



# MEMORANDUM

PLANNING DIVISION  
DEPARTMENT of COMMUNITY *and* NEIGHBORHOODS

---

To: Salt Lake City Planning Commission  
From: Trevor Ovenden, Principal Planner  
Date: March 27, 2024  
Re: 750 N Redwood Rd Planned Development Modification

---

**PROPERTY ADDRESS:** 750 N Redwood Rd  
**PARCEL IDS:** 08-27-452-049-0000  
**MASTER PLAN:** [Northwest Plan](#) (1992)  
**ZONING DISTRICT:** [Community Business](#) (CB)  
**PETITION:** PLNPCM2021-00702

**REQUEST:** Damian Mora, representing the property owner, is requesting several modifications to a previously approved Planned Development request. The original request was approved by the Planning Commission in December of 2021. After it was approved, the previous applicant sold the project to the current applicant. The current applicant redesigned the project with new architecture, fewer bedrooms, more parking, and two additional units. The modifications proposed by the current applicant require approval by the Planning Commission.

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

**RECOMMENDATION:** The Planning Commission approve the requested modifications to the previously approved Planned Development.

## ATTACHMENTS:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| A. <a href="#">Modification Request</a> | D. <a href="#">Original Record of Decision Letter</a>             |
| B. <a href="#">Original Drawings</a>    | E. <a href="#">Original Staff Report</a>                          |
| C. <a href="#">Current Drawings</a>     | F. <a href="#">Minutes from December 15, 2021</a>                 |
|   | G. <a href="#">21A.55.100 – Modifications to Development Plan</a> |

## BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:

The Planning Commission approved Design Review and Planned Development requests for this site on December 15, 2021. Both applications were approved:

- **Design Review:** Provision [21A.26.030.E](#) of the CB zoning regulations requires Design Review approval for buildings with more than 7,500 gross square feet of floor area for a first floor footprint or 15,000 gross square feet overall. The previous applicant submitted an application for Design Review because the cumulative floor area of the townhomes exceed 15,000 square feet. However, this provision applies only to *individual* buildings with floor area in excess of these limitations, not to *multiple* buildings with cumulative floor area in excess of these limitations. None of the individual buildings exceed these limitations, so Design Review approval is not required.
- **Planned Development:** Planned Development approval is required for this project because the proposal includes multiple buildings without frontage on a public street. Provision [21A.36.010.B.1](#) allows multiple buildings on a single parcel if all of the buildings front a public street. The Planned Development process allows the Planning Commission to modify this requirement.

The two applications were approved with the following conditions:

1. Final approval of the details for site signage, lighting, landscaping and street trees will be delegated to staff for verification during the building permit review.
2. A Condominium Plat must be finalized and recorded for this development.

The current applicant does not intend to create condominium units with these townhomes, so Condition #2 is no longer applicable.

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The original design included 82 townhome units, each 3 stories tall, built in 12 individual buildings containing 7 townhomes each with access via a private street that connects to Redwood Road. The original drawings can be found in [Attachment B](#) and the original staff report can be found in [Attachment E](#).

The layout and massing of the current proposal is very similar to the original design. Two additional units will be added to the site, totaling 84 townhomes. The project will include 120 garage parking spaces and 12 visitor parking spaces for a total of 132 spaces. The street facing facades will include brick veneer on the ground floor with stucco and fiber cement lap siding on the upper floors.

The current applicant redesigned the project with an architecture firm different from the original submission. The new building design includes different fenestration, architectural details, and several energy efficiency upgrades that will allow the project to be built and certified to the [EPA Energy Star New Homes program](#). These upgrades should *allow for a significant reduction in energy usage as compared with other buildings of similar type*, which meets Planned Development objective [E, Sustainability](#). Details regarding the individual efficiency upgrades can be found in the applicant's narrative.

## APPLICANT'S REQUESTED MODIFICATIONS

Provision [21A.55.100](#) of the City's zoning ordinance clarifies that modifications to an approved Planned Development other than those *necessary in light of technical or engineering considerations* are considered "Major" and require approval from the Planning Commission. The modifications proposed by the applicant are considered "Major" by this code section. Major Modifications may be approved by the Planning Commission *upon findings that any changes in the plan as approved will be in substantial conformity with the approved development plan*. The applicant is proposing the following modifications:

1. Different building design
2. An increase of units from 82 to 84
3. Replacing dumpsters with individual cans
4. An increase of parking spaces from 96 to 132
5. A reduction in bedrooms from 246 to 120
6. A change of ownership structure – Condominiums to rentals
7. An increase in space between buildings





*Previous proposal*



*Current proposal*


The current proposal includes two additional units than the original. The new units will replace several guest parking spaces and the project's waste and recycling dumpsters (See [approved](#) and [modified](#) plans). The dumpsters will be replaced by individual cans that will be stored within each unit's garage. This proposal also includes 36 additional parking spaces than the original design. The new parking spaces are created by making the garages approximately 2' wider.

The original submission included 41 four-bedroom units and 41 two-bedroom units, totaling 246 bedrooms. The current submission includes 36 two-bedroom units and 48 one-bedroom units, totaling 120 bedrooms. In the original proposal, the townhomes were to be subdivided as condominiums and sold separately. The current applicant intends to rent these units rather than subdividing them as condominium units to be sold separately. Complete floor plans can be found in attachments [B](#) and [C](#).




The new design also includes several dimensional modifications to create more space between buildings and units with fewer but larger bedrooms. The distance between buildings will be increased by approximately 10'. Driveways have been added to each garage that are between 4' and 5' long.

### Walkways




*Previous proposal*




*Current proposal*

### Driveways



*Previous proposal*



*Current proposal*

[illegible]

Two units added, one at end of each building.

## DISCUSSION:

Planned Development requests are required to achieve at least one objective from [21A.55.010](#). The original request was found to have achieved objective C (Housing) by constructing townhomes, a type of housing that is *not commonly found in the existing neighborhood but is of a scale that is typical to the neighborhood*. Like the original proposal, the current proposal will include townhomes and achieves this objective. The current proposal will also achieve objective E (Sustainability) by providing energy efficiency upgrades that will allow for *a significant reduction in energy usage as compared with other buildings of similar type*.

Planned Development requests must also comply with all of the standards listed in [21A.55.050](#). The original proposal was found to comply with these standards, and the modifications proposed by the current applicant will not impact the project's compliance with these standards. The proposed modifications do not affect the CB zoning requirements and can be considered to be in *substantial conformity with the approved development plan* as required by ordinance.

## NEXT STEPS:

### Modification of Planned Development Approval

If the Planning Commission finds that the proposed modifications **are** in *substantial conformity of the approved development plan* as required by ordinance, the modifications may be approved and the applicant may proceed with the project after meeting all standards and conditions required by all City Departments and the Planning Commission to obtain all necessary building permits.

### Modification of Planned Development Denial

If the Planning Commission finds that the proposed modifications **are not** in *substantial conformity of the approved development plan*, the modifications may be denied and the applicant will be required to develop the property as was originally approved by the Planning Commission or submit a new design that meets all applicable zoning standards. Alternatively, the applicant could submit a new Planned Development application for the Planning Commission to review the proposal as an entirely new project.

**Attachment A: Modification Request**

**Page intentionally left blank.**




# Villarosa

A Townhome Rental Community

By Garbett Homes

750 North Redwood Road

Salt Lake City, Utah 84116



750 North Redwood Road

Garbett Homes is requesting a review of alterations to the previously approved project Rivers Edge at Redwood Townhomes (PLNPCM2021-00606 and PLNPCM2021-00702) now called Villarosa.

Villarosa is a new townhome rental community by Garbett Homes located at 750 North Redwood Road in the Rose Park neighborhood of Salt Lake City. The site is currently vacant and will feature 84 townhome units, two different townhome styles, a one-bedroom and a two-bedroom option with attached garages. The site will have 12 surface parking stalls for visitors. Villarosa will be an all-electric (“zero emission”), energy efficient rental community.

Villarosa will be a planned development and will result in a more enhanced project by meeting the Sustainability objective in the planned development purpose statement. The design and systems will allow for a significant reduction in energy usage.

Villarosa will be built and certified to the EPA Energy Star New Homes program resulting in homes that are over 50% more energy efficient than existing homes in the area. In addition to the increased energy efficiency and significant reduction in energy usage, the homes will deliver higher comfort, improved indoor air quality, and lower utility and maintenance costs.

- **Zero Emission Homes.** All homes in Villarosa will be zero emissions (all-electric) homes. All heating, cooling, ventilation, cooking, and all other appliances will be electric. The Salt Lake


Valley can have bad air quality, so this is our solution to help improve outdoor and indoor air quality, by removing all combustion (gas) appliances from the homes.

- **Increased insulation and air sealing.** Homes will be built using advanced framing techniques allowing for increased blown-in fiberglass insulation in the wall cavity. The exterior will have an additional 1" of rigid foam insulation creating a robust, insulated wall and contributing to the home's air sealing strategy. Spray foam will be used in strategic areas and serve as an air sealing strategy that will reduce energy losses and contribute to a more comfortable home with lower utility costs.
- **LED disc lights** will be installed everywhere, greatly reducing energy loss compared to inefficient lighting sources.
- **Air source electric heat pump.** Highly efficient air source heat pump system will provide the heating and cooling for the units and drastically reduce the energy consumption for the homes.
- **Electric heat pump water heater** will be installed in each home which can reduce water heating costs by up to 71%.
- **High performance windows** will be installed, contributing to comfort and energy savings.
- **Low flow toilets, shower faucets and kitchen/bathroom sink fixtures** will help reduce water consumption.
- **ERV.** All homes will be equipped with an Energy Recovery Ventilator ("fresh air system") that will bring filtered outside air and provide ventilation for the homes.
- **Improved indoor air quality.** A big focus at Villarosa is improved indoor air quality. We accomplish this by selecting products that are no or low VOCs (volatile organic compounds) emitting, providing a fresh air system (ERV), and installing electric appliances over gas combustion appliances.
- **Independently verified and tested.** All homes will be tested and certified to the Energy Star New Homes program by a third-party inspector.
- **30 amp, 220V car charger outlet** standard in every garage.
- **"Localspaces" landscaping.** Water efficient landscaping will be implemented to reduce water consumption.

In addition to the energy efficient design, there are several issues with the original concept that we plan to address and modify with this proposal.

## Dumpster


We removed the central garbage and recycling dumpsters and replaced with individual garbage and recycling bins for each home to be stored in the garage of each unit.




## Architecture

Our next modification was changing the architecture. We wanted to provide more open space between the buildings as well as address concerns with the floor plans so the architecture for Villarosa is all new. The bedrooms and living space on the original plans were very cramped and not very livable so we opted for a smaller bedroom count per unit with a more open floor plan.

## Common Area



Old Design




New Design


In the original design, the buildings are less than 15' apart in some areas, creating a cramped common area. With our modification the buildings are now at least 25' apart, face to face, creating a more usable and open common area.

#### Driveway/Private Road

With the architecture update, we can provide more space between garages in the private road to allow vehicles to back out of garage easier and not run into the garage door across the road. We did this by providing a 4-5' driveway for each garage.



Old Design, Garage Side



New Design, Garage Side

## **Bedrooms**

The bedrooms in the original design are small. The main floor bedroom in Unit 1 does not technically meet the 70 square feet code required at finish stage and should not be included in the bedroom count. The secondary bedrooms are under 9' wide which creates a cramped space once a bed is placed in the room. Our new design fixes that issue, and the bedrooms are more comfortable to live in.

## **Parking**

The original design shows 82 garage parking spaces (1 space per unit) and 14 visitor parking spaces for a total of 96 parking spaces. The new design matches garage parking with the bedroom count. We show 120 garage parking spaces and 12 visitors parking spaces for a total of 132 parking spaces. Parking is typically an issue, and we feel this proposed parking will be better and less strain on the community and the neighborhood.

Other architectural issues:

- The original architecture uses roof drainpipes and scuppers. These can create potential leaking issues into the house, so we removed them in our design.
- Boxed eaves at front and rear elevation can create condensation issues bringing moisture into the wall so we removed from our design.
- The furnace in the original design is located on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor. We placed the mechanical room on the first floor since we typically like the HVAC system on the bottom or top floor so we can design an updraft or downdraft system.
- The original design has HVAC condensers on the roof which creates a leak potential and can be very noisy when placed on the roof. We relocated to avoid this issue.
- The half bath on the second floor of Unit 2 doesn't technically meet code minimum 30" width at finish.

With these modifications we believe we will deliver a more enhanced product by significantly reducing energy usage through design and systems inside the homes, and the changes to the architecture that will allow for more open space between the buildings which will also contribute to a better living environment.

**Attachment B: Original Drawings**

**Page intentionally left blank.**



## 750 RDWD

Rev. Date Description

Revisions:

RENOVATE  
PROJECT LOCATION 750 N REDWOOD RD  
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84116  
DATE 20-10  
DESIGNER JCH  
PROJECT SCHEMATIC DESIGN  
DATE 04 JUNE 2021  
DRAWN BY  
CHECKED BY

3D VIEWS

DATE



82 THREE  
STORY UNITS  
(41) 18'-0" W UNITS  
(41) 15'-0" W UNITS

LEVEL 1 PLAN - Unit Mix  
1/16" = 1'-0"

### KEYNOTES

- 17 PERIMETER FENCING
- 18 DUMPSTER

### GROSS BUILDING...

NAME	AREA
BLDG 1	1,408 SF
LEVEL 1 - GARAGE	2,427 SF
LEVEL 2	3,825 SF
LEVEL 3	4,033 SF
BLDG 1	11,857 SF
BLDG 2	1,418 SF
LEVEL 1 - GARAGE	2,427 SF
LEVEL 2	3,825 SF
LEVEL 3	4,033 SF
BLDG 2	11,867 SF
BLDG 3	1,411 SF
LEVEL 1 - GARAGE	2,427 SF
LEVEL 2	3,825 SF
LEVEL 3	4,033 SF
BLDG 3	11,860 SF
BLDG 4	1,408 SF
LEVEL 1 - GARAGE	2,427 SF
LEVEL 2	3,825 SF
LEVEL 3	4,033 SF
BLDG 4	11,857 SF
BLDG 5	1,241 SF
LEVEL 1 - GARAGE	2,110 SF
LEVEL 2	3,358 SF
LEVEL 3	3,579 SF
BLDG 5	10,288 SF
BLDG 6	1,408 SF
LEVEL 1 - GARAGE	2,427 SF
LEVEL 2	3,825 SF
LEVEL 3	4,033 SF
BLDG 6	11,857 SF
BLDG 7	1,452 SF
LEVEL 1 - GARAGE	2,505 SF
LEVEL 2	4,033 SF
LEVEL 3	4,219 SF
BLDG 7	12,207 SF
BLDG 8	1,447 SF
LEVEL 1 - GARAGE	2,499 SF
LEVEL 2	4,033 SF
LEVEL 3	4,219 SF
BLDG 8	12,198 SF
BLDG 9	1,451 SF
LEVEL 1 - GARAGE	2,505 SF
LEVEL 2	4,033 SF
LEVEL 3	4,219 SF
BLDG 9	12,206 SF
BLDG 10	1,447 SF
LEVEL 1 - GARAGE	2,499 SF
LEVEL 2	4,033 SF
LEVEL 3	4,219 SF
BLDG 10	12,198 SF
BLDG 11	1,241 SF
LEVEL 1 - GARAGE	2,110 SF
LEVEL 2	3,358 SF
LEVEL 3	3,579 SF
BLDG 11	10,315 SF
BLDG 12	1,447 SF
LEVEL 1 - GARAGE	2,499 SF
LEVEL 2	4,033 SF
LEVEL 3	4,219 SF
BLDG 12	12,198 SF
Grand Total	146,911 SF

### PARKING

TYPE	COUNT
9'0" x 17'-0" ADA	1
9'0" x 18'	7
PARALLEL - OFF STREET	6
14'	

### PROPERTY

Name	Area	Acres
SITE	98,790 SF	2.27

### ZONING ANALYSIS

ZONING JURISDICTION: SALT LAKE CITY  
ZONE: CB - COMMUNITY BUSINESS

SETBACKS:  
FRONT YARD: NO MIN REQD. MAX 15'  
SIDE YARD: NONE REQD  
REAR YARD: 10'

LANDSCAPE BUFFER: 7' AT RESIDENTIAL

MAX BUILDING HEIGHT: REQD 30' PROPOSED 30'

PARKING:  
MINIMUM PARKING SPACES: 82 SPACES 66 SPACES  
1 SPACE PER UNIT  
PUBLIC PARKING SPACES: 0 SPACES 14 SPACES  
MAXIMUM PARKING SPACES: 102.5 SPACES 90 SPACES  
TABLE 21A.44.230

ADA PARKING SECTION 21A.44.020: 1 SPACES 1 SPACES



750 RDWD

Rev. Date Description

Revisions:

RENOVATE  
750 N REDWOOD RD  
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84116  
20-10  
JCH  
SCHEMATIC DESIGN  
04 JUNE 2021  
As indicated

### SITE PLAN

9/20/2021 12:15:10 AM  
A2  
chris@outdoor.net


# 750 RDWD

Rev. Date Description


Revisions only

PROJECT: RENOVATE  
 750 N REDWOOD RD  
 SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84116  
 DATE: 20-10  
 DRAWN: JCH  
 CHECKED: SCHEMATIC DESIGN  
 DATE: 04 JUNE 2021  
 SHEET NO.: 1/4" = 1'-0"


## FLOOR PLANS




25 PLANNING - UNIT 1 - LEVEL 3  
 1/4" = 1'-0"




35 PLANNING - UNIT 1 - LEVEL 2  
 1/4" = 1'-0"




45 PLANNING - UNIT 1 - LEVEL 1  
 1/4" = 1'-0"




25 PLANNING - UNIT 2 - LEVEL 3  
 1/4" = 1'-0"



35 PLANNING - UNIT 2 - LEVEL 2  
 1/4" = 1'-0"



45 PLANNING - UNIT 2 - LEVEL 1  
 1/4" = 1'-0"






No.	Date	Description
-----	------	-------------

© 2004 Blackwell Publishing Ltd *Journal of Internal Medicine* 255: 103–110

DRAWN:	RENOVATE
PROJECT ADDRESS:	750 N REDWOOD RD SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84116
ORDER PROJECT #	20-10
ARCHT:	JDH
PHASE:	SCHEMATIC DESIGN
PUBLISHED BY:	04 JUNE 2021
SHEET SCALE:	1/4" = 1'-0"

NADAT NADON

© VEUEPT DESIGN LLC © 2021




## KEYNOTES

- 1 PEER CEMENT BOARD
- 2 STUCCO - DARK BROWN
- 3 STUCCO - CREAM
- 4 STUCCO - BURNT ORANGE
- 5 CREAM COLORED BRICK VENEER
- 6 ENTRY DOOR
- 8 GARAGE DOOR
- 9 OPERABLE WINDOW
- 10 WINDOW
- 12 GUARDRAIL
- 13 AC UNIT
- 16 ASPHALT SHINGLE ROOF
- 17 PERIMETER FENCING



① PLANNING - MODEL A - GARAGE ELEVATION  
1/8" = 1'-0"

0 4 8 16



③ PLANNING - MODEL A - PROPERTY LINE ELEVATION  
1/8" = 1'-0"


0 4 8 16



② PLANNING - MODEL A - FRONT ELEVATION  
1/8" = 1'-0"

0 4 8 16

597 SF IN THE GLAZING ZONE  
TOTAL GLAZING EQUALS 188 SF.  
188/597 = 31.2%



④ PLANNING - MODEL A - ROAD SIDE ELEVATION  
1/8" = 1'-0"

