

## Staff Report

To: Salt Lake City Planning Commission
From: Amanda Roman, Urban Designer
801-535-7660 or Amanda.Roman@slcgov.com
Date: December 13, 2023
Re: PLNPCM2023-00707 Edison Street Design Review

## Design Review

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 220 \& 250 S 200 E
PARCEL ID: 16-06-176-013-0000 \& 16-06-176-028-0000
GENERAL PLAN: Downtown Plan
ZONING DISTRICT: D-1 Central Business District

## REQUEST:

Salt Lake City has received a request from Mitch Vance with J. Fisher Companies, representing the property owner, for Design Review approval for a mixed use development at approximately 220 and 250 S 200 E . The site consists of two parcels totaling approximately 1.45 acres (63,000 SF). The subject property is in the D-1 Central Business District within the Central Business District of the Downtown Plan area.

The proposed development is 7 stories tall and includes 201 units, ranging from studios to twobedrooms, 157 parking spaces, and 9,500 square feet of retail and amenity space. The north side of the property will include a publicly accessible midblock walkway, as required in the Downtown Plan, connecting 200 East to Edison Street.

Design Review approval is required for the following modifications to both the D-1 Central Business District standards in 21A.30.020.D1 and the Design Standards in 21A.37.050:

1. A reduction in the minimum building height from 100 feet to approximately $78^{\prime} 6^{\prime \prime}$ (Section 21A.30.020.D1)
2. A decrease in the required glass percentages on both the ground floor and upper floors (Section 21A.37.050.C1 \& 21A.37.050.C2)
3. An increase in the maximum street facing facade length from 150 feet to approximately 307 ' 4", along 200 East (Section 21A.37.050.F)
4. Modifications to the upper floors stepbacks required for buildings between 78-104' within the D-1 zone (Section 21A.37.050.F)

## RECOMMENDATION:

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

1. All signage, lighting, and site details shall be delegated to staff for final review.
2. A public access easement shall be recorded to ensure the midblock walkway is privately maintained but publicly accessible.

## ATTACHMENTS

A. Vicinity Map
B. Applicant's Narrative
C. Plan Set
D. Property \& Vicinity Photos
E. Design Review Standards
F. Public Process \& Comments
G. Department Review Comments

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION



## Quick Facts

Height: 78'6" is the lowest average building height along the southern elevation; the average height of all elevations is 83 feet

Units: 201
Uses: Residential, ground floor retail, public midblock walkway

Exterior Materials: Brick and cementitious panel, with glass and metal accents

Parking: 157 parking stalls

Proposed 200 East elevation.

## Project Location

The project is located at approximately 250 S 200 E , in the D-1 Central Business District zoning district and Downtown Plan area. The development is oriented towards 200 East between 200 and 300 South and consists of two parcels totaling approximately 1.45 acres ( $63,000 \mathrm{SF}$ ). The property has approximately 84 feet of street frontage on Edison Street and 340 feet of street frontage on 200 East, which is notable as 200 East is a part of the city's Green Loop project area. City officials and a consultant team are currently working on design alternatives for this section of the Green Loop corridor.

## Proposed Development

The proposal seeks Planning Commission approval to modify the minimum building height in the $\mathrm{D}-1$ zoning district and additional approval to modify the zones design standards. Specifically, the applicant is requesting to reduce the minimum building height, increase the maximum building length, decrease the percentage of required glass, and modify upper floor stepbacks. Modifications to building height or a zoning district's underlying design standards in 21A. 37 may be approved through the Design Review process.

The project includes 201 units (mix of studios, and one- or two-bedrooms) with an average of 640 square feet. The building has 9,500 square feet of ground floor commercial space that includes two restaurants, a coffee shop, and three food stalls meant for small-scale production. The building has frontage on 200 East, which is currently being redesigned as part of the Green Loop project. An eastwest midblock walkway will connect the Green Loop to Edison Street.

The building is seven stories, built on a two story concrete podium using stick-frame construction. The design includes five levels of residential units situated over two levels of parking. The building's height, measured from the average elevation of the finished lot grade to the roof's highest point, varies due to the site's slope. The front (east, along 200 E.) and rear (west, along Edison St.) elevations have an average height of 83 feet. The average height of the northern elevation along the midblock walkway is $79^{\prime} 4$ " and the southern elevation averages $78^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime}$, which is the lowest average.

The two story brick base is approximately $307^{\prime} 4$ " in length along 200 East and 247 feet along the midblock walkway. The base is 22 feet in height from grade and wraps the parking structure with retail and amenity spaces. The first two stories of the building extend to the 200 East property line, establishing a contiguous street wall, and creating an active and transparent pedestrian environment.

Along the 200 East frontage, there are three entrances for commercial use and four for residential access. A canopy, extending 8 feet, shelters the entrances to the coffee shop, restaurant, and leasing office. These primary building entrances are within recessed areas, setback 4 feet from the main building façade. The building's ground floor shifts from brick to metal within the niches, highlighting breaks in the facade and adding more architectural detail.

The upper levels of building massing are divided into three sections, each creating approximately 65 feet of frontage on 200 East. Two podium level courtyards provide separation between the building masses and create an 89 foot stepback from the front façade. The building materials between the third and seventh level consist of light toned brick and dark cementitious board and batten. Durable materials are used on $100 \%$ of the structure, surpassing the zones requirement.


200 East frontage.


Midblock walkway looking west, towards Edison Street.

## Neighborhood Context

To understand the applicant's requested modifications, specifically the request to reduce the minimum building height, the context of the site and the surrounding properties is key. The proposed building height aligns with the development pattern of neighboring properties along 200 South, Edison Street, and the majority of the 200 East block faces. Vicinity photos are located on page 100 of the report.

The multi-family apartment building (the Randi apartments by C.W. Urban) abutting the property to the north and fronting 200 South, is 85 feet tall. The project, vested under different zoning regulations, received Planning Commission approval to reduce the minimum height of a corner property in the D1 zoning district from 100 to 85 feet. Further details on recent amendments to the D-1 zoning district are found under Consideration 1.

Among the three other properties with frontage on 200 South between Edison Street and 200 East, the one west of the Randi apartments is comparable in size to the corner lot, presenting a potential opportunity for redevelopment. The J.A. Fritsch building, located in the middle of the block face and considered a historic landmark site, and the property on the corner of Edison Street and 200 South which is constrained by its narrow 35 -foot width, makes these sites unlikely to redevelop.

Three properties on Edison Street are also unlikely to undergo redevelopment due to size or ownership. Just north of the subject property is a small lot of only 2,200 square feet. Directly south, a historic structure was recently renovated from two stories to three stories. On the corner of Edison Street and 300 South, a State-owned property is currently being developed into a three-story liquor store. On the corner of 200 East and 300 South, two lots, including the Ken Sanders bookstore, are expected to undergo redevelopment in the future.

On the eastern side of 200 East, there's a diverse range of structures, including exceptionally tall buildings, both new and old mid-rise apartments, and a historic Methodist church situated at the corner of 200 South and 200 East. The tallest building under construction, located on the southeastern corner, will reach approximately 335 feet in height. As a comparison, the height of the 335 foot tower is nearly the same as the width of the subject property's street frontage along 200 East.


## Midblock Walkway

The Downtown Plan identifies a midblock walkway within the project boundaries. The proposed walkway is to be located north of the development and will create an east-west connection between 200 East and Edison Street. The walkway is 21 feet in width, exceeding the minimum 15 foot standard within Downtown districts.

The walkway will be activated by three ground level food stalls, a restaurant space that wraps the north-eastern corner along 200 East, and resident amenity space with frontage on Edison Street. The walkway will also provide lighting features, seating, and art.

The proposed art installations are representative of Salt Lake City's history with cycling. Established in 1888, the Guthrie Bicycle Company holds the distinction of being the oldest bike shop in the State. Originally situated in the J.A. Fritsch building at 228 S 200 E , directly north of the current property, the business thrived in this location from the 1930s until 2011. The J.A. Fritsch building is now on the National Register of Historic Places, and while the location of Guthrie's has changed, its historical presence remains. The proposed midblock walkway will include cast iron plaques embedded in the pavement, detailing the history of Salt Lake's bike scene.


Midblock walkway renderings. Additionally, art installations will integrate bikes or their components into select pieces.

The midblock walkway will not include trees due to the area being shaded for most of the day. To soften the hardscape and help enclose the space, the walkway will include shade tolerant shrubs and plants within moveable planters. The walkway will also connect to the Green Loop. The preliminary design of the Green Loop includes a bike path on the western side of 200 East, seating, and a dense tree canopy. The applicant submitted a landscaping and materials palette that can be reviewed in Attachment C on pages $64-78$ of the staff report. Landscaping plans are provided on pages 79-91 of the report.

## APPROVAL PROCESS AND COMMISSION AUTHORITY

Design Reviews may be approved administratively or when required, by the Planning Commission. This project must be approved by the Planning Commission because the applicant is requesting to modify the adopted design standards of the D-1 Central Business District.

Per section 21A.59.030 of the Zoning Ordinance, the Planning Commission shall approve a project if it finds that the proposal complies with the purpose of the zoning district and applicable Overlay District(s), the purpose of the individual design standards that are applicable to the project, and the project is compliant with the design review objectives. The Commission may also add conditions or modifications.

## KEY CONSIDERATIONS

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

1. Requested Zoning Modifications
2. Compliance with City Goals \& Policies Identified in Adopted Plans

## Consideration 1: Requested Zoning Modifications

The applicant is requesting to reduce the minimum building height within the D-1 Central Business District from 100 feet to approximately 78'6" (Section 21A.30.020.D1). Buildings under the minimum or over 200 feet in height must receive Design Review approval.

The applicant is also requesting modifications to the following Design Standards in Section 21A.37.050 Design Standards may be modified through the Design Review process, if the modification complies with the purpose of the zoning district, complies with the purpose of the individual design standards that are applicable to the project, and if the modification is compatible with the development pattern of other buildings on the block face or on the block face on the opposite side of the street.

