

# Staff Report 

PLANNING DIVISION

To: Salt Lake City Planning Commission
From: Diana Martinez, Senior Planner, diana.martinez@slcgov.com, 801-535-7215
Date: October 25, 2023
Re: PLNPCM2023-00407 - Design Review
PLNPCM2022-00525 - Planned Development

## Design Review \& Planned Development

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 2903 S. Highland Drive
PARCEL ID: 16-29-236-002-0000
MASTER PLAN: Sugar House
ZONING DISTRICT: 21A.26.030: CB COMMUNITY BUSINESS DISTRICT

## REQUEST:

Matthew Pockrus with Axis Architects, on behalf of the property owners, is requesting approval for a 22-unit multi-family development project. The subject property is located in the CB (Community Business) zoning district at approximately 2903 S. Highland Drive. The property is approximately o. 54 acres (or 23,522 sq. ft.). The proposed project is subject to the following petitions:

1. Design Review- The development is required to go through the Design Review process because:

- The proposed buildings exceed the size limit of fifteen thousand gross square feet of floor area.
- Building 1 is proposed at approximately $17,940 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$.
- Building 2 is proposed at approximately 25,667 sq ft.

2. Planned Development- The development is required to obtain Planned Development approval for the following modification:

- To allow a height increase from 30 ' to 33 ' for proposed building 2 -to allow rooftop deck areas for 10 units.
- Modification from ordinance 21A.37.050.K: Dumpsters must be located a minimum of twenty-five feet from any building on an adjacent lot that contains a residential dwelling or be located inside of an enclosed building or structure. The applicant is asking to reduce this to twenty-one feet.



## RECOMMENDATION:

Design Review: Based on the information and findings listed in this report, staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the design review petition PLNPCM2023-00407.
Planned Development: Based on the information and findings listed in this report, staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the planned development petition PLNPCM2023-00525.

## ATTACHMENTS:

A. ATTACHMENT A: Vicinity Map
B. ATTACHMENT B: Applicant's Narrative
C. ATTACHMENT C: Plan Set
D. ATTACHMENT D: Property and Vicinity Photos
E. ATTACHMENT E: CB Zoning Standards
F. ATTACHMENT F: Design Review Standards
G. ATTACHMENT G: Planned Development Standards
H. ATTACHMENT H: Public Process \& Comments
I. ATTACHMENT I: Department Review Comments

## PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposal is for two buildings, which would contain 22 townhome rentals, to be located at approximately 2903 S. Highland Drive, which is the lot at the corner of Highland Drive and Zenith Avenue. Currently on the site is an out-of-business art studio building and parking lot. The property is approximately 0.54 acres or 23,522 square feet in size. Both buildings will be three stories tall but Building 2 will have rooftop deck access for 10 of the units.
There are four different types of units: A, C, D, and F. Twenty-one of the units will be twobedroom, and one unit will be a three-bedroom, two-bath. The difference between the types of units is mainly the parking provided. Unit type A will provide a single-car garage; type C will provide tandem parking for two cars; type D will provide a double side-by-side garage; and finally, type F will provide tandem parking for two cars and will be a three-bedroom/two-bath unit.

One main vehicular access to the project site will be a private drive coming from Highland Drive. All 22 garages will be accessible from the private drive. One recycling container and one trash container will be located along the east wall of Building 2.

The height of Building 1 is proposed at just less than 30 feet and Building 2 is proposed at 33 feet. Building 2 will have stairway access to individual roof-top decks for 10 units. The first unit fronting Highland Drive will not have rooftop deck access.

Both buildings will have a similar look, with boxed windows on the second floor, garages facing the interior driveway, and entry doors on the buildings' sides. The two units that front onto Highland Drive will have entry doors facing Highland Drive.


## Quick Facts:

Building Height - Bldg 1- under 30-feet, Bldg 2- 33-feet
Number of Residential Units - 22 units
Parking Spaces - 34 parking spaces are proposed.
Exterior Building Materials - Thin brick veneer, wood \& metal paneling, prefinished brake metal, and cementitious plaster.
Review Process \& Standards -Design Review and general zoning standards

| HIGHLAND ROW - UNIT MIX |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BUILDING 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TYPE | SQUARE FOOTAGE |  |  |  |  |  | UNIT COUNT | \% OF BLOG 1 | \% OF PROJECT | TOTAL USABLE SF | INCL. GARAGE. BALCCONY DECK |
|  | 1ST | 2ND | 3RD | GARAGE | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { UNIT } \\ & \text { USABLE } \\ & \text { SF } \end{aligned}$ | BALCONY/ DECK |  |  |  |  |  |
| UNITA | 138 | 527 | 567 | 313 | 1232 | 42 | 10 | 88.39\% | 42.38\% | 12320 | 15870 |
| UNIT D | 267 | 685 | 666 | 413 | 1618 | 39 | 1 | 11.61\% | 5.57\% | 1618 | 2070 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BLDG 1 TOTAL: |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 47.95\% | 13938 | 17940 |
| BUILDING 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TYPE | SQUARE FOOTAGE |  |  |  |  |  | Unit Count | \% OF BLLOG 1 | \% OF PROJECT | TOTAL USABLE SF | INCL GARAGE, BALCONY. DECK |
|  | $1 \mathrm{I}^{\text {T }}$ | 2 ND | 3RD | GARAGE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { UNIT } \\ & \text { USABLE } \\ & \text { SF } \end{aligned}$ | BALCONYI DECK |  |  |  |  |  |
| UNITC | 167 | 608 | 587 | 442 | 1362 | 41/515 | 10 | 90.01\% | 46.85\% | 13620 | 23600 |
| UNIT F | 123 | 725 | 664 | 506 | 1512 | 49 | 1 | 9.99\% | 520\% | 1512 | 2067 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BLDG 2 TOTAL | 52.05\% | 15132 | 25667 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | HIGHLAND ROW TOTAL: | 29070 | 43607 |

## APPLICABLE REVIEW PROCESSES AND STANDARDS

Applicable Standards: Design Review Standards and general zoning standards (landscaping, parking, etc.)

Planned Development: The Planned Development process allows applicants to seek modifications to zoning standards. An applicant must first meet one of the several objectives related to City Plan policies and goals. The Planned Development process includes standards related to whether any modifications will result in a better final product, whether it aligns with City policies and goals, and is compatible with the area or the City's master plan development goals for the area.

Design Review: The Design Review process allows applicants to pursue minor modifications to design standards or approval for larger developments that could be impactful to the City. For minor modifications, the process allows some flexibility in how the design standards are administered. The Design Review process seeks to create compatibility with surrounding properties, mitigate impacts on public infrastructure, and to ensure that the proposed development helps achieve the goals of the various master plans of the City.

## KEY CONSIDERATIONS

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

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

Consideration 1: Compliance with City Goals \& Policies Identified in Adopted Plans

## Plan Salt Lake:

Neighborhoods- Neighborhoods that provide a safe environment, opportunity for social interaction, and services needed for the well-being of the community therein.

- The proposal brings new housing into the area/community.

Growth- Growing responsibly while providing people with choices about where they live, how they live, and how they get around.

- The proposal would replace a small business property and bring in more options for housing stock.
Transportation \& Mobility- A transportation and mobility network that is safe, accessible, reliable, affordable, and sustainable, providing real choices and connecting people with places.
- The proposal is on Highland Drive, which has a main bus route in both directions. The neighborhood includes employment opportunities, shopping, restaurants, and other services that are accessible without a car.

