

1 **MINUTES OF THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY**
2 **PLANNING COMMISSION WORK MEETING**

3
4 **Wednesday, November 6, 2019**

5 **5:00 p.m.**

6 **Cottonwood Heights City Council Room**

7 **2277 East Bengal Boulevard**

8 **Cottonwood Heights, Utah**
9

10 ***ATTENDANCE***

11
12 **Members Present:** Chair Graig Griffin, Craig Bevan, Jesse Allen, Sue Ryser, Christine Coutts,
13 Dan Mills, Doug Rhodes, Bob Wilde (Alternate)

14
15 **Staff Present:** Community and Economic Development Director Michael Johnson, City
16 Attorney W. Shane Topham, Deputy City Recorder/HR Manager Heather
17 Sundquist, Senior City Planner Matthew Taylor, Associate City Planner
18 Andrew Hulka, Assistant City Planner/Sustainability Analyst Samantha
19 DeSeelhorst
20

21 **WORK SESSION**

22
23 Chair Graig Griffin called the meeting to order at approximately 5:08 p.m. and welcomed those in
24 attendance.
25

26 **1.0 Planning Commission Business.**

27
28 **1.1 Review Business Meeting Agenda.**
29

30 Community and Economic Development Director, Michael Johnson introduced Assistant City
31 Planner/Sustainability Analyst, Samantha DeSeelhorst.
32

33 Associate City Planner, Andrew Hulka addressed Project CUP 19-008 and reported that the
34 property is located at 1810 East Fort Union Boulevard. It had been reviewed previously by the
35 Commission and the proposed changes were identified.
36

37 Mr. Johnson explained that when the project originally was presented, significant concern was
38 expressed by the Planning Commission and the Architectural Review Commission (“ARC”).
39 After the original hearing, the item was continued. The applicant requested additional time to
40 substantially rework the development. On October 30 the ARC approved the project and issued a
41 Certificate of Design Compliance with four recommendations, which were described.
42

43 At the last ARC Meeting, one of the issues addressed was what to do on the rooftop area. The
44 original request was for a height in excess of 35 feet. Some of the comments were that it seemed
45 too large, tall, and tight on the site. With regard to the rooftop stairways, the applicant submitted
46 two options; one with internal stairwells and one with covered stairways above the roof. To the

1 top of the parapet wall is no higher than 35 feet on any of the buildings but the covered stairways
2 and trellises extend beyond that. The applicant was willing to do either design. The ARC preferred
3 having the covered stairwells for several reasons including the concern with snow and leaves
4 creating a maintenance issue. They were also worried that the covered area would provide a
5 separation between each of the units and create privacy. In addition, having the unified trellis
6 design would provide a sense of uniformity and prevent the owners from having umbrellas or
7 temporary structures that may not be uniform. Approval was recommended with the additional
8 height for the covered stairways.

9
10 The project was broken up into three buildings. Some of the comments made by the ARC included
11 a desire to step the units. On the rear unit, the ARC was concerned that it has a flat face and
12 suggested that some interest be added. Major recent changes were described. Building A is 38.5
13 feet tall, Building B is 32.5 feet, and Building C is 39.5 as measured from grade to the top of the
14 stairs. The applicant provided drawings and was willing to remove the stairwells from the front
15 and back buildings. Staff recommended the Commission consider granting approval with Building
16 A in front and require the internal stairwells on Building C. It was noted that Building B, regardless
17 of the stairwells, is only 33 feet in height.

18
19 A question was raised as to how to prevent the rooftop decks from being enclosed. Mr. Taylor
20 explained that there are very specific plans that act as an approval. There were concerns that some
21 of the units have office space on the ground level. The previous design did not provide parking in
22 front of the businesses and there was no internal pedestrian circulation. The units had since been
23 divided into separate buildings. There was still the same amount of guest parking, which exceeds
24 the minimum requirement but there are no pedestrian connections. Previously there were 31 total
25 parking stalls and that number had since been reduced to 29 as a result of the reduction of one unit.
26 There was also concern that the traffic study referenced two-story buildings, however, the
27 proposed buildings are three stories.

