

1 façade remodel at the KFC restaurant located at 6890 South Highland Drive. This is the third time
2 it has come before the ARC. The preferred color scheme was reviewed along with the removal of
3 gooseneck lighting from the sides of the building. A tan and brown color scheme was proposed
4 with a rock material similar to surrounding developments with a continued emphasis on
5 redesigning the entrance.

6
7 Reference was made to the previous proposal which was believed to have turned the building into
8 an advertisement for the franchise, which seemed inappropriate. Mr. Hulka emphasized that the
9 applicant is willing to implement the color scheme that is preferred by the Commission.

10
11 The applicant’s representative confirmed that they are willing to go with either of the suggested
12 color schemes and are open to the preference of the Commission. Earth tones were preferred as
13 opposed to the additional cost of stone.

14
15 Commissioner Valentiner referenced the entrance and believed it was not inviting. He preferred
16 the most subdued design.

17
18 *Commissioner Chapman moved to issue a Certificate of Design Compliance for Project SPL-*
19 *19-003. Commissioner Henriksen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous*
20 *consent of the Commission.*

21
22 **2.3 (Project CUP-19-005) Action on a Request by Stephen Selu (Kimley-Horn)**
23 **for Approval of a Certificate of Design Compliance for a New 7-Eleven**
24 **Convenience Store and Gas Station at 7269 South Union Park Avenue.**

25
26 Mr. Hulka presented the staff report and stated that the above request is from Stephen Selu of
27 Kimley-Horn for approval of a Certificate of Design Compliance for a new 7-Eleven located at
28 7269 South Union Park Avenue. He noted that the property has been granted a variance for
29 setbacks for the building and trash enclosure. A landscaping plan was reviewed. The awnings
30 have been adjusted and a cornice added to the proposed plan. He explained that a gas canopy plan
31 was recently received and is available for further review. Staff recommended approval of the
32 proposed project, especially with the revised plan. He felt that the applicant made a concerted
33 effort to implement recommendations suggested by the Commission.

34
35 Chair Peters commented that with the retaining wall, the entire embankment will be impacted by
36 the footings. He agreed with staff that the vegetation must be protected and should be reflected in
37 the landscaping plan. In addition, trees should be replaced with an understory groundcover to
38 protect the slope where it will be impacted.

39
40 Mr. Taylor recommended having an Arborist determine which trees are valuable and which should
41 be removed. The importance of a buffer along the backside of the creek was emphasized.

42
43 Staff explained that a gas station use is a conditional use and must be reviewed and approved by
44 the Planning Commission. One of the zoning requirements is a seven-foot wall between
45 commercial use and the residential zone or sufficient landscape buffer between. The applicant

1 proposed to maintain the buffer. Landscaping will need to be in place to meet the zoning
2 ordinance.

3
4 ***Commissioner Harman moved to issue a Certificate of Design Compliance for Project SPL-19-
5 005 subject to the following conditions:***

- 6
7 ***1. Revise the entryway design so the windows on both sides of the door are symmetrical.***
- 8
9 ***2. All awnings must be mounted at the same level.***
- 10
11 ***3. Modify the building-mounted light fixtures to match the color of the building.***
- 12
13 ***4. Revise the lighting plan so that the parking lot lights are not more than 18 feet in
14 height.***
- 15
16 ***5. Add a lintel above the entryway and windows.***
- 17
18 ***6. Add a brick sill at the transition from the brick to EIFS material.***
- 19
20 ***7. Add a cornice treatment to the proposed parapets.***
- 21
22 ***8. Preserve the existing vegetation along Little Cottonwood Creek to the greatest extent
23 possible.***
- 24
25 ***9. Add additional trees along the street frontage.***
- 26
27 ***10. Additional signage not shown in this submittal requires approval by the ARC.***
- 28
29 ***11. The applicant shall provide a landscape plan that shows existing vegetation to be
30 protected and details where it is being removed and replaced and a few additional trees
31 along the front.***

32
33 ***Commissioner Henriksen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent
34 of the Commission.***