- An increase to the maximum building length from 150 feet to 307 ' 4 "
- A reduction in the ground floor glass requirement from $60 \%$ to $52 \%$
- A reduction the upper floor glass requirement from 50\% to between $26.5-29 \%$
- The proposal does not provide adequate soil volume for the required street trees, but the applicant will mitigate this by using silva cells along 200 East


## 1. Request for Reduced Building Height

## Background

The original project area was confined to the southern lot, 250 S 200 E. However, following a fire that razed the 3 -story office building at 220 S 200 E , the property owner purchased the property and redesigned the project to encompass both lots. In 2018, the first iteration of the development was approved by the Planning Commission for a height of 108 feet. The original proposal was reviewed under different D-1 zoning regulations. Previously, there were different regulations for midblock and corner buildings, which were intended to emphasize the intersection of two primary streets and create a sense of enclosure within downtown nodes. Midblock buildings had a maximum building height of 100 feet and corner buildings had a maximum height of 375 feet. Additional height, with no imposed limit, could be approved through the Design Review process.

In 2023, the regulations for the D-1 Central Business District changed with the adoption of the Downtown Building Heights and Street Activation ordinance. The proposed development is the first in D-1 to seek Planning Commission approval to adjust the district's new height and design standards. It is also the first to request reduced building height under the new ordinance. If reviewed under the prior code, the proposed $78^{\prime}$ '" tall building would have met the height standards for the district.

The recent changes to the D-1 zoning district aim to support future growth, align zoning with building codes, and improve livability with active ground floor spaces and streets. The amendments eliminated the distinction between corner and midblock buildings and modified the by-right height in the D-1 zone to a minimum of 100 feet and a maximum of 200 feet. Buildings over 200 feet may be approved through the Design Review process if the project provides one of five public benefits. Buildings under 100 feet may be approved through the same process if their height is compatible with other buildings on the block face and the design meets the standards of review in 21 A .59 . The applicant submitted a narrative explaining their request to reduce the minimum building height, detailed in Attachment B on page 17 of the staff report.

## Applicant's Request

The applicant is requesting approval for a minimum building height of $78^{\prime} 6^{\prime \prime}$. The zoning ordinance defines building height as, "The vertical distance from the average elevation of the finished lot grade at each face of the building, to the highest point of the coping of a flat roof; the deck line of a mansard roof, or the average height of the gable on a pitched gambrel, hip, or shed roof." The proposed building, with a flat roof design, averages about 83 feet in height, but due to the slight grade of the property, each of the four elevations has different average heights. The front and rear elevations facing 200 East and Edison Street have an average height of 83 feet. The northern building elevation, next to the midblock walkway, has an average height of approximately 79 '' ". The southern building elevation has an average height of $78^{\prime} 10$ ", which is being rounded down to $78^{\prime} 6^{\prime \prime}$ to give the applicant some technical flexibility during the building permit process.


Eastern elevation (200 East) - average height of 83feet


Northern elevation (midblock walkway) - average height of 79'6"


Western elevation (Edison Street) - average height of 83feet


Southern elevation - average elevation of 78 '6"
Although the proposed height falls short of the minimum requirement in the $\mathrm{D}-1$ zoning district, it is in line with the development pattern of the surrounding properties. Situated at the eastern edge of the Central Business District, nearly all neighboring properties have either undergone redevelopment or are unlikely to do so due to their small lot sizes. The newer and under-construction buildings are of lower height than the proposed development. The older existing buildings are smaller in scale, ranging from one to three stories. The property just south of the subject property is anticipated to undergo redevelopment in the future, but at present, the existing buildings are single-story. The development pattern is similar with the other side of 200 East, which is the eastern edge of the D-1 zoning district. Apart from an under-construction residential building (the Worthington) at the corner of 200 East and 300 South, which will be 335 feet in height, the other structures are generally low to mid-rise.

The applicant believes that the reduced height will create a more comfortable pedestrian experience, specifically within the midblock walkway. The building's base is 22 feet tall and features primarily brick and batten board siding. The massing between levels 3-7 is broken up by two podium level courtyards that face 200 East. The ground floor is predominantly transparent, except for utilitarian spaces like fire risers, stairwells, and elevators. Over $90 \%$ of the ground floor will host active uses, fostering activity and creating a more engaging environment for pedestrians.


Proposed building next to the Randi apartments, which is approximately 85feet.

## 2. Request to Increase Allowable Building Length

The maximum building length of a street facing façade in the D-1 Central Business District is 150 feet. The applicant is requesting approval for a 307 '4" building façade along 200 East, which spans the length of the property, other than an 8 foot southern side yard setback and the 21 feet allocated to the midblock walkway. With the purchase of the property to the north, the original building design was changed to be longer and shorter than the design approved by the Planning Commission in 2018.

The applicant's narrative states that incorporating the northern parcel in the project redesign is mutually beneficial for the applicant and the city. This integration enables the creation of a midblock walkway extending from 200 East to Edison Street, preventing a dead end caused by the building at 231 S Edison Street, which currently houses Franklin Ave Cocktails \& Kitchen, which blocks through access to Edison Street. The applicant explained that the project meets the purpose of the D-1 district which states, "The standards are intended to achieve established objectives for urban design, pedestrian amenities, and land use control."


The proposed street facing façade length is 307'4". Maximum by-right building length is 150 feet.

The applicant has sought to reduce the perceived horizontal scale of the structure by incorporating various architectural details along the ground floor. The three main building entries lead to the lobby, center restaurant, and coffee shop. The other four pedestrian entrances are more utilitarian in nature and are not emphasized in the design. The primary building entrances are set back from the front line of the building by 4 feet. Each entry point has a deeper canopy than the rest of the building face, as well as a different window pattern. Additional details at these entry points include material changes from brick to metal, increased wall height,
 and architectural columns.

## 3. Request to Reduce Upper \& Lower Floor Glass Percentages

In the $\mathrm{D}-1$ zoning district, the ground floor glass requirement is $60 \%$, and the upper floor glass requirement is $50 \%$. The applicant is seeking approval to decrease the glass percentage on levels $1-2$ to $51 \%$ and on the upper floors to a range of $25-31 \%$. Specifically, levels 3-4 have $31 \%$, levels $5-6$ have $30 \%$, and level 7 has $25 \%$.

The ground floor comprises $90 \%$ active uses, including restaurants, a coffee shop, and a lobby along 200 East, as well as restaurants, food stalls, and a clubroom along the midblock walkway. All public spaces have high transparency, providing unobstructed views into the building from the public realm. The sections without glass include three stair towers, an elevator, an electrical room, and the fire riser room, strategically placed at the southern end or within the middle of the façade to separate the lobby and restaurant spaces. The first two floors along the midblock walkway and the portion with frontage on Edison Street are equally transparent. To mitigate the reduction in glazing, the proposal includes $100 \%$ durable building materials on all non-glass façade areas, exceeding the zones design standards that call for $70 \%$ durable materials on the ground floor and $50 \%$ on the upper floors.


## Diagram detailing the glazing on the front building elevation.

## 4. Request to Modify Upper Floor Stepbacks

The applicant's last request is to modify the upper floor stepback requirement, which mandates that a minimum of $80 \%$ of the upper floors be set back at least 10 feet. According to section 21A.37.050.G.1, for buildings ranging from 78-104 feet or six to eight stories, a minimum stepback of 10 feet is required at least 25 feet above grade. Additionally, $20 \%$ of the entire building façade can meet the street at the lot line with no stepback. Building stepbacks serve to enhance the pedestrian experience on the ground floor, creating a more human-scale environment. Additionally, they facilitate the penetration of light and airflow in confined urban spaces.
Even though the literal standard of the code has not been met, the building does incorporate substantial stepbacks at two locations, which meets the intent of the design standard. Approximately $35 \%$ of the façade meets the lot line with no stepback. At level three, the building has two courtyards that are approximately 89 feet deep and 55 feet wide. While amenity spaces for the residents, they also provide a change in both the vertical and horizontal massing. Additionally, the building materials change color, which helps differentiate the base from the middle of the structure.


The front building elevation is stepped back 89 feet from the front facade.


View of stepback from the sidewalk.

## Consideration 2: Compliance with City Goals \& Policies Identified in Adopted Plans

## Plan Salt Lake (2015)

Plan Salt Lake is a comprehensive, citywide vision designed to create a framework for managing the City's growth. The plan establishes a series of citywide policies that address crucial aspects like placemaking, density management, the integration of various land uses, and enhanced connectivity. Each Guiding Principle is linked to a range of initiatives that work to carry out the shared vision: a city that is inclusive, resilient, and economically prosperous. Applicable initiatives from the plan are below.

Neighborhoods: Vibrant neighborhoods are fundamental to the health and vitality of Salt Lake residents and visitors. Ones neighborhoods should enhance their quality of life by ensuring access to basic goods, services, and amenities, and providing opportunities for social interaction. Community gathering spaces may vary in size and use, but should be designed to be safe, distinctive, and engaging.

- Maintain neighborhood stability and character.
- Support neighborhoods and districts in carrying out the City's collective Vision.
- Create a safe and convenient place for people to carry out their daily lives.
- Support neighborhood identity and diversity.
- Support policies that provides people a choice to stay in their home and neighborhood as they grow older and household demographics change.
- Promote accessible neighborhood services and amenities, including parks, natural lands, and schools.
- Encourage and support local businesses and neighborhood business districts.
- Provide opportunities for and promotion of social interaction.
- Improve the usefulness of public rights-of-way as usable public space.

Growth: Responsible growth should minimize developments impact on the natural environment by focusing on transit-oriented development, concentrating density in areas already served by existing infrastructure, and promoting best practices in building and urban design.

- Locate new development in areas with existing infrastructure and amenities, such as transit and transportation corridors.
- Encourage a mix of land uses.
- Promote infill and redevelopment of underutilized land.
- Accommodate and promote an increase in the City's population.
- Provide access to opportunities for a healthy lifestyle (including parks, trails, recreation, and healthy food).

Housing: As the City's population continues to grow, providing residents with access to a wide variety of housing types that are not only attainable, but affordable, is a top priority. This involves preserving the existing housing stock, increasing the number of new family-sized housing units, and strategic placement of new development transit and neighborhood nodes. Ongoing efforts should focus on reducing barriers to obtaining housing, enabling residents to age in place, and taking proactive measures to address displacement.

- Increase the number of medium density housing types and options.
- Direct new growth toward areas with existing infrastructure and services that have the potential to be people-oriented.
- Enable moderate density increases within existing neighborhoods where appropriate.

Transportation \& Mobility: The establishment and enhancement of the City's transportation networks is pivotal to advancing a vibrant and connected community, where all residents live within $1 / 4$ mile to a transit option. The continued investment in a variety of transportation modes, from public transit and cycling infrastructure to widened sidewalks and the creation of midblock walkways, will create a more accessible and sustainable urban environment.