0 4 8 16

750 RDWD

Rev. Date Description

Revised: 06/01/2021

PROJECT: RENOVATE  
750 N REDWOOD RD  
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84116  
DATE: 25-10  
JOB: J01  
SCHEMATIC DESIGN  
DATE: 04 JUNE 2021  
SHEET SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

MODEL A  
ELEVATIONS

SHEET NUMBER

A5

01/06/2021 12:18:35 AM


## KEYNOTES

- 1 FIBER CEMENT BOARD
- 2 STUCCO - DARK BROWN
- 3 STUCCO - CREAM
- 4 STUCCO - BURNT ORANGE
- 5 CREAM COLORED BRICK VENEER
- 6 ENTRY DOOR
- 7 GARAGE DOOR
- 8 OPERABLE WINDOW
- 9 WINDOW
- 10 GUARDRAIL
- 12 ASPHALT SHINGLE ROOF



③ PLANNING - MODEL B - GARAGE ELEVATION  
1/8" = 1'-0"

0 4 8 16




④ PLANNING - MODEL B - ROAD SIDE ELEVATION  
1/8" = 1'-0"

0 4 8 16



② PLANNING - MODEL B - FRONT ELEVATION  
1/8" = 1'-0"

0 4 8 16



① PLANNING - MODEL B - PROPERTY LINE ELEVATION  
1/8" = 1'-0"

0 4 8 16

**750 RDWD**

Rev. Date Description

Revised: 06/01/2021

PROJECT: RENOVATE  
750 N REDWOOD RD  
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84116  
25-10  
JCH  
SCHEMATIC DESIGN  
04 JUNE 2021  
1/8" = 1'-0"

**MODEL B  
ELEVATIONS**



SHEET NUMBER

**A6**

06/02/2021 12:20:08 AM

## KEYNOTES

- 1 FIBER CEMENT BOARD
- 2 STUCCO - DARK BROWN
- 3 STUCCO - CREAM
- 4 STUCCO - BURNT ORANGE
- 5 CREAM COLORED BRICK VENEER
- 6 ENTRY DOOR
- 7 GARAGE DOOR
- 8 OPERABLE WINDOW
- 9 WINDOW
- 10 GUARDRAIL
- 11 PERIMETER FENCING



**750 RDWD**

Rev. Date Description

Revisions:

PROJECT: RENOVATE  
750 N REDWOOD RD  
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84116  
DATE: 25-10  
JOB: J01  
SCHEMATIC DESIGN  
04 JUNE 2021  
SHEET NO.: 1/8" = 1'-0"


**MODEL C  
ELEVATIONS**

SHEET NUMBER

**A7**

01/02/2021 12:29:42 AM





LANDSCAPE AREAS - SURFACING MATERIALS		AREA
HATCH	DESCRIPTION	SQUARE FT.
	CONCRETE PAVING - NATURAL GRAY (LIGHT ETCH FINISH)	2,595
	CONCRETE PAVING - OPTIONAL COLOR T.A.D. / LIGHT ETCH FINISH	4,760
	PUBLIC R.O.W. SIDEWALK	NA
	DECORATIVE ROCK MULCH - 3" DEPTH OF BLACK LAVIA ROCK	880
	DECORATIVE ROCK MULCH - 3" DEPTH OF WASATCH GOLD	2,135
	LANDSCAPE MULCH - 4" DEPTH OF SHREDDED BLACK BARK MULCH	13,275
	SODDED TURF	720

\*INSTALL ALL ROCK MULCH (EVEN WITH A MAXIMUM TOLERANCE OF 1/2" ABOVE ADJACENT PAVING, SIDING, AND PLANTER AREAS.  
 \*AREAS OF TOLERANCES OF EXISTING PLANTING AREA - CONTRACTOR TO ACCOUNT FOR REDUCTION IN MULCH DEPTH DUE TO PLANTING - REFER TO PLANTING PLANS.  
 \*QUANTITIES TO BE VERIFIED BY CONTRACTOR.

KEYNOTES		
TAG	DESCRIPTION	DETAIL
1	STEEL EDGING IN BLACK - 1/4" x 6" DEPTH, 3/8" RUSSELL "BURIED" OR EQUAL	1/1-1402
2	2" NYLON PULP FENCING - WHITE FINISH	2/1-1402
3	2" MASONRY TRASH ENCLOSURE - 1/4" HIGH TO BE FINISHED IN CHARCOAL COLOR	4/1-1402
4	3" HEIGHT - HORIZONTAL CEDAR PANEL GATE GATE & FENCE	6/1-1402
5	4" CONCRETE MOW CURB - NATURAL GRAY	5/1-1402
6	DOG POOT PET CLEANUP STATION	CUT SHEET A-1-1402

SITE ITEMS	
TAG	DESCRIPTION
A	PROPOSED STRUCTURE - SEE ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN
B	UTILITIES - SEE CIVIL PLAN
C	TRASH & REFUSE AREA - SEE ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN

**LANDSCAPE GENERAL NOTES**  
**REGULATIONS:**  
 1. ALL IMPROVEMENTS SHALL CONFORM TO THE GOVERNING (SALT LAKE CITY) STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS.  
 2. CONTRACTOR SHALL CALL BLUE STAKES OF UTAH TO VERIFY AND NOTE EXISTING UTILITIES AND SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR FINAL LOCATION OF ALL UTILITIES. CONTRACTOR IS LIABLE FOR DAMAGES TO EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW IMPROVEMENTS.  
**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**  
 1. CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY ALL PLANS WITH EXISTING CONDITIONS. CONTRACTOR SHALL REPORT ANY DISCREPANCIES, CHANGES, OR ERRORS TO THE OWNER AND/OR LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF WORK.  
 2. ALL UTILITIES ARE SHOWN FOR REFERENCE ONLY. CIVIL PLANS SHALL TAKE PRECEDENCE AND THE RESPONSIBILITY AND LIABILITY OF THE ACTING CONTRACTOR TO PROTECT AND REPAIR ANY DAMAGES TO UTILITIES.  
**PREPARATION:**  
 1. ALL LANDSCAPE AREAS TO HAVE WEEDS REMOVE AND GRUBBED WITH ALL DEBRIS MEASURING OVER 2" REMOVED.  
 2. APPLY, AS NEEDED, CERTIFIED APPLICATIONS OF HERBICIDE.  
 3. POSITIVE DRAINAGE IS TO BE MAINTAINED AWAY FROM ALL STRUCTURES.  
 4. EXISTING PLANS SHALL TAKE PRECEDENCE OVER NEW PLANS.  
**SOIL:**  
 1. MINIMUM OF 12" OF TOPSOIL IS REQUIRED IN ALL PLANTING AREAS.  
 2. MINIMUM OF 4" OF TOPSOIL IS REQUIRED IN ALL TURF PLANTING AREAS.  
 3. PLANTING HOLES SHALL BE DUG 2X AS WIDE AS ROOTBALL OF VEGETATION.  
 4. BACKFILL FOR BIRCH AND TREE PLANTINGS SHALL BE 80% TOPSOIL / 20% HUMUS MATERIAL.  
 5. SOILS REPORT SHALL TAKE PRECEDENCE.  
 5.1 TOPSOIL STANDARDS  
 SAND - 20%-70%  
 CLAY - 20%-70%  
 5.2 #10 SIEVE 15% MAXIMUM  
 5.3 PH 6 TO 8.5

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

LANDFORM DESIGN GROUP

PROJECT: 750 RDWD  
 SALT LAKE CITY, UT

DATE: 6.6.2021  
 PROJECT: COM-20-39  
 REVIEWED: JDR


REVISIONS:

TITLE:  
 LANDSCAPE SITE PLAN  
 SHEET:  
 L1-01


LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE // SITE DESIGN  
 511 W. 200 S. SUITE 125  
 SLC, UTAH 84101  
 OFFICE: 801.321.2370  
 WWW.LANDFORMDESIGNGROUP.COM




ALL RIGHTS RESERVED - LANDFORM DESIGN GROUP  
 No part of this document may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without the prior written permission of the author. The author disclaims any liability for any errors or omissions in this document.





CUT SHEET A - SHOWN REFERENCE, CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY



06 CEDAR PATIO GATE - TYPICAL INSTALLATION



04 TRASH ENCLOSURE  
1/2" = 1'-0"





05 6' MOW CURB  
3" = 1'-0"

- LEGEND**
- POURED-IN-PLACE CONCRETE - EXTRUDED CONCRETE SYSTEM NOT ACCEPTABLE
  - #3 REBAR CONTINUOUS WITH 12" LAPS
  - 1/4" RADIUS EDGE
  - FINISHED SURFACE IN TURF CONDITIONS
  - FINISHED SURFACE IN PLANTING CONDITIONS
  - 95% COMPACTED SUBGRADE
  - 1/8" SCORE @ 5' O.C. MAX.

**NOTES**

A. GEOTECHNICAL REPORTS, STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING, AND SOIL REPORTS SHALL TAKE PRECEDENCE OVER THIS DETAIL.





01 STEEL EDGING  
3" = 1'-0"


- LEGEND**
- STEEL EDGING PER CONSTRUCTION SCHEDULE - INSTALL PER MANUFACTURER'S RECOMMENDATIONS
  - STEEL STAKES PER MANUFACTURER'S RECOMMENDATIONS
  - ADJACENT MULCH/PLANTING AREA
  - ADJACENT TURF AREA
  - FINISHED GRADE
  - COMPACTED SUBGRADE

**NOTES**

A. GEOTECHNICAL REPORTS, STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING, AND SOIL REPORTS SHALL TAKE PRECEDENCE OVER THIS DETAIL.



02 VINYL FENCING - TYPICAL INSTALLATION  
1/2" = 1'-0"



- LEGEND**
- 5/8" WHITE VINYL FENCE KIT
  - TOP RAIL: 1-1/2"x5-1/2"
  - BOT. RAIL: 1-1/2"x5-1/2"
  - REINFORCEMENT
  - PICKETS: 5/8" T&G PANEL
  - END CHANNEL
  - 5"x5" POST - INSTALL WITH LOW PROFILE MATCHING CAPS, MIN. 30" EMBEDMENT IN CONCRETE FOOTING
  - CONCRETE FOOTING: 12" DIAMETER x MIN. 30" DEPTH
  - FINISHED GRADE
  - COMPACTED SUBGRADE


**NOTES**

A. INSTALL PER MANUFACTURER'S RECOMMENDATIONS. THIS DETAIL IS PER TYPICAL INSTALLATIONS.

B. CONTRACTOR TO INSTALL LINE POSTS, CORNER POSTS, AND ENDGATE POSTS TO ENSURE DESIGN LAYOUT IS FOLLOWED.



03 6' MASONRY WALL - TYPICAL  
1/2" = 1'-0"



- LEGEND**
- PRECAST CAP TO MATCH COLOR OF BLOCK
  - CMU BLOCK (TYP. 8x8x16)
  - VERTICAL REBAR: #5 @ 32" O.C. // 30" LAP
  - HORIZONTAL REBAR: #5 @ 24" O.C. // 24" LAP (2) #4 CONT. @ TOP // 24" LAP
  - TRENCH CONCRETE FOOTING
  - VERTICAL REBAR: #5 @ 24" O.C. // 30" LAP // 90° BEND
  - HORIZONTAL REBAR: (2) #5 CONT. @ BOT // 24" LAP
  - JOINT REINFORCEMENT
  - ISOLATION JOINT @ HORIZONTAL CONCRETE SURFACES
  - 90% MINIMUM COMPACTED GRADE

**NOTES**

A. GEOTECHNICAL REPORTS, STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING, AND SOIL REPORTS SHALL TAKE PRECEDENCE OVER THIS DETAIL.


B. REBAR SHALL BE CENTERED IN BLOCK.

C. CONCRETE BLOCK TO BE IN RUNNING BOND.

D. ALL BLOCKS WITH VERTICAL REBAR TO BE GROUTED SOLID.

E. PROVIDE CONTROL JOINTS MAXIMUM 15' O.C.

F. 3/8" MORTAR JOINTS.



PLANTING MATERIALS - 750 REDWOOD ROAD

SHRUBS, GROUNDCOVERS, GRASSES							
QTY	SYMBOL	SIZE	BOTANICAL NAME	COMMON NAME	HYDROZONE	HxW	NOTES
54	●	3 GAL.	BERBERIS THUNBERGII 'CORONATION PIGMY'	PIGMY JAP. BARBERRY	S03	2'x3'	
208	●	1 GAL.	BOULEA GRACILE	BLUE GAMA GRASS	TW0	1'x1'	
90	●	1 GAL.	CALAMAGROSTIS ACUTIFLORA 'OVERDAM'	OVERDAM REEDGRASS	TW2	3'x2'	
132	●	1 GAL.	CALAMAGROSTIS ARUNDINACEAE VAR. BRACHYTRICHA 'CASPIAN'	KOREAN FEATHER REED GRASS	TLOW	2'x2'	
134	●	3 GAL.	EUONYMUS FORTUNEI 'MOONSHINE'	WINTERCREEPER	OY4	2'x1.5'	EVERGREEN
220	●	1 GAL.	HEMEROCALLIS STELLA DE ORO	STELLA DE ORO DAYLILY	P3	2'x1.5'	
42	●	1 GAL.	PENNISETUM ALOPECUROIDES	FOUNTAIN GRASS	TW2	2.5'x2.5'	
64	●	5 GAL.	PINUS MUGO VAR. MUGO	DWARF MUGO PINE	SE2	4'x4'	EVERGREEN
58	●	3 GAL.	POTENTILLA FRUTICOSA 'JACKMAN'	JACKMAN POTENTILLA	T02	3'x3'	
220	●	1 GAL.	SALIX NEMOROSA 'SENSATION ROSE'	SENSATION ROSE-SAGE	P2	2'x2'	
64	●	3 GAL.	SPIRAEA Y. GOLDFLAME	GOLDFLAME SPIRAEA	S03	3.5'x3.5'	
74	●	3 GAL.	PHYSCARRUS ORNATUS 'NUGGET'	COLD MINEBARK	S04	4'x4'	
100	●	5 GAL.	TAXUS MEDIA 'DENSIFORMIS'	HICKS YEW	S03	3'x3'	EVERGREEN
21	●	3 GAL.	YUCCA FILAMENTOSA	ADAM'S NEEDLE	S00	3.5'x3'	EVERGREEN

LANDSCAPE PLANTING NOTES

- ALL LANDSCAPING SHALL BE INSTALLED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CURRENT PLANTING PROCEDURES ESTABLISHED BY THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF NURSERYMEN.
- CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE TO FURNISH PLANT MATERIAL THAT IS PEST AND DISEASE FREE AND TO MAINTAIN AND WARRANTY PLANT MATERIAL THROUGHOUT CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE.
- CONTRACTOR TO WARRANTY PLANT MATERIAL PER WARRANTY SPECIFICATIONS, TYPICALLY FOR A (1) YEAR PERIOD OF TIME.
- CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR VERIFYING QUANTITIES AND FURNISHING ALL PLANT MATERIALS TO ENSURE INTENDED COVERAGE. CONTRACTOR SHALL CONTACT OWNER AND/OR LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT FOR APPROVAL OF CHANGES IN QUANTITIES OR SPECIES.
- DEPENDENT ON PLANT AVAILABILITY, CONTRACTOR SHOULD ATTEMPT TO FIND PLANT MATERIAL OF LIKE KIND THAT IS APPROXIMATELY THE SAME HEIGHT AND GROWN HABIT. HOWEVER, ALL VARIETIES SHALL MATCH EACH OTHER WHEN INSTALLED. NO PARTIAL PLANTING SUBSTITUTIONS. IF A NEW VARIETY IS APPROVED, THE SAME PLANT VARIETY SHALL BE USED THROUGHOUT THE ENTIRETY OF THE PROJECT SCOPE.
- DOUBLE STAKE ALL TREES UNDER 2" CALIPER UNTIL MATURETY.
- ALL SHRUBS AND TREES TO CONTAINER GROWN OR BE BALLED AND BURLAPPED.
- TREES SHALL NOT BE PLANTED LESS THAN 40" FROM CURBS OR HARD SURFACE AREAS UNLESS A ROOT BARRIER IS INSTALLED NEXT TO HARDCAPPED SURFACE.
- ALL PLANTING SHALL ACCOUNT FOR SLOPES TO PROVIDE A SMOOTH TRANSITION.
- INSTALL COMMERCIAL GRADE WEED BARRIER FABRIC TO ALL PLANTING AREAS AND PLANTER BEDS WITH 6" LANDSCAPE STAPLES PER INDUSTRY STANDARDS. NO WEED BARRIER TO BE VISIBLE.
- ALL PLANT MATERIALS SHALL CONFORM TO THE AMERICAN STANDARD FOR NURSERY STOCK, PUBLISHED BY THE AMERICAN NURSERY ASSOCIATION, INC.
- FERTILIZE ALL SHRUBS AND TREES WITH FERTILIZER TABLETS.

CITY OF SALT LAKE LANDSCAPE CALCULATIONS:

ZONE: CB		
NET LANDSCAPE AREAS:		
TOTAL SITE:	98,710 S.F. (100%)	WATER WISE PLANTS FOR SALT LAKE CITY
REQUIRED LANDSCAPE AREA:	14,807 S.F. (15%)	DROUGHT TOLERANT SHRUBS
PROVIDED LANDSCAPE AREA:	16,710 S.F. (16.93%)	REQUIRED: 90% (OF 14,833)
TOTAL TURF AREA:	710 S.F. (0.72%)	PROVIDED: 91% (1,501 / 1,633)
TREES REQUIRED:	1/30 LF. (925 LF. OF BUFFER)	DROUGHT TOLERANT TREES
TREES PROVIDED:	31	REQUIRED: 100%
BUFFER SHRUBS PROVIDED:	206 SHRUBS	PROVIDED: 100% (41/41)
ROW TREES REQUIRED - REDWOOD ROAD:		
20'W L.F. TREE EVERY 30' AVG. W.	9.93 TREES	
REQUIRED:	10 TREES	
PROVIDED:		

PARKWAY PLANTING - URBAN FORESTER REQUIREMENTS

- ALL TREES IN PUBLIC ROW TO BE 2" CALIPER - LOCATED:
- 7' from water meter and/or utility box
  - 10' from fire hydrant
  - 5'-10' from residential driveway
  - 5'-10' from property line of adjoining parcel
  - 5'-10' from non-electricity containing signage
  - 5'-10' from utility pole and/or light
  - 20' from an unregulated intersection (20' back from intersecting sidewalk)
  - 30' from stop signs
  - 30' from commercial driveway and/or alley
  - 40' from an intersection with traffic lights (40' back from intersecting sidewalk)
  - 25'x40' from a tree that is medium in size at maturity (30' to 50' tall)



ALL RIGHTS RESERVED - LANDFORVORX  
GROUP  
Design and/or construction of the project  
shall be the sole responsibility of the owner.  
The owner shall be responsible for the project  
and shall be the sole provider of all  
information and data required for the project.  
No design or construction shall be  
performed without the approval of the owner.  
The owner shall be the sole provider of  
all information and data required for the project.

