

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

**City & County Building
451 South State Street, Room 326
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Wednesday, October 22, 2025**

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at approximately 5:30 p.m. Audio recordings of the Planning Commission meetings are retained for a period of time. These minutes are a summary of the meeting and not a verbatim transcript. A video recording of the meeting is available at www.youtube.com/slclivemeetings

Planning Commission members present were: Chair Landon Kraczek, Vice-Chair Brian Scott, and Commissioners Amy Barry, Aimee Burrows, Mike Vela, Lila Rosenfield, Richard Leverett, and Jeff Barrett.

Planning Division Staff members present at the meeting were: Planning Director Nick Norris, Planning Deputy Director Michaela Bell, Planning Manager Amy Thompson, Senior City Attorney Paul Nielson, Senior City Attorney Courtney Lords, Principal Planner Grant Amann, Senior Planner Sara Javoronok, Urban Designer Amanda Roman, and Senior Planner Cassie Younger, Senior Project Manager Wayne Mills.

Chair Landon Kraczek called the meeting to order.

Director Nick Norris called roll. Commissioner Vela was not present for roll call.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

There was nothing to report.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR

There was nothing to report.

OPEN FORUM

There were no questions or comments.

CONSENT AGENDA

1. Design Review & Planned Development at Approximately 145 E 1300 S (Public Hearing) –

Joshua Smith, representing Urban Alfandre, is seeking approval for a multi-family residential development at above-listed address, to include 95 townhomes and 42 apartments. The property is in the CC (Commercial Corridor) Zoning District.

- A. Design Review:** Requesting an additional 15 feet of height from 30 feet to 45 feet maximum, primarily along 1300 South. **Case Number: PLNPCM2025-00572**
- B. Planned Development:** Requesting a reduction in the required front yard setback from 15 feet to approximately 8 feet 2 inches along 1300 South. Also requesting a reduction in the

required corner side yard from 15 feet to approximately 9 feet 11 inches along 200 E and approximately 8 feet 2 inches along State Street. **Case Number: PLNPCM2025-00644**

The subject property is located within Council District 5, represented by Darin Mano. (Staff Contact: Grant Amann 801-535-6171 or grant.amann@slc.gov)

2. Approval of the Meeting Minutes for September 24, 2025, and October 8, 2025

Motion

Commissioner Rosenfield motioned to approve the minutes on the Consent Agenda but move Design Review & Planned Development at Approximately 145 E 1300 S to the regular agenda. Commissioner Burrows seconded the motion.

Vote

- **Yes:** Barrett, Burrows, Leverett (abstained from the minutes), Rosenfield (abstained from the minutes)
- **No:** Barry, Kraczek, Scott
- **Abstain:**

The motion passed 4 to three.

REGULAR AGENDA

Commissioner Vela joined the meeting.

1. Design Review & Planned Development at Approximately 145 E 1300 S (Public Hearing)

Principal Planner Grant Amann reviewed the proposal. He stated that staff recommends approval of the petition with a listed condition.

The applicant representative, Josh Smith, shared background of the proposal.

The Chair opened the public hearing.

Public Hearing

Todd Draper – concerned over the added traffic, existing and proposed trees, and requested setbacks affecting the ability for the road to be widened in the future.

Seeing that no one else wished to speak, the Chair closed the public hearing.

The applicant addressed comments made during the public hearing.

Executive Session

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed:

- Driving access
- The proposed setback relief
- Preservation of the row trees on 1300 S
- Bike lanes on 1300 S
- Length of 1300 S frontage
- Design standards for buildings over 200 ft
- Preservation of urban forestry
- Fire department approval

Design Review Motion 1

Commissioner Burrows motioned to approve the proposal with additional conditions: 1) the lighting and signage plans shall be submitted for review at the building permit phase, 2) work with staff to improve the entry features on the State Street façade, 3) approve a reduction in the required front yard setback on only the westernmost 125 ft of the parcel, and 4) there must be traffic entry on State Street.

Commissioner Vela seconded the motion.