28
29 With regard to landscaping, the original plan included 31 trees. The revised plans include 30.
30 There is no minimum landscaping requirement because the total site is less than one acre in size.
31 Street trees will be provided along Fort Union Boulevard. Staff recommended that in areas within
32 20 feet of the drive approaches, shrubs be maintained to be no taller than three feet in height. Trees
33 shall be pruned to 10 feet.

34
35 With regard to the sidewalks, Mr. Hulka reported that the desired width of the Fort Union
36 Boulevard sidewalk is seven feet with five feet for a bike lane. It was suggested that there be
37 consistency. It was noted that the half width dedication of the right-of-way is equal for both
38 projects. Project renderings were reviewed.

39
40 Staff recommended approval subject to the conditions set forth in the staff report.

1 **1.2 (Project PDD-19-001) Discussion on a Proposed Planned Development District**
2 **Preliminary Plan and Rezone Application for the Redevelopment of**
3 **Approximately 21.7 Acres at 6695 South Wasatch Boulevard Currently in the**
4 **F-1-21 (Foothill Residential) Zone and Identified in the General Plan for**
5 **Mixed-Use Development.**
6

7 Mr. Taylor reported that the above request was presented at the last meeting. The applicant
8 discussed the issue of the corporate headquarters they are proposing. They are requesting the
9 City’s support and plan to build an apartment structure that will serve as their corporate
10 headquarters. The plans include 650 to 800 parking stalls. At a recent meeting with staff it was
11 reported that UDOT’s goal is 5,000 stalls near the mouth of the canyon. They felt that a shared
12 parking situation would be advantageous rather than constructing a parking structure that is built
13 and used exclusively for parking. The various aspects of the project were described. Cottonwood
14 Heights City asked that the other corporate buildings down the hill make their parking available
15 outside of office hours to alleviate traffic congestion in the canyons. It was reported that the
16 Canyon Center is charging a fee for parking.
17

18 A question was raised about seismic data and the fault. Mr. Taylor explained that the information
19 that is available is from the last five years. Western Geologic and GeoStrata Engineering were
20 hired to provide an analysis. An entire chapter in the ordinance is dedicated to how it is to be
21 studied. The burden is on an applicant to submit the studies, which are reviewed by the contract
22 geologist against the Code.
23

24 Mr. Taylor reported that staff was in the process of reviewing the comments received from the
25 Planning Commission and the Engineering Department. The intent was to have the application
26 back before the Commission in the next few weeks. Potential options on the site were discussed
27 in detail as well as constraints that exist.
28

29 A question was raised about amenities for the condos and apartments. The applicant stated that
30 there will be several amenities including patio and courtyard areas, a swimming pool, fire pits,
31 sports courts, and gathering areas. Commissioner Coutts’ understanding was that with the special
32 zoning, one of the advantages is that the City would get something in return. She asked what the
33 benefit would be to the City. The applicant explained that there will be trail connections and
34 landscaped gathering areas along the trail. The condominiums will be 10 stories tall on top of five
35 stories of parking. The apartments will consist of five stories on top of two stories of parking. It
36 was noted that the ordinance requires a tremendous amount of detail and the current plans are far
37 from being fully articulated. It was suggested that 50 feet of parking garage not be shown next to
38 the trail. While both the apartments and condominiums have above ground parking, it will be
39 hidden.
40

41 **1.4 Adjournment.**
42

43 *Commissioner Coutts moved to adjourn the Work Session. Commissioner Rhodes seconded the*
44 *motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.*
45

46 The Work Session adjourned at 6:27 p.m.

1 **MINUTES OF THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY**
2 **PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

3
4 **Wednesday, November 6, 2019**

5 **6:00 p.m.**

6 **Cottonwood Heights City Council Room**

7 **2277 East Bengal Boulevard**

8 **Cottonwood Heights, Utah**
9

10 **ATTENDANCE**

11
12 **Members Present:** Chair Graig Griffin, Craig Bevan, Jesse Allen, Sue Ryser, Christine Coutts,
13 Dan Mills, Doug Rhodes, Bob Wilde (Alternate)