PROJECT:  
750 RDWD  
SALT LAKE CITY, UT

DATE: 6.6.2021  
PROJECT: COM-20.39  
REVIEWED: JDR

REVISIONS:


TITLE:  
LANDSCAPE  
PLANTING PLAN

SHEET:

L3-01


NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

LANDFORM DESIGN GROUP



# PLANTING MATERIALS - 750 REDWOOD ROAD

QTY	SYMBOL	SIZE	BOTANICAL NAME	COMMON NAME	HYDROZONE	HxW	NOTES
NA	-	NA	EXISTING NEIGHBORING TREE - DO NOT DAMAGE				
4	A0	1.5" CAL.	AMELANCHIER X GRANDIFLORA	AUTUMN SERVICEBERRY	TD4	20X15'	SHADE/BUFFER
10	Z1	2" CAL.	ZELKOYA SERRATA "WIRELESS"	WIRELESS ZELKOVA	TD4	20X30'	STREET TREE
10	A1	1.5" CAL.	ACER CAMPESTRE	HEDGE MAPLE	TD3	20X30'	SHADE/BUFFER
18	S1	1.5" CAL.	SYRINGA RETICULATA "IVORY SILK"	JAPANESE TREE LILAC	TD3	25X20'	SHADE/BUFFER



## TREE PLANTING DETAIL

NTS  
9/1/19  
SLC URBAN FORESTRY - REQUIRED DETAIL FOR ROW PLANTING



ALL RIGHTS RESERVED - LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

Design and construction of this project is the responsibility of the engineer. The engineer shall be responsible for the design and construction of the project. The engineer shall be responsible for the design and construction of the project.

For design information, contact the engineer at the address above. The engineer shall be responsible for the design and construction of the project. The engineer shall be responsible for the design and construction of the project.

PROJECT: 750 RDWD  
SALT LAKE CITY, UT

DATE: 6.6.2021  
PROJECT: COM-20.39  
REVIEWED: JDR

REVISIONS:

TITLE:

LANDSCAPE TREES

SHEET:

L3-02

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

# 750 RDWD

## PRELIMINARY DRAWINGS

LOCATED IN THE SOUTHWEST AND SOUTHEAST QUARTERS OF SECTION 27,  
TOWNSHIP 1 NORTH, RANGE 1 WEST, SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN  
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH



DRAWING NOTES:

### GENERAL NOTES

1. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL CONSTRUCT ACCORDING TO THE FOLLOWING, AS APPLICABLE, UNLESS STANDARDS HAVE BEEN WAIVED OR MODIFIED IN WRITING:  
-SALT LAKE CITY DESIGN STANDARDS-CONSTRUCTION SPECIFICATIONS AND STANDARD DRAWINGS-LATEST EDITION  
-UNIFORM FIRE CODE (LATEST EDITION)  
-UNIFORM BUILDING CODE (LATEST EDITION)
2. THE TERM CONTRACTOR SHALL MEAN ALL CONTRACTORS, SUBCONTRACTORS, AND ALL FOLLOW ON CONTRACTORS. REQUIREMENTS FOR ONE SHALL APPLY TO ALL.
3. ADDITIONAL NOTES THAT ARE SHOWN ON DESIGN OR DETAIL DRAWINGS ARE TO BE ADHERED TO IN THEIR ENTIRETY.
4. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY ALL OWNERS OF UTILITIES INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, WATER, SANITARY SEWER, TELEPHONE, ELECTRICAL, NATURAL GAS AND CABLE TELEVISION, OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION WITHIN THE UTILITY'S AREA OF RESPONSIBILITY. THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR MEETING WITH AND COORDINATING HIS CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES WITH THOSE OF THE UTILITY COMPANIES INVOLVED AND TO FIELD LOCATE ALL EXISTING UTILITIES WITHIN THE AREA OF OPERATIONS. IT IS THE CONTRACTORS RESPONSIBILITY TO VERIFY THE LOCATION OF ALL UTILITIES PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF ANY CONSTRUCTION.

### ROADWAY NOTES

1. ALL UTILITY TRENCHING SHALL BE PER SLOPU STANDARD PRACTICE NO. 1.
2. PRIOR TO WORKING IN THE PUBLIC WAY, A LICENSED, INSURED, AND BONDED CONTRACTOR, WHO HAS SAID INFORMATION ON FILE WITH SLC ENGINEERING, MUST OBTAIN A PUBLIC WAY PERMIT FROM SLC ENGINEERING AND PERHAPS A TRANSPORTATION PERMIT. ALL WORK IN THE PUBLIC WAY SHALL FOLLOW APWA STANDARDS.
3. PUBLIC WAY PERMIT AND TRAFFIC CONTROL PERMIT REQUIRED TO TERMINATE/CAP/REMOVE ANY EXISTING SERVICE IN THE PUBLIC WAY.
4. ASPHALT PAVEMENT CUTS IN DIRECTORS ROW TO BE RESTORED PER THE 2012 EDITION OF APWA STD. PLAN 355.


### PROJECT BASIS OF BEARING AND BENCHMARK

PROJECT BASIS OF BEARING:  
THE PROJECT BASIS OF BEARING IS SOUTH 00°11'42" WEST BETWEEN THE INTERSECTION MONUMENT OF REDWOOD ROAD AT 852 NORTH AND REDWOOD ROAD AT 700 NORTH.

PROJECT BENCHMARK:  
THE PROJECT BENCHMARK IS THE RIM OF THE EXISTING STORM DRAIN MANHOLE IN REDWOOD ROAD, NEAR THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF THE PROJECT, HAVING AN ELEVATION OF 4217.97'.

PROJECT TOPOGRAPHY: THE PROJECT WAS DESIGNED WITH CONVENTIONAL TOPOGRAPHY, SURVEYED IN JUNE 2020.

### VICINITY MAP



### PROJECT OWNER

TBD  
TBD  
TBD

### SHEET INDEX

- |        |                                    |
|--------|------------------------------------|
| C101   | COVER SHEET                        |
| 1 OF 1 | RECORD OF SURVEY                   |
| C201   | CIVIL SITE AND MASTER UTILITY PLAN |
| C202   | GRADING AND DRAINAGE PLAN          |



NO.	REVISION	DATE

PROJECT INFORMATION		
750 RDWD		
COVER SHEET		
750 NORTH REDWOOD RD SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH		


DRAWN MEC	CHECKED	PROJECT # 20131
		DATE 6/9/21
		SCALE NONE
		SHEET C101

ENGINEER'S STAMP

CS: UTAH 20131 (Drawn: 750 N Redwood Road) (Wg: 20131 750 rdwd site plan.dwg)  
PLOT DATE: Jun 09, 2021

# COMMUNITY PLAZA, INC PROPERTY

LOCATED IN THE SOUTHWEST AND SOUTHEAST QUARTERS OF SECTION 27,  
TOWNSHIP 1 NORTH, RANGE 1 WEST,  
SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN  
RECORD OF SURVEY



## SURVEYOR'S CERTIFICATE:

I, KAGAN M. DODD, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I AM A PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR AND THAT I HOLD LICENSE NO. 8061081 AS PRESCRIBED BY THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF UTAH. I HAVE MADE A SURVEY OF THE ABOVE DESCRIBED PROPERTY, THAT THIS PLAT CORRECTLY SHOWS THE TRUE DIMENSIONS OF THE BOUNDARIES SURVEYED AND THE VISIBLE IMPROVEMENTS AFFECTING THE BOUNDARIES AND THEIR POSITION IN RELATIONSHIP TO SAID BOUNDARIES.



## BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION

PART OF THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 27, TOWNSHIP 1 NORTH, RANGE 1 WEST, SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN, DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS (THE TRUE BASIS OF BEARING FOR THIS SURVEY IS NORTH 00°14'42\"

BEGINNING AT A POINT ON THE EASTERLY RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF REDWOOD ROAD, SAID POINT BEING NORTH 00°11'39\"

## AS-SURVEYED DESCRIPTION

A TRACT OF LAND BEING PART OF THE SOUTHWEST AND SOUTHEAST QUARTERS OF SECTION 27, TOWNSHIP 1 NORTH, RANGE 1 WEST, SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN, HAVING A BASE OF BEARINGS OF NORTH 00°14'42\"

BEGINNING AT A POINT ON THE EAST RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF REDWOOD ROAD, SAID POINT ALSO BEING SOUTH 04°52'25\"

CONTAINS 98,810 SQUARE FEET OR 2.268 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.

## GENERAL NOTES

(1) OTHER DOCUMENTS USED IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS SURVEY:

1. COMMENT FOR TITLE INSURANCE ISSUED BY WESTCOAST LAND TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY DATED JUNE 1, 2020, ORDER NO. 5892LP.
2. OTHER DOCUMENTS AS SHOWN ON THIS MAP.

(2) WILDLING ENGINEERING SURVEYED ABOVE GROUND VISIBLE EVIDENCE OF STRUCTURES THAT WOULD INDICATE THE POSSIBILITY OF AN EXISTING EASEMENT OR ENCUMBRANCE ON THE PROPERTY. A TITLE REPORT WHICH WOULD PROVIDE ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF EXISTING UTILITIES WAS NOT PROVIDED FOR THIS PROPERTY AT THE TIME THIS SURVEY WAS CONDUCTED.

(3) EXCEPTIONS AS SHOWN IN SCHEDULE B - SECTION II FROM THE ABOVE REFERENCED COMMENT FOR TITLE INSURANCE HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED AS FOLLOWS:

1-13 NOT ADDRESSED BY THIS SURVEY.

14 EASEMENT, AND THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS THEREOF:

GRANTED: UTAH POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

PURPOSE: COMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES

RECORDED: JANUARY 15, 1991

ENTRY NO.: 5215258

BOOK/PAGE: 6282/2467

SURVEY NOTES: THE REFERENCED DOCUMENT REFERS TO JORDAN PLAT \"A\", WHICH WAS NOT FOUND ON RECORD WITH THE SALT LAKE COUNTY RECORDER. THEREFORE, THE EXACT LOCATION OF THIS EASEMENT IS UNKNOWN.

15 AVIGATION EASEMENT TO SALT LAKE CITY CORPORATION AND THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS CONTAINED THEREIN, RECORDED SEPTEMBER 16, 2008, AS ENTRY NO. 10201164, BOOK 9654, PAGE 727.

SURVEY NOTES: BLANKET IN NATURE, AFFECTS ALL OF SUBJECT PROPERTY ABOVE 4377 FEET ABOVE SEA LEVEL.

16 JOINT EASEMENT AGREEMENT TO QWEST COMMUNICATIONS, INC. AND THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS CONTAINED THEREIN, RECORDED NOVEMBER 5, 2008, AS ENTRY NO. 1056624, BOOK 9656, PAGE 9597.

SURVEY NOTES: SHOWN HEREON.

17-20 NOT ADDRESSED BY THIS SURVEY.

## BASIS OF BEARINGS


THE BASIS OF BEARINGS FOR THIS SURVEY IS SOUTH 00°14'42\"

MONUMENTS IN REDWOOD ROAD AT 852 NORTH AND 700 NORTH AS SHOWN HEREON.

## NARRATIVE OF BOUNDARY

THE PURPOSE OF THIS SURVEY WAS TO LOCATE AND MONUMENT ON THE GROUND THE SURVEYED PROPERTY SHOWN HEREON. STREET MONUMENTS IN WHITEHEAD PLAT \"C\" WERE USED TO LOCATE THAT SUBDIVISION AND IRVING CIRCLE CONDOMINIUMS.

## LEGEND



G:\DATA\20131 750 N Redwood Road\dwg\20131 ROS.dwg  
PLOT DATE: JUL 13, 2020


UTILITY STATEMENT:  
THE UNDERGROUND UTILITIES SHOWN HEREON HAVE BEEN LOCATED FROM FIELD OBSERVATIONS AND UTILITY MARKINGS. THE SURVEYOR MAKES NO GUARANTEE THAT THE UNDERGROUND UTILITIES SHOWN HEREON COMPREHEND ALL SUCH UTILITIES IN THE AREA, EITHER IN SERVICE OR ABANDONED. THE SURVEYOR FURTHER DOES NOT WARRANT THAT THE UNDERGROUND UTILITIES SHOWN HEREON ARE IN THE EXACT LOCATION INDICATED, ALTHOUGH THE SURVEYOR DOES STATE THAT THE UTILITIES SHOWN HEREON ARE LOCATED AS ACCURATELY AS POSSIBLE FROM INFORMATION AVAILABLE AT THE TIME THE SURVEY WAS CONDUCTED. THE SURVEYOR HAS NOT PHYSICALLY LOCATED THE UNDERGROUND UTILITIES AND THE EXACT LOCATION OF SOME UTILITIES MAY REQUIRE FURTHER FIELD INVESTIGATION OR EXCAVATION TO DETERMINE THEIR PRECISE LOCATIONS.

NO.	REVISION	DATE

DRAWING TITLE
RECORD OF SURVEY
LOCATION
750 N REDWOOD ROAD
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

PROJECT NAME
COMMUNITY PLAZA PROPERTY
DRAWN
KMD
CHECKED
SWD
COUNTY
SALT LAKE

DATE
07/13/2020
SCALE
1" = 30'
SHEET
1 OF 1



- DRAWING NOTES:
1. ALL UTILITY CONSTRUCTION SHALL COMPLY WITH APWA STANDARDS AND SLOPE STANDARD PRACTICES.
  2. ALL UTILITIES MUST MEET THE FOLLOWING MINIMUM HORIZONTAL AND VERTICAL SEPARATIONS:  
WATER AND SEWER - 10' HORIZONTAL, 18" VERTICAL  
SEWER - 5' HORIZONTAL, 12" VERTICAL FROM ANY NON-WATER UTILITY  
WATER - 3' HORIZONTAL, 12" VERTICAL FROM ANY NON-SEWER UTILITY
  3. PRIOR TO WORKING IN THE PUBLIC WAY, A LICENSED, INSURED, AND BONDED CONTRACTOR, WHO HAS SAID INFORMATION ON FILE WITH SLC ENGINEERING, MUST OBTAIN A PUBLIC WAY PERMIT FROM SLC ENGINEERING AND PERHAPS A TRANSPORTATION PERMIT. ALL WORK IN THE PUBLIC WAY SHALL FOLLOW APWA STANDARDS.
  4. EXISTING WATER SERVICES ARE LOCATED PER SALT LAKE CITY GIS. THESE ARE TO BE REMOVED AND KILLED AT THE MAIN.

LEGEND

- ⊙ PROPOSED WATER SERVICE
- ⊙ PROPOSED SEWER LATERAL



CS:UTAH/2023/Drawn: 750 N Redwood Road/Way/2023/750 RDWD civil site plan.dwg  
PLOT DATE: Jun 09, 2021


NO.	REVISION	DATE


PROJECT INFORMATION

**750 RDWD**

PRELIMINARY  
CIVIL SITE & UTILITY PLAN  
750 NORTH REDWOOD ROAD  
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

DRAWN <b>MEC</b>	CHECKED	PROJECT # <b>20131</b>
ENGINEER'S STAMP		DATE <b>6/9/21</b>
		SCALE <b>1" = 20'</b>
		SHEET <b>C201</b>





**DRAWING NOTES:**

1. PRIOR TO WORKING IN THE PUBLIC WAY, A LICENSED, INSURED, AND BONDED CONTRACTOR, WHO HAS SAID INFORMATION ON FILE WITH S.E. ENGINEERING, MUST OBTAIN A PUBLIC WAY PERMIT FROM S.E. ENGINEERING AND PERHAPS A TRANSPORTATION PERMIT. ALL WORK IN THE PUBLIC WAY SHALL FOLLOW APWA STANDARDS.

### LEGEND

DRAINAGE FLOW DIRECTION  
 EXISTING INDEX CONTOUR (5')  
 EXISTING CONTOUR (1')



\\DATA\20131 Diverlot 750 N Redwood Road\dwg\20131 750 rdwd site plan.dwg

NO.	REVISION	DATE

## 750 RDWD

PRELIMINARY  
GRADING & DRAINAGE PLAN  
750 NORTH REDWOOD ROAD  
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

DRAWN <b>MEC</b>	CHECKED	PROJECT # <b>20131</b>
	DATE <b>8/5/20</b>	
	SCALE <b>1" = 20'</b>	
	SHEET <b>C202</b>	

**Attachment C: Current Drawings**

**Page intentionally left blank.**



## VILLAROSA

750 N. REDWOOD RD. SALT LAKE CITY UT



The designs shown and described herein including all technical drawings, graphics, representations & models thereof are the copyrighted work of Think Architecture, Inc. and its associated related subsidiaries, or commercially marketed material or in part without the prior and express written permission from Think Architecture, Inc.

## VILLAROSA

750 N. REDWOOD RD. SALT LAKE CITY UT

VIEW OF 7-PLEX-01  
COLOR SCHEME-01

# D201

27 OCT. 2023



The designs shown and described herein including all technical drawings, graphics, representations & models represent the copyrighted work of Think Architecture, Inc. and its associated related intellectual or commercially restricted material or in part without the sole and express written permission from Think Architecture, Inc.

## VILLAROSA

750 N. REDWOOD RD. SALT LAKE CITY UT

VIEW OF 7-PLEX-01  
COLOR SCHEME-02

D202

27 OCT. 2023



The designs shown and described herein including all technical drawings, graphics, representations & models thereof are the copyrighted work of THINK Architecture, Inc. and its associated related subsidiaries, or commercially marketed material or in part without the prior and express written permission from THINK Architecture, Inc.

# VILLAROSA

750 N. REDWOOD RD. SALT LAKE CITY UT

VIEW OF 7-PLEX-01  
COLOR SCHEME-01 @  
STREET

D203

27 OCT. 2023



The designs shown and described herein including all technical drawings, graphics, representations & models thereof are the copyrighted work of THINK Architecture, Inc. and its associated related divisions, or its affiliates. No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without the prior written permission of THINK Architecture, Inc.




## VILLAROSA

750 N. REDWOOD RD. SALT LAKE CITY UT

VIEW OF 7-PLEX-01  
COLOR SCHEME-02 @  
STREET

**D204**

27 OCT. 2023



The designs shown and specified herein including all technical drawings, graphic representation & models thereof are the copyrighted work of Think Architecture, Inc. and its associated related divisions, or commercially marketed in whole or in part without the prior written permission from Think Architecture, Inc.

GARBETT HOMES

7-PLEX-01

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

7-PLEX-01 EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS

D301

27 OCT. 2023



REAR ELEVATION SD  
3/18/2023

1  
0001  
0002



The designs shown and specified herein including all technical drawings, graphic representation & models thereof are the copyrighted work of Think Architecture, Inc. and its associated related entities, and are not to be reproduced, stored, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of Think Architecture, Inc.

GARBETT HOMES

7-PLEX-01

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

7-PLEX-01 EXTERIOR  
ELEVATIONS


D302

27 OCT. 2023



FRONT ELEVATION SD STREET FACING  
1/8" = 1'-0"

1  
030





WALL AREA =  
602.5 SQ. FT.



OPENING/WINDOW AREA =  
153.0 SQ. FT. (25.4%)

FRONT ELEVATION OPENING/GLASS EXHIBIT  
1/8" = 1'-0"

2  
030







2BD-01 GROSS AREAS	
Room	Area
GARAGE	382 SF
LEVEL 2	322 SF
LEVEL 3	485 SF
Grand Total	1189 SF



The designs shown and specified herein including all technical drawings, graphics, representation & models thereof are the copyrighted work of Think Architecture, Inc. and its associated related parties, and are not to be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without the prior written permission of Think Architecture, Inc.


# GARBETT HOMES UNIT 2BD-01

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

2-BEDROOM-01 FLOOR PLANS


D401

27 OCT. 2023




LEVEL 1 - PRESENTATION  
1/4" = 1'-0"

1  
D402



LEVEL 2 - PRESENTATION  
1/4" = 1'-0"

2  
D402



LEVEL 3 - PRESENTATION  
1/4" = 1'-0"

3  
D402

1BD-01 GROSS AREAS	
Name	Area
GARAGE	240.0 SF
LEVEL 01	240.0 SF
LEVEL 02	240.0 SF
LEVEL 03	240.0 SF
Grand Total	960.0 SF



The designs shown and specified herein including all technical drawings, graphic representation & models thereof are the copyrighted work of Think Architecture, Inc. and its affiliates. No part of this document may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without the prior written permission of Think Architecture, Inc.

