

1                                   **MINUTES OF THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY**  
2                                   **ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION MEETING**

3                                   **Tuesday, January 23, 2019**

4                                   **6:00 p.m.**

5                                   **Cottonwood Heights City Council Work Room**

6                                   **2277 East Bengal Boulevard**

7                                   **Cottonwood Heights, Utah**

8  
9 **Members Present:**      Chair Scott Peters, Robyn Taylor-Granda, Scott Chapman

10  
11 **Staff Present:**           City Manager Tim Tingey

12  
13 **BUSINESS MEETING**

14  
15 Chair Scott Peters called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00 p.m.

16  
17 **1.0     Welcome and Acknowledgements.**

18  
19         **1.1     Ex-Parte Communications or Conflicts of Interest to Disclose.**

20  
21 There were no ex-parte communications or conflicts of interest to disclose.

22  
23 **2.0     Discussion Items**

24  
25         **2.1     (Project PDD-19-001) Discussion on a Proposed Planned Development District**  
26         **Preliminary Plan and Rezone Application for the Redevelopment of**  
27         **Approximately 21.7 Acres at 6695 South Wasatch Boulevard.**

28  
29 City Manager, Tim Tingey reported that the applicants were not able to be present but planned to  
30 meet with the ARC formally at the next meeting. He explained that in addition to a site plan,  
31 ordinance and zoning codes are adopted specifically for Planned Development District (“PDD”)  
32 projects. There are three different tiers of PDD projects. The Council adopted a PDD ordinance  
33 to provide greater flexibility and control over the final design. Mr. Tingey stressed the importance  
34 of the decision, which will next be addressed by the Planning Commission and then by the City  
35 Council who will make the final decision.

36  
37 Mr. Tingey reported that the General Plan addresses the potential to redevelop the very large site  
38 into a mixed-use center. The Wasatch Boulevard Master Plan calls for connected thoroughfares,  
39 street connectivity, a mix of buildings, and unit types. The purpose of the design charette was to  
40 further explore various principles and design concepts. One option was to upgrade it to a boulevard  
41 concept with a transit-oriented component. A rendering of the site was displayed and the  
42 topography identified. Mr. Tingey noted that there are numerous site constraints and restrictions.

43  
44 An office area was identified with a subgrade parking area proposed along with a restaurant and  
45 retail pad. Mr. Tingey referenced an Internal Circulation Plan that will connect to the future  
46 Bonneville Shoreline Trail. He suggested the Design Review Committee provide guidance and

1 approval of an overall design theme that can be used to draft design guidelines that will be adopted  
2 as part of the project. The intent was to provide guidance and limitations going forward. Priority  
3 lanes were proposed during the winter months for bus rapid transit.

4  
5 A preliminary rendering was shown that would reflect height with a view from below the toe of  
6 the hill. Mr. Tingey explained that the zoning is liberal with respect to height on the site. The  
7 proposal is substantially below the maximum height allowed in the ordinance but is still an issue.  
8 The developers provided architecture and design styles they would like to incorporate. Mr. Tingey  
9 stated that the goal should perhaps be to consider the principles of design rather than architecture.

10  
11 A Commission Member considered it more important to provide direction on architectural  
12 materials and colors than architectural style. The intent was to provide cohesiveness within the  
13 community without requiring the same architectural style. Circulation issues were discussed as  
14 well as the lack of walkability. Mr. Tingey commented that there are constraints that must be  
15 overcome and where possible, turned into an amenity. A concern was raised about the lack of  
16 pedestrian areas.

17  
18 A Commission Member noted that the idea of a PUD is to determine the spaces that will work  
19 between buildings and how the buildings and uses will interface. He considered the proposed  
20 project to be a pad development. The intent was to create a cohesive development that will create  
21 inviting places to live in and outside the buildings. Concern was expressed with the lack of a City  
22 Center in Cottonwood Heights. There is an opportunity with the two proposed developments to  
23 create a City Center. It was also suggested that the area be pedestrian-friendly.

24  
25 Mr. Tingey commented that because there is so much density, it will increase the parking  
26 requirement, which eliminates other opportunities. The possibility of underground parking was  
27 discussed along with traffic and circulation issues. Mr. Tingey indicated that the developer will  
28 be limited to two intersections on Wasatch Boulevard. All of the traffic will need to funnel to  
29 those two access points, which will require an internal access road.

30  
31 The comment was made that the architecture steps up from the smallest buildings being up front  
32 and the taller buildings being in the back on the east side. As a result, they are not taking advantage  
33 of the site. In addition, the buildings on the back do not have views across the valley because they  
34 are screened by the tall buildings.

35  
36 It was recommended that the parking be screened and wrapped inside with the office retail outside.  
37 With regard to materials, it was suggested that the City specify what is desired. Mr. Tingey  
38 researched design themes from major tourist cities and identified specific featured elements.  
39 Renderings of street views from various places were displayed and discussed.