14
15 **Staff Present:** Community and Economic Development Director Michael Johnson, City
16 Attorney W. Shane Topham, Deputy City Recorder/HR Manager Heather
17 Sundquist, Senior City Planner Matthew Taylor, Associate City Planner
18 Andrew Hulka, Assistant City Planner Samantha DeSeelhorst, Youth City
19 Council Representative Nicholas Johnson
20

21 **BUSINESS MEETING**

22
23 **1.0 WELCOME/ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

24
25 Chair Graig Griffin called the Business Meeting to order at approximately 6:32 p.m. and welcomed
26 those in attendance.

27
28 **1.1 Ex-Parte Communications or Conflicts of Interest to Disclose.**

29
30 There were no conflicts.
31

32 **2.0 General Public Comment**

33
34 Laron Selfridge a Cottonwood Heights resident, thanked the Commission for their efforts in
35 educating the public. He also appreciated staff and the work they do. He was informed by the
36 Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”) that there is no intention in the near future of any lines coming
37 into Cottonwood Heights. If the Planning Commission and City Council wish to create a
38 sustainable city, the population must increase in a concentrated area. He did not support the
39 Mixed-Use zone and considered it a mechanism to create community development and mimic
40 every other city along the Wasatch Front. He suggested taking the existing commercial and
41 potential high-density multi-family and divert it to the town center. He pointed out that the area
42 is intended to serve as a gateway to the canyons. To divert it would encourage UTA to consider
43 coming to Cottonwood Heights.
44

45 There were no further public comments. The public comment period was closed.
46

1 **3.0 BUSINESS ITEMS**

2
3 **3.1 (Project CUP-19-008) – A Public Hearing and Possible Action on a Request by**
4 **Nathan Anderson for Approval of 12 Mixed-Use Live-Work Townhomes,**
5 **including a Conditional Use Permit for the Inclusion of a Third Story, at 1810**
6 **East Fort Union Boulevard in the MU – Mixed-Use Zone.**
7

8 Associate City Planner, Andrew Hulka presented the staff report and displayed an aerial view of
9 the site. The property is zoned Mixed-Use and what is proposed is a permitted use in the zone.
10 The matter was before the Commission to address the site plan approval as well as the conditional
11 use approval for the third story. The various changes proposed since the project was initially
12 presented were reviewed.
13

14 The property is in the Gateway Overlay District, which requires a Certificate of Design
15 Compliance from the Architectural Review Commission (“ARC”). The certificate was issued on
16 October 30 by the ARC with conditions of approval. One condition involved addressing the
17 rooftop area. The ARC preferred a rooftop area with covered stairs as opposed to an open rooftop
18 deck with internal stairwells. The ARC also addressed the building massing and specifically the
19 rear elevation.
20

21 Since the original submittal, the applicant has provided new designs. The comments pertaining to
22 the original design with one large building and 13 units were primarily that it was too large and
23 does not fit the site. The revised plans split the one 13-unit building into three buildings with four
24 units each for a total of 12. The change reduces the overall project density from 24 units per acre
25 to 22.
26

27 Mr. Hulka reported that the applicant provided two options for consideration. One with all of the
28 buildings at 35 feet in height or lower from grade and one with covered stairwells above the roof
29 that extend above 35 feet on the front and back. With regard to setbacks, initially the applicant
30 was requesting a conditional use permit for reduced setbacks, however, many felt it was too close
31 to Brookhill Drive and Fort Union Boulevard. The new site plan meets all required setbacks.
32

33 With regard to height, Mr. Hulka explained that the measurement to the top of the parapet wall
34 above the roof is less than 35 feet in every case. A portion of Buildings A and C, however, exceeds
35 that limit. The applicant submitted another optional design that did not include any structures
36 above the parapet wall on the roofs of Buildings A and C. the result was to bring the height of the
37 buildings under 35 feet in all cases to the highest point. In both options, Building B was lower
38 than 35 feet.
39

40 Parking was addressed frequently during the last public hearing. Each unit has two parking stalls
41 with five guest parking spaces available off-street rather than in the garages. The original plan
42 included 31 parking spaces with the revised plan showing 29. That number was reduced by two
43 when one unit was lost as part of the redesign. One concern with parking was that Brookhill Drive
44 is a narrow street and it can be difficult to pass when cars are parked on both sides of the street.
45 Staff’s recommendation was to post no parking signs and restrict parking to one side of the street
46 along a portion of Brookhill Drive.