- Create a complete circulation network and ensure convenient equitable access to a variety of transportation options by:
- Having a public transit stop within $1 / 4$ mile of all residents.
- Expanding pedestrian and bicycle networks and facilities in all areas of the City.
- Prioritize connecting residents to neighborhood, community, regional, and recreation nodes by improved routes for walking, biking, and transit.
- Incorporate pedestrian oriented elements, including street trees, pedestrian scale lighting, signage, and embedded art, into our rights-of way and transportation networks.

Staff Discussion: The project is at the eastern edge of the Central Business District, where the CBD and Broadway District come together. The downtown population is expected to double by 2025, going from 5,000 to 10,000 people. The project adds more housing units to support this growth. While the 201 units aren't for sale, the plans include 56 two-bedroom apartments, offering a chance for smaller families to live downtown. The property is between two roads with dedicated bike lanes, close to the Library TRAX station, and within walking distance of CBD amenities. The proposed Green Loop, a linear park network, will be built along 200 East. The planned bike lane within the loop will connect north and south comfortably and the linear park will add more usable outdoor space for residents. In general, the project aligns with the Downtown Plan by providing housing in a growing area, creating additional connections through the midblock walkway to existing transportation networks, and adding retail space that can be supported by the population.

## Downtown Plan (2016)

The Downtown Plan envisions a city that is livable, walkable, and connected, provides housing choice and affordability, is welcoming and safe, and incorporates a mix of public and private amenities. The subject property straddles the Central Business District which should "continue to be defined by Main Street shopping, the tallest buildings in the city, and arts and cultural institutions." The plan describes a linear parkway along 200 East that will mark the transition to a lower scale, more residential neighborhood to the east. As envisioned in the plan, the proposed Green Loop is moving forward, with preliminary designs presented to the public in November 2023.

Staff Discussion: The project aligns with the goals of the Downtown Plan by expanding the housing options, creating business opportunities through retail spaces, and enhancing midblock connections that lead to amenities and the city-owned park space in the envisioned future Green Loop.

The project meets the following Central Business District Initiatives:

- Ensure reasonable public access through private mid-block walkways and alleys.
- Utilize design standards to create a high quality interface between public spaces and private buildings.
- Prioritize pedestrian movement and safety by addressing conflicts with vehicles, designing the street for pedestrian comfort, and considering pedestrian convenience.
- Consider establishing appropriate scaled parks and open space.


## Central Community Plan (2005)

The Central Community Plan designated the subject property as part of the Central Business District, which aligns with the property's D-1 Central Business District zoning. Characteristics that define the CBD are land use regulations that enhance the urban design elements and strengthen the area's position as a vital and active regional center. Residential land use goals include encouraging a variety of housing types for higher-density multi-family housing within the CBD and near downtown light rail station to satisfy housing demand. The area should be a 24 -hour center that includes high-density residential, retail, restaurants, and high intensity employment uses. The proposal aligns with both the initial neighborhood plans and the recently adopted Downtown Plan, which advances the vision within the Central Community Plan.

## DISCUSSION

The proposed development will set precedent as the first within the D-1 Central Business District to request modifications to the zone's new height regulations and design standards that were adopted in mid-2023. The Downtown Building Heights and Street Activation ordinance aims to encourage downtown living by promoting density, providing publicly accessible and comfortable open spaces, and creating safe, active, and engaging streetscapes. Prior to the ordinance being adopted, the property had a maximum building height of 100 feet due to it being a midblock location. The amendment removed the midblock and corner lot distinctions and deemed 100 feet as the new height minimum. The ordinance updates also created the 150 -foot maximum street facing facade, upper floor glass, and upper floor stepback standards. The design standards in section 21A. 37 aim to encourage a dense and pedestrian-friendly community by using architectural and urban design principles, with the goal of creating a resilient urban environment that can adapt and thrive over time.

The applicant's proposal to reduce the minimum building height from 100 feet to approximately $78^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime}$ is in line with the existing development in the surrounding area, particularly between 200 and 300 South and between Edison Street and 200 East. Notably, the building directly north of the subject property, approved at a height of approximately 85 feet, was deemed by the Planning Commission to be more harmonious with the lower height historic buildings along 200 South and 200 East. While it's acknowledged that the approval for the neighboring building was under a different set of standards, the development pattern has remained relatively consistent since its approval in 2018. The tallest structure in the vicinity, the Worthington Apartments, will be approximately 335 feet tall once construction is complete. The apartments are located on the corner of 200 East and 300 South and are also being constructed under the previous D-1 standards, thus not did not require Design Review approval for additional building height. These apartments will be as tall as the subject property is long.

Regarding the request to double the allowable building length from 150 feet to approximately 307 feet, the applicant has taken steps to address potential concerns. These include the implementation of substantial upper level stepbacks, changes in building materials, and a modified entry design to mitigate the perceived horizontal scale of the proposed structure.

While the proposal does not meet the required glass percentages, the ground floor is highly transparent and contains $90 \%$ active uses. The high ground floor glass requirement of $60 \%$ is intended to enhance connectivity between public and private spaces, aiming to craft an inviting and visually engaging experience for pedestrians. This design standard is achieved through elements such as outdoor seating, a midblock connection, and the inclusion of multiple retail spaces with street frontage. The modifications to the upper level stepbacks, which are required for buildings between 74-104 feet, align with the intent of the code. The third level stepback is 89 feet in depth and there is a clear distinction between the building's base and its middle section (levels 3-6), which is accomplished by a change in material, color, and window treatment.

Additionally, while exceptionally tall buildings are supported in the $\mathrm{D}-1$ zoning district, the proposals reduced building height prevents the structure from overshadowing its surroundings, contributing to a balanced streetscape. In summary, the proposed modifications to the D-1 Downton Central Business District minimum height may be appropriate based on the context of the surrounding development framework. The applicant has also taken steps to address concerns related to building length and design elements.

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The proposal is generally in line with the intended purpose of the $\mathrm{D}-1$ zoning district, meets the established Design Review standards, and is compatible with the city's various general plans. The requested modifications adhere to the applicable standards of review outlined in 21A.59, and efforts have been made to address and mitigate these modifications by incorporating design elements aimed at enhancing the pedestrian experience.

## NEXT STEPS

## Approval of the Requests

If the petitions are approved by the Planning Commission, the applicant will need to comply with the conditions of approval, including any of the conditions required by City departments and the Planning Commission. A lot consolidation will need to be finalized and recorded with Salt Lake County prior to a building permit being issued. Additionally, the electrical transformer located in the front building setback must be screened. Compliance will be confirmed during the building permit process. Unless specified in the zoning ordinance as a minor modification, any modification to the development plan must be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission.

## Denial of the Requests

If the petition is denied, the applicant would be required to redesign the building, creating a taller and narrower structure. The building would be required to have a minimum height of 100 feet and the street facing façade could be no longer than 150 feet. The glass and stepback modifications being requested would also need to be addressed in the redesign.

## ATTACHMENT A: Vicinity Map

Vicinity Map


Salt Lake City Planning Division 9/15/2023

## ATTACHMENT B: Applicant's Narrative

## Project Description and Narrative

We, as representatives of J Fisher Companies, submit this Design Review application in request that the Planning Commission grant a reduction to the required minimum building height outlined in the newly adopted standards of the D-1 Zone (21A.30.020). Additionally, we are requesting that the Commission approve modifications to three of the recently adopted design standards for new buildings in the D-1 district that are found in 21A. 37 of the Salt Lake City code.

Several years ago, our group had progressed through the Salt Lake City building permit process and completed a building permit for a project on this site. However, when the opportunity arose to purchase the adjacent property to the north, we began a complete redesign of the building to develop the parcels together. We abandoned the approved plans and re-engaged an architect to design a new project that seamlessly incorporates both properties. The additional land allowed us to complete the redevelopment efforts along 200 East and provided the opportunity for the building and midblock walkway to connect to Edison Street.

Whereas the previous project was approved with a mid-block walkway composed of a 10 -foot-wide sidewalk that dead-ended into the back of an existing building, we now had the opportunity to design a truly functional mid-block walkway between 200 East and Edison that would be an amenity to our residents and anyone living in the area. The walkway, which will be open for the public's use, is designed to be 21 feet wide and will have outdoor seating, planters, overhead lighting, and artistic elements along the path. The current design of the walkway is included in the material submitted with this application.

Our project is proposed as a Type IIIA multi-family structure, five floors of residential over two floors of podium parking structure. The design shows 201 market-rate units including 40 studio units, 105 1BR units, and 56 2BR units. The building has approx. 9,500 sq. ft. of indoor leasing and amenity space as well as outdoor amenity space in two courtyards on top of the podium. Drawings currently show 157 parking spaces within the podium. The exterior of the building is designed primarily with brick and cementitious panel, along with glass and metal accents.

Our requests are that the Planning Commission consider approving the following:

1. A modification to the minimum building height found in the $\mathrm{D}-1$ code and assign the project a minimum height of 83 feet measured from average grade to the top of the roof
2. A modification to the design standard that requires $60 \%$ of the ground floor to be clad with glass (we have $51 \%$ ) and the $50 \%$ of the upper floors to be clad with glass (we have $31 \%$ on levels $3-4,30 \%$ on levels $5-6$, and $25 \%$ on level 7)
3. A modification to the design standard that limits street facing façade length to 150 ' (our building is 307 )
4. A modification to the design standard that requires the upper floors of a building to step back 10 ' for $80 \%$ of the building façade (we show $65 \%$ of the building façade at the lot line with no step back)

We feel that these modifications are justifiable for the following reasons along with those found in the responses provided in the "Demonstration of Compliance" section below:

- Context: The project was designed during the code amendments for both the D-1 zone and the design standards. The new D-1 code established the minimum building height requirement at what was previously the maximum building height. Building length and step back were added to the code after our building was already in the design process, though we had not yet submitted to the city. We decided to redesign the building from the original approved project for the better overall development of the block rather than developing parcel by parcel.
- Surrounding Heights: The project immediately to the northeast side of our property (the Randi) was recently approved as a corner project build under 100 feet tall. The other existing buildings to the north are 1-3 story buildings. The building immediately to the west of our project along Edison Street was recently remodeled and added onto, which made the building 3 stories tall. The State of Utah is in the process of building a new liquor store on the property south of ours, which will likely be 2 stories tall. An exceptionally tall building located in the middle of the block would be out of context with existing buildings and would adversely impact the pedestrian experience - particularly on Edison Street. The building we are proposing will be the correct scale for the block and will also act as a step-down solution to the tall buildings being built on the east side of 200 East.
- Pedestrian Connection: The D-1 Zone as well as the General Plan emphasize the importance of mid-block connections both for vehicles and pedestrian circulation. While our block has Edison Street running north-south through the block, there is currently no formalized east-west path. Our revised project includes a well-designed and functional midblock, east-west connection. This will be an important amenity not only to our tenants, but to the surrounding properties who have quicker and safer access to Edison Street and the downtown area. We anticipate keeping this walkway activated as it connects to our amenity space on the ground floor on Edison, a restaurant on 200 East, and three food stalls that can be used by local small-scale vendors.
- Design: We have been working with the city on this project for several years and have come back for minor revisions like this because we care about the quality of our finished product. Our project will reflect on both our team and the city, so we are working to ensure a highquality project that will complement the downtown and future projects.