Air Quality- Air that is healthy and clean.

- The proximity of the proposal to other activities of daily life and to transit improves the opportunity for residents to choose alternative means of transportation and to contribute to less greenhouse emissions.


## Sugar House Community Master Plan:

The Sugar House Community Master Plan provides policy guidelines for Salt Lake City commissions, boards, and administrative entities to use when directing and implementing projects, programs, and public policies that require review, recommendations, and approval. The master plan serves the community by providing policies and principles for a sustained and enhanced environment for living and working in the Sugar House Community.

The site proposed for redevelopment is within the Sugar House Community Master Plan area. The Future Land Use map identifies the property as Mixed Use- Low Intensity.

## Residential Land Use Policies:

- Encourage new Medium-Density housing opportunities in appropriate locations in Sugar House.
- Encourage a variety of densities in the Medium Density range while ensuring the design of these projects is compatible with surrounding residential structures.
- Continue to prohibit the development of the "box car" design of multi-family dwellings.
- Encourage street patterns that connect with other streets.
- Discourage gated developments.

The Sugar House Community Master Plan states that a variety of housing types are needed to meet the range of housing alternatives people want. Given the cost of single-family housing, many people -particularly young people, singles, and seniors can benefit from apartment complexes and townhome rentals. This meets another policy that calls to provide a diversity of housing types, sizes, and prices within the community.

## Housing SLC:

The Housing SLC plan is a guide to the City's housing-related efforts for the next 5 years. Among other things, the plan includes goals to make progress to increase the supply of housing at all levels of affordability.

The proposed development would provide 22 new units in an area close to jobs, transit, and retail services and goods within walking distance. This is an ideal spot for a medium-density housing project along a busy collector corridor.

## Consideration 2: Design Review Process

The applicant is required to go through the Design Review process since they are proposing buildings larger than the allowed 15,000 sq.ft in the CB Zoning District.

> Ordinance 21A.26.o3o.E.-Building Size Limits: Buildings in excess of seven thousand five hundred (7,50o) gross square feet of floor area for a first floor footprint or in excess offifteen thousand (15,ooo) 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: Compatibility, Roofline, Vehicular Access, Facade Design, Buffers, Step Backs.

The applicant is requesting approval of two buildings, which in total square footage would be approximately $43,607 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$. This is greater than the allowed building size limit of $15,000 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft}$. However, to maximize the site's density, the applicant wants to increase the size of both buildings. This would also allow parking to be on-site and within the buildings.

The Design Review process allows a review of the proposed redevelopment to ensure that no negative impacts will come to the existing land uses in the immediate vicinity -specifically to the single-family neighborhood to the east.

The proposal does meet most of the required ordinance design standards, which will help this project to be more compatible with the surrounding land uses. The project does provide adequate ground floor visual interest for pedestrian activity along Highland Drive and Zenith Avenue, by having the residential entrances for the units facing these streets and each unit will have a garage incorporated into each building unit.
Although the proposal generally complies with the design review standards of Chapters 21A. 37 and 21A.59, however, in order to develop the best possible project, the applicant is asking for two modifications to the zoning ordinance.

## Consideration 3: Requested Zoning Modifications

The applicant is asking for modifications from two requirements of the Zoning Ordinance through the Planning Development approval by the Planning Commission.

## 1- Ordinance 21A.26.030.H.- Maximum Height: Thirty feet (30').

The applicant is requesting an increase in the building height of Building 2 from the required 30 ' to $33^{\prime}$, in order to have roof-top deck access for 10 of the 11 units proposed in that building. The ordinance allows a 5 ' increase in building height above the maximum allowed by the district for a mechanical equipment parapet wall. However, it was determined by the Zoning Administrator that since the proposed roof-top deck is a habitable floor for the tenants rather than for screening mechanical equipment; this height increase can only be allowed through the Planned Development process, which must be approved by the Planning Commission.


Although this project does not contain any commercial uses, the development is in a low-intensity mixed use area, according to the Sugar House Community Master Plan. Low-intensity areas support more walkable community development patterns located near public transit. Proposed development and land use within the Low-Intensity Mixed Use area must be compatible with the land uses and architectural features surrounding each site, which this proposal does. The applicant has increased the upper floor architectural fenestration (glazing is not required on the upper floor in the CB zone) so that there is more street interaction with the top floor of the units that face onto Highland Drive.

The proposal is compatible with the other higher-density residential and commercial developments along Highland Drive. Therefore, adding the additional three feet to accommodate the rooftop decks will still be a building height consistent with the existing, neighboring, and future potential developments along Highland Drive.


Proposed roof-top decks for 10 units in Building 2.

2- Ordinance 21A.37.050.K. - Dumpsters must be located a minimum of twentyfive feet (25') from any building on an adjacent lot that contains a residential dwelling or be located inside of an enclosed building or structure.

The applicant is proposing to place the recycling and trash containers on the northeast corner of the property behind Building 2. Because this is a design review application, the applicant will have to meet the design review standard which requires the containers to be twenty-five feet from any building on an adjacent lot if not inside of an enclosed building or structure. The location of the containers will be approximately 21 feet from the single-family dwelling on the adjacent lot to the east. If this were not a design review application, the containers would only be required to be in the rear yard and screened.

The single-family dwelling to the east is 10 feet from their property line to the west. On the subject property, there will be a seven-foot landscaping buffer and then approximately eight feet between the buffer before the containers. This will be an adequate distance in addition to a rear yard fence that will be in place around the property.


Red Xs next to Building 2 on the east side indicate the Recycling and trash bin placement. The red $X$ inside the blue box represents the adjacent single-family dwelling to the east.

## STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The planning staff is recommending approval of the Planned Development and Design Review petitions. The proposal meets the standards and objectives of both review processes. By following the more stringent standards of Design Review and Planned Development process, a more enhanced product is achieved than would be through the strict application of the regulations within the CB zoning district alone.

## NEXT STEPS

## Approval of Design Review and Planned Development

If the requests are approved, the applicant will need to comply with any conditions of approval, including any of the conditions required by other City departments and the Planning Commission. The applicant would be able to submit plans for building permits once all conditions of approval are met.

## Denial of the Design Review Request

If the Design Review request is denied, the proposed townhomes would have to meet the required building size limit of 15,000 square feet or less for both buildings.

## Denial of the Planned Development

If the Planned Development request is denied, both proposed buildings would have to meet the 30foot building height limitation. The recycling and trash containers would have to be placed in a different location on the property to meet the setback requirement if the modification for Ordinance 21A.37.050.K. is not approved.

## ATTACHMENT A: Vicinity Map



## ATTACHMENT B: Applicant's Narrative

## I Axis Architects

927 South State Street
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
(801)-355-3003

Pierre Langue - plangue@axisarchitects.com
Matthew Pockrus - mpockrus@axisarchitects.com

2901 S Highland Dr. - "Highland Row"<br>Project Narrative<br>Updated October 4, 2023

## To: Salt Lake City Planning and Zoning

From: Axis Architects, on behalf of Langue Inc.

## Subject: Design Review Application submitted for proposed project at 2901 S. Highland Dr.; Planned Development Application submitted for proposed project on lot at 2901 S Highland Dr.