1
2 With regard to landscaping, the new plan includes 30 trees. The original plan proposed 31. Along
3 the rear property line, the trees were more closely clustered together. The intent was to provide a
4 landscape buffer between the project and the adjacent residential properties. Staff recommended
5 a condition be added that the clear view areas adjacent to the driveway accesses remain open. It
6 was recommended that trees be pruned that are within 20 feet of the accesses to 10 feet. Shrubs
7 within 20 feet will be maintained at a height of no greater than three feet.
8

9 One of the concerns raised during the Work Session pertained to Building C. The Commission
10 did not want a situation where residents can see over the edge and down into the neighboring
11 properties. The applicant submitted floor plans showing one-third of the roof dedicated to solar
12 panels and mechanical equipment. The intent was for the rooftop deck to face away from the
13 neighboring properties and create an additional buffer.
14

15 Renderings of the site were displayed. Another option was to have the internal stairwells not
16 extend above the roof. Staff recommended approval subject to the seven conditions set forth in
17 the staff report. Mr. Hulka explained that with the redesign, the applicant indicated that just the
18 four units facing Fort Union Boulevard will be used as live-work units. The impact was expected
19 to be minimal.
20

21 The applicant, Nathan Anderson referred to the ARC's recommendation that the stair tower
22 remains consistent. He explained that the rooftop deck area is highly sought after by the
23 homeowners who expressed interest in purchasing the units. They also placed solar panels on half
24 of the roof structure and a rooftop deck on the other half separated by a parapet wall. The stair
25 tower would be oriented away from the neighbors on the south.
26

27 With regard to the commercial along the front along Fort Union Boulevard will include offices
28 that are 9 ½ feet x 12 feet in size. In total, all four combined will be only 455 square feet. Mr.
29 Anderson noted that the live-work units that have been developed in Salt Lake City have done
30 quite well and tend not to generate much traffic or customers.
31

32 On Building C, there are windows facing south on the third level. The windows on the second
33 level are above the cabinetry, which lets light into the unit without impacting the view. He
34 commented that the use of the offices will be governed by the CC&Rs as well as what occurs on
35 the rooftop decks. No advertising will be allowed on the doors and no commerce will take place
36 in the offices other than those fronting Fort Union Boulevard.
37

38 Mr. Anderson was commended for proposing the solar panels on the roof as for his response to the
39 Fort Union Master Plan for the front at the main street level. Support was expressed for the lack
40 of retaining and the ability to make it accessible from the street level. It was reported that there
41 will be no dumpsters on the site. All trash and recycling bins will be stored inside the garages. It
42 was clarified that each unit will have its own garbage bins.
43

44 Chair Griffin opened the public hearing.
45

1 Sydnee Quigley a neighboring resident, commented on the garbage cans and stated that there will
2 be 36 garbage cans lined up along Brookhill Drive on garbage day. With regard to parking, she
3 asked if the project will be ADA compliant and provide handicapped stalls. She asked how the
4 sidewalk connects to the existing properties and if the units will be rented or owned. She reported
5 that she drives 700 East frequently and has noticed flags, banners, and trellises on these types of
6 buildings. She asked how they will control that. In addition, there are large orange signs that
7 prevent people from touching the solar panels. She asked if that type of equipment will be on the
8 rooftops as well. Ms. Quigley asked about parking and who will monitor it and who will be
9 responsible for maintaining the landscaping. She noted that the area around Fort Union Boulevard
10 has very limited visibility and she urged the Commission to take into consideration the fact that
11 Brookhill Drive is very narrow. During a past medical emergency, medical personnel were unable
12 to navigate the street to reach her now deceased husband.