## Purpose of D-1 District

The Purpose Statement for the D-1 Zone says the following (with our response below each phrase):
"...provide for commercial and economic development within Salt Lake City's most urban and intense areas. A broad range of uses, including very high density housing, are intended to foster a twenty four (24) hour activity environment consistent with the area's function as the business, office, retail, entertainment, cultural and tourist center of the region."

Our project is made up of residential units with retail uses on the ground floor. The midblock walkway will provide pedestrians with improved access to the downtown core in a way that is only found near City Creek Center. The building includes space along the walkway that will be available to food vendors, which will activate the walkway year-round. The proposed parking
structure will serve the needs of our residents in addition to commercial users visiting the area. Such a project supports this portion of the zone's Purpose Statement.
"Development is intended to be very intense with high lot coverage and large buildings that are placed close together while being oriented toward the pedestrian..."

Our project proposes very high lot coverage and spans a significant portion of the block. If we had not chosen to redesign the previously approved building on the site, a 75 ' wide lot that runs from 200 East to Edison would have been left to develop on its own. By incorporating that piece in our new design, the block will flow more naturally and allows for a 'large building' oriented to the pedestrian with a fully functional midblock walkway that includes retail space on the walkway, 200 East, and Edison. It was important for us during the design of the building to address Edison Street in a way that will continue to activate and energize that unique street.
"The standards are intended to achieve established objectives for urban design, pedestrian amenities and land use control."

As previously stated, our project is design-sensitive within and without the building. The pedestrian experience is central to the project design including high-quality screening for structured parking, a high level of material quality, the mid-block walkway, and retail uses throughout much of the ground floor of the building.

Demonstration of Compliance with standards for Design Review Section 21A.59.045 says that any modification to height requirements requires a response to all Design review Standards (A2), while modifications to design standards found in 21A. 37 only require responses to the design review standards that are directly related to the requested modification (A1). Our responses to design standards are found below each.

## $>$ Request for Reduction to the Minimum Height found in the D-1 Code from 100 to approximately 83 feet.

## 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 the project 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.

 As discussed in the previous section, our development plan is consistent with the stated purpose of the $\mathrm{D}-1$ zoning district.B. Development shall be primarily oriented to the sidewalk, not an interior courtyard or parking lot.

Our proposed building is oriented toward 200 East and Edison Street and designed as close to the street as permitted by the zone. Primary public entrances face directly onto the street sidewalk and the public right-of-way. Each entrance is setback into the building, providing a 6 -foot minimum covered refuge for pedestrians. Parking is completely enclosed within the building.

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

We are using a variety of materials for our building intended to enhance design and create visual interests for tenants and pedestrians at street level. The building has a large amount of glass to contribute eyes on the street on the upper levels, and visual interaction between individuals within and without the building on the ground floor/retail level. The active retail spaces on the ground floor are designed to maximize fenestration adjacent to the public sidewalk.
D. Large building masses shall be divided into heights and sizes that relate to human scale.

The street-level and street-facing façade of our proposed buildings is designed specifically for pedestrians. The first-floor height is designed to accommodate retail uses that will contribute to the urban environment and facilitate interaction between the private space in the building and the public right of way. We anticipate small outdoor dining areas that will further enhance this interaction.

This is a large building, but the massing along 200 East is broken up at the third level by two podium-level courtyards that add articulation to the architecture and break up the building from the pedestrian level. It will feel more like three buildings sitting on a common podium than one building. A reduction to the required height will create a more comfortable pedestrian environment for a large building than would a building with a minimum of 100 feet in height.
E. Building facades that exceed a combined contiguous building length of two hundred feet (200') shall include changes in vertical plane, material changes, and massing changes.
We feel that this standard is met through the breaks in the vertical plane and changes in massing. The building was designed so that the materiality and design of the building changes at the height of the pedestrian environment (about 30' or the first 2-3 levels). Podium-level amenity decks break up the vertical plane of the building along with vertical material changes on the upper levels.
F. If provided, privately-owned public spaces shall include at least three (3) of the six (6) of the following elements:

1. Sitting space of at least one sitting space for each two hundred fifty (25) 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
6. Other amenities not listed above that provide a public benefit.

The intended east-west pedestrian connection will be a privately-owned public space on the north side of our building. It will include seating, vegetation, and different applications of public art. Preliminary design of the walkway is attached for the Planning Commission to review.
G. Building height shall be modified to relate to human scale and minimize negative impacts. In downtown, the building height shall contribute to a distinctive city skyline.
We feel that our request to reduce the minimum height requirement is partially justified by our good-faith efforts in working with the City to come into compliance with a previous zoning code that set a maximum height at 100 ft . When the code amendment was approved that set the height minimum at 100 feet, we were in the process of revising our 112-foot building to be below

100 feet in order to bring it into compliance. Despite the bad timing, we feel that our current design complies with this design standard as follows:

- Human Scale: In order to reduce the sense of apparent height for pedestrians, the building material and scale shifts at the third story of height.
- Negative Impacts: Much of the block immediately around our site has already been or is in the process of being redeveloped. Many of the remaining buildings are unlikely to be removed. Constructing a building above 100 ft in the middle of the block is out of character for the block and would result in an unusual urban form.
- Cornices and Rooflines: The shape and articulation of our proposed rooflines are consistent with those found in both new projects being built near this property as well as many of the existing rooflines from older buildings in the downtown area.


## 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.

The parking structure for the building is accessed off 200 East and is designed to allow for adequate parking and circulation. All portions of the structure will be screened with highquality material and designed as part of the building behind the ground floor retail/leasing along the street. Pedestrian connections are provided via the proposed east-west paseo and direct-access to public sidewalks from the building.
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.

All service areas will be setback from the Street along Edison and will be located to allow our neighboring property to utilize them as well.
J. Signage shall emphasize the pedestrian/mass transit orientation.

We are not proposing signage with this application. Any signage on the property will be obtained through proper permits and will meet applicable requirements of the zone.
K. Lighting shall support pedestrian comfort and safety, neighborhood image, and dark sky goals.

We are not proposing any lighting as part of this application, but we intend to follow any applicable guidelines and requirements that the City has in place.
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.
2. Hardscape shall be utilized to differentiate privately-owned public spaces from public spaces. Hardscape for public sidewalks shall follow applicable design standards.
Our landscape architect has designed the right of way consistent with these standards. We will have an approved street tree every 3o' along street frontage and the hardscape material for the mid-block walkway will be different than that of the public right of way, differentiating the spaces for pedestrians.
> Request for Reduction to the Minimum Percentage of Glass in the Design
Standards from $60 \%$ to $51 \%$ on the ground level and from $50 \%$ to $31 \%$ of floors $3-4,30 \%$ of level $5-6$, and $25 \%$ of level 7 .

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

Although it is difficult to include large amounts of fenestration in residential buildings because of the need for security on the ground level and privacy on upper levels, the ground floor retail allowed us to design the building with a large of glass and fenestration at the ground level. Glass at all public areas will allow unhampered and unobstructed visibility into the building. The portions of the façade that do not have glass are three stair towers, an elevator, an electrical room, and a fire pump room. These rooms, two of which need to be secure for safety reasons, contributed to the reduction of glass on the ground level that dropped us below $60 \%$.

With all of that in mind, we feel that we still meet the intent of the design standard in that we are using high quality materials like brick and cementitious panels on $100 \%$ of the façade that is not glass. The design standards call for $70 \%$ and $50 \%$ of the ground floor and upper floors respectively to use these materials. While we are using less glass than requested by code, the materials we have chosen for the overall façade of the building are a great complement to the glass.

## $>$ Request for Increase to the Maximum Length of Street Facing Façade in the Design Standards from 150 feet to approximately 307 feet.

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

One reason that our building has such a large length along the 200 E frontage deals with something that is called out in the purpose statement for the D-1 zone - "The standards are intended to achieve established objectives for urban design, pedestrian amenities and land use control." We determined that it was in both our interest and that of the City to pause moving forward with our previously approved project to incorporate an adjacent parcel that would be difficult to re-develop on its own. Attention to land use control on this block led us to acquire the parcel and redesign.

For many months we designed two buildings on the site, which would break up the building façade into smaller pieces. However, because of the State-owned parcel to the west, there was no way to design a functional east-west mid-block walkway that would reach Edison Street. We knew that the City wanted a midblock walkway, we did not know about this new standard limiting building frontage to $150^{\prime}$. We designed the walkway in the only logical location - at the north end of the project where it could connect through to Edison.

We have worked to design this large building in a way that it can be comfortable to pedestrians walking along 200 E . The materiality at the pedestrian level is different than that of the upper stories. Much of the façade will have outdoor dining and overhangs to create a pedestrian environment on the ground floor. Because of the absence of an interior parking structure on floors 3-7, the upper stories were designed with two large courtyards on the podium deck that greatly reduce the impact of the façade length. These courtyards help break up the façade into three smaller sections, which will feel much less imposing to pedestrians on 200 E .

## E. Building facades that exceed a combined contiguous building length of two hundred feet (200') shall include changes in vertical plane, material changes, and massing changes.

 Much of what was described in response to "D" above could likely be applied to this response as well. But more specifically to this design standard, we have incorporated vertical changes in the materiality and breaks in the building plane along the lower two levels of the building where the impact of the building length is felt the greatest. We designed multiple niches in the building to allow for increased pedestrian interested. We also broke up the façade by emphasizing public entrances into the building. All entrances on 200 E to be used by the public are set back into the building, the material shifts in these sections, and canopies with 6 feet depth function for both shelter and as a method of architectural wayfinding.
## > Request for the Reduction of Percentage of Façade that Has Upper Floor Step back from $80 \%$ stepped back 10 or more feet to $35 \%$.