In accordance with the provisions of Salt Lake City Code of Ordinances, Chapter 21A.55, Langue Inc. Submits the Highland Row Townhomes for Design Review.

This project required a Design Review for two reasons:

1. Per section 21A.25.030E, any building in the Community Business District "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.
2. Per 21A. 37.050 C 1 : Design Standards Defined, "the ground floor building elevation of all new buildings facing a street, and all new ground floor additions facing a street, shall have a minimum percentage of glass, as calculated between three feet and eight feet ( $8^{\prime}$ ) above grade." Table 21A. 37.060 defines the minimum percentage of glass for the ground floor as $40 \%$.

In regard to item \#1 requiring Design Review, we have calculated the gross square footages of Highland Row's two buildings as 17,940 for the northern building ("Building 1") and 25,667 for the Southern building ("Building 2").

It is worth noting that though Building 1 is roughly $40 \%$ larger in terms of square footage, the buildings are roughly the same size. The primary reason for the discrepancy in gross square footage is the addition of rooftop decks on 10 of the 11 units on Building 2. At 515 square feet each, these decks account for 5,150 total square feet or roughly $20 \%$ of Building 2's gross square footage.

Our understanding is that this requirement is primarily a safeguard against erroneously large buildings not meant for the zoning districts within which they intend to be built. Section $21 \mathrm{~A} \cdot 26.030 \mathrm{E}$ outlines 6 criteria that aim to prevent such buildings from being built; our Design Review application addresses each of these in specific ways. The first criterion -
"Compatibility" - in many ways encompasses the other five, however, and we believe that despite the size of the buildings, the project feels compatible within the context of the surrounding area. In particular, we designed the buildings on the project to be similar in size (though our project is smaller in scope) to those in the Moda Townhomes project - just one block to the north.

Besides being aesthetically compatible, however, Highland Row seeks to be functionally compatible with the surrounding area. The CB Zone, per its own Purpose Statement (21A.26.030) intends "to provide for the close integration of moderately sized commercial areas with adjacent residential neighborhoods." We feel Highland Row is ideally sized and located to act as a bridge between commercial areas and residential neighborhoods. At the same time, In response to specific community feedback, we're aiming to fulfill the area's need for quality, cost-effective multifamily housing options by offering modestly-sized 2-bedroom townhomes (with flex rooms that offer 3-bedroom potential) that are ideally sized for young families and working professionals.

In regard to item \#2: As part of the Design Review process, we are asking to be granted an exception to the CB Zone's $40 \%$ minimum ground floor glazing requirement. Per 21A.37.050C1, "the planning director may approve a modification to ground floor glass requirements if the planning director finds . . . the ground level of the building is occupied by residential uses that face the street, in which case the specified minimum glass requirement may be reduced by fifteen percent ( $15 \%$ )." Our project is entirely residential in design. No part of our structures is not a part of one of the individual residences. Given this, we feel we are ideal candidates for this exception. We understand, however, the importance of glazing both to residents living in our units and to street engagement with the building. In line with this, and in conjunction with the city, we've worked to implement extra glazing on the upper levels of the project's facade in order to compensate for the reduction in glazing on the main floor.

In addition to the items above requiring a Design Review, we have submitted an application to have the project be designated a Planned Development. The Planned Development process was initiated in the hope that we would be able to receive Planning Commission approval for two exceptions to code items currently preventing inhibiting the project's progress:

1. Per 21A. 26.030 H , the Maximum Height for a building in the CB District is $30^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$. We are requesting an extension of this height in order to erect a parapet wall on 10 of the 22 units in the project (T.O. Parapet Wall: $33^{\prime}-0{ }^{\prime \prime}$ ).
2. Per 21A. 37.050 K , "Dumpsters must be located a minimum of twenty five feet ( 25 ') from any building on an adjacent lot that contains a residential dwelling." We are requesting an exception to the $25^{\prime}-0$ " minimum distance required between on-site dumpsters and
buildings located on adjacent lots. We are requesting this exception for 1 of the 2 dumpsters to be located on site, which we are unable to locate further than $22^{\prime}-6$ " as measured from the front of the dumpster to the exterior face of the house on the adjacent lot.

In regard to Exception \#1, it is worth noting that there is a specific provision in the code allowing for building heights to exceed the zoning district maximum. This project was designed with the intention to take advantage of this exception in order to best utilize the lot's limited space. These exceptions are allowed per 21A.36.020C, height exceptions of type "Mechanical equipment parapet wall" are granted a 5 foot "extent above maximum" allowable building height in all zoning districts other than the FP, FR-1, FR-2, FR-3, and Open. Given that the parapet walls on the units in question (our "C" units) were originally conceived as a method for the required screening of mechanical units located on those roofs, we felt we met the necessary requirements for this exception at the time of design.

Given the stair access to the roof and a parapet wall that we felt could easily double as a guardrail, it was our hope that the rooftop space not being allocated for mechanical use could be utilized as a rooftop amenity space for occupants. Doing so would enable us to better fulfill the Planned Development objectives (outlined in the Planned Development Application) by allowing us to offer better quality living spaces with increased habitable space without drastically increasing cost and thereby decreasing affordability and/or accessibility. In addition to benefiting future occupants, these outdoor amenity spaces would provide opportunities for rooftop greenery (as encouraged in the Design Review guidelines) and promote a sense of socialization between residents, neighbors, and the surrounding community, thus building upon the Master Plan's goal to "protect the stable well-kept residential neighborhoods" in the area.

In conversations with city officials, however, it was determined that our parapet wall would not qualify for the $5^{\prime}-0$ " Extent Above Maximum exception outlined in the code as long as it was being used as a guardrail, granting access to an amenity space. It is for this reason that we're seeking a 3 ' -0 " maximum height extension.

In regard to exception \#2: In designing the project, we originally proposed individually housing dumpsters and recycling bins in unit garages. In conversation with both Republic Services (one of the city's approved waste management companies) and the City Planner's office, it was agreed that individual dumpsters and recycling bins - the 44 in total that would have been required would pose a significant problem for trash and recycling collectors and the neighborhood at large for several reasons:

1. The project's central drive lane does not provide sufficient space for collection trucks to turn around, meaning collectors would be forced to back off the property into often-congested Highland Drive traffic.
2. The project's central drive lane would be narrowed substantially by the presence of 22-44 trash/recycling containers, making navigation difficult and potentially dangerous.
3. Alternatives to placing containers in the central drive lane - either by placing them on Highland Drive itself or along Zenith Avenue would be inconvenient and potentially dangerous for residents, neighbors, and collectors.

In light of these concerns, we agreed to create space for shared trash and recycling containers and worked with the Transportation Department, Urban Forestry Department, Republic Services, and City Planner's office to provide sufficient, safe access to those containers via Zenith Avenue rather than via Highland Drive.

Despite our best efforts, 1 of these 2 containers remains just inside the $25^{\prime}-0^{\prime \prime}$ minimum distance required by 21 A .27 .050 K . Per our measurements, the further north of our two containers (which will contain recycling instead of refuse) will be $22^{\prime}-7$ " from the closest building on the adjacent residential lot. We are requesting a reduction to the $25^{\prime}-0$ " minimum to permit the location of these containers, which, in addition to the distance, will be separated from the adjacent residence by screening fences and by the 7 ' -0 " landscape buffer required on the property. We believe these measures will be satisfactory to eliminate any potential concerns with regard to dumpster proximity.