13
14 Bill Smelser noted that the Fire/Traffic Study was completed in June when school was not in
15 session. As the area in question is part of a school bus route, he did not believe the study provided
16 an accurate picture of the traffic pattern on Brookhill Drive. In addition, the study covered the
17 mouth of Brookhill Drive and Fort Union Boulevard but did not address the area directly around
18 the school. Because of congestion on Fort Union Boulevard, most of the traffic is diverted down
19 Brookhill Drive. Mr. Smelser explained that the traffic the project will generate increased traffic
20 into the school zone. He understood that development is inevitable, but it should be done
21 responsibly. Cost-effectiveness for developers results in greater profit; however, Mr. Smelser did
22 not feel the burden should be placed on the neighborhood to subsidize those profits. He reported
23 that over 65% of the project is on Brookhill Drive and not on Fort Union Boulevard. For that
24 reason, he felt it should not be referred to as a Fort Union project. Mr. Smelser requested that an
25 additional traffic study be undertaken to accurately reflect traffic on school days. Mr. Smelser
26 indicated that there are portions of the Brookhill Drive that are only 20 feet wide, which is
27 comparable to an alleyway. Adding additional traffic to such a narrow road would pose a safety
28 threat to children and others who will be forced to walk in the street due to a lack of sidewalks.

29
30 Randi Robison reported that she has resided in the Brookhill area since April 2019. She has three
31 teenaged children, all of whom are licensed drivers with their own vehicles. All three park their
32 cars on the street in front of the family home. Ms. Robison stated that if parking for the proposed
33 project is designated to be on the street, residents and their guests will occupy on-street parking
34 spaces that are needed by the residents of the single-family homes. She reiterated that this will
35 pose a major safety risk for neighborhood residents, particularly since there is no sidewalk for
36 pedestrians. She challenged the applicant's statement that mixed-use developments are common,
37 as she was unaware of any in the Cottonwood Heights area. She asked if the applicant is a resident
38 of Cottonwood Heights and whether he would appreciate a similar project so close to his home.
39 She asked that committee members consider visiting the location during school hours to experience
40 firsthand how congested the area can be, before making a decision.

41 A Commissioner acknowledged that the parking situation is a dichotomy. Ms. Robison was asked
42 what her parking preference would be. She remarked that any solution that requires on-street
43 parking would ultimately encroach on spaces currently utilized by her family. Staff was asked if
44 it is possible to provide parking for residents only. Mr. Hulka confirmed that there is a provision
45 in the ordinance for permit parking near the Ferguson Canyon Trailhead. Residents and guests
46 would be required to obtain permits to park there, which can be enforced.

1
2 The width of the right-of-way was estimated to be 45 feet wide.
3

4 Mike Jessop brought up the construction process for the project and stated that he has been
5 involved in the development of similar projects. He felt that the proposed space and road are not
6 adequate for the project, particularly the road. Once construction begins, truck traffic and
7 equipment will increase and impede local traffic.
8

9 Nicki Selfridge identified her property on the map displayed and expressed concern with traffic.
10 She suggested the Commission visit the area on a Wednesday when school is in session and
11 garbage cans are out for collection. Between on-street parking and the presence of garbage cans,
12 she was concerned about school busses having difficulty navigating the road. In addition, she
13 voiced concern about issues relative to snow removal and blocking available parking spaces. She
14 expressed a desire to have sidewalks extended for pedestrian safety. Ms. Selfridge was concerned
15 about people who live on the opposite side of the development and suggested that solar panels be
16 placed in a manner that will prevent residents of the new development from seeing down into
17 neighboring properties.
18

19 Chair Griffin commented that school buses are nine-feet wide but there is 26 feet of asphalt. As a
20 result, two school buses would be able to pass one another even with garbage cans on the
21 street. While not ideal, it is possible.
22

