

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

**City & County Building
451 South State Street, Room 326
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
Wednesday, November 12, 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, Richard Leverett, Lila Rosenfield, and Mike Vela, Commissioner Jeff Barrett was absent from the meeting.

Planning Division Staff members present at the meeting were: Planning Manager Kelsey Lindquist, Planning Manager John Anderson, Senior City Attorney Courtney Lords, Senior Planner Sara Javoronok, Principal Planner Ben Buckley, Senior Planner Brooke Olson, Principal Planner Grant Amann, and Office Facilitator Aubrey Clark.

Chair Landon Kraczek called the meeting to order.

Commission Secretary Aubrey Clark called roll.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

There was nothing to report.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR

Planning Manager Kelsey Lindquist reported that the update to the Northwest Community plan has been posted on the Planning Division website and the first public hearing will be held in December.

OPEN FORUM

Commissioner Rosenfield remarked on comments made by her at a previous commission meeting and spoke on fear of change. Commissioner Vela questioned whether the Commission could do more to facilitate better neighborhoods. He also spoke about firetruck access on dead-end streets.

CONSENT AGENDA

- 1. Extension Request for Planned Development Approval at Approximately 602 & 612 E 300 S and 321 S 600 E** – Thom Jakab, representing the property owners, is requesting a one-year extension for the Bamboo Multifamily project approved on November 29, 2023, and granted a previous one-year extension on November 13, 2024. The subject property is zoned RMF-35 (Moderate Density Multi-family) and 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: PLNPCM2023-000124**

2. **Extension Request for Planned Development & Design Review Approval at Approximately 1518 S 300 W** – Jarod Hall of Di’velept Design LLC, representing the property owners, is requesting a one-year extension for the 300 West Apartments Planned Development and Design Review approved on January 10, 2024, and granted a one-year extension on December 11, 2024. The subject properties are zoned MU-11 and are located within Council District 5, represented by Darin Mano. (Staff Contact: Kelsey Lindquist at 801-535-7930 or kelsey.lindquist@slc.gov.com) **Case Number: PLNPCM2023-00001 & PLNPCM2023- 00456**
3. **Extension Request for Design Review Approval at Approximately 850 W 100 S** - Jeff Douglas, representing the property owner, is requesting a one-year time extension for a Design Review originally approved on November 13, 2024. When originally heard and approved by the Planning Commission, the subject property was zoned TSA-UN-T. It is now zoned MU-5. It is within Council District 2, represented by Alejandro Puy. (Staff Contact: Ben Buckley at 801-535-7142 or benjamin.buckley@slc.gov) **Case Number: PLNPCM2024-01038**
4. **Approval of the Meeting Minutes for October 22, 2025**

Motion

Commissioner Vela motioned to approve the Consent Agenda.
Commissioner Rosenfield seconded the motion.

Vote

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

The motion passed.

REGULAR AGENDA

5. **Rezone at Approximately 2260, 2270 & 2290 E 1300 S** – J-Development, LLC, property owner representative, is requesting approval to rezone the above-listed properties from R-1/7000 (Single Family Residential) to MU-3 (Mixed Use District 3). There are existing single-family dwellings on the properties. The proposed rezone is intended to allow for a portion of a 26-unit residential development, which includes approximately 8 townhomes and 18 condominiums. Ten percent of the units are proposed to be set aside as affordable units for buyers who meet 80% of the Area Medium Income (AMI) as the proposed community benefit. The subject property is located within Council District 6, represented by Dan Dugan. (Staff Contact: Brooke Olson at 801-535-7118 or brooke.olson@slc.gov) **Case Number: PLNPCM2025-00558**

Senior Planner Brooke Olson reviewed the petition. She stated that staff recommend the Planning Commission forward a recommendation of approval—with the staff’s suggested conditions—to the City Council.

The applicant Joe Johnson gave background information regarding the proposal and shared the vision for the site. Matt Knight introduced himself.

The Commission asked clarifying questions regarding:

- Department review
- Rental rates
- Council's purview regarding community benefits
- Hotel height

The Chair opened the public hearing.