## ATTACHMENT C: Plan Set
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## ATTACHMENT D: Photos <br> Property and Vicinity



Subject Property at 2903 S. Highland Drive.


Subject property located on the corner of Highland Drive and Zenith Avenue.


Subject property (right) and adjacent property to north (Subway Restaurant).


MODA apartments two properties to the north on Highland Drive from the subject property.


7-Eleven retail store directly to the south of the subject property.


Businesses on the southwest corner of Zenith Avenue across the street from the subject property.


Businesses on the northwest corner of Zenith Avenue across the street from the subject property.


View looking north at the back of the Subway restaurant and the single-family dwellings on Crandall Avenue.


View looking to the east at the adjacent single-family dwelling property.


View looking south toward the 7-Eleven.


Subject property (left), adjacent property to the east (right).


Subject property -viewed from the southeast corner on Zenith Avenue.


Current east entrance point to subject property along Zenith Avenue.


Current west entrance point to subject property along Zenith Avenue.


Tree in the middle of the property that will be removed.

## ATTACHMENT E: CB Zoning Standards

## CB COMMUNITY BUSINESS DISTRICT:

Purpose Statement: 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.

| Standard | Requirement | Proposed | Finding |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum <br> Building Height | $30^{\prime}$ | Bldg 1: 29'8" <br> Bldg 2: 33' | Building 2 does not complyrequires approval of Planned Development |
| Front/Corner/ <br> Side/Rear Yard Setbacks | F. Minimum Yard Requirements: <br> 1. Front or Corner Side Yard: No minimum yard is required. If a front yard is provided, it shall comply with all provisions of this title applicable to front or corner side yards, including landscaping, fencing, and obstructions. <br> 2. Interior Side Yard: None required. <br> 3. Rear Yard: Ten feet (10'). | Front/corner side yard: 3' from the property line along Highland Drive for both buildings. <br> 6' from the property line along Zenith Avenue <br> Rear yard: 10' setback | Complies |
| Lot Size | No minimum lot area or lot width is required | 0.54 acres or 23,522 square feet | Complies |
| Mid-Block Walkway | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Refuse Control | All screening devices shall be a minimum of one foot higher than the object being screened, and in the case of fences and/or masonry walls the height shall not exceed eight feet (8'). Dumpsters must be located a minimum of twenty-five feet (25') from | The applicant is proposing one recycling container and one trash container to be located at the east side of the subject property next to Building 2. It will be screened with a 6 ' fence. | Does not Comply <br> The distance of the proposed recycling and trash containers must be 25, from the adjacent singlefamily dwelling |


|  | any building on an adjacent lot that contains a residential dwelling or be located inside of an enclosed building or structure. | The proposed location is only 21 feet from the single-family dwelling on the adjacent property. | and, therefore, requires approval of a Planned Development from the Planning Commission. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lighting | All exterior lighting shall be shielded and directed down to prevent light trespass onto adjacent properties. Exterior lighting shall not strobe, flash or flicker. | Proposed exterior lighting will be directed on site and will not trespass onto adjacent properties. | Complies |
| Off Street <br>  <br> Loading <br> (21A.44.040.A.) | Min: Studio and 1+ bedrooms: 1 space per DU <br> Max: All Contexts: Studio \& 1 Bedroom: 2 spaces per DU 2+ bedrooms: 3 spaces per DU | 34 parking spaces are proposed within 22 garages. | Complies |
| Landscaping \& Buffering (21A.48) | Any lot abutting a lot in a Residential District shall conform to the buffer yard requirements of Chapter 21A. 48 of this title. | Proposed 7 ' landscaping buffer in rear yard. | Complies |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Signage } \\ & \text { (21A.46.110) } \end{aligned}$ | Sign package per ordinance 21A.46.095 (TSA) | No signs are being proposed. Wall art is being proposed. | Any signs will be reviewed for compliance during building permit review. |
| Building Materials | Durable materials include stone, brick, masonry, textured or patterned concrete, and fiber cement board or other material that includes a minimum manufacturer warranty of twenty (20) years from color fading, weather, and local climate induced degradation of the material. | Thin brick veneer, wood \& metal paneling, prefinished brake metal, and cementitious plaster. | Complies |
| Ground Floor Glass | 40\% | Bldg 1: $28.1 \%$ \& Bldg 2: 25.1\% Alone Highland Drive . | Complies <br> Residential uses are allowed to decrease the required amount |


|  |  | Glazing along Zenith Avenue <br> complies with the 40\% glass <br> requirement. | of ground floor <br> glass by $15 \%$. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Upper Floor <br> Glass | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Building <br> Entrances | At least one operable <br> building entrance on the <br> ground floor is required for <br> every street facing facade. | Both buildings will have a front <br> door facing Highland Drive. <br> Along Zenith Ave. there will be <br> operable entrances to the units <br> of Building 2. | Complies |

## ATTACHMENT F: Design Review Standards

21A.59.050: Standards for Design Review: In addition to standards provided in other sections of this title for specific types of approval, the following standards shall be applied to all applications for design review:

The Finding for each standard is the recommendation of the Planning Division based on the facts associated with the proposal, the discussion that follows, and the input received during the engagement process. Input received after the staff report is published has not been considered in this report.
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.

## Finding: Complies

Discussion: Although the purpose statement of the CB zone focuses on moderately sized commercial areas, this multi-family residential proposed development will add to the mix of land uses in this area by broadening the existing housing stock. It will provide additional much-needed rental housing in this southern part of Salt Lake City.
The proposed development is located along a major collector street (Highland Drive) and will, therefore, create an urban neighborhood by giving the residents the option to use alternative forms of transportation (biking, walking, transit) to get to retail services and goods in the immediate area.
The proposal complies with the policies and design guidelines of the Sugar House Community Master Plan by offering alternative housing options to this area of Salt Lake City, which is located within walking distance to jobs, public transit, and retail goods and services.

Condition(s): n/a
B. Development shall be primarily oriented to the sidewalk, not an interior courtyard or parking lot.

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

## Finding: Complies

Discussion: The proposed building entrances face the public sidewalks. The secondary entrances would be through the attached garages of each unit. The two units that face onto

Highland Drive will have entry doors facing the street. The buildings along Highland Drive and Zenith Avenue have setbacks from the property lines that keep the building facades close to the public sidewalk; this will engage pedestrian interest. Each unit will have at least one required parking space within its garage.

## Condition(s): n/a

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

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

## Finding: Does Not Comply

Discussion: Buildings 1 and 2 have street-facing units and ground-floor glazing. Since the ground floor will have residential space in addition to the garage space, the applicant is asking for a modification from the required glazing requirement. For residential structures, the glass requirement can be reduced to a $25 \%$ glazing allowance from $40 \%$ for both buildings for the ground floor glazing along Highland Drive. The proposal meets the glazing requirement for the ground floor fronting Zenith Ave and does not require a reduction. This slight reduction will still provide sufficient glass to facilitate pedestrian interest. The proposal does include an outside courtyard area in the northeast corner of the project, which will create a direct visual connection to the street and outdoors.

Condition(s): n/a
D. Large building masses shall be divided into heights and sizes that relate to human scale.