23 Xiaofen Jin identified herself as the new owner of a duplex next to the proposed development. She
24 was concerned that the presence of high buildings will cast excess shade on her property and
25 permanently block the sun. A lack of sunlight was raised a health concern for Ms. Jin. In addition,
26 occupants of the new development would have a clear view into her backyard, which will eliminate
27 her privacy. Because she shares a driveway with the homeowners of the adjoining unit, it is
28 necessary to back their vehicles onto Brookhill Drive, because it is not possible to execute a turn.
29 If there is an increase in cars parked on the street, it will be difficult for her to safely back out. She
30 expressed a desire for rooftops of the new project not be accessible, as she would not be
31 comfortable seeing people standing at such a great height. In addition, she was concerned about
32 24 garbage cans lining the street, and the impact it will have on drivers. She asked where the
33 transformers will be located. If close to her home, they could pose a health risk for her as well as
34 result in increased noise pollution. She was also worried that the project will result in additional
35 lighting, which will make it difficult for her to sleep.
36

37 Bliss Allen was concerned about the narrow roadway, primarily because when people come into
38 the neighborhood, they are approaching from Fort Union Boulevard where there the speed limit is
39 40 miles per hour. Turning drivers approach at speeds so as not to inconvenience drivers behind
40 them. On a weekly basis, there is a landscaping truck and trailer parked close to this turn, resulting
41 in a very congested, dangerous situation. The addition of trash cans would exacerbate the situation.
42 She suggested the possibility of making use of the large parking lot at the fire station.
43

44 Gary Allen reported that he attended many meetings related to the accessory dwelling unit and
45 recalled that parking was a concern then as well. The project currently in question involves half
46 as many units. He asked why the applicant is requesting that an exception be made for him rather

1 than going through appropriate channels. With regard to the applicant maximizing the property
2 by reducing the total density by one unit, Mr. Allen felt that the reduction was not significant
3 enough. The addition of living space on the patio rooftops was of particular concern. He noted
4 that none of the surrounding properties have rooftop living spaces. He agreed that the installation
5 of solar units will create a buffer for properties to the south but felt that the necessary condenser
6 will lead to an increase in noise for the surrounding residents. He believed that if “no parking”
7 signs are placed on the property, people will simply park further down the road, as has happened
8 at Pinnacle Highland Apartments, where cars are frequently parked bumper to bumper.

9
10 Laron Selfridge addressed a previous discussion about the CC&Rs. He state that CC&Rs are not
11 enforceable unless the City is consistent. In his experience, CC&Rs do not typically have a long
12 duration. He previously recommended to staff that requirements be listed on the plat so that they
13 are clearly visible to residents. He remained concerned about water and sewer. In past years,
14 numerous water and sewer lines have broken on Brookhill Drive. He questioned whether water
15 and sewer authorities have adequately reviewed the development plans. With regard to trees being
16 planted on the south side of the development, Mr. Selfridge recommended the use of mature trees.
17 He also felt it would be ideal for the bathrooms in the units be southerly located to provide as much
18 privacy as possible for both the occupants and the surrounding residents. He questioned whether
19 the suggestions regarding solar panels are enforceable

20
21 There were no further public comments. The public hearing was closed.

22
23 A question was raised about the lighting ordinance and if it addresses rooftop lighting. Mr. Hulka
24 explained that in a commercial or mixed-use zone, lighting must be full cut off and directly
25 shielded away from adjacent properties in residential zones. A photometric plan would also need
26 to be submitted that shows very little or no light trespass at the property lines as measured from
27 the ground. The conditions of approval also reference the outdoor lighting standards. It was
28 clarified that any permanent lighting must comply with the ordinance that is in place. The intent
29 was to eliminate the direct impact of the bright bulbs and the light trespass. Any lighting emanating
30 from the site will be indirect and minimal.

31
32 With regard to a question raised regarding signage, Mr. Hulka explained that there is no master
33 plan so signs will be regulated by what is allowed in the Mixed-Use zone. With regard to the
34 CC&Rs, staff will make sure that they exist but will not review or enforce them. In response to a
35 question raised, Mr. Anderson explained that the top of the parapet wall surrounding the
36 townhomes is approximately 4 ¾ feet tall. The tallest air conditioning unit stands 3 ½ feet.
37 Mr. Hulka explained that the Mixed-Use zone requires rooftop mechanical equipment to be
38 completely screened from the public view. A comment was made that if there is to be rooftop
39 access it should be consistent across all buildings. The CC&Rs will also make it easier to control
40 what is up there.