Public Hearing

- Ralph Gochner – Shared concerns about the traffic and accidents at the intersection
- Jim Webster – Shared concerns about a change from single family residential to MU-3, the historic Donner Trail, traffic, and parking.
- James Moore – Shared concerns about the intersection at 2300 E and 1300 S
- Laura Gaylord – Shared concerns about preserving the Donner Trail, traffic volume, and community character
- Katherine Lindquist – Shared concerns regarding pedestrian safety if the sidewalk is too close to the road
- John Lear – Shared concerns about pedestrian conflicts with traffic
- David Leetah – Shared that residents are not opposed to the development, but they are opposed to the proposed traffic flow pattern. He shared a proposed traffic pattern they felt would help the traffic congestion.

The Chair reviewed the comments made by the public and gave the applicants an opportunity to respond to community concerns.

The applicants responded to community concerns.

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

Executive Session

The Commission and Staff discussed:

- The Commission's purview regarding this proposal
- MU-3 setbacks
- Project next steps if the rezone is approved by City Council
- Street congestion and traffic calming measures
- Whether drive throughs were permitted in the MU-3 district
- Comments about the current conditions of the area
- The proposed rezone being appropriate for the area
- City Council's intent for there to be affordable housing in the area
- Appreciation for the capital investment projects happening in the neighborhood
- Concerns regarding the proposal sidesteps "Thriving in Place"
- Clarification on housing replacement requirements

Motion 1

Commissioner Rosenfield stated, “Based on the information presented and discussion, I move that the commission recommends that the city council adopt this request as recommended by staff with the following modification: Replace condition two as follows; A minimum of three housing units or 10% of all housing units, whichever is greater, constructed within the boundaries of the zoning map amendment, shall be transmitted by the developer to residents by a bond for title or other arrangement that permits the new owner of the unit to have a monthly payment no more than 10% greater than each of the current rental rates for the demolished units. That, furthermore, the current residents of the rental units located on the parcel be granted right of first refusal on said parcels. and that thereafter these units be titled as affordable home ownership units for housing households earning at or below 80% of the area median income AMI. The affordable units shall be comparable to the market rate units in terms of unit size and number of bedrooms.”

Senior City Attorney Courtney Lords inserted that the motion on the table was unclear and parts of it were illegal.

Commissioner Vela offered a friendly amendment.

Commissioner Rosenfield rescinded her motion.

Motion 2

Commissioner Barry stated, “Based on the information presented in discussion, I move that the commission recommend that the city council adopt this request as recommended by staff with the additional suggestion that they review the components of Thriving Salt Lake more clearly to make sure that they are all represented in this potential rezone.”

Commissioner Rosenfield seconded the motion.

Vote

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

The motion passed unanimously.

A break was called for at 6:59 PM. The meeting was reconvened at 7:06 PM.

6. **Rezone, General Plan Amendment, & Design Review at Approximately 346, 350, 354 & 370 S 800 E and 775 E 400 S** – Sean Thompson, representing property owner Hardage Hospitality, is requesting approval for a Rezone, General Plan Amendment, and Design Review for the above-listed addresses.
- A. **Rezone:** Requesting a rezone for the 346, 350 & 354 S 800 E properties from RMF-35 (Moderate Density Residential Multi-Family) to MU-5 (Mixed-Use 5). **Case Number: PLNPCM2025-00641**
- B. **General Plan Amendment:** Requesting to amend the future land use designation from Medium Density Transit Oriented Development to High Density Transit Oriented Development. **Case Number: PLNPCM2025-00660**

C. Design Review: Proposing a façade length of 275’ in the MU-5 district. **Case Number:** PLNPCM2025-00856

The subject properties are located within Council District 4, represented by Eva Lopez-Chavez. (Staff Contact: Grant Amann at 801-535-6171 or grant.amann@slc.gov)

Principal Planner Grant Amann reviewed the petition. He stated that Staff recommends forwarding an approval recommendation to the City Council, consistent with staff’s recommendation.