1. Relate building scale and massing to the size and scale of existing and anticipated buildings, such as alignments with established cornice heights, building massing, step-backs and vertical emphasis.
2. Modulate the design of a larger building using a series of vertical or horizontal emphases to equate with the scale (heights and widths) of the buildings in the context and reduce the visual width or height.
3. Include secondary elements such as balconies, porches, vertical bays, belt courses, fenestration and window reveals.
4. Reflect the scale and solid-to-void ratio of windows and doors of the established character of the neighborhood or that which is desired in the master plan.

Finding: Complies

## Discussion:

1. The ground floor of the development will be garages and residential living space.
2. The applicant is asking for a $15 \%$ reduction in the glazing on the ground floor between 3'-8', along Highland Drive. Building 2 will meet the $40 \%$ glazing requirement along Zenith Ave.
3. The proposed development will not have commercial uses on the ground floor. The applicant has increased pedestrian and street interaction on the upper floor by adding a window fenestration for the units facing onto Highland Drive.
4. The proposed project does not have outdoor patios or courtyards that face the street. There will be landscaping in front of the buildings along both street frontages to give a visual connection to the streets.

## Condition(s): n/a

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

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

Finding: Not Applicable
Discussion: The proposed buildings are not 200 feet or longer. The proposal building façade lengths for the two buildings with street frontage will be approximately 34.5 -feet for building 1 and approximately 46- feet along Highland Drive and 160-feet alone Zenith Avenue for building 2.

## Condition(s): $\mathbf{n} / \mathbf{a}$

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

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

## Finding: Complies

Discussion: The applicant is providing privately-owned public spaces in the east portion of the property. They are providing seating and BBQ areas for the residents of the townhomes. They are providing trees in the landscaping plan that would meet the required number of trees to provide seasonal shade. In addition, the applicant is proposing private roof-top decks for 10 of the units in Building 2.

Condition(s): n/a
G. Building height shall be modified to relate to human scale and minimize negative impacts. In downtown and in the CSHBD Sugar House Business District, building height shall contribute to a distinctive City skyline.

1. Human scale:
a. Utilize stepbacks to design a building that relate to the height and scale of adjacent and nearby buildings, or where identified, goals for future scale defined in adopted master plans.
b. For buildings more than three (3) stories or buildings with vertical mixed use, compose the design of a building with distinct base, middle and top sections to reduce the sense of apparent height.
2. Negative impacts:
a. Modulate taller buildings vertically and horizontally so that it steps up or down to its neighbors.
b. Minimize shadow impacts of building height on the public realm and semipublic spaces by varying building massing. Demonstrate impact from shadows due to building height for the portions of the building that are subject to the request for additional height.
c. Modify tall buildings to minimize wind impacts on public and private spaces, such as the inclusion of a wind break above the first level of the building.
3. Cornices and rooflines:
a. Cohesiveness: Shape and define rooflines to be cohesive with the building's overall form and composition.
b. Complement Surrounding Buildings: Include roof forms that complement the rooflines of surrounding buildings.
c. Green Roof And Roof Deck: Include a green roof and/or accessible roof deck to support a more visually compelling roof landscape and reduce solar gain, air pollution, and the amount of water entering the stormwater system.

## Finding: Complies

Discussion: Subject property fronts along Highland Drive. Building 1 complies with the building height as proposed at just below 30 feet tall. The applicant is asking for a minimal height increase of three feet to accommodate rooftop decks for 10 of the 11 units. Although the increased height is for a habitable deck area for the residents, if the three-foot height were intended for mechanical equipment, the applicant would not need to go through the Planned Development process; it would be a height exception allowed by Ordinance @1A.36.020C.

## Condition(s): n/a

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.

## Finding: Complies

Discussion: The parking for this project will be located in private garages and off-site parking on public streets. There is a clear pedestrian connection to the public sidewalks.

## Condition(s): n/a

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.)

Finding: Complies
Discussion: Waste and recycling containers will be screened and located in the southeast area of the project adjacent to the east of Building 2.

## Condition(s): n/a

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

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

Finding: Complies
Discussion: Any proposed signs will have to be reviewed and approved through the permitting process with the building permit.

Condition(s): $\mathbf{n} / \mathbf{a}$
K. Lighting shall support pedestrian comfort and safety, neighborhood image, and dark sky goals.
1.Provide streetlights as indicated in the Salt Lake City Lighting Master Plan.
2.Outdoor lighting should be designed for low-level illumination and to minimize glare and light trespass onto adjacent properties and uplighting directly to the sky.
3.Coordinate lighting with architecture, signage, and pedestrian circulation to accentuate significant building features, improve sign legibility, and support pedestrian comfort and safety.

## Finding: Complies

Discussion: The lighting proposed for this project will meet the standards above. Lighting will help the safety and circulation of the proposal while not causing a negative impact to the adjacent properties or community.

## Condition(s): $\mathbf{n} / \mathbf{a}$

L. Streetscape improvements shall be provided as follows:

1. One street tree chosen from the street tree list consistent with the City's urban forestry guidelines and with the approval of the City's Urban Forester shall be placed for each thirty feet ( $30^{\prime}$ ) of property frontage on a street. Existing street trees removed as the result of a development project shall be replaced by the developer with trees approved by the City's Urban Forester.
2. Hardscape (paving material) shall be utilized to differentiate privately-owned public spaces from public spaces. Hardscape for public sidewalks shall follow applicable design standards. Permitted materials for privately-owned public spaces shall meet the following standards:
a. Use materials that are durable (withstand wear, pressure, damage), require a minimum of maintenance, and are easily repairable or replaceable should damage or defacement occur.
b. Where practical, as in lower-traffic areas, use materials that allow rainwater to infiltrate into the ground and recharge the water table.
c. Limit contribution to urban heat island effect by limiting use of dark materials and incorporating materials with a high Solar- Reflective Index (SRI).
d. Utilize materials and designs that have an identifiable relationship to the character of the site, the neighborhood, or Salt Lake City.
e. Use materials (like textured ground surfaces) and features (like ramps and seating at key resting points) to support access and comfort for people of all abilities.
f. Asphalt shall be limited to vehicle drive aisles.

Finding: Complies
Discussion: The applicant is proposing to keep 3 of the 4 street-lined trees along Zenith Avenue and is proposing trees along Highland Drive. They will upgrade the overall landscaping for the subject property. The applicant will install hardscape using durable and permitted materials.

Condition(s): n/a

## ATTACHMENT G:Planned Development Standards

## Planned Development Standards

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

The Finding for each standard is the recommendation of the Planning Division based on the facts associated with the proposal, the discussion that follows, and the input received during the engagement process. Input received after the staff report is published has not been considered in this report.
> A. Planned Development Objectives: The planned development shall meet the purpose statement for a planned development (section 21A.55.010 of this chapter) and will achieve at least one of the objectives stated in said section. To determine if a planned development objective has been achieved, the applicant shall demonstrate that at least one of the strategies associated with the objective are included in the proposed planned development. The applicant shall also demonstrate why modifications to the zoning regulations are necessary to meet the purpose statement for a planned development. The Planning Commission should consider the relationship between the proposed modifications to the zoning regulations and the purpose of a planned development, and determine if the project will result in a more enhanced product than would be achievable through strict application of the land use regulations.