There was discussion among Staff and the Commission regarding the conditions.

Commissioner Burrows withdrew her motion.

Design Review Motion 2

Commissioner Burrows motioned to approve the proposal with the following conditions: 1) the lighting and signage plans shall be submitted for review at the building permit phase, 2) work with staff to improve the entry features on the State Street façade.

Commissioner Rosenfield seconded the motion.

Senior City Attorney Paul Nielson asked that there be clarification on what improvement of the entry features means. There was discussion among staff and the commission on what could be applied to that condition.

Commissioner Burrows amended her motion to include the following on the second condition: that the building façade that front State Street to have entry features as defined in City Code 21A.37.

Commissioner Rosenfield accepted the amendment.

Vote

- **Yes:** Barrett, Barry, Burrows, Kraczek, Leverett, Rosenfield, Scott, Vela
- **No:**
- **Abstain:**

The motion passed unanimously.

Planned Development Motion

Commissioner Burrows motioned to approve the petition with the following conditions: 1) approve a reduction in the required front yard setback on only the westernmost 125 ft of the parcel, and 2) there must be traffic entry approved on State Street.

There was clarifying discussion regarding the 125 ft.
Commissioner Barry seconded the motion.

There was discussion among the commission and staff regarding urban forestry.

There was a friendly amendment suggested by Commission Leverett that if there are modifications to the site plan or if the dimensions change that coincide with the State Street opening after the fire safety review that it would need to come back before the commission for Planned Development.

Commissioner Burrows accepted the friendly amendment.

Vote

- **Yes:** Barrett, Barry, Burrows, Kraczek, Leverett, Scott, Vela
- **No:** Rosenfield
- **Abstain:**

The motion passed 7 to one.

3. **Zoning Map Amendment at Approximately 265 E 100 S** - Joe Brown of Silverado Development, LLC, representing property owners Raven One, LLC, is requesting a Zoning Map Amendment for the above-listed address. The proposal is for a Map Amendment from MU-8 (Mixed Use 8) to D-1 (Central Business) zoning district. The rezone would enable redevelopment of the site with a mixed-use development including ground floor retail and residential units on the upper floors. The property is approximately 2.19 acres or 95,350 sq. ft. Although the applicant has requested that the property be rezoned to the D-1 zone, consideration may be given to rezoning the property to another zoning district with similar characteristics. The subject property is located within Council District 4, represented by Eva Lopez Chavez. (Staff contact: Sara Javoronok at 801-535-7625 or sara.javoronok@slc.gov) **Case Number: PLNPCM2024-01377**

Senior Planner Sara Javoronok reviewed the petition. She stated that Staff recommends forwarding a recommendation of approval to City Council.

Commissioner Rosenfield asked for clarification on zoning for a small sliver of property between the subject property and the D1 district.

The applicant representative, Dave Hunter, gave background information regarding the proposal.

The Chair opened the public hearing.

Public Hearing

Ashley Kinzer – Shared concerns regarding parking, neighborhood dynamics, possible tax increases, and shared what she would like to see for the ground floor activation.

Justone Connie – Central City Neighborhood Council Chair – Would like there to be a 20% volume of 3-bedroom apartments if they are rentals to insure the needs of families in Salt Lake

City. If that is not possible, they would like to see 10% of the building to be in the form of condos to promote home ownership.

Ben Engle – Wants to see more effort at community engagement.

Kyle Holland – Wants to see the zoning approved for higher density housing on the site.

Kurt Cook – Gave some background on the Saint Mark's Church.

Elisabeth Hunter – Concerned with the potential impact construction could have on the cathedral

Bill Leech – Concerned that the new development would impact services that the cathedral provides.

Cindy Cromer – Concerned about the development creeping to the east.

Annie Issacson – Concerned about the proposed upzoning.

Seeing that no one else wished to speak, the Chair closed the public hearing. He reviewed public comments that were heard.

The applicant stated that he was available to the neighborhood to address the concerns brought up and spoke about working with the cathedral to address solar panel issues.