## GARBETT HOMES

## UNIT 1BD-01

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH





1-BEDROOM-01 FLOOR  
PLANS

**D402**

27 OCT. 2023


# MATERIAL CHART

## COLOR SCHEME - 01

								
<b><u>ENTRY DOORS</u></b> Material: Fiberglass/Glass Manufacturer: TBD Color: To Match Charcoal Gray	<b><u>GARAGE DOORS</u></b> Material: Steel/Glass Manufacturer: TBD Color: White	<b><u>WINDOWS</u></b> Material: Vinyl Manufacturer: TBD Color: White	<b><u>FIBER CEMENT LAP SIDING 1</u></b> Material: Fiber Cement Lap Siding 6" Exposure Manufacturer: TBD Color: SW7615 "Sea Serpent" or	<b><u>FIBER CEMENT LAP SIDING 2</u></b> Same as Lap Siding 1	<b><u>FIBER CEMENT BOARD &amp; BATT SIDING</u></b> Material: Fiber Cement BD & BATT Manufacturer: TBD Color: SW7615 "Sea Serpent" or	<b><u>BRICK VENEER</u></b> Material: Thin Brick Manufacturer: Interstate Color: "Midnight" or similar	<b><u>STUCCO-1</u></b> Material: Stucco Manufacturer: Western One-Coat Color: "Bright White" <i>DRYVIT, SENECA or similar</i>	<b><u>COLUMNS/BEAMS</u></b> Material: Varies Manufacturer: TBD Color: "Charcoal" or similar
<b><u>FASCIA/TRIM/PARAPET CAP/DWP EDGE</u></b> Material: Fiber Cement /MTL Manufacturer: TBD Color: "White" or similar								

## COLOR SCHEME - 02

									
<b>ENTRY DOORS</b> Material: Fiberglass/Glass Manufacturer: TBD Color: To Match Charcoal Gray	<b>GARAGE DOORS</b> Material: Steel/Glass Manufacturer: TBD Color: White	<b>WINDOWS</b> Material: Vinyl Manufacturer: TBD Color: White	<b>FIBER CEMENT LAP SIDING 1</b> Material: Fiber Cement Lap Siding 6" Exposure Manufacturer: TBD Color: SW6215 "Rocky River" or similar Note: Door, Window and other trim in these siding areas to match.	<b>FIBER CEMENT LAP SIDING 2</b> Material: Fiber Cement Lap Siding 6" Exposure Manufacturer: TBD Color: SW6069 "French Roast" or similar Note: Door, Window and other trim in these siding areas to match.	<b>FIBER CEMENT BOARD &amp; BATT SIDING</b> Material: Fiber Cement BD & BATT Manufacturer: TBD Color: SW6215 "Rocky River" or similar Note: Door, Window and other trim in these siding areas to match.	<b>BRICK VENEER</b> Material: Thin Brick Manufacturer: Interstate Color: "Pewter" or similar	<b>STUCCO-1</b> Material: Stucco Manufacturer: Western One-Coat Color: "Bright White" DRYVIT, SENECA or similar	<b>COLUMNS/BEAMS</b> Material: Varies Manufacturer: TBD Color: "Charcoal" or similar	<b>FASCIA/TRIM/PARAPET CAP/DWP EDGE</b> Material: Fiber Cement/MTL Manufacturer: TBD Color: "White" or similar



2	SALT LAKE CITY COMMENT	7/19/22
1	SALT LAKE CITY COMMENT	6/17/22
NO.	REVISION	DATE

PROJECT INFORMATION

**RIVERS EDGE  
AT REDWOOD**


CIVIL SITE & UTILITY PLAN

750 NORTH REDWOOD ROAD  
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

DRAWN <b>MEC</b>	CHECKED  	PROJECT # <b>20131</b>
---------------------	-----------------	---------------------------



DATE	3/28/22
SCALE	1" = 20'
SHEET	C202




A TRACT OF LAND BEING PART OF THE SOUTHWEST AND SOUTHEAST QUARTERS OF SECTION 27, TOWNSHIP 1 NORTH, RANGE 1 WEST, SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN, HAVING A BASIS OF BEARINGS OF NORTH 00°11'42" EAST BETWEEN THE EXISTING CENTERLINE MONUMENTS LOCATED IN REDWOOD ARCT AT 700 NORTH AND 852 NORTH, SAID TRACT OF LAND BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT A POINT ON THE EAST RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF REDWOOD ROAD, SAID POINT ALSO BEING SOUTH 04°32'52" WEST 1241.46 FEET THE MONUMENT. AT 852 NORTH REDWOOD ROAD (ALSO KNOWN AS SALT LAKE COUNTY POINT NO. 08273300) AND SOUTH 00°11'42" WEST 243.00 FEET ALONG THE MONUMENT LINE A DISTANCE OF 617.69 FEET NORTH NORTH 89°58'46" EAST 52.48 FEET FROM THE CENTER OF SECTION 27, TOWNSHIP 1 NORTH, RANGE 1 WEST, SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN AND RUNNING THENCE NORTH 89°58'46" EAST ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF RIVINE CIRCLE CONDOMINIUMS; ON FILE WITH THE OFFICE OF THE SALT LAKE COUNTY RECORDER, 700 WEST 700 NORTH, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84103, BEING 100 FEET ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF RIVINE CIRCLE CONDOMINIUMS; ON FILE WITH THE OFFICE OF THE SALT LAKE COUNTY RECORDER, 700 WEST 700 NORTH, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84103, BEING 100 FEET ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF RIVINE CIRCLE CONDOMINIUMS; ON FILE WITH THE OFFICE OF THE SALT LAKE COUNTY RECORDER IN BOOK FF, AT PAGE 14 A DISTANCE OF 290.01 FEET THENCE WEST 33.61 FEET TO SAID EAST RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE; THENCE NORTH 00°51'51" EAST ALONG SAID EAST RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE A DISTANCE OF 236.89 FEET

CONTAINS 98,810 SQUARE FEET OR 2.268 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.  
SALT LAKE COUNTY PARCEL #08-27-452-049

 3/4" WATER SERVICE  
 SEWER LATERAL (SEE SHEET C301)



**WILDING**  
ENGINEERING

14781 SOUTH MOUNTAIN DRIVE WAY  
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH 84115  
801.366.8118  
WWW.WILDINGENGINEERING.COM

- DRAWING NOTES:
1. ALL UTILITY CONSTRUCTION SHALL COMPLY WITH APWA STANDARDS AND SLOPE STANDARD PRACTICES.
  2. ALL UTILITIES MUST MEET THE FOLLOWING MINIMUM HORIZONTAL AND VERTICAL SEPARATIONS:  
WATER AND SEWER - 10' HORIZONTAL, 18" VERTICAL  
SEWER - 5' HORIZONTAL, 12" VERTICAL FROM ANY NON-SEWER UTILITY  
WATER - 3' HORIZONTAL, 12" VERTICAL FROM ANY NON-SEWER UTILITY
  3. THE ABOVE CLEARANCES APPLY TO THE OUTSIDE OF PIPES AND ALL VALVES AND BOXES.
  4. UNLESS EXISTING WATER SERVICES TO THE PROPERTY SHALL BE KEPT AT THE WATER MAIN PER SLOPE STANDARDS.
  5. PRIOR TO WORKING IN THE PUBLIC WAY A LICENSED, INSURED, AND BONDED CONTRACTOR, WHO HAS SAID INFORMATION ON FILE WITH SLC ENGINEERING, MUST OBTAIN A PUBLIC WAY PERMIT FROM SLC ENGINEERING AND FURNISH A TRANSPORTATION PERMIT. ALL WORK IN THE PUBLIC WAY SHALL FOLLOW APWA STANDARDS.
  6. NEW WATER MARKS AND LATERALS SHALL BE INSTALLED IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER:  
a. 10% OF RISE SHALL BE NO LESS THAN 5 FEET  
b. PIPE RECORD MATERIAL MUST BE INSTALLED PER SLC STANDARD PRACTICES NO. 10  
c. NO NET CONNECTIONS. ADDITIONAL RISING SHALL BE INSTALLED AS REQUIRED BY SALT LAKE CITY PUBLIC UTILITIES.
  7. FIRE HYDRANTS SHALL BE PROVIDED WITH TWO 2-1/2" OUTLETS AND ONE 4-1/2" RISE OUTLET THAT ARE MALE NATIONAL STANDARD THREADED, GRY BARBED, TYPE WITH A SHOCK CONTROL VALVE AND DRAIN VALVE AT THE BASE OF THE FIRE HYDRANT. THE HYDRANTS SHALL BE COLOR-CODED AS DIRECTED BY PUBLIC UTILITIES AS TO THE COLOR AND SHADE OF THE HYDRANT. FIRE HYDRANTS SHALL BE EQUIPPED WITH AN INDEPENDENT LATERAL CONTROL VALVE PLACED AT THE BASE OF THE FIRE HYDRANT.
  8. SLOPE, HYDRANT AND AN IN-BOX VALVE SHALL BE TO BE 6" THICK CONCRETE PER APWA STD. PLAN 225. 6" THICK CONCRETE IS REQUIRED FOR ANY OTHER APPROVED THAT SERVICES ACCESS TO A TRASH ENCLOSURE.
  9. SLOPE LATERALS MUST GRAVITY DRAIN ALL FLOORS AND MEET MINIMUM SLOPE REQUIREMENTS (2% FOR 4" LATERALS, 1% FOR 6" LATERALS).
  10. A MINIMUM OF ONE EXTERIOR SEWER CLEANOUT IS REQUIRED ON THE SEWER LATERAL WITHIN 5 FEET OF THE BUILDING. ADDITIONAL CLEANOUTS ARE REQUIRED AT EACH REAR AND AT LEAST ONE EVERY 35 FEET FOR 4" LATERALS AND EVERY 100 FEET FOR 6" LATERALS. CLEANOUTS IN CONCRETE OR ASPHALT SHALL BE PROTECTED BY A RING AND LID.
  11. POWER, GAS, AND COMMUNICATION COMPANIES ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR SUBMITTING DESIGN PLANS AS REQUIRED BY TITLE 14 CHAPTER 32 OF THE UTAH CODES OF SALT LAKE CITY FOR ALL PROPOSED WORK FOR THEIR RESPECTIVE UTILITY LINES. THIS PROJECT IS IN ADJUNCT TO THE CITY ROW OR A PUBLIC UTILITIES ROW. PLAN REVISIONS ARE REQUIRED BY THE PUBLIC UTILITIES DEPARTMENT UTILITY COORDINATOR AND THE CITY ENGINEERING PUBLIC WAY PERMIT PLAN REVISIONS.
  12. THE WATER METER SHALL BE MINIMUM SIZE. CONTRACTOR MAY UPSE TO A MORE COMMON SIZE AS NEEDED.
  13. THE WATER METER VAULT MAY BE UNDER THE SIDEWALK, BUT THE ACCESS TO THE VAULT IN THE PAVEMENT IT DOES NOT SHALL BE CENTERED ON THE SIDE. THE WATER SERVICE LEAVING THE VAULT SHALL RUN 3 FEET BEYOND THE BOX BEING BURNING.

**Blue Stakes of**  
**UTAH811**  
Bluestakes.org


NO.	REVISION	DATE

PROJECT INFORMATION

**GARBETT HOMES**  
**VILLAROSA**

CIVIL SITE & UTILITY PLAN  
750 NORTH REDWOOD ROAD  
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

DRAWN <b>MEC</b>	CHECKED 	PROJECT # <b>23040</b>
DATE <b>3/13/23</b>		SHEET <b>C202</b>
SCALE <b>1" = 20'</b>		
ENGINEER'S STAMP 		



**BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION**

A TRACT OF LAND BEING PART OF THE SOUTHWEST AND SOUTHEAST QUARTERS OF SECTION 27, TOWNSHIP 1 NORTH, RANGE 1 WEST, SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN, HAVING A BASE OF BEARINGS OF NORTH 001°42' EAST BETWEEN THE EXISTING CENTERLINE MONUMENTS LOCATED IN REDWOOD ROAD AT 700 NORTH AND 802 NORTH, SAID TRACT OF LAND BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT A POINT ON THE EAST RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE OF REDWOOD ROAD, SAID POINT ALSO BEING SOUTH 04°30'25" WEST 1241.46 FEET TO THE MONUMENT AT 802 NORTH REDWOOD ROAD (ALSO KNOWN AS SALT LAKE COUNTY POINT NO. 082/2000) AND SOUTH 001°14'2" WEST ALONG THE MONUMENT LINE A DISTANCE OF 677.69 FEET AND NORTH 80°56'46" EAST 52.49 FEET FROM THE CENTER OF SECTION 27, TOWNSHIP 1 NORTH, RANGE 1 WEST, SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN, AND RUNNING THENCE NORTH 89°58'46" EAST ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF IRVINE CIRCLE CONCERNING ON FILE WITH THE OFFICE OF THE SALT LAKE COUNTY RECORDER IN BOOK 79-10, AT PAGE 342 A DISTANCE OF 330.45 FEET, THENCE SOUTH 001°37'07" WEST ALONG THE WESTERN LINE OF SAID PLAT AND THE WEST LINE OF WHITEHEAD PLAT 12 SUBDIVISION, ON FILE WITH THE OFFICE OF THE SALT LAKE COUNTY RECORDER IN BOOK PP. AT PAGE 34 A DISTANCE OF 330.47 FEET, THENCE WEST 330.61 FEET TO SAID EAST RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE, THENCE NORTH 001°15'11" EAST ALONG SAID EAST RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE A DISTANCE OF 298.89 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

CONTAINS 0.810 SQUARE FEET OR 2.268 ACRES, MORE OR LESS.  
SALT LAKE COUNTY PARCEL #08-27-452-049

**LEGEND**

- ① 3/4" WATER SERVICE
- ② 4" SEWER LATERAL

# GARBETT HOMES VILLAROSA

DATE: 05.27.22  
DESCRIPTION: CITY COMMENTS



OWNER: GARBETT HOMES  
PROJECT ADDRESS: 750 N REDWOOD RD  
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84116





DATE: 26 June 23  
PROJECT: MINOR MODIFICATION  
SHEET NO.: PER SHEET

LANDSCAPE  
SITE PLAN

L1-01

KEYNOTES	DESCRIPTION	DETAIL
1	4" WHITE PERIMETER FENCING - WHITE (RHS) 485 L.F.	21-140
2	4" CONCRETE MOW CURB - NATURAL GRAY	5A-140
3	DOOR PLOT PET CLEANUP STATION	CUT SHEET AL-140
4	PRIVATE BEE RACK INSTALL - BASED BID ON 1/2 CYCLE SAFE BEE RACK - IN GROUND INSTALLATION	CUT SHEET F1-F2A-140

SITE ITEMS	DESCRIPTION
A	PROPOSED STRUCTURE - SEE ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN
B	UTILITIES - SEE CIVIL PLAN

LANDSCAPE AREAS - SURFACING MATERIALS		AREA
HATCH	DESCRIPTION	SQUARE FT.
	PRIVATE CONCRETE WALKWAY - NATURAL GRAY (PER CIVIL PLANS)	6,845
	EXISTING PUBLIC R.O.W. SIDEWALK	NA
	LANDSCAPE MULCH - 4" DEPTH OF SHREDDED BLACK BARK MULCH (WITH WEED BARRIER (PLANTING AREA))	20,150
	SODDED TURF - SUCH AS BIOBLUE FROM BIOGROSS SOD FARMS OR EQUIVALENT	910

\*AREAS OF TAKEOVERS OF BIRDS PLANTING AREA - CONTRACTOR TO ACCOUNT FOR REDUCTION IN MULCH NEEDS DUE TO PLANTING - REFER TO PLANTING PLANS  
\*QUANTITIES TO BE VERIFIED BY CONTRACTOR

**REGULATIONS**  
1. ALL IMPROVEMENTS SHALL CONFORM TO THE GOVERNING (SALT LAKE CITY) STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS  
2. CONTRACTOR SHALL CALL BLUE STAKES OF UTAH TO VERIFY AND NOTE EXISTING UTILITIES AND SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR DAMAGES TO EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE AND NEW IMPROVEMENTS

**EXISTING CONDITIONS**  
1. CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY ALL PLANS WITH EXISTING CONDITIONS. CONTRACTOR SHALL REPORT ANY DISCREPANCIES, CHANGES, OR ISSUES TO THE OWNER AND/OR LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF WORK  
2. ALL UTILITIES ARE SHOWN FOR REFERENCE ONLY. CIVIL PLANS SHALL TAKE PRECEDENCE AND IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY AND LIABILITY OF THE ACTING CONTRACTOR TO PROTECT AND REPAIR ANY DAMAGES TO UTILITIES

**SITE PREPARATION**  
1. ALL LANDSCAPE AREAS TO HAVE WEEDS REMOVE AND GRUBBED WITH ALL DEBRIS MEASURING OVER 2" REMOVED  
2. APPLY, AS NEEDED, CORTED APPLICATIONS OF HERBICIDE  
3. POSITIVE DRAINAGE IS TO BE MAINTAINED AWAY FROM ALL STRUCTURES  
4. ENGINEERING PLANS SHALL TAKE PRECEDENCE

**SOIL**  
1. MINIMUM OF 12" OF TOPSOIL IS REQUIRED IN ALL PLANTING AREAS  
2. MINIMUM OF 4" OF TOPSOIL IS REQUIRED IN ALL TYPICAL PLANTING AREAS  
3. PLANTING HOLES SHALL BE DUG 2X AS WIDE AS ROOTBALL OF VEGETATION  
4. BACKFILL FOR SHRUB AND TREE PLANTINGS SHALL BE 80% TOPSOIL/ 20% HUMUS MATERIAL  
5. SOILS REPORT SHALL TAKE PRECEDENCE  
5.1. TOPSOIL STANDARDS  
SAND - 20%-70%  
S.2. CLAY - 20%-70%  
S.3. #10 SIEVE IS 15% MAXIMUM  
S.4. PH 6 TO 8.5

## CITY OF SALT LAKE LANDSCAPE CALCULATIONS

<b>ZONE: CB</b>	
<b>SITE LANDSCAPE AREAS:</b>	<b>WATER WISE PLANTS FOR SALT LAKE CITY</b>
TOTAL SITE: 98,710 S.F. (100%)	DROUGHT-TOLERANT SHRUBS
PROVIDED: 19,080 S.F. (19.33%)	REQUIRED: 80% (1,441,430)
TOTAL TURF AREA: 910 S.F. (4.77%)	PROVIDED: 100% (1,430/1,430)
	DROUGHT-TOLERANT TREES
	REQUIRED: 100%
	PROVIDED: 100% (41/41)

### LANDSCAPE BUFFER REQUIREMENTS:


1/30 L.F. (10' L.F. OF BUFFER)  
30.8 SHADE TREES REQUIRED IN BUFFER  
TREES PROVIDED: 31  
1/3 OF ALL TREES TO BE LANDSCAPED


### ROW TREES REQUIRED - REDWOOD ROAD:

288 L.F. / TREE EVERY 37' AVG. = 9.93 TREES  
REQUIRED: 9.93 TREES  
PROVIDED: 10 TREES

### PARKWAY PLANTING - URBAN FORESTER REQUIREMENTS

ALL TREES IN PUBLIC ROWS TO BE 4" CALIBER - LOCATED:  
5' from water meter and/or utility box  
10' from fire hydrant  
5'-10' from residential driveway  
5'-10' from property line of adjoining parcel  
5'-10' from non-paved connecting signage  
5'-10' from utility pole and/or light  
20' from an unsignalized intersection (20' back from intersecting sidewalk)  
30' from stop signs  
30' from commercial driveway and/or alley  
40' from an intersection with traffic lights (40' back from intersecting sidewalk)  
20-40' from a tree that is medium in size at maturity (20 to 50' tall)





**CITY OF SALT LAKE LANDSCAPE CALCULATIONS:**

**ZONE: CB**

**SITE LANDSCAPE AREAS:**

**TOTAL SITE:** 16,710 S.F. (100%)

**PROVIDED LANDSCAPE AREA:** 19,080 S.F. (114.2%)

**TOTAL TURF AREA:** 910 S.F. (5.4%)

**LANDSCAPE BUFFER REQUIREMENTS:**

1730 S.F. (10.4% OF BUFFER)

30.8 SHADE TREES REQUIRED IN BUFFER

TREES PROVIDED: 31

73% OF ALL BUFFERS TO BE LANDSCAPED

**ROW TREES REQUIRED - REDWOOD ROAD:**

20' PLANTING STRIP EVERY 30' AVG.

