 400 West, and 704 S 400 West with the following conditions:

1. Final approval of the details for public art, development, and site lighting (including the mid-block walkway), street lighting, streetscape details, street furniture, midblock walkway paving, sidewalk paving and landscaping to be delegated to Planning Staff to ensure compliance with the standards for Design Review as well as the Downtown Community Plan.
2. Applicant to mitigate the building mass and improve the relationship of building height to human scale through provision of an awning of 4’ in depth, subject to an encroachment agreement approved by all required City divisions and departments.
3. Final approval a tree form with a spreading canopy in the park strip, that will also meet the needs of the Urban Forestry Division and relevant utility companies to be delegated to Planning Staff.
4. A public easement will be recorded on the property for the midblock walkway. A sign will be posted on the midblock walkway stating it is open to the public.
5. A complete lot consolidation application for the three existing parcels shall be submitted and approved.

Commissioner Jon Lee seconded the motion. Vice-Chairperson Maurine Bachman, Commissioners Adrienne Bell, Jon Lee, Brenda Scheer, Adrienne Bell, and Aimee Burrows all voted “yes”. The motion passes unanimously.

Swaner Preliminary Subdivision at approximately at 2691 North 2200 West - Colby Anderson, representing the developer Scannell Properties, is requesting preliminary subdivision approval for property at the above-stated address. The applicant is proposing to subdivide the property into 20 lots. The subdivision would also include new right-of-way and associated infrastructure improvements through the property to provide access to the lots, including a north-south running roadway at approximately 2900 West and an east-west right of way at 2950 North. Additional right-of-way along 2200 West and 3200 West would be dedicated. The applicant is also requesting that the Planning Commission make a recommendation on the modification of a block size regulation. Subdividing property requires this preliminary subdivision plat process. The property is currently zoned Business Park (BP), which allows for a variety of light industrial and commercial uses. The property is approximately 430 acres and primarily vacant. The property is located in Council District 1, represented by Victoria Petro-Eschler. (Staff contact: Daniel Echeverria at 801-535-7165 or daniel.echeverria@slcgov.com) Case number PLNSUB2021-00740
Chair Barry reviewed the Planning Commissions role in the Swaner proposal.

Senior Planner Daniel Echeverria reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report. He stated that Staff recommends approval of the Preliminary Subdivision request with the conditions listed in the staff report and that they recommend sending a positive recommendation for the block size modification to the Mayor.

Chairperson Barry asked about the Master Plan update for the subject property and whether the future development would be subject to that. Staff clarified that the development would be subject to any zoning changes brought about by the Master Plan redesign.

Commissioner Scheer asked where the traffic would be directed. Staff clarified that it would go up 2200 West.

Commissioner Burrows asked whether there is any precedent for the Mayor making block size changes. Staff clarified that the Mayor has not yet approved modifications in the BP zone but has approved some in other areas recently.

Dan Harrington, the Development Manager, stated that the Staff Report was well done and that they feel there is not a lot left to say. He introduced Colby Anderson as the civil engineer on the project. He shared a slide that shows the site between 2200 West and 3200 West. He stated that while all traffic will initially come from 2200 West, they want to get the bypass road done as quickly as possible so that the site will have another point of entry. He stated that it would be a multi-year build out, taking 7-10 years to complete.

Chairperson Barry asked when the bypass road would be completed. The applicant stated he would like to see it done as close to the first two buildings as possible dependent on the process with the City.

PUBLIC HEARING
Chairperson Amy Barry opened the public hearing.

- Dan Thompson – resident at 2200 W 2600 N – Concerned about the traffic that will be imposed upon their property. He is also concerned about the size of the road only being 25-30 feet and construction traffic that will affect them.
- Dave Tolman – Comment read into the record in support of the project.
- Peter Anjuarrerden – neighboring property owner – Concerned about the wetlands and wildlife in the area and also concerned about whether biking in the neighborhood will be safe. Concerned about the lack of remaining open space.
- Jack Ray – On behalf of Rudy Reclamation and North Point Reclamation – Concerned that development so close to the wetlands will negatively affect the area. Supports the developer’s request for block size modification.
- Denise Payne – resident at 2840 N 2200 W – Concerned that construction will destroy 2200 West. Feels the road is already dangerous and doesn’t want to see added development.
- Allison Musser – property owner on 2200 W – Supports the letter from the West Side Community Council. Concerned about additional traffic on 2200 W and would like to see the bypass road completed prior to the development of the subdivision.
• Chris Souther – resident near the proposed development – concerned about 2200 West and construction traffic. Feels it is a liability and that the bypass road should be completed prior to development.
• Nichole Solt – 2610 N 2200 W – in opposition to the petition. Concerned about the effect on wildlife and feels 2200 West is too small
• Terry Marasco – worried about the intent of the developer versus what will actually happen.
• Ella Mendoza – resident in the area – concerned about the speed and adding traffic on 2200 West.
• Joel McAllister – owner at 2596 N 2200 W – says that they have looked at improving the street but that it takes money.
• Email from Cindy Cromer – Concerned about the wildlife in the area
• Email from Steven Keyser - in favor of the petition

Seeing that no one else wished to speak, Chairperson Amy Barry closed the public hearing.