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

This design standard asks that a large portion of the building façade be stepped back by 10 feet between floors 3 and 5 to reduce the impact to pedestrians created by a large building built to the lot line from top to bottom. While we do not address this concern through a 10 -foot step back, the building was designed to reduce visual impact to pedestrians through other strategies.

It is generally agreed that the pedestrian realm of a building ends at the second or third story of the building. We designed the building to have a distinct base that is oriented to the pedestrian on the bottom two levels. There is a clear break between the pedestrian (base) layer of the building and its middle portion (floors 3-6), which is accomplished by a change in material, color, and window treatment. This creates a visual separation similar to what is done by a step back in the building at this height. Additionally, the step backs that we do have are more substantial than 10 feet and do more to break up the building mass than what a small building step back would do. The courtyards that begin on the third floor are 89 feet deep and 54 feet wide. These large divisions break up the building into three smaller sections that only have 65 ' of frontage along 200 E each, ultimately realizing the intent of the design standard.
E. Building facades that exceed a combined contiguous building length of two hundred feet (200') shall include changes in vertical plane, material changes, and massing changes.
Again, much of what was written for "D" above can be attributed to this design standard as well. The step back standard seeks to lessen the potential impact of a large building, built to the property line in downtown Salt Lake City, that could potentially be hundreds of feet tall by right. Such a building would have a great impact on a pedestrian walking down the street.

Our building, however, is a simple 5 level building on top of 2 levels of parking structure. It is much less imposing to pedestrians than the base zoning asks for. This combined with the strategies mentioned above regarding architectural treatment of the pedestrian realm and significant vertical breaks in the façade, work to meet the intent of the step back design standard.

## ATTACHMENT C: Plan Set

| Screening of <br> service areas <br> (21A.37.050.K) |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Ground floor <br> residential <br> entrances <br> (21A.37.050.L) |  |  |
| Parking garages <br> or structures <br> (21A.37.050.M) |  |  |

D. Downtown Districts:

| Standard (Code Section) | District |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EDISON STREET |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Ground floor use (\%) } \\ & \text { (21A.37.050.A.1) } \end{aligned}$ | 90 | 90\% See 'Zoning Information' Sheet A00.22 |  |
| Ground floor use + visual interest (\%) (21A.37.050.A.2) | 80/10 | n/a |  |
| Building materials: ground floor <br> (\%) (21A.37.050.B.1) | 70 | 100\% |  |
| Building materials: upper floors <br> (\%) (21A.37.050.B.2) | 50 | 100 \% |  |
| Glass: ground floor (\%) (21A.37.050.C.1) | 60 | 51\% |  |
| Glass: upper floors (\%) <br> (21A.37.050.C.2) | 50 | 25-31\% |  |
| Reflective Glass: ground floor (\%) (21A.37.050.C.1) | 0 | None |  |
| Reflective Glass: upper floors (\%) <br> (21A.37.050.C.2) | 50 | None |  |
| Building entrances (feet) (21A.37.050.D) | 40 | All less than 40' spacing |  |
| Blank wall: maximum length (feet) (21A.37.050.E) | 20 | 11' 8" |  |
| Street facing facade: maximum length (feet) <br> (21A.37.050.F) | 150 | Do not meet: 307' |  |
| Upper floor stepback (feet) (21A.37.050.G.1) | X | Do not meet |  |
| Lighting: <br> exterior (21A.37.050.H) |  | $\downarrow$ |  |


| Lighting: parking lot (21A.37.050.I) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Screening of mechanical equipment (21A.37.050.J) | X | MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT IS SET BACK FROM ROOF EDGE AND NOTE VIEWABLE FROM SITE |
| Screening of service areas (21A.37.050.K) | X | TRANSFORMERS: ELECTRICAL IS EXEMPT FROM SCREENING <br> - TRASH: INSIDE THE BUILDING <br> - LOADING: OPEN AREA THAT DOES NOT NEED TO BE SCREENED |
| Ground floor residential entrances for dwellings with individual unit entries (21A.37.050.L) |  |  |
| Parking garages or structures (21A.37.050.M) | $\mathrm{X}^{2}$ | Compliant |
| Tree canopy coverage (\%) (21A.37.050.P.1) | 40 | WE WILL MEET - 43.5\% ROW COVERAGE (ASSUMED 400 SF PER TREE @ MATURITY |
| Minimum vegetation standards (21A.37.050.P.2) | X | WE WILL MEET. SEE EXHIBIT 01 AND 02 |
| Street trees <br> (21A.37.050.P.3) | X | WE WILL MEET. SEE EXHIBIT 03 |
| Soil volume (21A.37.050.P.4) | X | WE WILL MEET. SEE EXHIBIT 04 |
| Minimize curb cuts (21A.37.050.P.5) | X | WE WILL MEET |
| Overhead cover <br> (21A.37.050.P.6) | X |  |
| Streetscape landscaping (21A.37.050.P.7) | X | WE WILL MEET. SEE EXHIBIT 01 AND 02 |
| Height transitions: angular plane for adjacent zone districts (21A.37.050.Q) |  |  |
| Horizontal articulation (21A.37.050.R) | X | Max spacing 60' - See 'Zoning Information' Sheet A00 |

## Notes:

1. In the $\mathrm{D}-3$ zoning district this percentage applies to all sides of the building, not just the front or street facing facade.
2. Parking structures shall be located behind principal buildings. This requirement may be modified so that structures may be located at least 15 ' from front and corner side lot lines if a minimum of seventy five percent (75\%) of the ground floor adjacent to a sidewalk is used for retail goods/service establishments, office and/or restaurant space to encourage pedestrian activity. The facades of the ground floor shall be designed to be compatible and consistent with the associated retail or office portion of the building and other retail uses in the area.

| GROUND FLOOR USE\% | STREET FACMG FACADE |
| :---: | :---: |
|  <br>  | 20' MIN BETWEEN BUILDINGS MEETS CODE |
|  | OT MEET: CURRENT FACADE IS |
|  | UPPER FLOor Settack |
| Ellung materals: Grouno |  |
| - $100 \%$ OF THE BUILDING <br> MATERALS ON GROUND LEVEL <br>  | SCREENNG For Service area |
|  | TRANSFORMERS: ELECTRICAL IS EXEMPT FROM SCREENING |
| SUlLING MATERALS: UPPER | - TRASH: msIDE the buloong |
|  | -LOADING: OPEN AREA THAT DOES NOT NEED TO BE SCREENED |
|  |  |
|  | PaARING GARPGEE |
| REFLECTIVE GLASS: GROUND FLOOR \% | INTERIOR ARCH. ARTICULATION OF STAIR AND LEVATORS IS CLEAR |
| - no Reflective Glass Is used | -SIGNAGE AND WAYFINDING WILL BE PROVIDED -WILL BE ARCHITECTURALY INTEGRATED |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| - no reflective class is used |  |
| Buling Entrances |  |
| AL PUBLIC SPACES ONTHE STREET HAVE ENTRANCES |  |
|  |  |
| MAXIUM OFOC AND MNMMM |  |
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| EXTERIOR MATERIAL LEGEND ${ }^{\text {a }}$（ RETURN ALL MATERIALS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| M，10 | ввск cooorchipewa | ${ }^{\text {m } 20}$ | BRICK COLOR：ASH | 4330 | васк <br> сооввиаскк⿺𠃊 | Crom | CEMENTITIOUS PANEL WITH REVEAL COLOR：MEDIUM GREY | $\square^{\text {ств }}$ | CEMENTITIOUS BOARD AND BATTEN COLOR：DARK GREY | $\square \mathrm{sF}$ | STOREFRONT <br> COLOR：DARK BRONZE | M ${ }^{\text {m }}$ | MISCELLANEOUS METAL COLOR•DARK BRONZE | AND COLORS TO INSIDE CORNERS． |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\square \mathrm{Cov}$ | VERTICAL CEMENTITIOUS BOARD AND BATTEN | Ra00 | ALUMINIUM RAILING | ns | METAL SCREEN |  |





















## The Edison <br> Landscape Materials <br> 11.9.2023

## Design Inspiration

## THE HIDDEN BIKE HISTORY



Pioneering Bike Manufacturers
In the late 1800s, Alfred and Oliver Meredith began manufacturing bicycles in downtown Salt Lake City at 228 S .200 E (one block over from Edison St) This was the beginning of what would become Guthrie Bicycle Co

1900s-1910s


The Speed Merchants

Biking quickly became one of Salt Lakers favorite sports and pastimes. Bike races at Saltair and the Salt Palace drew athletes from around the country There were also races that took place in present day Washington Square in downtown. Professiona cyclists were referred to as "speed merchants".


Guthrie Bicycle
Lorus Manwaring purchased Guthrie Bicycle (formerly owned by the Meredith Brothers and James William Guthrie). This began the first of 5 generations of family ownership for Guthrie Bicyc Co., including the current owner Jeff Goddard.

1976


Historic Landmark Status

Starting in the 1970s, investment in Salt Lake City's downtown slowly grew. The Main Library was completed in 1964, the Gallivan Center in 1993, and by the 2002 Winter Olympics, downtown was becoming a destination again. The JA Fritsch Block that housed Guthrie Bicycle Co, was established as a historic landmark building in 1976, preserving the company's legacy in downtown SLC.

2010s-Present


Edison St Renaissance and the Green Loop

With the outdoor recreation culture of Utah and growing demand for bike infrastructure, biking is as important to Salt Lakers today as it was in th early 1900s. The Green demand for amenities along the bike path and increase the comfort for pedestrians and Cyclists in downtown. Along with these infrastructure improvements, recent investments in downtown and new businesses on Edison St. are bringing new life to this neighborhood.

## GUTHRIE BICYCLE SHOP

## 1931-2011

Guthrie Bicycle Shop has had a presence on Edison Street since the late 1800 s. The company was established in 1888 and moved into the J.A.
Fritsch Building at 158 S 200 E in 1931. Guthrie Fritsch Building atdest bicycle shop in Utah, and possibly the oldest in the United States.
Prior to being the home of Guthrie Bicycle Shop, the J.A. Fritsch Building housed the Fritsch Investment Company, giving the building its name. The building was also home to several artists studios, stores, offices, and boarding houses while Guthrie Bicycle Shop was there. The building itself is also an architectural landmark, as it was designed by Carroll and Kern, a prominent architecture firm during Utah's building boom.

Today the J.A. Fritsch Building is home to Este Pizza, Guthrie Artist Studios, and FICE Gallery (streetwear), further reviving the alternative arts
 scene on and around Edison Street.