Planned Development Purpose Statement: A planned development is intended to encourage the efficient use of land and resources, promoting greater efficiency in public and utility services and encouraging innovation in the planning and building of all types of development. Further, a planned development implements the purpose statement of the zoning district in which the project is located, utilizing an alternative approach to the design of the property and related physical facilities. A planned development incorporates special development characteristics that help to achieve City goals identified in adopted Master Plans and that provide an overall benefit to the community as determined by the planned development objectives. A planned development will result in a more enhanced product than would be achievable through strict application of land use regulations, while enabling the development to be compatible with adjacent and nearby land developments.

Discussion: The proposal supports the Planned Development purpose, which is to encourage efficient use of land and innovative development. The proposal provides an overall benefit to the community by providing needed housing with a mix of unit types in a location with proximity to public transit and retail goods and services.

Finding: $\boxtimes$ Meets Purpose Statement $\square$ Does Not Meet Purpose Statement

A. Open Space And Natural Lands: Preserving, protecting or creating open space and natural lands:

1. Inclusion of community gathering places or public recreational opportunities, such as new trails or trails that connect to existing or planned trail systems, playgrounds or other similar types of facilities.
2. Preservation of critical lands, watershed areas, riparian corridors and/or the urban forest.
3. Development of connected greenways and/or wildlife corridors.
4. Daylighting of creeks/water bodies.
5. Inclusion of local food production areas, such as community gardens.
6. Clustering of development to preserve open spaces.

Discussion: The proposal will revitalize an out-of-business commercial property. Although there are no outdoor open spaces or natural lands/water bodies in this area, all developed or paved areas will be landscaped, including preserving existing trees as much as possible.

Finding: $\square$ Objective Satisfied
® Objective Not Satisfied
B. Historic Preservation:

1. Preservation, restoration, or adaptive reuse of buildings or structures that contribute to the character of the City either architecturally and/or historically, and that contribute to the general welfare of the residents of the City.
2. Preservation of, or enhancement to, historically significant landscapes that contribute to the character of the City and contribute to the general welfare of the City's residents.

Discussion: The subject property is not in a historic district, and the existing building is not a contributing historic building. Therefore, this will not apply.

## Finding: $\square$ Objective Satisfied <br> 区 Objective Not Satisfied

C. Housing: Providing affordable housing or types of housing that helps achieve the City's housing goals and policies:

1. At least twenty percent (20\%) of the housing must be for those with incomes that are at or below eighty percent ( $80 \%$ ) of the area median income.
2. The proposal includes housing types that are not commonly found in the existing neighborhood but are of a scale that is typical to the neighborhood.

Discussion: This area has started to transition along Highland Drive. Gradually, higher-density projects are being developed; the proposal includes housing types that are not common in this immediate area since most of the residential housing is single-family dwellings that are part of older subdivisions to the east. The proposal will bring more residential rental options to the area.
D. Mobility: Enhances accessibility and mobility:

1. Creating new interior block walkway connections that connect through a block or improve connectivity to transit or the bicycle network.
2. Improvements that encourage transportation options other than just the automobile.

Discussion: This development does not propose an interior block walkway. The applicant is not encouraging other transportation options other than vehicular.

Finding: $\square$ Objective Satisfied $\boxtimes$ Objective Not Satisfied
E. Sustainability: Creation of a project that achieves exceptional performance with regards to resource consumption and impact on natural systems:

1. Energy Use And Generation: Design of the building, its systems, and/or site that allow for a significant reduction in energy usage as compared with other buildings of similar type and/or the generation of energy from an on-site renewable resource.
2. Reuse Of Priority Site: Locate on a brownfield where soil or groundwater contamination has been identified, and where the local, State, or national authority (whichever has jurisdiction) requires its remediation. Perform remediation to the satisfaction of that authority.

Discussion: No on-site renewable resources have been noted to be used in the development, and it is not located on a brownfield site.

Finding: $\square$ Objective Satisfied $\boxtimes$ Objective Not Satisfied
F. Master Plan Implementation: A project that helps implement portions of an adopted Master Plan in instances where the Master Plan provides specific guidance on the character of the immediate vicinity of the proposal:

1. A project that is consistent with the guidance of the Master Plan related to building scale, building orientation, site layout, or other similar characterdefining features. (Ord. 8-18, 2018)

Discussion: The proposal meets the objectives of the Plan Salt Lake plan by providing new housing options and opportunities to the community. In addition, the proposal meets the growth, transportation \& mobility, and air quality objectives of Plan Salt Lake as discussed in Key Considerations \#1.Objective Not Satisfied


#### Abstract

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.


## Finding: Complies

Discussion: The master plan policies call for neighborhoods to provide a safe environment and housing opportunities within their community. More information describing how this project is meeting this standard can be found in the Key Considerations section of this staff report.

Condition(s): n/a
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;

## Finding: Complies

Discussion: The proposal is compatible with the scale, mass and intensity of the neighborhood. The development scale in the immediate area has started to change over time; therefore, the placement of the proposed building and overall design will aid in keeping the building at a design that relates to human scale. Other buildings/properties in the area have the potential to meet the height allowance of 30 feet since most of Highland Drive along this immediate area is CB zoned.
The applicant is asking for a three-foot increase to have a habitable rooftop deck for ten of the 11 units in Building 2. If the applicant was using the additional three feet as a parapet wall to cover mechanical equipment, that would not require a Planned Development application, instead, it would be allowed under the height exception (21A.36.020C.)
The project will have a required seven-foot landscaping buffer from the dwelling to the east. It will also have an open space area in the northeast corner of the property for outdoor activities for the residents.

## Condition(s): n/a

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;

## Finding: Complies

Discussion: The proposal meets the CB requirements by locating the building closer to the public road and sidewalk for more public pedestrian interaction. The proposal is to provide durable exterior building materials to upgrade the subject property and to be compatible with other buildings in the immediate area. The project is also adding plants to upgrade the landscaping plan to improve the subject property for the common area on the east side of the subject property.

## Condition(s): n/a

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.
b. Provide sufficient space for private amenities.
c. Provide sufficient open space buffering between the proposed development and neighboring properties to minimize impacts related to privacy and noise.
d. Provide adequate sight lines to streets, driveways and sidewalks.
e. Provide sufficient space for maintenance.

## Finding: Complies

Discussion: The project is currently meeting the front, side, and rear setbacks, which are determined. The property will be landscaped along the west and south along the street frontages. This project abuts a residential zone to the east, and therefore, a landscaping buffer is required. The project meets City standards for sufficient open space within the subject property. Adequate sight lines provide safety for pedestrians using the sidewalk and allow for adequate visibility to vehicles traveling along Highland Drive.

## Condition(s): $\mathbf{n} / \mathbf{a}$

4. Whether building facades offer ground floor transparency, access, and architectural detailing to facilitate pedestrian interest and interaction;

## Finding: Complies

Discussion: The applicant is proposing a reduction in the glazing requirement from $40 \%$ to $28.2 \%$ for Building 1 and to $25.1 \%$ for Building 2 along Highland Drive. The applicant is complying with the $40 \%$ glazing requirement along Zenith Avenue. The ground floor of the townhomes is used for residential purposes: garages and storage space. Therefore, the applicant is eligible for a $15 \%$ reduction of the glazing requirement. The pedestrian interest and interaction will still be detailed at the reduced glazing percentage.
The applicant has increased the glazing on the upper floor, which is not required in the CB zoning district. The upper floor will have large window frames that will hang over the ground floor for an aesthetic feature. This and the ground floor entryways will add to the pedestrian interest and interaction for those walking or driving along Highland Drive and Zenith Avenue.