The applicants Carla Lehi, Sean Thompson, and Hyrum Madison reviewed the proposal.

The Commissioner, Staff, and Applicants discussed:

- How staff analyzes articulation
- Residential units on the ground floor
- Enhanced ground floor requirements
- Intended market
- Fire access requirements

Public Hearing

- Maha Barani – disputed claims of community support, questions why the more intrusive proposal now receives a positive staff report and argues that neglect shouldn’t justify an upzone. She challenged the accuracy of the solar study, saying the building height would negatively affect nearby homes and solar access. She urged the project to be stepped back to reduce neighborhood impacts.
- Danielle Barani – a longtime resident and former 9/11 responder, raises fire-safety concerns, argued that emergency vehicles can’t access Linden Avenue and that removing nearby hydrants endangers neighbors. They stress their deep ties to the area and feel the project ignores safety impacts on existing residents.
- Mark Rex – Shared concerns regarding the size of the proposal on the north end, the ability for Linden Ave to accommodate delivery vehicles and the like, and the height of the proposal.
- Cindy Cromer – noted 800 East is a low-scale, historic block with mostly 1–2 story homes. She shared concerns about the project’s scale, orientation, and demolition plans conflict with the historic character of the neighborhood.
- Monica Hilding – East Central Community Council - opposes rezoning from MF35 to MU5 and the related general plan change. They argue the proposal rewards demolition by neglect, threatens naturally occurring affordable housing, and undermines the 2012 TSA plan designed to balance transit-oriented development with historic family neighborhoods. The council supports responsible development that preserves existing family-friendly units, maintains neighborhood scale, and provides diverse housing, rather than market-rate, student-focused projects that accelerate displacement.
- Melinda Mane – shared concerns about the scale of the proposal and fire access from Linden Ave. Requested denial of the proposal.
- Judy Valentine – Felt the existing housing should be left and the proposal didn’t fit the neighborhood.
- Jen Colby – urges a negative recommendation, arguing the proposed project is larger, out of scale, and misaligned with housing needs. She emphasized the historic 800 East

district's value, note overbuilding in the city, and criticized the project for rewarding demolition by neglect. She supports smaller, zoning-compliant development on vacant lots and stress that claimed "community benefits" mostly serve private interests.

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

The applicant was given the opportunity and responded to the public comments.

Executive Session

The Commission discussed:

- The Commission's purview regarding demolitions
- The effects of rezoning
- The length proposed in the design review
- Concerns over approving the proposal
- The proposed zoning
- Transit access
- Pedestrian experience
- Shadow impact
- The scale of the proposal compared to the surrounding neighborhood
- Comparison of medium density to high density zoning

Motion 1

Commissioner Burrows motioned to table all 3 items for consideration.

Commissioner Rosenfield seconded the motion

Commissioner Burrows added that the public hearing would remain open and the applicant should come back when there is another iteration of the design review to see.

Vote

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

The motion failed 4 to three.

Rezone Motion

Commissioner Burrows motioned to forward a recommendation to adopt the Zoning Map Amendment to City Council.

Commissioner Barry seconded the motion.

Commissioner Rosenfield offered a friendly amendment to split the building into two structures.

Commissioner Burrows denied the friendly amendment.

Vote

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

- **Abstain:**

The motion passed 4 to three.

General Plan Amendment Motion

Commissioner Burrows motioned to forward a recommendation of denial to City Council because evidence has not been presented that demonstrates the proposal complies with standard 3.

Commissioner Scott seconded the motion.

Vote

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

The motion passed 6 to one.

Design Review Motion

Commissioner Burrows motioned to table the Design Review with the direction that the applicant come back with another iteration of that design that it does a better job of meeting 21A.59.050 standard E.

Commissioner Barry seconded the motion.

Commissioner Barry offered a friendly amendment that the applicant come back with a design that treats the break with more pedestrian focused treatment to satisfy the request for the additional building length. Senior City Attorney Courtney Lords asked that there be clarification that the public hearing remain open.

Commissioner Burrows approved the amendments.

Vote

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

The motion passed 6 to one.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:06 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.