Applicant Patrick Marcotte stated that they do not have any reason to improve 3200 W. Responding to concerns about 2200 West he stated they are aware of the challenges, and they are proposing and funding a bypass road that will tie into 2100 North. He said it will take some time, so while there will be added traffic on 2200 W it will only be for a short time.

Commissioner Burrows stated the at the block size modification will allow traffic to be limited on 2200 West. She also stated that the Commission cannot require the property owner to do something on land that they do not own, that they are not able to make a condition to build a road for the block size modification since they do not own that property.

Commissioner Bell asked for a description of the improvements that will be made on 2200 West that are listed in the staff report. Staff clarified that 36 feet of additional asphalt will be added to the west side of the road. Commissioner Bell asked whether sidewalks would be added. Staff clarified that it would be on the west side. Commissioner Bell asked if the developer would be required to fix any damaged area of the roads. Staff stated that would be a requirement for them to complete repairs.

Chairperson Barry asked if the Commission had any legal purview to address the timing. Staff clarified that there was no legal purview for the Commission to do that. She also wanted to know if the City required construction flagging since the road is quite narrow. Staff clarified that the Engineering Department has requirements for what that access point has to be, and flagging could be required.

Commissioner Scheer stated that she does not have a problem with the block size modification. She stated that she did drive to the site and down 2200 West. She stated that she believed that North Point Community Council may be working on a Plan for that area but that they as a Commission are not able to hold up this proposal while the North Point Plan is being completed. She encouraged the public to participate in the plan to the extent possible.

Commissioner Burrows asked who would be responsible for closing 3200 West. Planning Director Nick Norris clarified that the City could potentially close the street or vacate it but that it is ultimately a City Council's decision.
Commissioner Scheer asked for clarification on whether the open space required for each lot could be consolidated and what kind of process would need to be gone through to accomplish that. Director Nick Norris clarified that a Planned Development could be done or that state code authorizes administrative development agreements if the proposal meets code. He stated that a change to code would be required for the BP zone in the future to allow for consolidation of open space without another process. Commissioner Scheer asked how much BP zone is left in the City. Director Nick Norris stated that he believed that there were 800 to 900 acres total in the City. Commissioner Scheer then asked whose decision it is to make changes to the canal in the open space. Staff clarified that it would be up to City through public utilities. He stated that they have had canals that have been diverted before.

**MOTION**

Commissioner Brenda Scheer stated, based on the analysis and findings listed in the staff report, information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, I move that the Planning Commission send a positive recommendation to the Mayor for the block size modification as requested as part of Preliminary Subdivision request PLNSUB2021-00740.

Commissioner Adrienne Bell seconded the motion. Commissioners Aimee Burrows, Brenda Scheer, Maurine Bachman, Jon Lee, and Adrienne Bell all voted “yes”. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Maurine Bachman stated, based on the analysis and findings listed in the staff report, information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, I move that the Planning Commission approve the Preliminary Subdivision request (PLNSUB2021-00740) for the Swaner Subdivision located at approximately 2691 N 2200 West, with the conditions listed in the staff report.

Commissioner Brenda Scheer seconded the motion. Jon Lee, Aimee Burrows, Adrienne Bell, Brenda Scheer, and Maurine Bachman all voted “yes”. The motion passed unanimously.

A five-minute break was taken. The meeting reconvened at 7:45 PM.

**Zoning Map Amendment at approximately 805 South 800 West** - Jake Billitteri, representing the property owner, is requesting an amendment to the zoning map for the property at the above-stated address. The proposal would rezone the property from M-1 Light Manufacturing to R-MU-45 Residential Mixed Use Zoning District. The subject parcel is approximately .11 acres or 4,792 square feet. Future development plans were not submitted with this application. The property is within Council District 2, represented by Alejandro Puy. (Staff contact: Brooke Olson at 801-535-7118 or brooke.olson@slcgov.com) **Case number PLNPCM2021-01077**

Associate Planner Brooke Olson reviewed the petition as outlined in the staff report. She stated that Staff recommends a positive recommendation to City Council.
Commissioner Brenda Scheer asked for clarification on how many units would be allowed under zoning for R-MU-45. Brooke Olson clarified that R-MU-45 doesn’t require a minimum for square footage and that it really depends on how the applicant lays out the parcel. Brenda Scheer asked for clarification on if each unit requires 2,500 square feet. Planning Manager John Anderson clarified that if it is rear loaded unit, it doesn’t require lot size requirements. Brenda Scheer asked for clarification on a rear loading unit. John Anderson clarified that if you have a unit where the parking is located in the back of the property instead of on the street. Brenda Scheer asked why they chose R-MU-45 and not R-MU-35. Brooke Olson stated it was because the applicant requested R-MU-45.