## Condition(s): n/a

5. Whether lighting is designed for safety and visual interest while minimizing impacts on surrounding property;

## Finding: Complies

Discussion: Lighting on the property will be limited to on-site lumination and will not impede the adjacent properties.

Condition(s): $\mathbf{n} / \mathbf{a}$
6. Whether dumpsters, loading docks and/or service areas are appropriately screened;

## Finding: Complies

Discussion: The dumpsters will be screened and will be located in the southeast corner of the project next to Building 2.
In working with the applicant on the placement of the recycling and trash containers, staff believed it was safer and more convenient for the project to have two large containers placed in the rear yard rather than having two containers per unit (44 containers total). With separate unit containers, pickup trucks would have to back up from Highland Drive, potentially causing traffic issues.
The applicant is asking for a modification from the design review standard in ordinance 21A.37.050.K. due to the proximity of the recycling and trash containers to the adjacent property's dwelling. The requirement is $25^{\prime}$ ' between the containers and the adjacent structure; the applicant is asking for a modification to $21^{\prime}$.

## Condition(s): $\mathbf{n} / \mathbf{a}$

7. Whether parking areas are appropriately buffered from adjacent uses.

## Finding: Complies

Discussion: The proposal will have a garage for each unit; therefore, buffering from adjacent uses is not required.

Condition(s): n/a

## 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;

## Finding: Complies

Discussion: The landscaping plan shows an upgrade from the existing landscaping. Plants will be added to the property, primarily in the east portion of the subject property and around the buildings along the street frontages. The applicant will be keeping three of the existing mature trees along Zenith Avenue. One of the mature trees will be taken out for access to the trash and recycling containers. A small tree species will be planted to replace the mature tree.

## Condition(s): n/a

2. Whether existing landscaping that provides additional buffering to the abutting properties is maintained and preserved;

## Finding: Complies

Discussion: The applicant is proposing to upgrade the landscaping with plants. Seven feet of additional buffering in the rear yard is required since the subject property is abutting a residential zoning district. There is currently no landscaping on the subject property between the adjacent property to the east; there is only a fence where the existing parking lot abuts.

Condition(s): n/a
3. Whether proposed landscaping is designed to lessen potential impacts created by the proposed planned development;

Finding: Complies

Discussion: The proposed landscaping will serve as a buffer for the residential single-family dwelling to the east. There will also be upgraded landscaping around the proposed townhome buildings along the street frontage of Highland Drive and Zenith Avenue.

## Condition(s): n/a

4. Whether proposed landscaping is appropriate for the scale of the development.

## Finding: Complies

Discussion: The proposed landscaping is appropriate for the scale of the development. The proposal provides a private landscaping area in the rear of the property in the east portion of the subject property. There is also landscaping proposed along the buildings along Highland Drive and Zenith Avenue. This will give more appeal to the subject property.

## Condition(s): n/a

## E. Mobility: The proposed planned development supports Citywide <br> 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;

## Finding: Complies With Conditions

Discussion: Currently, there is one access point along Highland Drive to this property, and there are two along Zenith Avenue. This will be changed by the proposed project. There will only be one entrance coming from the west side of the property in the center of the project along the Highland Drive frontage. There is a curb cut proposed at the east end of the property from Zenith Avenue for access to the trash and recycling containers, which are proposed to be located next to Building 2. However, this will not be for vehicular access.
The negative impact on both streets will be low, and the safety, purpose, and character of the street should remain.

## Condition(s): n/a

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;

| b.Bicycle facilities and connections where appropriate, and orientation to transit where <br> available; and <br> c. Minimizing conflicts between different transportation modes; |
| :--- |
| Finding: Complies |
| Discussion: The orientation of the site allows safe circulation for pedestrians and vehicular <br> traffic. The proposal accommodates bike racks on-site, and bus transit routes are available <br> along Highland Drive. No conflicts are expected. |
| Condition(s): n/a |
| 3. Whether the site design of the proposed development promotes or enables access to adjacent <br> uses and amenities; |
| Finding: Complies |
| Discussion: The surrounding uses to the north and south are mostly commercial and are <br> easily accessed via the public sidewalk. Bus routes are within walking distance of the subject <br> property. |
| Condition(s): n/a |
| 4. Whether the proposed design provides adequate emergency vehicle access; |
| Finding: Complies |
| Discussion: Emergency vehicular access has been reviewed by the Fire reviewer. Fire will do |
| a full review during the building permit stage. Initially, Fire is accepting of the project. |
| Condition(s): n/a |
| 5. Whether loading access and service areas are adequate for the site and minimize impacts to the |
| surrounding area and public rights-of-way. |
| Finding: Complies |
| Discussion: The site is small enough that loading access and service areas will not be needed. |
| Condition(s): n/a |

# 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. 

## Finding: Complies

Discussion: The existing building does not significantly contribute to the character of the neighborhood or the environment, and there are no natural features as the property has been previously built upon. The proposal will add a revitalization to the corner, adding a new residential product that will enhance the area.

Condition(s): n/a

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

Finding: Complies
Discussion: Public Utilities has reviewed and approved the initial plans. A full review of the utility plans will be conducted when the applicant applies for a building permit.

Condition(s): n/a

## ATTACHMENT H: Public Process \& Comments

## Public Notice, Meetings, Comments

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

- August 7, 2023 - The Sugar House Community Council was sent the 45 -day required notice for recognized community organizations, a letter was received and is attached below.
- August 21, 2023- The applicant appeared before the Sugar House Land Use Committee.
- July 10, 2023-Property owners and residents within 300 feet of the development were provided early notification of the proposal.

Notice of the public hearing for the proposal included:

- October 13, 2023
- Public hearing notice sign posted on the property.
- October 20. 2023
- Public hearing notice mailed.
- Public notice posted on City and State websites and Planning Division list serve.


## Public Input:

The Planning Staff has received no public comments regarding this application.

October 19, 2023
Sugar House

TO: Salt Lake City Planning Commission
FROM: Judi Short, Vice Chair and Land Use Chair
RE: PLNPCM2023-00407
PLNPCM2023-00525
The Sugar House Land Use and Zoning meeting reviewed this request at our August 21 meeting. We flyered the neighborhood around the project and emailed those who had submitted comments when we reviewed the rezone several years ago.

We find this does meet the purpose of a Planned Development. Adding another town home development is compatible with the others that have been built along this section of Highland Drive. And we definitely need more housing units in Salt Lake City. We do not like the reduction of glass, the drawings make it look like these windows are very tiny, and we fail to see why they cannot be larger. The window size detracts from the building.

I have attached comments from the neighbors. One refers to workers that were leaving trash around. I asked Bill Knowles, the city ombudsman, to check this out. He could not find any evidence of work being done. One of our committee members said that when Millcreek was making their improvements to the east side of Highland, their workers were parked all up and down the street, and those could have been what was causing the issue. There appears to not be enough space for garbage pickup, and wonder if that can be relocated so it is not so close to the neighboring homes. The neighbors are clearly opposed to this apartment building, but if what was added instead were 6 single family homes on that parcel, those would look out of place along that area of Highland Drive, and they would not be built in the Craftsman style. We do not think 3 extra feet is a problem because the building is set at least 20 feet from the nearest house on Zenith

The comment about parking is a good one. On the surface, it looks like it is enough parking, but the tandem garages are difficult to easily park two cars, and it seems likely that there could be an overflow into the neighborhood rather than using both parking stalls. It certainly is the case in other areas of Sugar House where that sort of parking is provided. The developer needs to figure out a way to ensure that the tenants park on his lot, not the neighboring streets.