35
36 **2.4 (Project SPL-19-007) Action on a Request by 1700 Fort Union Partners, LLC
37 for Approval of a Certificate of Design Compliance for 24 New Townhomes at
38 Approximately 1700 East Fort Union Boulevard.**

39
40 Senior City Planner, Matt Taylor presented the staff report and stated that the above request is
41 from 1700 Fort Union Partners, LLC for site plan approval. The property consists of four existing
42 parcels, three of which three include single-family homes with one vacant lot. The surrounding
43 properties were described. Initially, the applicant proposed three live/work units and staff
44 recommended all ground apartments be live/work units as they are exactly the same. The mixed-
45 use would allow for small offices or small client-based services along the main floor. He explained
46 the Fort Union Corridor Plan is intended to redevelop Fort Union Boulevard but does impact the

1 site as they require additional right-of-way to make half of the cross-section work. Staff's
2 recommendation was prepared from the design guidelines based on those recommendations.

3
4 One area of focus was the entrance where the Commission recommended a minimalistic design.
5 Floor plans were discussed. Residents will park in designated units where they will have tandem
6 parking. Staff could place conditions on the Planning Commission in the CC&Rs to address the
7 parking management plan that would include signage of designated commercial parking.

8
9 Commissioner Valentiner expressed concern with the site not being practical with overpopulation
10 and minimal parking.

11
12 Potential parking issues were identified. A comment was made that the proposed development
13 was overcrowded with no open space.

14
15 Mr. Taylor had reservations with the site being tight but believed it could be mitigated with a
16 parking management strategy and appropriate signage. The current zoning allows for the site plan,
17 which complies with site coverage, density, and height regulations. The applicant requested
18 exceptions for a reduction of the front yard. Mr. Taylor stated that although all requirements of
19 the zone are in compliance, the ARC has input regarding the design guidelines. Options for
20 maximizing space were discussed.

21
22 It was suggested that a small porch be added and some units eliminated to maximize the space and
23 create a better flow through the development. A design curve or angular step along the front of
24 the building was recommended.

25
26 Mr. Taylor explained that although the vision for the corridor is more urban, providing too much
27 parking would destroy the urban feel and density necessary to achieve the vision. Having too little
28 parking will create spillage and issues for the neighbors. He believed that the proposed parking
29 falls somewhere in the middle for Cottonwood Heights.

30
31 The applicant stated that they originally proposed the four end units be designated for live/work
32 space. They were open to extending that to the ground floor units. He was agreeable to a small
33 balcony and creating more open space.

34
35 Design guidelines were next discussed. Mr. Taylor stated that the lighting plan was submitted
36 previously and had yet to be reviewed. The landscaping plan requires further refinement and the
37 hammerhead issue needs to be addressed. Bicycle parking was also recommended.

38
39 A comment was made that the matter has not been advanced to an approval stage and the applicant
40 has a lot of work to do and items to consider. The applicant was invited to return with corrections
41 and continue working through recommendations for consideration. Design variation issues were
42 discussed.

43
44 ***Commissioner Harmon moved to continue Project SPL-19-007. Commissioner Chapman***
45 ***seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.***

1 **3.0 Consent Agenda**

2
3 **3.1 Approval of Minutes of June 27, 2019.**

4
5 *Commissioner Henriksen moved to approve the minutes of June 27, 2019 after the following*
6 *process is met: The Recorder will prepare the minutes and email them to each member of the*
7 *Commission. The members will have five days to review the minutes and provide any changes*
8 *to the Recorder. If, after five days there are no changes, the minutes will stand approved. If*
9 *there are changes, the process will be followed until the changes are made and the Commission*
10 *is in agreement, at which time the minutes shall be deemed approved. Commissioner Chapman*
11 *seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.*

12
13 **4.0 ADJOURNMENT**

14
15 *Commissioner Chapman moved to adjourn. Commissioner Henriksen seconded the motion.*
16 *The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.*

17
18 The Architectural Review Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:05 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the*
2 *Cottonwood Heights Architectural Review Commission Meeting held Thursday, June 27, 2019.*

3
4
5

6 Teri Forbes

7 Teri Forbes
8 T Forbes Group
9 Minutes Secretary

10
11 Minutes Approved: September 25, 2019