REQUIRED: 9.93 TREES

PROVIDED: 10 TREES

**PARKWAY PLANTING - URBAN FORESTER REQUIREMENTS**

**ALL TREES IN PUBLIC ROW TO BE 2" CALIPER - LOCATED:**

1' from water meter or fire utility box

10' from fire hydrant

5'-10' from residential driveway

5'-10' from property line of adjoining parcel

5'-10' from non-specific conducting signage

5'-10' from utility pole and/or sign

20' from an unsignalized intersection (20' back from intersecting sidewalk)

20' from side signs

30' from commercial driveway and/or alley

20' from an intersection with traffic lights (10' back from intersecting sidewalk)

(20' from a tree that is medium in size at maturity (30 to 50' tall))


# PLANTING MATERIALS - RIVERS EDGE

QTY	SYMBOL	SIZE	BOTANICAL NAME	COMMON NAME	HYDROZONE	H/W	NOTES
NA	-	NA	EXISTING NEIGHBORING TREE - DO NOT DAMAGE				
10	Ac	1.5" CAL.	ACER CAMPESTRE	HEDGE MAPLE	TD3	20'x30'	SHADE/BUFFER
6	At	1.5" CAL.	ARALIANC-REY'S GRANDIFLORA	AUTUMN SERVICEBERRY	TD4	20'x15'	SHADE/BUFFER
15	S1	1.5" CAL.	SYRINGA RETICULATA IVORY SILK	JAPANESE TREE LILAC	TD3	25'x30'	SHADE/BUFFER
10	Z1	2" CAL.	ZELKOVA SERATA "WIRELESS"	WIRELESS ZELKOVA	TD4	20'x30'	STREET TREE

QTY	SYMBOL	SIZE	BOTANICAL NAME	COMMON NAME	HYDROZONE	H/W	NOTES
72	●	3 GAL.	Berberis Thunbergii 'Crimson Pigmy'	PYGMY JAP. BARBERRY	SD3	2'x3'	
84	●	1 GAL.	BOUTELOUA GRACILIS 'BLONDE AMBITION'	BLUE GRAMA GRASS	TW0	2'x1.5'	
132	●	1 GAL.	Calamagrostis Canadensis	FEATHER REED GRASS	TW2	3.5'x2'	
61	●	3 GAL.	EUNONYMUS FORTUNEI 'EMERALD & GOLD'	WINTERCREEPER	GV4	2'x1.5'	EVERGREEN
203	●	1 GAL.	HEICTOTRICHON SEMPERVIRENS	BLUE OAT GRASS	TW1	2.5'x2'	
205	●	1 GAL.	HEMEROCALLIS 'STELLA DE ORO'	STELLA DE ORO DAYLILY	P3	2'x1.5'	
70	●	1 GAL.	PENNSETUM ALOPECUROIDES	FOUNTAIN GRASS	TW2	2.5'x2.5'	
82	●	3 GAL.	PHYSCARPUS OLYMPICUS 'NUGGET'	GOLD MINERARK	SD4	4'x4'	
44	●	5 GAL.	THUS HUGO VAR. HUGO	DWARF MUDDY PINE	SE2	4'x4'	EVERGREEN
24	●	3 GAL.	POTENTILLA 'PUTICOSA' JACKMANII	JACKMAN POTENTILLA	TD2	3'x3'	
241	●	1 GAL.	SALVIA HEMORRHOIS 'Sensation Rose'	SENSATION ROSE SAGE	P2	2'x2'	
40	●	3 GAL.	SPHRACA X GOLDLAME	GOLD LAME SPIRAEA	SD3	3.5'x3.5'	
33	●	3 GAL.	TAKUS WICKA 'DORIS-ORCHID'	HICKS YEW	SE3	3'x3'	EVERGREEN
241	●	3 GAL.	'YUGCA FLAMMEOSA	ADAMS' HEEDLE	SE0	3.5'x3'	EVERGREEN

## LANDSCAPE PLANTING NOTES


- ALL LANDSCAPING SHALL BE INSTALLED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CURRENT PLANTING PROCEDURES ESTABLISHED BY THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF NURSERYMEN
- CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE TO FURNISH PLANT MATERIAL THAT IS PEST AND DISEASE FREE AND TO MAINTAIN AND WARRANTY PLANT MATERIAL THROUGHOUT CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE
- CONTRACTOR TO WARRANTY PLANT MATERIAL PER WARRANTY SPECIFICATIONS, TYPICALLY FOR A (1) YEAR PERIOD OF THE CONTRACT
- CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR VERIFYING QUANTITIES AND FURNISHING ALL PLANT MATERIALS TO ENSURE INTENDED COVERAGE. CONTRACTOR SHALL CONTACT OWNER AND/OR LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT FOR APPROVAL OF CHANGES IN QUANTITIES OR SPECIES
- DEPENDING ON PLANT AVAILABILITY, CONTRACTOR SHOULD ATTEMPT TO FIND PLANT MATERIAL OF THE KIND THAT IS APPROXIMATELY THE SAME HEIGHT AND GROWTH HABIT. HOWEVER, ALL VARIETIES SHALL MATCH EACH OTHER WHEN INSTALLED I.E. NO PARTIAL PLANTING SUBSTITUTIONS. IF A NEW VARIETY IS APPROVED, THE SAME PLANT VARIETY SHALL BE USED THROUGHOUT THE ENTIRETY OF THE PROJECT SCOPE
- DOUBLE STAKE ALL TREES UNDER 2" CALIPER UNTIL MATURE
- ALL SHRUBS AND TREES TO CONTAINER GROWN OR BE BALLED AND BURLAPPED
- IRIS SHALL NOT BE PLANTED LESS THAN 4" FROM CURB OR HARD SURFACE AREAS UNLESS A ROOT BARRIER IS INSTALLED NEXT TO HARDSCAPE SURFACE
- NO WED BARRIER TO BE VISIBLE
- ALL PLANTING SHALL ACCOUNT FOR SPOES TO PROVIDE A SMOOTH TRANSITION
- INSTALL COMMERCIAL GRADE WED BARRIER FABRIC TO ALL PLANTING AREAS AND PLANTER BEDS WITH 4" LANDSCAPE STAPLES PER INDUSTRY STANDARDS
- ALL PLANT MATERIALS SHALL CONFORM TO THE AMERICAN STANDARD FOR NURSERY STOCK, PUBLISHED BY THE AMERICAN NURSERY ASSOCIATION, INC.
- FERTILIZE ALL SHRUBS AND TREES WITH FERTILIZER TABLETS



## TREE PLANTING DETAIL

NTS 3/1/19

SLC URBAN FORESTRY - REQUIRED DETAIL FOR ROW PLANTING



**Attachment D: Original Record of Decision Letter**

**Page intentionally left blank.**



PLANNING DIVISION

ERIN MENDENHALL  
MAYOR

NICK NORRIS  
DIRECTOR

December 20, 2021

**Jarod Hall**  
**Di'velept Design**  
**454 N 600 W**  
**Salt Lake City, UT 84116**

RE: **Record of Decision for Petitions PLNPCM2021-00606 and PLNPCM2021-00702 – Design Review and Planned Development for the Rivers Edge at Redwood Townhomes**

Location: **750 North Redwood Road (CB – Community Business zoning district)**

Dear Jarod,

On **December 15, 2021**, the Salt Lake City Planning Commission granted approval of your Planned Development and Design Review for the Rivers Edge at Redwood Townhomes project located at approximately 750 N Redwood Road. This Record of Decision is provided to you indicating the date action was taken, the decision of the Planning Commission including any approval conditions, the one-year time limit on the approval, the limitations on modifications to the plans, and the 10-day appeal period.

***Project Description***

The Planning Commission reviewed and approved the following project:

***Rivers Edge at Redwood Design Review & Planned Development at Approximately 750 North Redwood Road - Case numbers PLNPCM2021-00606 & PLNPCM2021-00702***

*Jarod Hall, architect, representing the property owner is requesting Design Review and Planned Development approval for the Rivers Edge at Redwood Townhomes to be located at approximately 750 North Redwood Road. The subject property is approximately 2.27 acres (98,000 square feet) in size and is located in the CB (Community Business) zoning district. The proposed design consists of a total of 82 units built in 12 individual buildings on the site which will be accessed via a private street that connects to Redwood Road. Design Review is required for the size of development which exceeds the allowances of the CB zone permitted by right. Planned Development approval is required for the configuration which includes multiple buildings on the site without public street frontage. The subject property is located within Council District 1, represented by Victoria Petro-Eschler.*

### **Conditions of Approval**

The following conditions were applied to the approval of this proposal:

1. Final approval of the details for site signage, lighting, landscaping and street trees will be delegated to staff for verification during the building permit review.
2. A Condominium Plat must be finalized and recorded for this development.

### **Review Process Standards and Findings of Fact**

The Planning Commission made specific findings related to the standards of review for Design Review and Planned Development as stated in Chapter 21A.59 and Chapter 21A.55 of the Zoning Ordinance. The decision was also based on the purpose of the zoning ordinance, the purpose of the zoning district where the project is located, the information contained in the staff report, the project details provided by you, testimony from the public, and the discussion of the Planning Commission. Copies of this information will be made available online here: <https://www.slc.gov/planning/planning-commission-agendas-minutes/>.

### **Modifications to the Approved Plans – Design Review**

To obtain a building permit, all plans must be consistent with the plans reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission. Except where specifically modified by the Planning Commission as a condition of approval, modifications to the approved plans are limited by the following (see 21A.59.080 of the Zoning Ordinance):

*Minor Modifications: The Planning Director may authorize minor modifications to approved design review applications as listed below.*

1. *Dimensional requirements that are necessary in order to comply with adopted Building Codes, Fire Codes, or engineering standards. The modification is limited to the minimum amount necessary to comply with the applicable Building Code, Fire Codes, or engineering standard.*
2. *Minor changes to building materials provided the modification is limited to the dimension of the material, color of material, or texture of material. Changes to a different material shall not be considered a minor modification.*

*Other Modifications: Any other modifications not listed above requires a new application.*

### **Modifications to the Approved Plans – Planned Developments**

To obtain a building permit, all plans must be consistent with the plans reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission. The plan approved by the Planning Commission constitutes the site design in relation to building placement and design, landscaping, mobility and circulation elements, and any elements that were approved as zoning modifications through the Planned Development process. Modifications to the plan requires an application to the Planning Division and the Planning Director can only approve narrowly defined minor modifications as listed in 21A.55.100B of the Zoning Ordinance. Any modification not listed as a minor modification requires approval by the Planning Commission.

### **One Year Time Limit on Approval**

No Design Review or Planned Development approval shall be valid for a period longer than **one year** from the date of approval unless a building permit is issued or a complete building plans and building permit applications have been submitted to the Division of Building Services and Licensing. An extension of one

year may be granted by the entity that approved the application. Extension requests must be submitted in writing prior to the expiration of the Design Review and Planned Development approvals.

### **10-Day Appeal Process**

There is a 10-day appeal period in which any affected party can appeal the Planning Commission's decision. This appeal period is required in the City's Zoning Ordinance and allows time for any affected party to protest the decision, if they so choose. The appeal would be heard by the Appeals Hearing Officer. Any appeal, including the filing fee, must be submitted by the close of business on **Friday, December 31, 2021.**

The summary of action for the Planning Commission meeting is located on the Planning Division's website at:

<https://www.slc.gov/planning/public-meetings/planning-commission-agendas-minutes/>

The Minutes of the Planning Commission meeting, when available, can be located on this same website.

Please feel free to contact me at (801) 535-6107 or by email at [david.gellner@slcgov.com](mailto:david.gellner@slcgov.com) in relation to this letter if you have questions or need additional clarification.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David J. Gellner", with a stylized flourish at the end.

David J. Gellner, MAG, AICP, Senior Planner  
Salt Lake City Planning Division

Cc: Files: PLNPCM2021-00606 & PLNCPM2021-00702

**Attachment E: Original Staff Report**

**Page intentionally left blank.**



# Staff Report

PLANNING DIVISION  
DEPARTMENT of COMMUNITY and NEIGHBORHOODS

To: Salt Lake City Planning Commission

From: David J. Gellner, AICP, Senior Planner - 801-535-6107 - [david.gellner@slcgov.com](mailto:david.gellner@slcgov.com)

Date: December 15, 2021

Re: Rivers Edge at Redwood Townhomes - PLNPCM2021-00606 & 00702  
Planned Development & Design Review

## Planned Development & Design Review

**PROPERTY ADDRESSES:** 750 North Redwood Road  
**PARCEL:** 16-06-405-015-0000  
**MASTER PLAN:** Northwest Master Plan (1992)  
**ZONING DISTRICT:** CB – Community Business Zoning District

**REQUEST:** Jarod Hall, architect, representing the North Redwood Road Property Trust, the property owner is requesting Design Review and Planned Development approval for the Rivers Edge at Redwood Townhomes project to be located at approximately 750 North Redwood Road. The subject property is approximately 2.27 acres (98,000 square feet) in size and is located in the CB – Community Business zoning district. The proposed design consists of a total of 82 units, each 3 stories tall, built in 12 individual buildings on the site. The petitions associated with this proposal are Design Review application PLNPCM2021-00606 and Planned Development application PLNPCM2021-00702. A Condominium Plat application has also been filed.

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Based on the findings listed in the staff report, it is the Planning Staff's opinion that the project generally meets the applicable Design Review and Planned Development standards and therefore, recommends the Planning Commission approve both the Planned Development and Design Review requests subject to the following conditions:

1. Final approval of the details for site signage, lighting, landscaping and street trees will be delegated to staff for verification during the building permit review.
2. A Condominium Plat must be finalized and recorded for this development.

### ATTACHMENTS:

- A. [Vicinity/Zoning Map](#)
- B. [Site Photographs & Existing Conditions](#)
- C. [Applicant's Narrative, Plans & Rendering](#)
- D. [Development Standards](#)
- E. [Analysis of Standards](#)
- F. [Public Process and Comments](#)
- G. [Department Review Comments](#)

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION:



### Project Quick Facts

**Property Size:** 2.27 acres

**Property Status:** Vacant

**Zoning:** CB – Community Business

**Proposed Use:** Multi-family Residential – within separate buildings – condominium configuration

**Number of Units:** 82 units

**Parking:** 96 parking stalls – 1 per unit in an attached garage. 14 guest surface parking stalls.

### Review Process & Applications:

- Design Review – required for size of development on site.
- Planned Development – required due to buildings not having public street frontage.

### Overview

Jarod Hall, architect, representing the North Redwood Road Property Trust, the property owner is requesting Design Review and Planned Development approval for the Rivers Edge at Redwood Townhomes to be located on a 2.27 acre parcel in the CB – Community Business zoning district. The proposed design consists of a total of 82 units, each 3 stories tall, built in 12 individual buildings on the site. Each building consists of 6 or 7 units. The development will be accessed via a private street that connects to Redwood Road. Design Review approval (Application PLNPCM2021-00606) is required for the size of development which exceeds the allowances of the CB zone permitted by right. The CB zone allows for buildings up to 7,500 gross square feet of floor area for a first floor footprint or up to 15,000 gross square feet floor area overall. Buildings or developments in excess of these limits may only be approved through the Design Review process.



Planned Development approval (Application PLNPCM2021-00702) is required for the site configuration which includes multiple buildings with the development that do not have public street frontage. There is also a Condominium Plat/Subdivision application (PLNSUB2021-00710) associated with this proposal. The Condominium Plat is not subject to review by the Planning Commission but is mentioned here for the purpose of process clarification. Due to the configuration and requirements in the CB zoning district, the Condominium Plat is required and is listed as a Condition of Approval.

### General Project Details, Site Configuration, Parking & Building Materials

The proposed design consists of a total of 82 units, each 3 stories tall to be built in 12 individual buildings on the site with 6 or 7 units located in each building. The general layout of the site and building configuration is shown below and more fully described in the applicant's materials found in [Attachment C](#).



Within the separate wood-framed buildings, the units will range in size from 1,432 to 1,732 square feet of living space. The exterior materials for the buildings consist of brick veneer, cementitious siding and stucco. The units facing Redwood Road, that is to say those that are located within Building 1 and Building 7 shown on the site plan above, meet the General Design Standards in Chapter 21A.37 in terms of glazing, entrance requirements and blank wall spaces.

More specifically, the CB zoning district requires front façade glazing for 25% of the building. This would apply to Buildings 1 & 7 shown on the site plan above and the applicant's drawings. Building 1 includes approximately 31.2% glazing on the ground floor of the street facing elevation while Building 7 includes 34.3% glazing. A similar level of glazing is also included in the other buildings on the site although there is no strict requirements if the buildings are not street facing. The materials and colors are shown in more detail in the applicant's renderings and drawings included in [Attachment C](#).

Entrance to the site will be via a private drive that connects to Redwood Road in approximately the middle of the site. The main drive will provide west to east access to the site and will be intersected with a private drive segment running north and south off the main drive on the east side of the site. The north/south drive aisles will run between the building clusters and will provide access to the attached garages located under each unit. The main private drive will provide emergency vehicle access to the site. The location of these drive aisles are shown on the site plan inset shown on the previous page.

### **Parking**

The CB zoning district requires one (1) parking space for each residential dwelling unit. The individual units each include one parking space within an enclosed garage. Additional surface parking is being provided on the site in 3 locations as well as along the north side of the private drive. An additional 14 shared surface parking spaces will be located on the site.

### **Pedestrian Circulation**

Individual sidewalks from the fourteen (14) units that face Redwood Road will connect with the existing sidewalks along Redwood. Pedestrian circulation into the site beyond those front units will be through the shared private drive access.

### **Provided Buffering**

The CB zoning district does not require an interior side yard setback or interior side yard landscaping buffer. However, the applicant is providing a 7-foot interior side yard setback along with a landscape buffer of 7-feet along both the north and south property boundaries. This is not required but is being provided for additional buffering from neighboring properties. The CB requires a 10-foot rear yard, as well as a landscape buffer of 7-feet, both of which are being provided along the eastern portion of the development. To provide additional buffering, a solid vinyl fence, 6 feet in height will enclose the site on the north, south and east sides.

### **Service Areas and Mechanical Equipment**

A central trash and recycling dumpster will be provided east of the middle of the site in a common area along the main private drive. This is illustrated on the site plan on the previous page. This area will be screened from view with fencing and have gates that open for access. There are no additional service areas being included in the development. Transformers will be located at the end of individual drive aisles in six (6) different locations. These locations were reviewed by Rocky Mountain Power for both sizing requirements and locational access for servicing. Mechanical equipment for each unit such as the air conditioner condensers will be located on the roof of each individual unit.