41
42 With regard to parking, a comment was made that to restrict parking on Brookhill Drive will annoy
43 the residents. If, however, they restrict parking within the project, people will just go up the street
44 and park in front of private homes. A suggestion was made that they either prohibit the rooftop
45 access on Building C or request that the building be lowered to match Building B.

1 In response to a comment about the difficulty pulling onto Fort Union Boulevard, Mr. Hulka stated
2 that there is a clear view requirement that prohibits vertical obstructions within a specific distance
3 of the intersection. It was noted that the buildings are fully compliant with the setback
4 requirements.

5
6 With regard to snow and snow removal, Mr. Hulka explained that it is a private development so
7 the residents must provide its own snow removal service. Snow cannot be placed on public
8 property and the minimum parking requirement must be maintained.

9
10 ***Commissioner Allen moved to approve Project CUP-19-008 subject to the following:***

11
12 ***Conditions:***

- 13
14 ***1. The final site plan shall comply with all conditions of the Architectural Review
15 Commissioner’s Certificate of Design Compliance.***
- 16
17 ***2. The applicant shall submit an outdoor lighting plan that complies with the
18 standards of Section 19.77 (Outdoor Lighting) of the zoning ordinance.***
- 19
20 ***3. The final plan shall include a plan with details for all equipment and dumpster
21 locations and screening if applicable and a plan for residential waste and
22 recycling pickup.***
- 23
24 ***4. No “No Parking” signs shall be required on the west side of Brookhill Drive.***
- 25
26 ***5. All trees within 20 feet of the driveway approaches shall be pruned to 10 feet and
27 all shrubs within 20 feet of the driveway approaches shall be maintained at no
28 more than three feet in height.***
- 29
30 ***6. The final plan shall include a traffic letter that is updated to remove any
31 references to two-story buildings.***
- 32
33 ***7. The applicant shall provide full frontage improvements in accordance with the
34 Fort Union Corridor Master Plan and City right-of-way standards.***
- 35
36 ***8. Building C shall not have any rooftop access.***

37
38 ***Commissioner Rhodes seconded the motion.***

39
40 ***Commissioner Ryser moved to amend the motion to include a condition that references a
41 signage master plan. The amendment died for lack of a second.***

42
43 ***Vote on motion: Jesse Allen-Aye, Sue Ryser-Aye, Christine Coutts-Aye, Doug Rhodes-Aye, Dan
44 Mills-Aye, Craig Bevan-Aye, Chair Griffin-Aye. The motion passed unanimously. Alternate
45 Planning Commission Member, Bob Wilde did not participate in the vote.***

1 **4.0 CONSENT AGENDA**

2
3 **4.1 Approval of Planning Commission Minutes.**

4
5 **4.1.1 Approval of Minutes of September 4, 2019.**

6
7 *Commissioner Coutts moved to approve the minutes of September 4, 2019. Commissioner*
8 *Bevan seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. Alternate Planning Commission*
9 *Member, Bob Wilde did not participate in the vote.*

10
11 **4.1.2 Approval of Minutes of October 16, 2019.**

12
13 *Commissioner Coutts moved to approve the minutes of October 16, 2019. Commissioner Allen*
14 *seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with one abstention. Commissioner*
15 *Bevan abstained from the vote as he was not present at the October 16, 2019 meeting. Alternate*
16 *Planning Commission Member, Bob Wilde did not participate in the vote.*

17
18 **5.0 ADJOURNMENT**

19
20 *Commissioner Bevan moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Coutts.*
21 *The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission. Alternate Planning*
22 *Commission Member, Bob Wilde did not participate in the vote.*

23
24 The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:30 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the*
2 *Cottonwood Heights City Planning Commission Meeting held Wednesday, November 6, 2019.*

3
4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes
7 T Forbes Group
8 Minutes Secretary

9
10 Minutes Approved: January 8, 2020