Jordan Atkin stated that after discussion with staff they believed R-MU-45 was more compatible. He stated that they decided on R-MU-45 over R-MU-35 because it helps to create a hierarchy as you get closer to the development potential that is likely to occur as you come off the freeway. He did state that they are open to switching to R-MU-35 instead of R-MU-45.

Commissioner Brenda Scheer stated that she needs clarification regarding the setbacks and the development requirements of the R-MU-45 zone. Nick Norris stated that for R-MU-45 there is no minimum unit requirement for lot area and no minimum for existing lots. He stated that there is no minimum lot size for multi-family if it’s an existing lot. He also stated that they rely on the bulk requirements of the zone and if someone is able to design something that fits and meets all the standards.

Chairperson Amy Barry stated that she is concerned how this block ultimately redevelops, in that height seems more appropriate closer to the freeway in relationship to the R-MU zone that is on the corner of 9th West. She also stated that she believes R-MU-45 is not the right zone for the portion of the block. Jordan Atkin stated that they would be willing to change to the R-MU-35 instead of the R-MU-45.

PUBLIC HEARING

Chairperson Amy Barry opened the public hearing. Seeing that no one wished to speak, Chairperson Amy Barry closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Brenda Scheer stated that she would be more comfortable recommending a R-MU-35. Chairperson Amy Barry asked for clarification if they would be able to create a motion with the new zone of R-MU-35 since the applicant has already agreed to allowing R-MU-35. Planning Director Nick Norris stated that he would recommend the applicant provide a clear response to the Commission’s R-MU-35 rezone recommendation. Brenda Scheer asked if they should table the motion to allow the applicant to bring back a revised proposal. Nick Norris clarified that to table the motion would not be necessary but to clarify that the applicant is accepting of a motion of a different zone. Amy Barry asked the applicant if he is clear on what a development for a R-MU-35 zone would entail for this lot. Jordan Atkin stated that they are fully on board with R-MU-35 zoning.

MOTION

Commissioner Brenda Scheer 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 the City Council for a R-MU-35 zoning change that was on the parcel part of PLNPCM2021-01077.

Commissioner Adrienne Bell seconded the motion. Vice-Chairperson Maurine Bachman, Commissioners Adrienne Bell, Jon Lee, Brenda Scheer, Adrienne Bell, and Aimee Burrows all voted “yes”. The motion passes unanimously.

R-2 Lot Coverage Zoning Text Amendment - Jim Bradley, the property owner at approximately 927 East 700 South, has submitted a petition to amend a section of the Zoning Ordinance related to building coverage limitations in the R2 Single and Two-Family Residential District. The subject regulation is found in Section 21A.24.110F. The Zoning Ordinance currently limits the building coverage for single-family homes to 40% of the lot and the building coverage for duplexes to 45% of the lot. The proposed amendment would increase the allowable building coverage to 45% for single-family homes in the R2 district. (Staff Contact: Meagan Booth at 801-535-7213 or meagan.booth@slcgov.com) Case number PLNPCM2021-01228

Planning Manager Wayne Mills, filling in for Principal Planner Meagan Booth, reviewed the petition as outlined in the staff report. He stated that Staff analyzed the applicant’s proposal and took it a step further and analyzed allowing 45 percent building coverage for all single-family homes in the R-2 zoning district. He added that the proposal does not affect or impact the other zoning requirements. He stated that Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve the request.

Commissioner Scheer asked if the public input was sought on the second part of the proposal. Staff clarified that it had not been part of the initial notification.

Chairperson Barry addressed that the Commission did receive one emailed public comment that mentioned the second part of the proposal.

The applicant Jim Bradley stated that his home needs to be kept as it is but the limitations under the current zoning don’t allow it to be. He stated that Wayne Mills did a good job and feels that expanding the request to all of the R-2 zones is very appropriate.

PUBLIC HEARING

Chairperson Amy Barry opened the public hearing.
Seeing that no one wished to speak, Chairperson Amy Barry closed the public hearing.

Chairperson Barry stated that the staff report was very direct and helpful and is in favor of the petition.

Planning Manager Wayne Mills further explained the public notification process in regard to this specific petition saying that the notice language was kept open. He stated that the language for the notice advertised it as expanding the building coverage in the R-2 district so that people wouldn’t assume that it only applied to 5,000 square foot lots.
Chairperson Barry reminded the audience that the Commission is making a recommendation to City Council and there would be additional opportunity for public participation.

Director Nick Norris opened up the open house language and read the proposal to the Commission, sharing that it does not differentiate the lot size.

Commissioner Scheer stated that her concern was that it was properly noticed.

MOTION

Commissioner Adrienne Bell stated, Based on the staff report, the information presented, and input received during the public hearing, I move that the Planning Commission transmit a favorable recommendation to the City Council regarding petition PLNPCM2021-01228, an amendment to Section 21A.24.110F of the Salt Lake City Zoning Ordinance. The specific change to the text of the Zoning Ordinance is found on page 2 of the Planning Commission Staff Report.

Commissioner Maurine Bachman, Aimee Burrows, Jon Lee, Adrienne Bell, Brenda Scheer all voted “yes”. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 8:22 PM.