40  
41 A comment was made that mixed-use verticality was preferable to mixed-use land use. Ways to  
42 locate uses to provide a sense of community were discussed. A mixed-use development requires  
43 open space and pedestrian connections. It was suggested that they go beyond commercial retail,  
44 commercial office, and residential and think about entertainment uses as well. Connectivity issues  
45 were discussed as well as a desire to not make the same mistake as Lehi. A Commission Member  
46 was of the opinion that the problem is Wasatch Boulevard, which goes through the center of the

1 project. This forces the parking to be located around all of the other buildings. The desire was to  
2 not have a 40 MPH road through the project. Ways to slow down traffic were discussed. The  
3 desire was to narrow the road, provide parking on both sides of the road, and create pedestrian  
4 spaces and activities. The area should also be inviting enough that motorists will be willing to get  
5 off of Wasatch Boulevard.  
6

7 It was noted that the proposed plan places two arterial streets parallel to each other. Because there  
8 is an arterial street on Wasatch Boulevard, there was some question as to why the City would want  
9 another arterial street to bring traffic through as quickly as possible. The desire was for three or  
10 four lanes of two-way traffic with parking. That way cars will travel slowly and stop and  
11 experience the area. The preference was for a narrower road with trees on both sides and a wide  
12 sidewalk rather than a median. A comparison was made to Main Street in Park City.  
13

14 Mr. Tingey stated that there needs to be balance. It was suggested that the residential be developed  
15 in the context of the overall project and be part of the fabric of the community.  
16

## 17 **2.2 Discussion on the Bengal Boulevard Roundabout Design Approximately** 18 **located at 2300 East Bengal Boulevard.** 19

20 Mr. Tingey reported that years ago the City applied for funding for a roundabout using Congestion  
21 Mitigation Funding. The full context of the plan was not being shown as it had not yet been fully  
22 designed. The location at 2300 East Bengal Boulevard was identified on a map displayed. Over  
23 the past two years the City had acquired the needed property and went through an environmental  
24 process. They were now entering the design phase. The City Engineer and Public Works Director  
25 were seeking input on the landscaped areas in terms of aesthetically pleasing plantings that are low  
26 maintenance.  
27

28 The suggestion was made that the design incorporate low-impact development standards such as  
29 water harvesting, directing runoff water into landscaped areas, and filtering water through the  
30 landscaped areas before it goes into the storm drain system. Suggestions were also available for  
31 plant materials that work in different areas. Plants should be salt tolerant since salt will be pulled  
32 off of the roads, be drought tolerant, and adaptive. Care should be taken in U-triangles as well.  
33 Previously, landscaping was not allowed in roundabouts, however, that had changed. This was  
34 thought to be an opportunity to bring what is in the mountains into the City. Plant materials should  
35 be introduced that exist in the mountain areas as well as those that can be found at City Hall. The  
36 intent was for the roundabout area to feel like an extension of City Hall.  
37

38 Commissioner Taylor-Granda commented on a roundabout in South Jordan. A mound was built  
39 inside the roundabout that blocks the view of traffic on either side, which is nerve-wracking. It  
40 was noted that roundabouts function better in terms of circulating traffic through. In the past,  
41 traffic backed up onto the freeway and emergency traffic was directed away from the roundabouts.  
42 That was no longer the case as the issues had been resolved. It was also suggested that there be  
43 nothing on the inside of the roundabout that could be considered an attractive nuisance.  
44

45 This was considered a great opportunity to create an artistic statement about the community.  
46 Mr. Tingey explained that the one of the requirements for acquiring the property was that there be

1 some sort of acknowledgement of the historic value. The Art and Historic Committees were  
2 working on establishing that.

3  
4 It was suggested that there be one grouping of trees at one end and a mix of native shrubs and  
5 ground cover extending out. It should be done in large massings that are legible and avoid salt and  
6 pepper plantings. Mr. Tingey stated that so far the focus has been on the actual design and logistics  
7 of traffic circulation.

8  
9 Robyn Taylor-Granda suggested that there be trees along the long portions of sidewalk to provide  
10 shade. Ways to avoid damage were discussed. It was recommended that sidewalks be no wider  
11 than three feet and of colored or stamped concrete to soften the look. Commissioner Taylor-  
12 Granda's preference was for the roundabout to be low with ample visibility.

### 13 14 **3.0 Consent Agenda**

#### 15 16 **3.1 Approval of Minutes of January 23, 2020.**

17  
18 *Commissioner Taylor-Granda moved to approve the minutes of January 23, 2020, after the*  
19 *following process has been met. The Recorder will prepare the minutes and email them to each*  
20 *member of the Commission. Members will have five days to review the minutes and provide any*  
21 *changes to the Recorder. If, after five days, there are no changes, the minutes will stand*  
22 *approved. If there are changes, the process will be followed until the changes are made and the*  
23 *Commission agrees at which time the minutes shall be deemed approved. Commissioner*  
24 *Chapman seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the*  
25 *Commission.*

### 26 27 **4.0 Adjournment**

28  
29 *Commissioner Chapman moved to adjourn. Commissioner Taylor-Granda seconded the*  
30 *motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.*

31  
32 The Architectural Review Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 7:45 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,*  
3 *January 23, 2020.*

4  
5

6 Teri Forbes

7 Teri Forbes  
8 T Forbes Group  
9 Minutes Secretary

10

11 Minutes Approved: February 27, 2020