1931


2000s


2009-Present


FUTURE PLANS - THE GREEN LOOP


## Site Plan

THE EDISON SITE PLAN

| 1 | Streetscape Planters |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 | Outdoor Dining |
| 3 | Moveable Furnishings |
| 4 | Built in Wood Benches |
| 5 | Raised Metal Planters |
| 6 | Raised Metal Planters with Built in Benches |
| 7 | Pedestrian Unit Paving |
| 8 | Festoon Lights |
| 9 | Catenary Lights |
| 10 | Pool |
| 11 | Spa |
| 12 | Cabana |
| 13 | Lounge Furnishings |
| 14 | Outdoor Kitchen |
| 15 | Bar Rail |
| 16 | Fire Feature |
| 17 | Raised Planters |
| 18 | Synthetic Turf Lawn |
| 19 | Pergolas |
| 20 | Synthetic Turf + Gravel Dog Run |



## THE EDISON

$\square$ Midblock Alley
$\square 200 \mathrm{E}$. Streetscape
$\square$ Pool Terrace - Level 3
$\square$ Garden Rooms Terrace - Level 3


## Materials Palettes

THE EDISON
midBLOCK ALLEY

Furnishings

- Site Pieces - Monoline Solid Series Planters

Streetlife - Drifter Big Green Benches

Paving
Wausau Tile - H-Series EcoPremier

## Lighting

- Ligman Lighting - Macaron Catenary
- Tivoli - ADAPT Laura


THE EDISON
200 E. STREETSCAPE

Furnishings

- Site Pieces - Monoline Solid Series Planters
- Tournesol - Boulevard Planters
- Landscape Forms - Chipman Collection


Paving

THE EDISON
POOL TERRACE -
LEVEL 3


Furnishings


Paving + Walls

THE EDISON
GARDEN ROOMS
TERRACE - LEVEL 3


Furnishings


Paving + Walls

THE EDISON
DOG RUN

Furnishings

- Site Pieces - Monoline No, 2 Bag Holder + Waste Bin
- Landscape Forms - Abril Bench
- Omega II Fence Systems - Elite Double Wire
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TREE PLANTING Peference notes

## TREE PLANTING KEY <br> 



DESICNWORKSHOP

TREE PLANTING
pLAN
$\stackrel{\text { LEVEL } 1}{ }$

Insumer: 223890
18.02
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## ATTACHMENT D: Property \& Vicinity Photos



Project site along 200 East - Subject property is approximately 340 feet in length.


The Randi Apartments directly north of the subject property The apartments are comparable in height to the proposal.



Properties on the east side of 200 E-Building heights range from two stories to 335feet.
The height of the tower is nearly the same as the length of the subject property, which is 340feet.

December 13, 2023


Buildings along 200 South


Buildings along Edison Street - The parking garage is part of the subject property and will be redeveloped.



Buildings along 300 South - Buildings include a new three story State liquor store and single story structures on land owned by Ivory Development

## ATTACHMENT E: Design Review Standards

21A.59.050: 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:
> 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 the project 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.

## Discussion:

The downtown districts are intended to provide use, bulk, urban design and other controls and regulations appropriate to the commercial core of the city and adjacent areas in order to enhance employment opportunities; to encourage the efficient use of land; to enhance property values; to improve the design quality of downtown areas; to create a unique downtown center which fosters the arts, entertainment, financial, office, retail and governmental activities; to provide safety and security; encourage permitted residential uses within the downtown area; and to help implement adopted plans.

The D-1 Central Business District is Salt Lake City's most urban and intense zoning district. The zone supports very high density housing, and a broad range of land uses that are intended to foster a 24-hour environment. Development should be very intensive with high lot coverage, minimal setbacks, and a strong emphasis on a safe and pedestrian friendly streetscape, while preserving the urban nature of the area.

The project provides the uses discussed in the D-1 Central Business District purpose statement and meets policies and initiatives in Plan Salt Lake and the Downtown Plan. The design adheres to the "Urban Design Element" by facilitating pedestrian interest through the midblock connection, connecting Edison Street to the Green Loop.

## Condition(s):

```
Finding: \boxtimes Complies }\square\mathrm{ Complies with conditions }\square\mathrm{ Does not comply }\square\mathrm{ Not Applicable
```


## 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.

## Discussion:

1. All primary building entrances face the public sidewalk along 200 East or the midblock walkway along the northern property line. The building entrances include design details that emphasize the entrances such as changes in material from brick to metal, architectural columns, and taller and deeper canopies than what is provided on the rest of the front and side building facades.
2. The building has no front yard setback, which follows the existing development pattern along 200 East and responds to the desires of the D-1 zone and the Downtown Plan, which calls for improved pedestrian infrastructure and activated ground floors.
3. The parking is located within a two and a half story podium, wrapped by restaurant/retail space along both 200 East and the midblock walkway. There is one garage entrance from 200 East, located on the southern end of the structure. To minimize curb cuts, the city's Green Loop design team aligned the developments garage entrance with the preliminary design of the public open space.

## Condition(s):

Finding: $\boxtimes$ Complies $\square$ Complies with conditions $\square$ Does not comply $\square$ Not Applicable

## 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.

## Discussion:

1. While the applicant is requesting to modify the ground floor glass requirement from $60 \%$ to $52 \%$, staff believes the ground floor of the development includes sufficient transparency that will support the active uses being proposed. The 200 East façade includes a residential lobby in the middle of the building, plus three individual spaces intended for restaurants and a coffee shop within the northern half of the ground floor.
2. The proposal essentially includes two frontages, 200 East and the midblock walkway frontage. Both building facades are transparent and allow the passerby to see into the spaces dedicated to active uses.
3. The lobby and two retail spaces use traditional storefront elements including canopies, different window patterns, and building articulation to provide additional interest along the storefront facades.
4. The east-west midblock walkway connection between Edison Street and 200 East is fully visible from both streets. Outdoor dining will be provided along both building frontages.

## Condition(s):

Finding: $\boxtimes$ Complies $\square$ Complies with conditions $\square$ Does not comply $\square$ Not Applicable

## D. Large building masses shall be divided into heights and sizes that relate to

human scale.

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.
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.
3. Include secondary elements such as balconies, porches, vertical bays, belt courses, fenestration and window reveals.
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.

## Discussion:

1. The proposal reflects the current development pattern of the block face, with buildings on Edison Street ranging from one to three stories. Redevelopment along the street is not anticipated due to small lot sizes and recent reinvestment in the existing structures. The property south of the subject property, owned by Ivory Development, is expected to be redeveloped in the future. Additionally, the property to the southwest, adjacent to the subject property, is owned by the State, and they are currently constructing a three-story liquor store with frontage on 300 S .
2. The building includes material changes, differentiating the ground level brick masonry from the upper levels, breaking up the horizontal massing. The building includes balconies along the midblock walkway, encouraging eyes on the walkway and allowing for interaction between the ground floor retail space and residential units above. The two podium level courtyards, which are stepped back 89 feet from the front line of the building break up the massing of levels 3-7 and help reduce the vertical scale of the structure. The vertical scale of the structure is comparable to the apartment building directly north of the site, but there are no other buildings that are of similar length.
3. The project includes projecting balconies over the midblock walkway, on some of the units located at the back of the courtyard area, and on the rear façade that is not covered by another structure.
4. The scale and solid-to-void ratio of the windows is appropriate and promotes engagement between public and private spaces along streets and midblock areas. While the ground floor falls below the $60 \%$ glass requirement, it is still transparent. To address the lower glass ratio, the building will use $100 \%$ durable materials on all nonglass parts of the facade.

## Condition(s):

Finding: $\boxtimes$ Complies $\square$ Complies with conditions $\square$ Does not comply $\square$ Not Applicable

## E. Building facades that exceed a combined contiguous building length of two hundred feet (200') shall include:

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

## Discussion:

The applicant was requested by staff to address this standard, as they seek to double the permitted street facing building length in the D-1 from 150 feet to $307^{\prime} 4^{\prime \prime}$. This is the first project in the D-1 zoning district to seek Planning Commission approval for a modification of the recently established maximum building length standard under the Downtown Building Heights and Street Activation ordinance. The applicant's narrative is as follows:
"We have incorporated vertical changes in the materiality and breaks in the building plane along the lower two levels of the building where the impact of the building length is felt the greatest. We designed multiple niches in the building to allow for increased pedestrian interest. We also broke up the façade by emphasizing public entrances into the building. All entrances on 200 E to be used by the public are set back into the building, the material shifts in these sections, and canopies with 6 feet depth function for both shelter and as a method of architectural wayfinding."

Planning staff worked with the applicant on the ground floor design and believes that modifications to the original submission may help address the impacts of the long façade length. The revised design includes material changes at key entry points (lobby, restaurant, and coffee shop), transitioning from brick to metal, and emphasizes the canopy design. In contrast to the original flat brickwork between the second and third levels, the updated design elevates the brick at the podium level stepback, resulting in a shift in the horizontal façade.

## Condition(s):

# Finding: $\boxtimes$ Complies $\square$ Complies with conditions $\square$ Does not comply $\square$ Not Applicable 

## 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 ( $16^{\prime \prime}$ ) 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 ( $2^{\prime \prime}$ ) 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.

## Discussion:

The midblock walkway is required per the Downtown Plan and will include seating, vegetation within planter boxes, and public art.

## Condition(s):

Finding: $\boxtimes$ Complies $\square$ Complies with conditions $\square$ Does not comply $\square$ Not Applicable

## 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.

1. Human scale:
a. Utilize stepbacks 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 (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.
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.

## Discussion:

The development utilizes stepbacks, building modulation, and varying parapet heights to create a human scaled experience from the public realm. The ground floor of the street facing, and midblock facing façades are highly transparent and engage the pedestrian by providing seating, art, and interactive commercial spaces. The applicant's narrative explains the compatibility of the design below.

Human Scale: The building establishes a "base" at the pedestrian level via the two-story brick masonry facade. The "middle" of the building is defined by a change materials and form that steps inward from the base at level three. The "top" of the structure is clad in batten board siding, distinguishing the roofline from the lower six levels.

Negative Impacts: The applicant argues that because much of the block has either been developed or is unlikely to be redeveloped, constructing a building about 100 feet in the middle of the block would be out of character and would result in an unusual urban form. Staff agrees that contextually the building height aligns with the block face. However, if it were taller, it would also be compatible with the 335 -foot tall structure currently under construction across 200 East. This taller by-right option would align with the purpose of the D-1 zoning district, which has design standards in place to mitigate adverse impacts of taller constructions within the district.