## **KEY CONSIDERATIONS:**

### **Consideration 1: Proposed Use**

The applicant is proposing to build units in a configuration that for all intents and purposes will function as single-family attached structures in a townhome configuration. These units will be accommodated in twelve (12) individual buildings on the site with each building containing six (6) or seven (7) units. The CB (Community Business) zoning district allows multi-family uses but does not allow attached and detached single-family dwellings or two-family dwellings. The proposed development is being processed as a multi-family development. The definition of multi-family in the zoning ordinance does not prevent the establishment of multiple buildings on a site provided the overall property is maintained under central ownership. The ordinance definition follows:

*DWELLING, MULTI-FAMILY: A building containing three (3) or more dwellings on a single lot. For purposes of determining whether a lot is in multiple-family dwelling use, the following considerations shall apply:*

*A. Multiple-family dwelling uses may involve dwelling units intended to be rented and maintained under central ownership or management, or cooperative apartments, condominiums and the like.*

As long as the applicant is not creating individual parcels or lots, the proposal meets the definition of multi-family and would be allowed in the CB zoning district. The applicant has submitted a preliminary plat for a Condominium for review under Planning file PLNSUB2021-00710. This would allow ownership of the individual condominium units and facilitate the creation of an HOA for central ownership of the common areas. This plat is in keeping with the requirements for multi-family developments in the CB zoning district. The Condominium Plat is not subject to review by the Planning Commission. It is mentioned here for clarity and the finalization of that is included as a Condition of Approval.

### **Consideration 2: Required Processes**

The CB zoning district does limit the size of building and the cumulative development of the site. Buildings in excess of seven thousand five hundred (7,500) gross square feet of floor area for a first floor footprint or in excess of fifteen thousand (15,000) gross square feet floor area overall, are only allowed through the Design Review process with Planning Commission approval. The total footprint area of all the buildings is approximately 46,500 square feet while the total building area, including all levels, is approximately 140,900 square feet. This proposal is going through Design Review to exceed the development limits listed above.

Planned Development review is required as the proposal would be creating multiple buildings that would not have frontage on a public street. The development includes twelve (12) buildings but only two (2) have public street frontage. This requirement is stipulated in Chapter 21A.36.010 – Use of Land and Buildings in the Zoning Ordinance which allows multiple buildings on a single parcel if all of the buildings front a public street. Planned Development approval is required to modify this requirement.

### **Consideration 3: Neighborhood Compatibility**

The proposed development is located to the east of Redwood Road on a vacant property parcel. Abutting parcels to the south are zoned CB – Community Business. Some of these parcels were recently (2020) rezoned from R-1/5000 to CB. Properties to the north and east are all zoned R-1/5000 – Single Family Residential. To the south the property has been developed for a gas station and some small-scale retail uses. To the north and east, while the zoning designation is single-family, the development pattern does not match the zoning. To the east, the property line abuts the back of properties located

on Ivy Circle. The properties on Ivy have been developed for multi-family uses and consist of a number of small 4-plex type buildings. To the immediate north, the property has been developed as a condominium complex within a multifamily building that is 3 stories tall. That property is also zoned R-1/5000. Aerial photographs of the neighborhood to the east and the property context of the subject parcel is included in [Attachment B](#) of this report.

While the adjacent zoning of neighboring properties may create some concern about compatibility on their face value, the actual development of these properties tells a different story. The residential uses that have been developed consist of small multiplex buildings of a similar scale as the individual buildings proposed on this site. The proposed development would not be incompatible with the existing development on adjacent properties and will be generally compatible with the surrounding neighborhood in terms of size and scale. The way adjacent residential uses on Ivy and Irving are situated with their rear yards along with the additional buffering between the subject property and neighboring developments, will help to mitigate the impacts from the development.

#### **Consideration 4: Design Details & Public Realm Experience**

The applicant is going through the Design Review process due to the size of the proposed development which has specific limits in the CB zoning district. The process is mandated, and the applicant is not using it to modify any materials or other required design elements. The intent of the Design Review process is to encourage design with an emphasis on human scale and to mitigate any negative impacts. The applicant's narrative articulates how the design elements of the development relate to the Design Review Standards. The proposed development generally meets the Design Review standards and will create an aesthetically pleasing environment that will add to the area with the development of a vacant parcel.

#### **Consideration 5: Master Plan Compliance**

##### **Northwest Master Plan**

The subject area is discussed in the Northwest Master Plan (NWMP - 1992). The NWMP and subsequent amendments in 2000 and 2004 contains statements that could be both interpreted as supporting and in conflict with the vision articulated in the Master Plan.

The Future Land Use Map in the 1992 NWMP showed this area as "low density residential". The Future Land Use Map in the Northwest Master Plan was amended in 2004 to designate the properties along 700 N as a future commercial area. The amendments recognized that an expansion of the existing commercial area near this intersection was desirable. The amended Map shows the future land use of this area, including the subject parcel as "commercial." The property is zoned CB – Community Business, which is a low scale commercial zone that is in line with the applicable master plan. The CB zoning district permits multi-family residential development. While the proposed use does not strictly adhere to the vision articulated in the Future Land Use map which was identified as a commercial use, the CB zoning allows multi-family residential uses as a permitted use by right. This proposal however is subject to Planning Commission approval due to the Planned Development and Design Review applications that were required based on the site configuration and size of development.

In additional support of the proposal, the Northwest Master Plan includes the following language:

- *Construction of new housing should be emphasized, but preservation of the existing housing stock is also of paramount importance.*

The proposed development will be on a vacant parcel so will not remove any of the existing housing stock. As such, the use is not in conflict with the Master Plan and the zoning designation specifically allows the use. Based on this, it is staff's conclusion that the proposed development is not in conflict with the Northwest Master Plan and future vision for the area.

### **Plan Salt Lake (2015)**

Plan Salt Lake was adopted in 2015 as the citywide vision for Salt Lake City for the next 25 years. The Plan contains Guiding Principles as well as Initiatives in the various chapters that relate to the proposed use including the following:

- *Maintain neighborhood stability and character.*
- *Create a safe and convenient place for people to carry out their daily lives.*
- *Support neighborhood identity and diversity.*
- *Provide opportunities for and promotion of social interaction.*
- *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.*
- *Ensure access to affordable housing citywide (including rental and very low income)*
- *Encourage housing options that accommodate aging in place.*
- *Direct new growth toward areas with existing infrastructure and services that have the potential to be people oriented.*
- *Promote high density residential in areas served by transit.*
- *Create a complete circulation network and ensure convenient equitable access to a variety of transportation options by:*
  - *Having a public transit stop within ¼ mile of all residents.*
- *Prioritize connecting residents to neighborhood, community, regional, and recreation nodes by improved routes for walking, biking, and transit.*
- *Reduce automobile dependency and single occupancy trips.*
- *Encourage transit-oriented development (TOD).*
- *Incorporate pedestrian oriented elements, including street trees, pedestrian scale lighting, signage, and embedded art, into our rights-of-way and transportation networks.*
- *Promote increased connectivity through mid-block connections.*

The proposed project supports the initiatives listed above. It would promote infill development on underutilized (vacant) land and provide more housing into the area. The type of housing would be of a type that promotes ownership at a lower price point than single-family housing. People moving into the area would help to support existing businesses and may help to provide justification for additional commercial development at or near the intersection of 700 N and Redwood Road.

### **Growing SLC: A Five-Year Housing Plan – 2018-2022 (2017)**

Growing SLC: A Five-Year Housing Plan – 2018-2022 (aka – the Salt Lake City Housing Plan) was adopted in late 2017 as the City's first housing plan since 2000. The Housing Plan is intended to advance the vision that Salt Lake City is a place for a growing diverse population to find housing opportunities that are safe, secure, and enrich lives and communities. The overall intent of the plan is to increase housing opportunities within the City and the various goals and initiatives support that vision.

The Plan puts a particular emphasis on the development and preservation of affordable housing as a pressing issue that the City is facing. This project will include 82 units of housing (condominiums) for purchase that may be offered at a lower price point than single-family dwellings in the area.

The proposed use will add to the City's existing housing and increase the diversity of housing options. The use is in concert with the principles and strategies identified in the Salt Lake City Housing Plan.

#### **DISCUSSION:**

The applicant is proposing a use that is allowed in the zoning district and that is in concert with the established development of the area. The applicant's narrative is included in [Attachment C](#) of this report. Staff recommends that both the Planned Development and Design Review applications be approved by the Planning Commission.

#### **NEXT STEPS:**

##### **Planned Development and Design Review Approval**

If the Planned Development and Design Review applications are approved, the applicant will need to comply with the conditions of approval, including any of the conditions required by City departments and the Planning Commission. The applicant will be able to submit for building permits for the development and the plans will need to meet any conditions of approval. Final certificates of occupancy for the buildings will only be issued once all conditions of approval are met including the finalization of a Condominium Plat.

##### **Planned Development and Design Review Tabled/Continued**

If the Planned Development and Design Review applications are tabled by the Planning Commission, the applicant will have the opportunity to make changes to the design and/or further articulate details in order to return to the Planning Commission for further review and a decision on the applications.

##### **Planned Development and Design Review Denial**

If the Planned Development and Design Review applications are denied, the applicant will be able to submit a new proposal that meets all of the standards required by the Zoning Ordinance. The proposal will be subject to the required review processes for all new principal buildings and uses in the CB zoning district.

## ATTACHMENT A: Vicinity/Zoning Map



## **ATTACHMENT B: Site Photographs & Existing Conditions**



**Subject property looking north-east from Redwood Road**



**Existing gas station to the south of the subject property.**



**View south from the carports from the development to the north**



**Neighborhood Context showing development to the east**



**Aerial for additional neighborhood context of site**



**Street view of neighboring development to east**

## **ATTACHMENT C: Applicant's Narrative, Plans & Project Renderings**

---



**di'Velept design LLC**  
454 N 600 W  
SLC, UT 84116  
[801-680-4485](tel:801-680-4485)  
[howdy@divelept.com](mailto:howdy@divelept.com)

---

07 July, 2021

RE: Design Review and Planned Development at 750 N Redwood Rd.

Because of the total size of this project, it is required to be submitted for design review.

**Project Summary**

The project will be new construction on an currently empty lot with 82 single family attached townhomes. The total site is 2.27 acres and will have a density of 36.1 units / acre.

The project consists of 12 separate wood frame buildings. The exterior materials are brick veneer, cementitious siding and stucco. In total there are eighty-two units consisting of 2 different types of units - Unit type 1 (41): 4 bedroom , 2.5 bath with 1,732 square feet of conditioned space. Unit type 2(29): 2 bedroom, 2.5 bath units with 1,432 square feet of conditioned space. Both units 1 and 2 each will have a covered second level balcony. Unit type 3(12): 2 bedroom, 2.5 bath units with 1,469 square feet of conditioned space.

The primary access to the units will be sidewalks from N Redwood Rd and the parking is accessed from N. Redwood Rd as well.

The most recent master planning document for this area is the Northwest Master Plan adopted in January 1992 and amended in 2000 and 2004.

Sincerely,

**Jarod Hall, AIA**  
Manager  
di'Velept design LLC

# **Proposed Exceptions to Zoning Standards**

Developments of over 15,000 gross square feet are required to go to design review.

# 21A.55.050 Standards for Planned Developments

## A: Planned Development Objectives

Referencing the Northwest Master Plan plan, this project addresses several stated goals:

1. In the first paragraph of the housing section of the Northwest Master Plan it states "Construction of new housing should be emphasized, but preservation of the existing housing stock is also of paramount importance." This project seems to perfectly fit this goal in that it is providing new housing without removing any existing housing stock.
2. It creates a compact development that is in line with walkable neighborhood best practices.
3. This project helps increase the diversity of housing options in the area. Currently there are very few townhomes (condos).
4. By creating a condominium subdivision plat we are creating the opportunity for ownership at a lower price point than single family homes which will help create economic stability.
5. The project will develop a 2.27 acre lot that is currently empty. It has 82 units which gives a unit density of 36.1 units per acre. Which is right in line with the medium density shown on page 4 of the master plan.
6. The site provides safe, convenient circulation patterns for vehicular and non-vehicular traffic movement by separating the main entrance and the garage.

## B: Master Plan Compatibility

The proposed planned development is generally consistent with adopted policies set forth in the Citywide, community, and/or small area Master Plan that is applicable to the site where the planned development will be located.

1. This proposed plan is consistent with best development practices and will increase housing density and provide a variety of housing options to the area, encouraging increased diversity and economic stability.

### C. Design And Compatibility

The proposed planned development is compatible with the area the planned development will be located and is designed to achieve a more enhanced product than would be achievable through strict application of land use regulations. In determining design and compatibility, the Planning Commission should consider:

1. Whether the scale, mass, and intensity of the proposed planned development is compatible with the neighborhood where the planned development will be located and/or the policies stated in an applicable Master Plan related to building and site design
  - a. This lot has previously been part of a commercial zone, so surrounding buildings are large and commercial in nature, and the lot is also adjacent to multi-family and single-family buildings. This project will provide a good transition from the commercial buildings to the single and multi-family houses in the surrounding area.
2. Whether the building orientation and building materials in the proposed planned development are compatible with the neighborhood where the planned development will be located and/or the policies stated in an applicable Master Plan related to building and site design
  - a. The west facing building facades will add excellent visual interest and livelihood– a quality this side of the street is currently lacking. The rhythm and variety of building materials used in the west (street-facing) facades will provide a positive presence to this currently-empty lot next to a gas station.
3. Whether building setbacks along the perimeter of the development:
  - a. Maintain the visual character of the neighborhood or the character described in the applicable Master Plan.
    - i. Yes. This project uses building forms that are oriented toward the street and close to the sidewalk, with the entry door facing the street. We have also created a covered entry that faces the sidewalk as well as roof decks that will provide some engagement with the street.
  - b. Provide sufficient space for private amenities.
    - i. We have provided a garage for each unit. We believe that one of the greatest advantages to building in urban environments is that there are a wealth of public amenities that can be used by residents. The project is within walking distance of Riverside Park. Providing additional private amenities only serves to reduce community engagement.
  - c. Provide sufficient open space buffering between the proposed development and neighboring properties to minimize impacts related to privacy and noise.
    - i. We have provided greater than zoning required setback from neighboring properties. We will also be providing an opaque fence along the property line. See sheet A2 for site plan.
  - d. Provide adequate sight lines to streets, driveways and sidewalks.
    - i. We have provided sufficient sightlines to safely traverse onto and off of the property.
  - e. Provide sufficient space for maintenance.
    - i. Maintenance will be provided by a third party, so there is no need for maintenance space.
4. Whether building facades offer ground floor transparency, access, and architectural detailing to facilitate pedestrian interest and interaction;
  - a. The building facades visible from the public way have many windows and a variety of building materials.
5. Whether lighting is designed for safety and visual interest while minimizing impacts on surrounding property;
  - a. There will be lights at each of the entry doors alcove to the units.
6. Whether dumpsters, loading docks and/or service areas are appropriately screened; and
  - a. Dumpsters will be located at the end of one of the driveways and screened from view. See sheet A2 for site plan showing dumpster location.

7. Whether parking areas are appropriately buffered from adjacent uses.
  - a. Parking will be located in each unit. Driveways have been separated from the primary pedestrian circulation on the site. See sheet A2 for site plan.

## **D. Landscaping**

The proposed planned development preserves, maintains or provides native landscaping where appropriate. In determining the landscaping for the proposed planned development, the Planning Commission should consider:

1. Whether mature native trees located along the periphery of the property and along the street are preserved and maintained;
  - a. There are no existing trees on the lot.
2. Whether existing landscaping that provides additional buffering to the abutting properties is maintained and preserved;
  - a. The existing landscape provides no buffering to abutting properties and is an eyesore.
3. Whether proposed landscaping is designed to lessen potential impacts created by the proposed planned development; and
  - a. We are providing a landscape buffer between the project and street, as encouraged in the master plan. There is currently no such buffer. We are also providing fencing to buffer the property from the adjacent properties.
4. Whether proposed landscaping is appropriate for the scale of the development.
  - a. We feel that the proposed landscaping is appropriate for the scale of this development. See Landscape plans.

## **E. Mobility**

The proposed planned development supports citywide transportation goals and promotes safe and efficient circulation within the site and surrounding neighborhood. In determining mobility, the Planning Commission should consider:

1. Whether drive access to local streets will negatively impact the safety, purpose and character of the street;
  - a. The project will have a positive impact on the safety of the street, and should add a sense of activity by having residences on their second story deck or front porches. The buildings also engage the street and increase activity on the ground level. Additionally we are reducing the number of curb cuts, thus reducing the pedestrian vehicle interactions.
2. Whether the site design considers safe circulation for a range of transportation options including:
  - a. Safe and accommodating pedestrian environment and pedestrian oriented design;
    - i. There will be separated pedestrian walkways and driveways to create a safer access for pedestrians. See sheet A2 for site plan.
  - b. Bicycle facilities and connections where appropriate, and orientation to transit where available; and
    - i. Each unit has a private garage where bicycles may be securely stored. Public bike racks are intended to be included in this project; their location is to be determined.
  - c. Minimizing conflicts between different transportation modes;
    - i. We believe that through the strategies we have mentioned above we are minimizing conflicts between different transportation modes.
3. Whether the site design of the proposed development promotes or enables access to adjacent uses and amenities;
  - a. The increase of residential density that this project provides will enable adjacent uses and amenities by adding customers to the area for future businesses.
4. Whether the proposed design provides adequate emergency vehicle access; and

- a. We have complied with the required codes.
- 5. Whether loading access and service areas are adequate for the site and minimize impacts to the surrounding area and public rights-of-way.
  - a. This project will not have any major loading or service areas.

## **F. Existing Site Features**

The proposed planned development preserves natural and built features that significantly contribute to the character of the neighborhood and/or environment.

- 1. There are no significant natural or built features that will be affected by the construction of this project.

## **G. Utilities**

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

- 1. We have had a DRT meeting and they feel that our plan for the utilities is acceptable.

# 21A.59.050: STANDARDS FOR DESIGN REVIEW

## A. Comply with the Intent of Zoning District

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.

1. We believe this project complies with the intent of the Northwest Master Plan by meeting the housing objectives. On page 5 of the master plan it states that new housing construction should be emphasized while persevering existing housing. Given this parcel is currently empty we are doing just that.

## B. Primary oriented to Sidewalk

The development shall be primarily oriented to the sidewalk, not an interior courtyard nor parking lot.

1. Primary entrances shall face the public sidewalk (secondary entrances can face a parking lot).

The two west buildings' units' primary entrances face the public sidewalk. See sheet A2 for the site plan and A5 and A6 for front elevations.

2. Building(s) shall be sited close to the public sidewalk, following and responding to the desired development patterns of the neighborhood.

The buildings are sited close to the sidewalk. This follows the desired development pattern laid out in the zoning standards for CB zones.

3. Parking shall be located within, behind, or to the side of buildings.

There is a garage in each unit. See sheet A2.

## C. Building Facade Detailing and Glass

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.
  - a. The ground floor near the public sidewalk will be the entry and bedroom/office of fourteen units. This qualifies as an active use. See sheet A2 for floor plans and site plan.
2. Maximize transparency of ground floor facades.
  - a. We have provided the required amount of glass into the ground floor facades. See sheet A5, A6, and A7 for elevations.
3. Use or reinterpret traditional storefront elements like sign bands, clerestory glazing, articulation, and architectural detail at window transitions.
  - a. It is not appropriate to the scale and rhythm of N Redwood Rd. to have storefront elements. Architectural elements such as a covered entry and steps in the facade have been incorporated into the project.
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.
  - a. In the 2 townhomes that face N Redwood Rd, the second floor decks all face the street. See sheet A5, A6, and A7 for elevations.