Executive Session

The Commissioners, Staff, and Applicants discussed:

- Development Agreement
 - What it would entail
 - Community benefit options
- Construction vibration control

Motion 1

Commissioner Rosenfield motioned to forward a recommendation of approval to City Council without the height limit.

Commissioner Burrows seconded the motion.

Vote

- **Yes:** Burrows, Leverett, Rosenfield
- **No:** Barrett, Barry, Kraczek, Scott, Vela
- **Abstain:**

The motion failed.

Motion 2

Commissioner Scott motioned to forward a recommendation of approval to City Council.

Commissioner Vela seconded the motion.

Vote

- **Yes:** Barrett, Burrows, Kraczek, Leverett, Rosenfield, Scott, Vela
- **No:** Barry
- **Abstain:**

The motion passed 7 to one.

4. **General Plan & Zoning Map Amendment for the Sugar House Hotel at Approximately 2111 S 1300 E** - John Potter with Magnus Commercial Properties, representing the property owner, is requesting amendments that would facilitate the redevelopment of the above-listed property. The property is .83 acres (36,155 square feet) in size. If approved, the developer intends to build a hotel on the currently vacant site.

- A. **General Plan Amendment:** Requesting to amend the Sugar House Master Plan's land use map from Mixed Use-Low Intensity to Business District Mixed-Use – Town Center Scale. **Case Number: PLNPCM2025-00622**
- B. **Zoning Map Amendment:** Requesting to rezone the property from MU-3 to MU-8. **Case Number: PLNPCM2025-00624**

The subject property is located within Council District 7, represented by Sarah Young. (Staff Contact: Amanda Roman at 801-535-7660 or amanda.roman@slc.gov)

Urban Designer Amanda Roman reviewed the petitions. She stated that Staff recommends forwarding a recommendation of approval to City Council for both petitions.

The applicants, John Potter and Jackson Fergeson, reviewed the proposal.

The Commission and Staff discussed:

- Ground floor use for the project
- Which MU zones allow hotels

The Chair opened the public hearing.

Public Hearing

Judy Short – Expressed overwhelming opposition from Sugar House constituents. Concerns were raised about zoning boundaries, parking, environmental safety, and traffic.

Soren Simonsen – Supports staff's recommendation.

Milton Brazelton – Opposed to the proposal due to the building footprint and the increased traffic.

Ivon Martinez – Concerned about the increased traffic and the traffic pattern.

Francis Lily – Supports the proposal and is excited about the type of use to be added to the neighborhood.

Andrew Capone – Opposed to the proposal due to concerns of increased traffic, lack of parking, not adding jobs to the local community, and disruption of views.

Janet Hemming – Opposed to the proposal due to concerns of existing hotels within the area, hotels not being permitted in the MU-3 zone, and traffic congestion.

Sheila O'Driscoll – Opposed to the proposal due to concerns about the proposed MU-8 zoning.

Kenner Kingston – Opposed to the proposal due to concerns over the viewshed and possible effects on the park.

Richard Lyman – Opposed to the proposal due to concerns of a hotel abutting the park.

Alan Sanderson – Opposed to the proposal due to concerns that the applicant failed to prove a substantial need for another hotel, that the public would not realistically be able to take advantage of the amenities due to lack of parking, and felt that more suitable projects consistent with the existing zoning could be built on the site.

Cindy Cromer – Opposed to the proposal due to concerns that there is no community benefit, and the proposed zoning not being consistent with the surrounding context.

Bim Oliver – Opposed to the proposal due to concerns that the parcel is not, and should not be, an extension of the business district. He also shared concerns over the visual and environmental impact the hotel would have and felt that the proposal was spot zoning.

Lynn Schwartz – Opposed to the proposal. Wants to see the site remain MU-3 and doesn't feel the business district should extend to the east side of 1300 East, saying that it does not comply with the Master Plan.

Moheath Repale – Supports the proposal, saying the city needs to allow for change.

Camile Thorp – Opposed to the request feeling that it does not benefit the community.

Jean Daily – Concerned that the possible flooding of the park with a hotel nearby could be a disaster waiting to happen.