Rooflines \& Cornices: The flat rooflines are designed to harmonize with the overall form of existing developments and mirror the architectural design commonly found in stick frame structures. These structures typically consist of five stories of residential units situated above two stories of parking. The flat roof aligns with the character of the area and is in keeping with prevalent architectural styles in the vicinity.

## Condition(s):

Finding: $\boxtimes$ Complies $\square$ Complies with conditions $\square$ Does not comply $\square$ Not Applicable

> 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.

## Discussion:

Parking is contained within the first two levels of the building, with a single vehicular access point leading to the parking garage on the southern side of the building, off 200 East. All portions of the structure will be screened with high-quality material and wrapped with retail and amenity spaces along the midblock walkway and 200 East. The applicant is proposing changes in material to identify the midblock walkway from vehicular surfaces.

## Condition(s):

```
Finding: \boxtimes Complies }\square\mathrm{ Complies with conditions }\square\mathrm{ Does not comply }\square\mathrm{ Not Applicable
```

> 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.)

Discussion: Service areas are setback 50 feet from Edison Street. The waste container will be positioned inside the building and can be accessed either internally or through a retractable garage door. The loading area for the building is situated within this 50 -foot setback. It's important to note that vehicles are not allowed to use this space for long-term parking. The eleetrieal transformer in the front building setback must be sereened.
Condition(s):
Finding: $\boxtimes$ Complies $\square$ Complies with conditions $\square$ Does not comply $\square$ Not Applicable

## 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.

Discussion: The applicant stated that the signage design will comply with this standard. The signage package will be reviewed separately from this petition, during the building permit process.

## Condition(s):

Finding: $\boxtimes$ Complies $\square$ Complies with conditions $\square$ Does not comply $\square$ Not Applicable

## 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.

Discussion: The applicant stated that streetlights for the development will be provided according to the Salt Lake City Street Lighting Master Plan. Lighting must emphasize pedestrian connections and not create up-lighting or glare for neighboring properties. Building lighting will be coordinated with architectural and sign elements to provide street level visibility. The applicant submitted preliminary lighting details for the midblock walkway, which will be formally approved during the building permit process.

## Condition(s):

## Finding: $\boxtimes$ Complies $\square$ Complies with conditions $\square$ Does not comply $\square$ Not Applicable

## 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 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.

## Discussion:

1. There are no existing street trees or vegetation on the property. Trees along 200 East will be planted within silva cells because the provided soil volume does not meet
[^1]
## ATTACHMENT F: Public Process \& Comments

## Public Notice, Meetings, Comments

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

- September 22, 2023-Property owners and residents within 300 feet of the development were provided early notification of the proposal.
- September 25, 2023 - Current - The project was posted to the Online Open House webpage.
- October 2, 2023 - The Central City Community Council was sent the 45 day required notice for recognized community organizations. The comment period ended on November 17, 2023. The Downtown Community Council is also within 600 feet of the project boundary, but they have not renewed their recognized organization status so no formal notice was required.
- November 1, 2023: The applicant presented the project at the Central City Community Council meeting. The Community Council Chair supports the reduction in building height but did not provide comments on the other requested modifications.

Notice of the public hearing for the proposal included:

- December 1,2023
- Public hearing notice signage posted on the property.
- December 1, 2023
- Public hearing notice mailed.
- Public notice posted on City and State websites and Planning Division list serve.


## Public Input:

At the time of publishing, four comments were received concerning the project, and each of these comments expressed opposition to the proposal to decrease the building height below the minimum specified in the D-1 zone. Additionally, one resident opposed the request to extend the building length. The email correspondence is provided below.

```
From:
jason berntson
To:
Subject:
Date:
Roman, Amanda
(EXTERNAL) Edison Street design review public comment

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

Hi Amanda, I am sending this email to voice my opinion on the proposed project at 250 S 200 E. While I do appreciate that the project looks to be of relatively high quality, I am troubled that we continue to allow developers to break the minimum design review standards, particularly in our downtown and transit-oriented zones. I see that they are proposing to build this project below the recently instituted \(100^{\prime}\) minimum height limit, as well as increasing the building facade over the allowed 200'.

As I have followed along on the projects happening all around our city, I am discouraged at how often developers seem to be able to get away with not following these minimum standards. I am deeply invested in the urban form of our city, and I'm glad to see a lot of the steps our city is taking to deal with the growth we're seeing. However, the more these standards are broken, the worse it will be for our city in the long-term.

The developers cite the Randi to the north as an example of something that was built below the minimum height, but I think that is a good example of why we shouldn't allow them to go under the minimum. It's an underwhelming, stubby structure built on a prominent corner lot, with a ground floor retail space that hasn't been filled in 3 years.

While I would be happy to see this lot developed, and appreciate urban infill, I think approving this would set a bad precedent for future development that doesn't live up to the design standards the city has spent a long time developing and updating.
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
From: & Andre Orantes-Thomas \\
To: & Roman, Amanda \\
Subject: & (EXTERNAL) Edison Street Design Review - Comment Submission \\
Date: & Friday, November 3, 2023 11:39:14 AM
\end{tabular}

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

Hello Amanda,
This is email is a comment in regards to the Edison Street Design Review, petition number: PLNPCM2023-00707.

Comment: The planning division should give a negative recommendation to the planning commission. The project underutilized the current zoning. We should not be allowing exceptions to lower heights in the valuable D-1 zoning. This seems like a poor effort on the developers part to meet the minimum requirements of the city. The project should not be considered in its current proposal. The city needs to hold strong to the standards set for how they want the city to develop. We should not be allowing ourselves to drop to the developers level, we need to force the developers to rise to the standards we have in place. Please send a negative recommendation to the planning commission.

Thanks,

Andre Orantes
```

From: John Visser
To: Roman, Amanda
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Edison Street Design Review PLNPCM2023-00707
Date:
Friday, November 3, 2023 7:41:38 AM

```

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

Hello,

As a resident of SLC, I feel that with the recent changes to the height limits within the D-1 zoning area, it would be wrong to approve a building height of less than the required minimums for the zoning.

With D-1 zoning being limited and constrained, the City should not sacrifice this for the sake of a new public mid-block walkway.

The project could easily shrink the street facing by \(50 \%\) and increase the height of the project accordingly to keep the same number of units. This would also allow for at least 1 future additional project on the now unused portion. This portion could even be sold by the developer to assist with the cost of building taller.

My final comment is just that the City spent months looking at and adjusting the heights (minimum and maximum) throughout many areas of the City. To go against this change now would be akin to a 'slap in the face' for all of those that worked on the increases. We should strive to become the City we want, not the City that capitulates to whatever project comes along. With projects pushing heights upward less than 1 block away, it would be a disservice to current and future residents of the City to accept anything less than the bare minimum of the current zoning.

Thanks,

John
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
From: & Henry Murray \\
To: & Roman, Amanda \\
Subject: & (EXTERNAL) Edison Street Design \\
Date: & Friday, November 3, 2023 7:05:22 AM
\end{tabular}

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

Hey! My name is Henry Murray and Im in the process of moving downtown from the suburbs of Salt Lake City. I would like to stress the importance of making sure that Edison street is treated as a D1 property. Previously there was a proposal that was fitting for the area, a ten story tower. But now there is a significantly smaller one that is being proposed instead and if approved it shows developers that Salt Lake City is a joke and doesn't take their downtown seriously, because the planner commission approved a very small building on a site that is fit for a tower 15 stories +. We want SLC to grow and grow, but if you guys keep holding us back we cannot. Please hold your ground and don't approve it as it will require additional hight because it is in a D1 area. Don't fall into the developers trap. More proposals will come with more height. This isn't the last proposal for the sight. Edison Street is downtown, please treat it like that.
-Henry Murray
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
From: & Max Horehled \\
To: & Roman, Amanda \\
Subject: & (EXTERNAL) Edison Street Design Review \\
Date: & Monday, December 4, 2023 8:37:37 PM
\end{tabular}

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

To the planning committee,
I was born and raised in the Salt Lake valley and now reside in the downtown area.
While I have seen the city and skyline grow, it is downsized projects such as this, that have become quite infuriating. I do not work in an architectural field, but am an avid follower of all things urban development in my hometown.

I am pleased with the aesthetics of this project, but to allow further buildings below 100' in the few remaining D1 areas we have seems absurd. This would be another wasted "Birdie" development, effectively giving the bird to the people of Salt Lake City. We are a growing urban center putting strangle holds on opportunity. A project this size is better suited for a \(4^{\text {th }}\) south or sugar house development. As I write this, even Sugarhouse has a proposed 300' building in the pipeline. You should demand this project scale with the new Worthington development directly across the street.

As a city poised to host not one, but two Olympic games, we should continue to build and grow vertically. With all the stories I have read over the years depicting a housing crisis, why would we scale back at all? Once again, I am not in the industry, but 100' is a bare minimum and there should be no concessions to anything below that so save money. I have traveled to enough cities around the country to see what Salt Lake should emulate and this project should not be allowed to proceed.

Max Horehled
Video Producer

\section*{ATTACHMENT G: Department Review Comments}

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

Building: Comments provided by Bryan Romney on 9/21/23
Comments are attached to the information sheet and will be reviewed during the building permit process.

The 2021 IBC Table 504.3 limits the Allowable Building Height in Feet Above Grade Plane for a Group R-2 Occupancy of Type III-A Construction to a MAXIMUM building height of 85 ', not a minimum height of \(83^{\prime}\) as noted in the Project Description and Narrative. In order for a Group R-2 Occupancy to have a building height of over 100' above Grade Plane is to have a Construction Type of either Type I-B or Type I-A.

Fire: Comments provided by Douglas Bateman on 10/24/23
*Approved fire apparatus access roads shall be provided for every facility, building or portion of a building hereafter constructed or moved into; and shall extend to within 150 feet of all portions of the facility and all portions of the exterior walls of the first story of the building as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the building or facility. They do not meet requirement and would need additional fire access roads or work through alternative means and methods with Fire Prevention Bureau
*Fire apparatus access roads shall have an unobstructed width of not less than 20 feet for buildings 30feet and less, exclusive of shoulders, except for approved security gates in accordance with Section 503.6, and an unobstructed vertical clearance of not less than 13 feet 6 inches. Buildings greater than 30 feet shall have a road width of not less than 26 feet. Fire apparatus access roads with fire hydrants on them shall be 26 -feet in width; at a minimum of 20 -feet to each side of the hydrant in the direction or road travel.
*Fire apparatus access roads shall be designed and maintained to support the imposed loads of fire apparatus ( 80,000 pounds) and shall be surfaced to provide all-weather driving capabilities.
*The required turning radius of a fire apparatus access road shall be the following: Inside radius is 20 feet, outside is 45 -feet
*Buildings or portions of buildings constructed or moved into or within the jurisdiction is more than 400 feet from a hydrant on a fire apparatus access road, as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the facility or building, on-site fire hydrants and mains shall be provided where required by the fire code official. Additional fire hydrants may be necessary dependent on total square footage and required fire flows in accordance with IFC appendix B and C
*Fire department connections shall be located on the street address side of buildings, fully visible and recognizable from the street, and have a fire hydrant within 100-feet on the same side of the street.
*Where a fire hydrant is located on a fire apparatus access road, the minimum road width shall be 26 feet, exclusive of shoulders.
*Aerial fire apparatus access roads shall be provided where the highest roof surface exceeds 30 feet measured from grade plane. For purposes of this section, the highest roof surface shall be determined
by measurement to the eave of a pitched roof, the intersection of the roof to the exterior wall, or the top of parapet walls, whichever is greater. Some exceptions have been added by SLC; those can be obtained from this office.
*Aerial fire apparatus access roads shall have a minimum unobstructed width of 26 feet, exclusive of shoulders. Aerial access routes shall be located not less than 15 feet and not greater than 30 feet from the building and shall be positioned parallel to one entire side of the building.
*Overhead utility and power lines shall not be located over the aerial fire apparatus access road or between the aerial fire apparatus road and the building.
*Buildings with an occupied level (including occupied roofs) that are more than 75 -feet above the lowest level of fire department access are considered a high rise buildings and would need to meet all the requirements of IBC 403

Engineering: Comments provided by Scott Weiler on 10/2/23
No objections.
Transportation: Comments provided by Jena Carver on 10/4/23
A minimum of \(20 \%\) of provided parking must be electric vehicle ready (see SLC ordinance 21A.44.040(C)(2)). Plans will be reviewed for EV-ready compliance with building permit review.

Public Utilities: Comments provided by Kristeen Beitel on 10/4/23
Public Utilities has no issues with the proposed special exceptions for reduced minimum building height or increase in maximum façade length. However, regarding a reduced setback, applicant should be aware that reducing setbacks may limit space/options for green infrastructure, which is required by Public Utilities. Applicant should also consider providing enough space for all required utilities with required clearances. Also, the applicant should be aware that with increased densification, the applicant must consider the potential increase in construction costs resulting from required offsite utility improvements, potentially downstream of the subject property. Densification may place greater demands on water, sewer, and storm drain systems, which could exceed the capacity of the existing infrastructure. Property owners and developers will be required to upgrade the offsite public utilities to ensure sufficient capacity for the new development.

Additional comments have been provided to assist in the future development of the property. The following comments are provided for information only and do not provide official project review or approval. Comments are provided to assist in design and development by providing guidance for project requirements.
- Public Utility permit, connection, survey, and inspection fees will apply.
- All utility design and construction must comply with APWA Standards and SLCPU Standard Practices.
- All utilities must meet horizontal and vertical clearance requirements. Water and sewer lines require 10 ft minimum horizontal separation and 18 " minimum vertical separation. Sewer must maintain 5 ft minimum horizontal separation and 12 " vertical separation from any nonwater utilities. Water must maintain 3 ft minimum horizontal separation and 12 " vertical separation from any non-sewer utilities.
- Contact SLCPU Street Light Program Manager, Dave Pearson (801-483-6738), for information regarding streetlights.
- Utilities cannot cross property lines without appropriate easements and agreements between property owners.
- Parcels must be consolidated prior to permitting.
- Site utility and grading plans will be required for building permit review. Site utility plans should include all existing and proposed utilities, including water, irrigation, fire, sewer, stormwater, street lighting, power, gas, and communications. Please refer to APWA, SLCDPU Standard Practices, and the SLC Design Process Guide for utility design requirements.
- Applicant must provide fire flow, culinary water, and sewer demand calculations to SLCDPU for review. The public sewer and water system will be modeled with these demands. If the demand is not adequately delivered or if one or more reaches of the sewer system reach capacity as a result of the development, a water/sewer main upsizing will be required at the property owner's expense. Required improvements on the public water and sewer system will be determined by the Development Review Engineer and may be downstream of the project.
- (NOTE CONTINUED)...
- One culinary water meter is permitted per parcel and fire services, as required, will be permitted for this property. If the parcel is larger than 0.5 acres, a separate irrigation meter is also permitted. Each service must have a separate tap to the main. There are multiple existing water meters to the site. These will need consolidated to a single culinary water meter and service.
- Water meters 4 " or larger require a justification letter. Calculations must prove that it is necessary beyond what can be provided with a 3 " water meter for average daily flows. If approved, the water meter will require additional monthly fees. The estimated average daily flow in GPD is used to calculate the required fees.
- Applicant must provide sewer demand calculations to SLCPU for review. The expected maximum daily flow (gpd) from the development will be modeled to determine the impacts on the public sewer system. If one or more reaches of the sewer system reach capacity as a result of the development, sewer main upsizing will be required at the property owner's expense. Required improvements on the public sewer system will be determined by the Development Review Engineer. A plan and profile and Engineer's cost estimate must be submitted for review. The property owner is required to bond for the amount of the approved cost estimate.
- Laterals must be 4 " or 6 " if larger connections are desired calculations must prove that it is necessary beyond what a 6 " sewer line can provide. Three newly proposed manholes will not be allowed. Please either design the plumbing to reduce to multiple 6 " sewer laterals with wye connections per APWA 431 to the main or provide only one new connection to the EXISTING manhole in front of the property.
- Please note that neither the grease interceptor nor the sampling manhole is permitted within the public right-of-way; they must be situated on the property.
- Site stormwater must be collected on site and routed to the public storm drain system. Stormwater cannot discharge across property lines or public sidewalks.
- As this project disturbance is over one acre, stormwater treatment is required prior to discharge to the public storm drain. Utilize stormwater Best Management Practices (BMP's) to remove solids and oils. Green Infrastructure should be used whenever possible. Green Infrastructure and LID treatment of stormwater is a design requirement and required by the Salt Lake City UPDES permit for Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4). The applicant will need to provide options for stormwater treatment and retention for the 80th percentile storm. If additional property is not available, there are other options such as green roof or other BMP's. Lack of room or cost is generally not an exception for this requirement. If green infrastructure is not used, then applicant must provide documentation of what green infrastructure measures were considered and why these were not deemed feasible. Please verify that plans include appropriate treatment measures. Please visit the following websites for guidance with Low Impact Development: https://deq.utah.gov/water-quality/low-impact-development?form=MYo1SV\&OCID=MYo1SV and
https://documents.deq.utah.gov/water-quality/stormwater/updes/DWQ-2019000161.pdf?form=MY01SV\&OCID=MY01SV.
- Stormwater detention is required for this project. The allowable release rate is 0.2 cfs per acre. Detention must be sized using the 100-year 3-hour design storm using the farmer Fletcher rainfall distribution. Provide a complete Technical Drainage Study including all calculations, figures, model output, certification, summary, and discussion.
- Projects larger than one acre require that a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Technical Drainage Study are submitted for review.

\section*{Urban Forestry: Comments provided by Rick Nelson 9/20/23}

I have no concerns with their proposals as long as the code continues to require one tree to be planted in the public ROW for every \(30^{\prime}\) of street frontage.

Planning \& Zoning: Comments provided by Amanda Roman
1. Midblock Walkway:
a. Walkway specifications need to be provided such as proposed paving materials, lighting, shade structures, seating, and landscaping.
b. Provide details on the building overhangs and associated cantilever - These coverings may be between 9 and 14 feet above the level of the sidewalk. They shall provide a minimum depth of coverage of 6 feet.
c. A ground level rendering from 200 E and Edison St should be provided to show how the space interacts with the building and the properties to the north.

\section*{2. Landscape Plan:}
a. The landscape plan needs to include calculations that demonstrate compliance with 21A.48. This will include information on the percentage of live plant material, which must be \(33 \%\) of the required planting area and include \(80 \%\) drought tolerant species.
b. Dimension the spacing in between trees and provide information on the proposed silva cells, which will be required as the soil volume has not been met.
c. Provide landscaping plans for the rooftop amenity space.
d. Provide the sidewalk width. The unobstructed path must be a minimum of 10 feet.
e. What is the width of the dog run?
3. Transformer Location \& Screening: Electrical equipment is not exempt from screening requirements. Please provide screening details for the transformers along 200 E . They can be screened by a wall, fence, or hedge.

\section*{4. Other Clarifications:}
a. Provide building setbacks on the site plan. Regardless of the setback provided, doors shall be setback a minimum distance to allow the door to operate without swinging into a right of way or midblock walkway. The maximum yard depth is 8 feet. The provided rear and side yard must meet the requirements in 21A.30.020.C.1.
b. Provide the width of the elevator, stair wells, and fire pump rooms, which are not active uses.
c. All materials shown on the site plan must be labeled. What types of pavers will be used? Where are the turf areas? Gates are shown on the site plan, but the types and materials are not included. Will fencing be used along the property lines? Please show the planter boxes and benches along the front facades that are shown on the building renderings. If any site feature is permanent, it must be included in the site plan.

Requested Modifications: Each modification of 21A. 37 or the D-1 zoning standards needs to be addressed in your narrative with justification as to why the modification is appropriate and how it meets the Design Standards in 21A.59. The narrative only addresses the reduced building height, but I think the most impactful thing you are requesting is to more than double the allowable building length.
- Request to reduce minimum building height from 100 to approximately \(78^{\prime} 6\) ".
- Request to modify ground floor and upper floor glass requirements, the ground floor does not include residential units, thus is not subject to at \(15 \%\) reduction in glass.
- Request to increase the building length from 150 to \(307^{\prime} 4\)."
- Request to modify the required upper floor stepback.```


[^0]:    0
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[^1]:    regulations. The soil surrounding a tree must be $750 \mathrm{ft}{ }^{3}$ to $1,000 f{ }^{3}{ }^{3}$ per tree, provided that this area is exclusive of the soils volume calculation for adjacent trees.
    2. The proposed hardscape will differ between the public sidewalk and the midblock walkways. Native landscaping will also be provided.

    ## Condition(s):

    Finding: $\boxtimes$ Complies $\square$ Complies with conditions $\square$ Does not comply $\square$ Not Applicable