## **D. Building Mass**

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.
  - a. The three story building scale is slightly larger than the scale of existing buildings, except for the neighbor directly north which is the same. The rest of the western side of N. Redwood Rd is one story residential as you head north, while the eastern side of N. Redwood Rd is mixed between small scale commercial and more residential as you move north.

Modulate the design of a larger building using a series of vertical or horizontal emphasis to equate with the scale (heights and widths) of the buildings in the context and reduce the visual width or height.

- b. At only three stories tall, the proposed buildings are not tall enough to require modulation to reduce the visual height.
2. Include secondary elements such as balconies, porches, vertical bays, belts courses, fenestration and window reveals.
  - a. We have included a number of secondary elements on the west facade that provide visual interest. See sheet A5 and A6 for elevations.
3. 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.
  - a. This project will help establish the desired character neighborhood. We have met all glazing requirements on the front facade of the building and have used windows as a way to create visual interest on the facade. Each unit will have a single front door similar to the existing houses in the neighborhood. There will be a similar, slightly larger, amount of windows in the proposed west facade than of the adjacent houses.

## **E. 200' Facade Limit**

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

1. No building facades are in excess of 200 feet.

## **F. Privately Owned Public Spaces**

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

There will not be any privately-owned public spaces included with this project.

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

## G. Building Height

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.

In general, the proposed buildings are small enough that this section doesn't apply. We have responded to individual points as applicable.

1. Human scale:
  - a. Utilize setbacks 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.
    - i. **Buildings are three stories tall.**
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.
    - i. **There is a mix of roof forms in the area. Most of the houses have steeply sloped roofs while the businesses all have flat roofs. We are providing a flat roofline edge for most of the building.**



ii.

View from the apartment building directly north of the project site.

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

## **H. Parking and Circulation**

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

We have separated the vehicular circulation from the pedestrian circulation. See sheet A2 for site plan.

## **I. Waste and Recycling Containers**

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.)

The waste and recycling containers are located at the rear of the driveways. The dumpster area will have a screen around the equipment. The mechanical equipment will be placed in the roof of each unit and will also not be visible from N. Redwood Rd. See sheet A2 for site plan.

## **J. Signage**

Signage shall emphasize the pedestrian/mass transit orientation.

This project is a small scale residential project and we don't feel that it is appropriate to have signage.

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.

## **K. Lighting**

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

1. Provide street lights as indicated in the Salt Lake City Lighting Master Plan.
  - a. No street lights have been requested in connection with this project.
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.
  - a. Lighting levels will be low-level illumination. Lights that are on the outer walls of the building will be pointed down at the ground. Lighting on the west facade will be can lights in the soffit above the front entries.
3. Coordinate lighting with architecture, signage, and pedestrian circulation to accentuate significant building features, improve sign legibility, and support pedestrian comfort and safety.
  - a. There are no signs on the building to be lit.

## **L. Streetscape Improvements**

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.
  - a. **A total of 10 trees will be provided in the park strip. See landscape plans.**
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 the 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.
    - i. **Hardscape will comply with these requirements.**

# 21A.37 Design Standards

## 50.C.1 Glass Ground Floor

- Required: 25% (including the 15% reduction for residential uses)
- Provided:
  - Building 1: 31.2% (597 square feet of wall within the glazing zone and 186 sf of glazing for a total of 31.2% glazing provided). See sheet A5 for front elevation.
  - Building 7: 34.3% (614 square feet of wall within the glazing zone and 210 sf of glazing for a total of 34.3% glazing provided). See sheet A6 for front elevation.

## 50.D Building Entrances

- Required: At least one operable building entrance on the ground floor is required for every street facing facade with a maximum of 40' of wall between entrances.
- Provided: Seven street-facing entrances are provided at each of the two street facing buildings. There is no more than 18' between the entrances in each building. See sheet A5, A6, and A7 for elevations.

## 50.E Max. Blank Wall

- Required: 15 feet maximum length at ground level.
- Provided: There is no section of blank wall greater than 4' - 2" feet at the ground level. See sheet A5, A6, and A7 for elevations.

## 50.I Parking Lot Lighting

There are no exterior parking lots so this standard does not apply to this project.

## 50.J Screening of Mechanical Equipment

Mechanical equipment has been screened by roof parapets.

## 50.K Screening of Service Areas

Dumpsters for the project are located on the South East side of building 5 inside of an enclosure.

## Photos of Site and Adjacent Properties



Existing site at 750 N Redwood Rd.



From Site looking West



Looking North West at site



Looking South West at site



Looking South West from site



Looking North West from site



726 N Redwood Rd



768 N Redwood Rd



780 1700 W



790 N Redwood Rd



808 N Redwood Rd



783 N Redwood Rd



787 N Redwood Rd



801 N Redwood Rd



814 N Redwood Rd



840 N Redwood Rd

# ATTACHMENT D: Development Standards

## CB – Community Business Zoning District

The subject property is located within the CB – Community Business zoning district. The purpose of the CB zoning is defined as follows:

*The CB Community Business District is intended to provide for the close integration of moderately sized commercial areas with adjacent residential neighborhoods. The design guidelines are intended to facilitate retail that is pedestrian in its orientation and scale, while also acknowledging the importance of transit and automobile access to the site.*

The CB zoning district also includes a limit on building size. In this case, the cumulative size of buildings would far exceed the limits listed below so the proposal must be approved by the Planning Commission through the Design Review process. This process is defined below:

*Building Size Limits: Buildings in excess of seven thousand five hundred (7,500) gross square feet of floor area for a first floor footprint or in excess of fifteen thousand (15,000) gross square feet floor area overall, shall be allowed only through the design review process (Chapter 21A.59 of this title). An unfinished basement used only for storage or parking shall be allowed in addition to the total square footage. In addition to the design review standards in Chapter 21A.59 of this title, the Planning Commission shall also consider the following standards:*

## Applicable General Zoning Standards:

### CB Zoning Standards – Summarized from Chapter 21A.26.030

Requirement	Standard	Proposed Development Status
<b>Front/Corner Side Yard</b>	No minimum required. If provided must conform to provisions for landscaping, fencing and obstructions.	<b>Complies</b> – applied to front yard
<b>Interior Side Yard</b>	None required	<b>Complies</b> – proposal includes an interior side yard of 7 feet which exceeds the requirement.
<b>Rear Yard</b>	10-feet required	<b>Complies</b> – 10 feet provided
<b>Lot Area</b>	No Minimum – over 4 acres requires Design Review	<b>Complies</b> – 2.5 acre property - Design Review due to building size limits.
<b>Building Height</b>	Maximum building height of 30-feet	<b>Complies</b>
<b>Step Backs</b>	<b>May be required</b> by the PC with Design Review when abutting single family residential uses to mitigate building mass and location impacts.	<b>Not provided and not recommended by Staff.</b> Proposed development is 30 feet as allowed so is similar in scale to existing use to the north and is separated from low density residential to the east through buffering and the existing development pattern. As such, Staff is not recommending that

		additional building step backs be required.
<b>Maximum Setback</b>	Maximum setback of 15-feet for 75% of the street facing building façade.	<b>Complies</b>
<b>Parking Setbacks</b>	Applicable to surface parking lots	<b>Not applicable – parking is provided in each unit and in some common areas within the development.</b>
<b>Landscape Yard Requirements</b>	Required rear yard of 10 feet. No side yard requirements.	<b>Complies</b>
<b>Landscaping Buffer – Rear Yard</b>	Landscape buffer of 7-feet required when abutting a lot in a residential district. PC may require a larger buffer through Design Review approval.	<b>Complies</b> – rear landscaping buffer of 7-feet being provided. <b>Additional buffering is not being recommended by Staff.</b>
<b>Design Standards – Chapter 21A.37</b>		
<b>1) Ground floor glass</b>	25% required on ground floor facades when there are ground floor residential uses on street facing elevations	<b>Complies</b> – Building 1 includes 31.2% glazing and Building 4 includes 34.3% glazing on the first floor street facing elevation. Similar on interior buildings although not required.
<b>2) Blank wall maximum</b>	15-feet	<b>Complies</b> – no walls exceed this length of blank space.
<b>3) Building entrances</b>	Required on street-facing facades	<b>Complies</b> – doors on all street facing units are being provided.
<b>4) Parking lot lighting</b>	Required for parking lots – must be shielded if adjacent to residential	<b>Not applicable – no parking lots provided</b>
<b>5) Screening of mechanical equipment</b>	Mechanical equipment must be screened from view.	<b>Complies</b> – individual mechanical on each unit and set back from edges to better hide them from view
<b>6) Screening of service areas</b>	Required to be screened from public view.	<b>Complies</b> – dumpster and recycling are screened.

# ATTACHMENT E: Analysis of Standards

## DESIGN REVIEW STANDARDS – Planning Application PLNPCM2021-00606

**21A.59.050: Standards for Design Review:** The standards in this section apply to all applications for design review as follows:

For applications seeking modification of base zoning design standards, applicants shall demonstrate how the applicant's proposal complies with the standards for design review that are directly applicable to the design standard(s) that is proposed to be modified.

For applications that are required to go through the design review process for purposes other than a modification to a base zoning standard, the applicant shall demonstrate how the proposed project complies with each standard for design review. If an application complies with a standard in the base zoning district or with an applicable requirement in chapter 21A.37 of this title and that standard is directly related to a standard found in this section, the Planning Commission shall find that application complies with the specific standard for design review found in this section. An applicant may propose an alternative to a standard for design review provided the proposal is consistent with the intent of the standard for design review.

Standard	Finding	Rationale
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.	<b>Complies</b>	<p>According to Chapter 21A.26 the intent of the Community Business District is to provide for the close integration of moderately sized commercial areas with adjacent residential neighborhoods. While the project is not commercial, the proposed multi-family housing is a permitted use in the CB zoning district. The scale of the proposed development is appropriate and reasonable given the context of the site and the proposed height of the buildings are allowed by right.</p> <p>Moreover, the proposed project would provide additional units of housing of a type that is not readily available in the district and would provide a transition between commercial uses to the south and adjacent low density residential area.</p> <p>The proposed use also complies with the applicable master plans and City policies as discussed in the Key Considerations section of this report.</p>
B. Development shall be primarily oriented to the sidewalk, not an interior courtyard or parking lot.	<b>Complies</b>	<p>The two buildings that have frontage on Redwood Road (Buildings 1 and 7) have individual</p>

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Primary entrances shall face the public sidewalk (secondary entrances can face a parking lot).</li> <li>2. Building(s) shall be sited close to the public sidewalk, following and responding to the desired development patterns of the neighborhood.</li> <li>3. Parking shall be located within, behind, or to the side of buildings.</li> </ol>		<p>walkways that connect to the public sidewalks on Redwood Road. They are also located close to the public sidewalk.</p> <p>Parking is provided within a garage for each unit. Additional surface parking has been provided on the site but not within close proximity to the public interface with Redwood Road.</p> <p>This standard has been met.</p>
<p>C. Building facades shall include detailing and glass in sufficient quantities to facilitate pedestrian interest and interaction.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Locate active ground floor uses at or near the public sidewalk.</li> <li>2. Maximize transparency of ground floor facades.</li> <li>3. Use or reinterpret traditional storefront elements like sign bands, clerestory glazing, articulation, and architectural detail at window transitions.</li> <li>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.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Generally Complies</b></p>	<p>The ground floor facing units have connection to the public sidewalk and entrances to the bedroom or offices of those units.</p> <p>The configuration of multifamily in a townhouse style does lend itself to providing active ground floor uses adjacent to the public sidewalk. The required ground floor glazing (40%) has been met on the units that face Redwood Road.</p> <p>The configuration of multifamily in a townhouse style does lend itself to providing traditional storefront elements as listed. As such, the majority of the elements are not being provided. The applicant has included elements such as covered entries and steps in the project, elements that you might see in a traditional storefront setting. The applicant further articulates their reasoning for this in their narrative.</p> <p>There are 2<sup>nd</sup> floor decks on the units that face Redwood Road.</p> <p>Staff feels that the proposed design substantially meets this standard.</p>
<p>D. Large building masses shall be divided into heights and sizes that relate to human scale.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>2. Modulate the design of a larger building using a series of vertical or horizontal</li> </ol>	<p><b>Generally Complies</b></p>	<p>This standard is more applicable to a larger scale building and one that is seeking additional building height through the Design Review process. This proposal is not seeking additional height and the density is spread out in separate buildings so there is no one large building mass on the site.</p>

<p>emphases to equate with the scale (heights and widths) of the buildings in the context and reduce the visual width or height.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Include secondary elements such as balconies, porches, vertical bays, belt courses, fenestration and window reveals.</li> <li>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.</li> </ol>		<p>For items 1 &amp; 2 the applicant makes the arguments that:</p> <p><i>The three story building scale is slightly larger than the scale of existing buildings, except for the neighbor directly north which is the same. The rest of the western side of N. Redwood Rd is one story residential as you head north, while the eastern side of N. Redwood Rd is mixed between small scale commercial and more residential as you move north. At only three stories tall, the proposed buildings are not tall enough to require modulation to reduce the visual height.</i></p> <p>Staff agrees with the applicant's assessment on items 1 &amp; 2.</p> <p>In <a href="#">Attachment C</a>, the applicant articulates how they have incorporated elements at the second level to increase visual interest per items 3 &amp; 4 and how the design generally reflects the character of the established neighborhood. This includes meeting glazing requirements and using windows to create visual interest. The units also have a single front door and similar window proportions to houses in the adjacent neighborhood in order to reflect the general neighborhood pattern.</p> <p>Staff feels that the design substantially meets this standard.</p>
<p>E. Building facades that exceed a combined contiguous building length of two hundred feet (200') shall include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Changes in vertical plane (breaks in facade);</li> <li>2. Material changes; and</li> <li>3. Massing changes.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Not Applicable</b></p>	<p>Does not apply as no buildings exceed this dimension.</p>

<p>F. If provided, privately-owned public spaces shall include at least three (3) of the six (6) following elements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sitting space of at least one sitting space for each two hundred fifty (250) square feet shall be included in the plaza. Seating shall be a minimum of sixteen inches (16") in height and thirty inches (30") in width. Ledge benches shall have a minimum depth of thirty inches (30");</li> <li>2. A mixture of areas that provide seasonal shade;</li> <li>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;</li> <li>4. Water features or public art;</li> <li>5. Outdoor dining areas; and</li> <li>6. Other amenities not listed above that provide a public benefit.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Not Applicable</b></p>	<p>None provided. This standard is not applicable.</p>
<p>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.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Human scale: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Negative impacts: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Modulate taller buildings vertically and horizontally so that it steps up or down to its neighbors.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p><b>Generally Complies</b></p>	<p>This standard is more applicable to a larger scale building and one that is seeking additional building height through the Design Review process.</p> <p>Buildings are only three (3) stories in height or 30-feet as allowed in the CB zone so are not of a scale that would make this standard applicable.</p> <p>The applicant asserts that there are a mix of roof forms in the general area. Staff has confirmed this via a field visit in preparing this report. This development will have a flat roof form and thus complies with standard 3.</p> <p>Staff feels that the design substantially meets this standard.</p>

<p>3. Cornices and rooflines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Cohesiveness: Shape and define rooflines to be cohesive with the building's overall form and composition.</li> <li>b. Complement Surrounding Buildings: Include roof forms that complement the rooflines of surrounding buildings.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>		
<p>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.</p>	<p><b>Generally Complies</b></p>	<p>Parking is being provided within individual garages and in surface stalls provided for guest or overflow parking.</p> <p>The units along Redwood have connections to the public sidewalks. Pedestrian access to the interior units will be via the shared driveway.</p>
<p>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.)</p>	<p><b>Complies</b></p>	<p>Waste and recycling dumpsters will be located in a common area along the main drive and screened from view.</p> <p>Mechanical equipment will be located on the roof of each unit. The roof top mechanical items will not be shielded with a parapet but will be set back from the roof edges to help make them less noticeable.</p> <p>No additional service areas are being provided.</p> <p>This standard has been met.</p>
<p>J. Signage shall emphasize the pedestrian/mass transit orientation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>2. Coordinate signage locations with appropriate lighting, awnings, and other projections.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Not Addressed – Signage will Require Separate approval if Added Later</b></p>	<p>The applicant has indicated that they don't intend to have signage for the project. If signage is later desired, it will be reviewed by staff for compliance with the applicable standards.</p>

3. Coordinate sign location with landscaping to avoid conflicts.		
<p>K. Lighting shall support pedestrian comfort and safety, neighborhood image, and dark sky goals.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide streetlights as indicated in the Salt Lake City Lighting Master Plan.</li> <li>2. Outdoor lighting should be designed for low-level illumination and to minimize glare and light trespass onto adjacent properties and up lighting directly to the sky.</li> <li>3. Coordinate lighting with architecture, signage, and pedestrian circulation to accentuate significant building features, improve sign legibility, and support pedestrian comfort and safety.</li> </ol>	<b>Complies – Verification at Building Permit</b>	<p>The applicant has indicated the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No City street lights have been requested with this project.</li> </ul> <p>Outdoor lighting will be located on walls or soffits and will be pointed at the ground. The applicant has indicated that there are no outdoor signs that will be lit.</p> <p>This standard has been met.</p>
<p>L. Streetscape improvements shall be provided as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>b. Where practical, as in lower-traffic areas, use materials that allow rainwater to infiltrate into the ground.</li> <li>c. Limit contribution to urban heat island effect by limiting use of dark materials and incorporating materials with a high Solar-Reflective Index (SRI).</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<b>Complies – Verification at Building Permit</b>	<p>There are no trees within the park strip along Redwood Road. The applicant intends to provide ten (10) trees within the park strip. Specification of tree species and planting details require approval from the City's Urban Forester. Verification will occur at the Building Permit stage of review.</p> <p>There are no privately owned public spaces being provided in the development.</p> <p>This standard has been met. Additional verification will take place during the Building Permit review.</p>

<p>d. Utilize materials and designs that have an identifiable relationship to the character of the site, the neighborhood, or Salt Lake City.</p> <p>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.</p>		
--	--	--

## PLANNED DEVELOPMENTS (Planning Application PLNPCM2021-00702)

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

Standard	Findings	Rationale
<p><b>A. Planned Development Objectives</b></p> <p>The planned development shall meet the purpose statement for a planned development and will achieve at least one of the objectives stated in said section. To determine if a planned development objective has been achieved, the applicant shall demonstrate that at least one of the strategies associated with the objective are included in the proposed planned development. The applicant shall also demonstrate why modifications to the zoning regulations are necessary to meet the purpose statement for a planned development. The Planning Commission should consider the relationship between the proposed modifications to the zoning regulations and the purpose of a planned development and determine if the project will result in a more enhanced product than would be achievable through strict applicable of the land use regulations.</p>	<p><b>Complies</b></p>	<p>The applicant's Planned Development narrative indicates that the proposed development will meet the following objectives:</p> <p><b>Objective C: Housing</b> - The proposal includes housing types that are not commonly found in the existing neighborhood but are of a scale that is typical to the neighborhood.</p> <p>The project provides additional housing of a type that is not typically found in the neighborhood. Housing in the neighborhood consists of small multifamily uses to the east and a larger multifamily use to the north. That gives way to commercial zoning and more intense commercial uses to the south.</p> <p><b>Objective F: Master Plan Implementation</b> - A project that helps implement portions of an adopted Master Plan in instances where the Master Plan provides specific guidance on the character of the immediate vicinity of the proposal. A project that is consistent with the guidance of the Master Plan related to building scale, building orientation, site layout, or other similar character defining features.</p> <p>Applicant:  <i>In the first paragraph of the housing section of the Northwest Master Plan it states "Construction of new housing should be emphasized, but preservation of the existing housing stock is also of paramount importance."</i>  <i>This project seems to perfectly fit this goal in that it is providing</i></p>

		<p><i>new housing without removing any existing housing stock.</i></p> <p>The project meets at least one of the Planned Development objectives as required so this standard has been met. The Planned Development process generally speaks to an enhanced project through the modification of zoning regulations. The Planned Development is required in this case to address buildings that do not have public street frontage. No other zoning regulations are being modified.</p>
<p><b>B. Master Plan Compatibility</b> The proposed planned development is generally consistent with adopted policies set forth in the Citywide, community, and/or small area Master Plan that is applicable to the site where the planned development will be located.</p>	<b>Complies</b>	<p>The proposed development is consistent with the goals and policies related to growth and housing outlined in the citywide master plan, Plan Salt Lake, and the city's 5-year housing plan, Growing SLC. The proposal is generally consistent with the vision and goals in the Northwest Master Plan and the zoning of the property allows the use. This is further articulated in the Key Considerations section of this report. The proposal meets this standard.</p>
<p><b>C. Design and Compatibility</b> The proposed planned development is compatible with the area the planned development will be located and is designed to achieve a more enhanced product than would be achievable through strict application of land use regulations. In determining design and compatibility, the Planning Commission should consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Whether the scale, mass, and intensity of the proposed planned development is compatible with the area the planned development will be located and/or policies stated in an applicable Master Plan related to building and site design;</li> <li>2. Whether the building orientation and building materials in the proposed</li> </ol>	<b>Complies – Design Review Approval Required due to Size of Development</b>	<p>The proposed development addresses the Design and Compatibility Standards in the following manner:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The scale, mass and general intensity of the proposed development is compatible with the area. The type of development and the building height is allowed by the zoning. Policies in the Master Plan and other City documents support the proposal.</li> <li>2. The proposed building orientation is compatible with the area and will enhance the neighborhood as the lot is currently empty and creates a nuisance issue with dumping and trespassing/camping on the property. The applicant's narrative asserts that the street facing building facades</li> </ol>

<p>planned development are compatible with the neighborhood where the planned development will be located and/or the policies stated in an applicable Master Plan related to building and site design;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Whether building setbacks along the perimeter of the development: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Maintain the visual character of the neighborhood or the character described in the applicable Master Plan.</li> <li>b. Provide sufficient space for private amenities.</li> <li>c. Provide sufficient open space buffering between the proposed development and neighboring properties to minimize impacts related to privacy and noise.</li> <li>d. Provide adequate sight lines to street, driveways and sidewalks.</li> <li>e. Provide sufficient space for maintenance.</li> </ol> </li> <li>4. Whether building facades offer ground floor transparency, access, and architectural detailing to facilitate pedestrian interest and interaction;</li> <li>5. Whether lighting is designed for safety and visual interest while minimizing impacts on surrounding property;</li> <li>6. Whether dumpsters, loading docks and/or service areas are appropriately screened; and</li> <li>7. Whether parking areas are appropriately buffered from adjacent uses.</li> </ol>		<p>and the materials chosen for them will provide a positive presence to the street frontage on the currently vacant lot. Staff feels that the choice of materials will be compatible with the neighborhood and that the design meets this objective.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. The two buildings along the west property line have a façade oriented... toward the street to create additional engagement. On the interior side yards, that is, along the north and south property lines the buildings will have a setback of 7 feet. No interior setback is required by the zoning so these exceed the requirements but will provide additional buffering. This additional separation benefits both the neighboring property owners through reduced impacts as well as future residents in the development. The setbacks along the perimeters are appropriate While no common space amenities are being provided in the development, there are public park spaces such as Riverside Park within walking distance. Sight lines have been designed to provide safe access to and from the property. These individual items are further addressed in the applicant's narrative.</li> <li>4. The building facades visible from the public way have many windows and use a variety of building materials.</li> <li>5. Lighting will be provided on building walls and at doorway entries. Compliance will be verified at the building permit stage.</li> <li>6. Dumpsters are provided in a common area along the main drive and screened from sight.</li> </ol>
--	--	---

		<p>The location is illustrated in the site layout plan on page 3 of this report and in the applicant's materials found in Attachment C.</p> <p>7. Parking is located within each unit and surface parking is not located near the edges of the development or adjacent uses.</p> <p>The proposal meets this standard.</p>
<p><b>D. Landscaping:</b> The proposed planned development preserves, maintains or provides native landscaping where appropriate. In determining the landscaping for the proposed planned development, the Planning Commission should consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Whether mature native trees located long the periphery of the property and along the street are preserved and maintained;</li> <li>2. Whether existing landscaping that provides additional buffering to the abutting properties is maintained and preserved;</li> <li>3. Whether proposed landscaping is designed to lessen potential impacts created by the proposed planned development; and</li> <li>4. Whether proposed landscaping is appropriate for the scale of the development.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Complies – Verification at Building Permit</b></p>	<p>There are no trees on the site or within the park strip along Redwood Road. The applicant intends to provide ten (10) trees within the park strip. Specification of tree species and planting details require approval from the City's Urban Forester. Verification will occur at the Building Permit stage of review.</p> <p>A rear yard of 10 feet is being provided on the eastern edge of the site along with a landscape buffer 7-feet wide which is required as the property abuts single-family residentially zoned properties. In addition, the proposal includes a side yard and landscape buffer 7-feet wide on both the north and south property boundaries. Interior side yards are not required in the CB zoning district so these additional yards and buffers exceed the zoning requirements. A fence is also being provided around the site to further buffer the abutting properties.</p> <p>The landscaping is appropriate for the scale of development and the proposal meets this standard. Additional verification will take place during the building permit review.</p>

<p><b>E. Mobility:</b> The proposed planned development supports City wide transportation goals and promotes safe and efficient circulation within the site and surrounding neighborhood. In determining mobility, the Planning Commission should consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Whether drive access to local streets will negatively impact the safety, purpose and character of the street;</li> <li>2. Whether the site design considers safe circulation for a range of transportation options including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Safe and accommodating pedestrian environment and pedestrian oriented design;</li> <li>b. Bicycle facilities and connections where appropriate, and orientation to transit where available; and</li> <li>c. Minimizing conflicts between different transportation modes;</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Whether the site design of the proposed development promotes or enables access to adjacent uses and amenities;</li> <li>4. Whether the proposed design provides adequate emergency vehicle access; and</li> <li>5. Whether loading access and service areas are adequate for the site and minimize impacts to the surrounding area and public rights-of-way.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Complies</b></p>	<p>The proposed development supports City goals and promotes safe and efficient circulation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Only one drive access into the development from Redwood Road limiting curb cuts. The access will not negatively impact the safety or character of the street.</li> <li>2. The development provides access to the sidewalks on Redwood Road for the front units. Bicycle parking can be accommodated within each individual unit's attached garage. Additional bike racks may be added on site. There are no anticipated or foreseen conflicts between different transportation modes.</li> <li>3. The development is self-contained within the site but within close proximity to adjacent commercial uses.</li> <li>4. The proposal will be required to comply with all fire code requirements before obtaining a building permit. The Fire Department has reviewed the proposed design in terms of emergency vehicle access the design complies with their requirements.</li> <li>5. The loading and service areas consist of the garbage and recycling dumpsters and are adequate for the site.</li> </ol> <p>The proposal meets this standard.</p>
--	------------------------	---

## **ATTACHMENT F: Public Process and Comments**

---

The following is a list of public meetings that have been held, and other public input opportunities, related to this project:

### **Public Notices:**

- Notice of the project and a formal letter requesting comments was sent to the Chairs of the Rose Park, Jordan Meadows, Westpointe and Fairpark Community Councils on July 20, 2021. Note: The project is located within the boundaries of the Rose Park Community Council but is within 600 feet of the boundaries of the other community councils.
- Staff sent an early notification announcement of the project to all residents and property owners located within 300 feet of the project site on July 20, 2021. The mailed notice included project details, that recognized community organizations were aware of the proposal and included information on how to access the online open house and give public input on the project.
- Staff hosted an online Open House to solicit public comments on the proposal. The Online Open House period started on July 26, 2021 and ended on September 6, 2021.
- The 45-day recognized organization comment period expired on September 6, 2021.

### **Public Hearing Notice:**

- Public hearing notice mailed: December 2, 2021
- Public hearing notice signs posted on properties: December 2, 2021
- Public notice posted on City & State websites & Planning Division list serve: December 2, 2021

### **Public Comments:**

To date no public comments have been received in relation to the proposal.

No formal comments were submitted by any of the Community Councils to which information was sent.

## **ATTACHMENT G: Department Review Comments**

---

The following comments were received from other City divisions/departments with regards to the proposed development:

### **Engineering – Scott Weiler**

Public Way Permit is required for project completion. Licensed, bonded and insured Contractor to obtain permit to install or repair required street improvements. Possible Condominium plat required.

Check with SLC Transportation and UTA for proposed future bus stop locations. Engineering and Transportation review/approval of bus stops required. Transit website map  
No footings, foundations, permanent soldier piles, or permanent soil nails  
permitted in the public right of way

Private streets will be privately maintained. Consequently, SLC Engineering doesn't need to review the design of the private streets or issue a Permit to Work in the Public Way for them. However, SLC Engineering regulates work behind curb on Redwood Road (state highway) and will issue a Permit to Work in the Public Way for any disturbance to the area behind curb.

### **Public Utilities - Jason Draper**

Green Infrastructure / LID is required for this project. The applicant needs to consider what best practices to use for treatment of stormwater for this site.

Existing water and sewer services must be capped at the main.

A technical drainage study will be required for this project.

This project is in a shaded X flood zone. This area is protected by the Jordan River Levee.

Please note that approval of the planned development does not imply approval of any utility services shown on the plans. Building and utilities improvement plans must be permitted separately including applicable agreements, bonds, and fees.

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.

- The water main in Redwood is 6" main. Depending on fire flow requirements and/or hydrant requirements this main will likely need to be replaced to provide fire protection of this project.
- The sewer main in Redwood road is a 18" main and is on the west side of redwood road.
- All utility design and construction must comply with APWA Standards and SLCPU Standard Practices.
- Utilities cannot cross property lines without appropriate easements and agreements between property owners.
- Other plans such as erosion control plans and plumbing plans may also be required, depending on the scope of work. Submit supporting documents and calculations along with the plans.
- One culinary water meter is permitted per parcel. If the parcel is larger than 0.5 acres, a separate irrigation meter is also permitted. Fire services are permitted, as required. A detector check will be required for fire service. Each service must have a separate tap to the main.
- A minimum of one sewer lateral is required per building.
- The groundwater may be shallow and a problem for the proposed stormwater detention.
- Stormwater cannot discharge across property lines without agreement between property owners.

## **Fire – Douglas Bateman**

\*Fire hydrants shall be located within 600-feet of all ground level exterior portions of structures on the parcels \*Fire access roads shall be installed within 150-feet of all ground level exterior portions of all structures on the parcels. \*Fire access roads shall provide a minimum clear width of 20-feet for structures less than 30-feet in height \*Turn radii shall be 20-feet inside and 45-feet outside \*Dead end fire access roads greater than 150-feet in length shall be provided with emergency vehicle turn around. Hammerhead turn areas shall be provided with 80-feet turn areas, which is an increase from the 60-feet identified in the IFC

## **Transportation – Michael Barry**

Traffic study: We could ask for this, but it is not required. This is a good size development but not huge and it is on a major arterial which can handle a lot of traffic. Sometimes a traffic study indicates if a traffic signal is recommended but there is already a signal at 700 N.

Trips: There should be less than ten (10) trips per household per day. There are bus routes on Redwood and also 700 N. There are bike lanes on Redwood.

Transportation Master Plan: This may be a little fuzzy, but generally this project does not necessarily help nor hinder any transportation master plan objectives.

ROW plans: I am not aware of any. Maybe you could check with Engineering.

Adjacent street: I am not aware of any plans.

Off street parking: The off street parking is satisfied with this proposal; one space for a single bedroom and two spaces for a two bedroom or more. The spaces for the units are generally located in garages and there is some surface parking available. There is limited surface parking and one ADA space is provided so this meets the ADA requirement. Since most of the parking located in garages and there is assumably electricity to the garages we do not require EV spaces; if they had more than 25 surface parking spaces then we would require EV parking/charging station. The dimensional standards (stalls, drive aisle and radii) are complied with.

Loading/unloading: There don't appear to be any loading issues. The private services are handled by the owner and we generally don't get involved with that.

Driveway: The driveways are sufficient. The owner must apply for a permit with UDOT for the access on Redwood Road; the other accesses would be city. The location of the access points are sufficient and comply with standards.

ROW: I don't know the condition of the ROW but generally I have heard Engineering request to the owner to inspect the sidewalk and c&g to see if any are in disrepair and to fix if necessary. They will have to do some road cuts and repair as necessary. I don't think this will have any impact on bike lanes. The vehicles will be entering and exiting in a forward manner and there is sufficient sight distance.

## **Zoning Review – Alan Hardman**

Maximum height in the zone is 30 feet. Additional height may be approved by the Planning Division per 21A.26.010.J.

Redwood Road is a UDOT road and will require their approval.

This proposal will need to be discussed with the building code personnel.

A Certified Address is to be obtained from the Engineering Division for use in the plan review and permit issuance process. More than one address may be requested.

See 21A.26.030 for general and specific regulations of the CB zoning district, including maximum lot size, setbacks, height, etc.

A completed Impact Fee Assessment Worksheet will be required.

See 21A.36.250 for permanent recycling collection stations.

See 21A.36.250 for construction waste management plan requirements. The Waste Management Plans shall be filed by email to the Streets and Sanitation Division

See Table 21A.37.060 for the Design Standards for the CB zoning district.

See 21A.40 for Accessory Uses, Buildings and Structures, and including ground mounted utility boxes, fences and gates.

See 21A.44 for parking and maneuvering, with parking calculations provided that address the minimum parking required, maximum parking allowed, number provided, bicycle parking required/provided outside of the building and within 50' of the principal entry and any method of reducing or increasing the parking requirement.

Any park strip tree removal/protection/planting will need to be evaluated by Urban Forestry.

See 21A.48 for landscaping, including landscape buffers and park strip trees.

Signage requires a separate sign permit and approval.

### **Salt Lake City Department of Airports – David Miller**

Thank you for the notice regarding property located at 750 North Redwood. This address is in the Salt Lake City's airport influence zone "C" and is listed as an area exposed to moderate levels of aircraft noise and having specific height restrictions. Salt Lake City requires an aviation easement for new development in this zone. The owner or developer should contact me at the address or email below, to complete the aviation easement if one has not already been created. The height restrictions would be approximately 150' above ground level up to elevation 4377.4' MSL.

Note: A signed aviation easement was issued by the Department of Airports on September 15, 2021.

### **Rocky Mountain Power – Michael Lange**

This project proposal would require a more detailed review and study. It appears they are only including planned space for one transformer. Townhome projects typically include a meter on each building, which would require more than just a single transformer at the east end. Our initial view is this scale of development would require at least six transformers (based on previous townhome developments of similar size). If the developer want to meter all of the units at one location it may be possible, but would require a detailed review and design to understand the loading, site constraints, etc. We can schedule a meeting with you and the developer, or with the developer individually to discuss the plans in greater detail and to evaluate the best course moving forward to ensure adequate space is provided and the locations and necessary easements can be assigned prior to approval.

**Urban Forester** – No comments provided. Verification of street tree requirements will take place during the Building Permit review phase.

**Sustainability** – No comments provided

**Attachment F: Minutes from December 15, 2021**

**Page intentionally left blank.**

**SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**This meeting was held electronically Wednesday,**  
**December 15, 2021**

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

Present for the Planning Commission meeting were: Chairperson Amy Barry, Vice-Chairperson Maurine Bachman, Commissioners Andra Ghent, Jon Lee, Andres Paredes, Mike Christensen, Brenda Scheer, and Aimee Burrows. Commissioners Adrienne Bell and Sara Urquhart were excused.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: John Anderson, Planning Manager; Kelsey Lindquist, Planning Manager; Paul Nielson, Senior City Attorney; Kristina Gilmore, Senior Planner; Aaron Barlow, Principal Planner; Michael McNamee, Associate Planner; Nan Larsen, Senior Planner; Katia Pace, Principal Planner; David Gellner, Senior Planner; Eric Daems, Senior Planner; Aubrey Clark, Administrative Secretary; David Schupick, Administrative Secretary.  
Chairperson Amy Barry read the virtual meeting determination.

**Rivers Edge at Redwood Design Review & Planned Development at Approximately 750 North Redwood Road** - Jarod Hall, architect, representing the property owner is requesting Design Review and Planned Development approval for the Rivers Edge at Redwood Townhomes to be located at approximately 750 North Redwood Road. The subject property is approximately 2.27 acres (98,000 square feet) in size and is located in the CB (Community Business) zoning district. The proposed design consists of a total of 82 units built in 12 individual buildings on the site which will be accessed via a private street that connects to Redwood Road. Design Review is required for the size of development which exceeds the allowances of the CB zone permitted by right. Planned Development approval is required for the configuration which includes multiple buildings on the site without public street frontage. The subject property is located within Council District 1, represented by Victoria PetroEschler. (Staff contact: David J. Gellner at 801-535-6107 or david.gellner@slcgov.com) **Case number PLNPCM2021-00606 & PLNPCM2021-00702**

Senior Planner, David Gellner, reviewed the petition as outlined in the staff report. He stated that Staff recommends approval with the conditions listed in the staff report.

Chairperson Amy Barry wanted clarification on the width of the building access drives. David Gellner stated it was about 24 feet.

The applicant Jarod Hall stated that he had no formal presentation. He stated that they included extra buffering between buildings and that each individual building meets the size requirement of the zone but since there are multiple buildings, they do go over the size requirement of the zone.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

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

## **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

Senior Planner, David Gellner stated that it falls within 600 ft. of four different community councils but heard no comment from any.

## **MOTION**

**Commissioner Andra Ghent stated, Based on the findings and analysis in the staff report, testimony, and discussion at the public hearing, I move that the Planning Commission vote to APPROVE the proposed Design Review & Planned Development applications for the Rivers Edge at Redwood Townhomes located at 750 North Redwood Road, files PLNPCM2021-00606 and PLNPCM2021-00702 with the conditions of approval listed in the staff report. (Conditions noted below for reference) 1. Final approval of the details for site signage, lighting, landscaping and street trees will be delegated to staff for verification during the building permit review. 2. A Condominium Plat must be finalized and recorded for this development.**

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

## **Attachment G: 21A.55.100 – Modifications To Development Plan**

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

- A. New Application Required For Modifications and Amendments: No substantial modification or amendment shall be made in the construction, development or use without a new application under the provisions of this title. Minor modifications or amendments may be made subject to written approval of the Planning Director and the date for completion may be extended by the Planning Commission upon recommendation of the Planning Director.
- B. Minor Modifications: The Planning Director may authorize minor modifications to the approved development plan pursuant to the provisions for modifications to an approved site plan as set forth in chapter 21A.58 of this title, when such modifications appear necessary in light of technical or engineering considerations. Such minor modifications shall be limited to the following elements:
  - 1. Adjusting the distance as shown on the approved development plan between any one structure or group of structures, and any other structure or group of structures, or any vehicular circulation element or any boundary of the site;
  - 2. Adjusting the location of any open space;
  - 3. Adjusting any final grade;
  - 4. Altering the types of landscaping elements and their arrangement within the required landscaping buffer area;
  - 5. Signs;
  - 6. Relocation or construction of accessory structures; or
  - 7. Additions which comply with the lot and bulk requirements of the underlying zone.

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

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