

MINUTES OF THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION ("ARC") MEETING HELD IN-PERSON AND VIA ZOOM ON THURSDAY, MAY 25, 2023, AT 6:00 P.M. AT COTTONWOOD CITY HALL LOCATED AT 2277 EAST BENGAL BOULEVARD, COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS, UTAH.

Members Present: Commissioner Zahra Hassanipour
Commissioner Niels Valentiner
Commissioner Scott Peters
Commissioner Sarah Kovac

Staff Present: Community and Economic Development Director, Michael Johnson
Senior City Planner, Samantha DeSeelhorst
Associate City Planner Ian Harris
Deputy City Recorder, Maria Devereaux
IT Tech, Alex Earl

Excused: Commissioner Scott Chapman
Commissioner Stephen Harman
Commissioner Scott Henrickson

Others: Roy Wamboldt
Sandy Rudolph

BUSINESS MEETING

1.0 Welcome and Acknowledgements.

In the absence of Chair Chapman, Commissioner Kovac assumed the role of Chair and called the meeting to order at 6:03 P.M.

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

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

2.0 Business Items

2.1 (Project SPL-23-001) Review and Potential Action on a Certificate of Design Compliance Request from Sandy Rudolph for a Detached Garage at 1399 East Fort Union Boulevard.

Senior City Planner, Samantha DeSeelhorst displayed the property request under review at 1399 East Fort Union Boulevard and stated that the applicants are seeking a Certificate of Design Compliance for a detached garage project. Staff recommended approval with two conditions. The property is across from the Union Park Commercial Area. Ms. DeSeelhorst displayed an aerial view of the project. The property is zoned Neighborhood Commercial but is in the Gateway Overlay District.

1
2 The property is used as an insurance office and private residence, which is allowed in a
3 Neighborhood Commercial Zone. In 2021, the ARC reviewed and approved the exterior remodel
4 of the building. This remodel received the City's Landscape Beautification Award for the
5 Commercial Business category and received some recognition in the City.
6

7 The current request is approval for a detached garage project for a 30 ft by 64 ft detached garage
8 in the rear yard. The applicant also plans to do updated fencing on the west and rear property lines
9 using wood and galvanized metal fencing that will be 6 to 10 feet high. They are also planning to
10 update a portion of the aging lawn in the backyard with some raised planter beds and trees.
11

12 Ms. DeSeelhorst displayed the Site Plan showing the existing building in the forefront and the
13 proposed detached garage in the rear. The proposed fencing will run along two property lines.
14 There is an existing fence along the east side. The area of lawn the applicant is proposing to
15 remove is along the north property line. They are proposing to add trees and some raised beds.
16 The material proposed for the detached garage is metal in onyx and cream colors. The request was
17 analyzed by staff in terms of compliance with the City Code and Design Guidelines. Staff found
18 it to be fully compliant with the setbacks and height requirements and had no recommended
19 conditions there.
20

21 The purpose of the garage was for personal storage related to the residence, which is allowed in
22 the zone.
23

24 The Design Guidelines were reviewed and the project was found to be compliant. The applicant
25 is not proposing to not redevelop the entire site. They are not changing the access or the public
26 entry. That rear portion is not visible from Fort Union. The only condition the City recommended
27 was planting five new trees. The applicant has proposed to remove six trees as part of the
28 construction. The applicant was originally proposing three as a replacement. They are also
29 recommending that some Evergreen material should be used.
30

31 Ms. DeSeelhorst stated that the grading slopes backward, so the road sits higher. The garage is
32 20' 4". A building can be up to 35 feet in that zone. It is lower than what is allowed and was
33 characterized as a minor addition.
34

35 In response to a comment, Ms. DeSeelhorst reiterated that the property is not in a residential zone.
36 The Neighborhood Commercial Zone allows for a mixed-use building with a residential
37 component. The applicant had considered using some wood materials on the detached garage if
38 feasible. It was noted that the curb appeal is good and no one will see the building except for the
39 applicant.
40

41 The applicant, Sandy Rudolph stated that she tried to match the look of the existing building as
42 much as she could. Cost was an issue. She stated that there is also an issue with people coming
43 over the wall from the commercial building next door, which is a security issue. Ms. Rudolph
44 stated that she will probably place black garage doors on the garage to match the existing building
45 to the extent possible. She was also considering placing faux windows on the new garage.
46

1 Ms. DeSeelhorst discussed Design Guidelines relative to security and maintenance. The City
2 found that the project meets the intent of providing greater property security. She asked if the
3 Commission had any feedback on the City's recommended conditions. Ms. Rudolph commented
4 that she has already purchased three Evergreen trees.

5
6 ***Commissioner Valentiner moved to APPROVE the request and issue a Certificate of Design
7 Compliance for Project SPL-23-001 subject to the following:***

8
9 ***Conditions:***

- 10
11 ***1. For the removal of six trees, at least five new trees shall be planted on site.***
12
13 ***2. Some evergreen plant material should be provided, whether in tree form
14 (counting toward the five-tree minimum) or shrubbery form.***
15

16 ***Commissioner Hassanipour seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous
17 consent of the Commission.***

18
19 **3.0 Consent Agenda**

20
21 **3.1 Approval of Minutes of May 25, 2023.**

22
23 ***Commissioner Peters moved to APPROVE the minutes of May 25, 2023, after the following
24 process has been met. The Recorder will prepare the minutes and email them to each member
25 of the Commission. Members will have five days to review the minutes and provide any changes
26 to the Recorder. If, after five days, there are no changes, the minutes will stand approved. If
27 there are changes, the process will be followed until the changes are made and the Commission
28 agrees at which time the minutes shall be deemed approved. Commissioner Hassanipour
29 seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.***

30
31 **4.0 Adjournment**

32
33 ***Commissioner Peters moved to adjourn. Commissioner Valentiner seconded the motion. The
34 motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.***

35
36 **4.1 The Next Meeting is Scheduled for June 22, 2023, Pending Agenda Items.**

37
38 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, May 25, 2023.*
3
4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes

7 T Forbes Group

8 Minutes Secretary

9
10 Minutes Approved: _____