The green space that is allowed seems very minimal, maybe the rooftop deck is a way to add more outside space to offset the lack of open space. With some of these tweaks to the plan, we find this is acceptable.

Attachment:
Comments on the project

## ATTACHMENT I: Department Review Comments

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

## Transportation: Jena Carver //jena.carver@slcgov.com // 801-535-6694

These plans have addressed all of my comments. I have not additional concerns with the project.

Fire: Seth Hutchinson // seth.hutchinson@slcgov.com // 801-535-7164
Approved fire apparatus access roads shall be provided for every facility, building or portion of a building hereafter constructed or moved into or within the jurisdiction. The fire apparatus access road shall comply with the requirements of IFC section 503 and shall extend to within 150 feet of all portions of the facility and all portions of the exterior walls of the first story of the building as measured by an approved route around the exterior of the building or facility. Fire apparatus access roads shall have an unobstructed width of not less than 20 feet, exclusive of shoulders, and an unobstructed vertical clearance of not less than 13 feet 6 inches. Fire apparatus access roads shall not be obstructed in any manner, including the parking of vehicles, or medians. Dead-end fire apparatus access roads in excess of 150 feet in length shall be provided with an approved area for turning around fire apparatus. FD turnarounds must meet SLC Fire Department requirements, and requirements in Appendix D Section D103.4 and Table D103.4 in the IFC. SLC Fire Department requires that hammer head turnarounds measure 160 feet ( 80 -foot Y ).

Aerial access shall be provided when the building is greater than 30 -feet in height from the lowest level of fire department access. Aerial access road shall be at least 26 -feet wide, located not closer than 15 -feet and not greater than 30 -feet parallel to one entire side of the building and have no overhead obstructions, in accordance with Appendix D of the IFC.
If FD access roads to all points of the buildings (measured by an approved route), and aerial access as described above, cannot be achieved an Alternate Means and Methods Form, AMM must be submitted for review.
AMM forms can be found at, https://www.slc.gov/buildingservices/applications-forms/.

The Current Alternate Means and Methods form, for adding a sprinkler system in the North building in place of FD access, will no longer be valid with the change that is proposed. The original AMM was approved for 9 units not 11. A new AMM will have to be submitted for the change in the number of units.

As of 10.19.23. a new AMM has been submitted and approved by the Fire Dept for the 22-unit proposal.

## Urban Forestry: Rick Nelson // rick.nelson@slcgov.com // 801-972-7839

Urban Forestry's concerns with this project are focused on the preservation of existing trees and the ability to plant new trees in the parkstrips adjacent to the property. Current designs are not compatible with fire safety requirements and the preservation of existing public ROW trees. I suggest looking at ways to gain compliance without the removal of ROW trees.

## Housing Stability Division: Tony Milner // tony.milner@slcgov.com // 801-535-6168

The Housing Stability Division's comments on the revised plans for the planned Highland Townhomes development located at 2901, 2903 Highland Dr., in relation to the City's five-year housing plan, Housing SLC: 2023-2027, https://www.slc.gov/can/housing-SLC/, are as follows.

Concerns:

- No concerns.

Recommendations:

- Salt Lake City is committed to increasing the supply of housing at all levels of affordability.
- We encourage the developer to review the City's available fee waivers and low-interest loan products that support the development and operations of income-restricted affordable units. https://slcrda.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/SLC-Affordable-Residential-Developers-Guide-2019-v1.pdf
- For example: Code 18.98.060: EXEMPTIONS, E:
- "1. The following housing may be exempt from the payment of impact fees, to the following extent:
- A one hundred percent ( $100 \%$ ) exemption shall be granted for rental housing for which the annualized rent per dwelling unit does not exceed thirty percent ( $30 \%$ ) of the annual income of a family whose annual income equals sixty percent ( $60 \%$ ) of the median income for Salt Lake City, as determined by HUD;"
- We encourage the developer to include units with accommodations and amenities in alignment with the Americans with Disabilities Act, such as ramps, wider door frames, grab bars, and roll-in showers to benefit residents with temporary or long-term mobility difficulties.


## Public Utilities: Kristeen Beitel // Kristeen.beitel@slcgov.com // 801-483-6733

. Public Utilities has no issues with the proposed special exceptions for increased building height or modified glazing requirements. Additional comments have been provided to assist the applicant in obtaining a building permit.

The following comments are provided for information only and do not provide official project review or approval.

- Public Utility permit, connection, survey, and inspection fees will apply.
- All utility design and construction must comply with APWA Standards and SLCPU Standard Practices.
- All utilities must meet horizontal and vertical clearance requirements. Water and sewer lines require 10 ft minimum horizontal separation and 18 " minimum vertical separation. Sewer must maintain 5 ft minimum horizontal separation and $12^{\prime \prime}$ vertical separation from any non-water utilities. Water must maintain 3 ft minimum horizontal separation and 12 " vertical separation from any non-sewer utilities.
- Contact SLCPU Street Light Program Manager, Dave Pearson (801-483-6738), for information regarding street lights.
- CC\&R's must address utility service ownership and maintenance responsibility from the public main to each individual unit.
- Utilities cannot cross property lines without appropriate easements and agreements between property owners.
- Site utility and grading plans will be required for building permit review. Please refer to APWA, SLCDPU Standard Practices, and the SLC Design Process Guide for utility design requirements. Other plans such as erosion control plans and plumbing plans may also be required, depending on the scope of work. Submit supporting documents and calculations along with the plans.
- Applicant must provide fire flow, culinary water, and sewer demand calculations to SLCDPU for review. The public sewer and water system will be modeled with these demands. If the demand is not adequately delivered or if one or more reaches of the sewer system reach capacity as a result of the development, a water/sewer main upsizing will be required at the property owner's expense. Additionally, if a new fire hydrant is required, then an upsize will be required. A new fire hydrant cannot connect to the existing 6 " water main. Required improvements on the public water and sewer system will be determined by the Development Review Engineer and may be downstream of the project.
- One culinary water meter is permitted per parcel and fire services, as required, will be permitted for this property. If the parcel is larger than 0.5 acres, a separate irrigation meter is also permitted. Each service must have a separate tap to the main. There are multiple existing water meters to the site. These will need consolidated to a single culinary water meter and service. All unused water services must be killed at the water main per SLCDPU standards.
- A minimum of one sewer lateral per building is required. Existing laterals may be reused, if they pass a video inspection with SLCDPU present. Any unused sewer laterals must be capped and plugged at the sewer main per SLCDPU standards.
- Site stormwater must be collected on site and routed to the public storm drain system. Stormwater cannot discharge across property lines or public sidewalks.
- Stormwater treatment is required prior to discharge to the public storm drain. Utilize stormwater Best Management Practices (BMP's) to remove solids and oils. Green Infrastructure should be used whenever possible. Green Infrastructure and LID treatment of stormwater is a design requirement and required by the Salt Lake City UPDES permit for Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4). If green infrastructure is not used, then applicant must provide documentation of what green infrastructure measures were considered and why these were not deemed feasible. Please verify that plans include appropriate treatment measures.
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