Seeing that no one else wished to speak, the Chair closed the public hearing. He reviewed the public comments.

The applicants addressed public comments regarding water, sunlight obstruction, community benefits, parking capacity, hotel use of the site, and traffic.

Executive Session

The Commission and Staff discussed:

- Definition of a General Plan Amendment
- Hotel as a use for the site
- Growth of Sugar House in the past and future
- Viewsheds
- The project minimally meeting the requirements
- Concerns over the expansion of the business district
- Analysis of the General Plan Amendment standards
- The proposal not providing housing
- Traffic
- Transit
- Hotel maximizing potential public benefits for the site

General Plan Amendment Motion

Commissioner Burrows motion to forward a recommendation of approval to City Council as recommended by staff.

Commissioner Scott seconded the motion.

Vote

- **Yes:** Barrett, Burrows, Kraczek, Leverett, Rosenfield, Scott, Vela
- **No:** Barry
- **Abstain:**

The motion passed 7 to one.

Zoning Map Amendment Motion

Commissioner Burrows motion to forward a recommendation of approval to City Council as recommended by staff.

Commissioner Scott seconded the motion.

Vote

- **Yes:** Barrett, Burrows, Kraczek, Leverett, Rosenfield, Scott, Vela
- **No:** Barry
- **Abstain:**

The motion passed 7 to one.

5. **Zoning Map & General Plan Amendment for the Rio Grande District** – Mayor Mendenhall has initiated a petition to amend the current zoning of 35 parcels within the Rio Grande District from GMU (Gateway Mixed-Use) to D-4 (Secondary Central Business District), amend the Downtown General Plan to incorporate the Rio Grande District Vision & Implementation Plan, and amend the identified midblock walkway map. The subject properties are located between 200 S and 400 S, 500 W and 600 W.

- A. Zoning Map Amendment:** Requesting 35 properties within the Rio Grande neighborhood rezone from GMU (Gateway Mixed Use) to D-4 (Downtown Secondary Central Business District). **Case Number: PLNPCM2025-00181**
- B. General Plan Amendment:** Requesting adoption of the updated Rio Grande District Vision & Implementation Plan and amendment of the midblock walkway map. **Case Number: PLNPCM2025-00180**

The subject property is within Council District 2, represented by Alejandro Puy. (Staff Contact: Cassie Younger at 801-535-6211 or cassie.younger@slc.gov)

Senior Planner Cassie Younger reviewed the petition. She stated that Staff recommends forwarding a recommendation of approval to City Council.

CRA (Community Reinvestment Agency) representative Wayne Mills shared a history of the Depot District and the Rio Grande Implementation Plan.

Commissioner Vela asked if the ground floor of the train station would be open to the public. Staff stated that those conversations had not yet taken place.

Mr. Mills continued his discussion of the intent for the area and the reason behind the request.

The Chair opened the public hearing.

Public Hearing

Seeing that no one wished to speak, the chair closed the public hearing.

The Commission and Staff discussed:

- The length of implementation of the Housing and Reinvestment Zone
- Borders for the General Plan Amendment and Rezone
- CRA must follow zoning rules
- University of Utah property may be exempt if the project serves a state function
- The zoning for the General Plan area
- D3 zoning
- D3 vs D4 height differences
- Benefits to developing the area
- Timelines for development
- Green Loop planning

Executive Session

The commissioners discussed the plan process, and concerns of the treatment of the unhoused in the area.

Motion

Commissioner Barry motioned to forward a recommendation of approval to City Council. Commissioner Vela seconded the motion.

Vote

- **Yes:** Barrett, Barry, Burrows, Kraczek, Leverett, Rosenfield, Scott, Vela
- **No:**
- **Abstain:**

The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 10:25 p.m.

For Planning Commission agendas, staff reports, and minutes, visit the Planning Division's website at slc.gov/planning/public-meetings. Staff Reports will be posted the Friday prior to the meeting and minutes will be posted two days after they are ratified, which usually occurs at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission.