

1 **MINUTES OF THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY**
2 **ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION (“ARC”) MEETING**
3 **Thursday, December 17, 2020**

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

5 **Meeting Held Electronically, without a Physical Location Due to the Current Covid-19**
6 **Pandemic and as Authorized by the Governor’s Executive Order dated 18 March 2020**

7
8 **Members Present:** Chair Scott Peters, Stephen Harman, Jonathan Oldroyd

9
10 **Staff Present:** Senior City Planner Andrew Hulka, Deputy Recorder Heather Sundquist

11
12 **Others:** Paul Slotemaker

13
14 **BUSINESS MEETING**

15
16 Chair Scott Peters called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m. He read in its entirety the declaration
17 giving the Commission the authority to hold the meeting via Zoom, pursuant to Utah Code
18 Annotated §52-4-207(4).

19
20 **1.0 Welcome and Acknowledgements.**

21
22 **1.1 Ex-Parte Communications or Conflicts of Interest to Disclose.**

23
24 There were no ex-parte communications or conflicts of interest to disclose.

25
26 **2.0 Discussion Items**

27
28 **2.1 (Project WT-20-001) Action on a Request by SQF, LLC for a Certificate of**
29 **Design Compliance for Two New Small Cell Facilities Located in the City**
30 **Right-of-Way. Continued from the November 19, 2020, ARC Meeting.**

31
32 Senior City Planner, Andrew Hulka presented the staff report, which was initially heard at the
33 November ARC meeting. He reported that the application is for two new small cell 4G and 5G
34 facilities, which are smaller than typical wireless facilities that will serve a smaller area. They are
35 proposed to be located along the public right-of-way.

36
37 During last month’s discussions, staff was asked to review the potential for a Small Cell and
38 Streetlight Master Plan. Mr. Hulka reported that this task had been added to staff’s project list.
39 He noted that applications received prior to the adoption of a Master Plan cannot be held to the
40 requirements of any future plan.

41
42 Mr. Hulka recounted the suggestions made by the Commission with respect to this application
43 including the feasibility of redesigning the facilities by adding a decorative base to match the
44 surrounding streetlights. Another suggestion was to add a fluted element to the pole, add an
45 additional light fixture for the sidewalk, and integrate the equipment inside the pole as opposed to
46 outside, if possible.

1 There are two locations for the proposed facilities. The first is at 1869 East Fort Union Boulevard.
2 This facility is proposed to be located behind the sidewalk and includes one light fixture. Mr.
3 Hulka highlighted the proposed changes, which include a sleeker pole and a decorative base. The
4 applicant is working with a light manufacturer to create a fixture that matches other streetlights
5 and includes the City logo.

6
7 The second location was at 7069 South Highland Drive, located outside of the new Starbucks
8 building. He highlighted the proposed changes to this design, which included removal of external
9 equipment, a secondary light fixture so that there is one fixture over the street, and one fixture over
10 the sidewalk. The new design also incorporates the suggested decorative base.

11
12 Mr. Hulka addressed the prior discussions centering around the streetlight to the north of the
13 second location on Highland Drive. The applicant was proposing a design that has the two fixtures
14 at a taller height. The applicant explained in their response that this allows them to preserve space
15 for equipment in the future. He noted that the streetlight in front of the Zion's Bank is slightly
16 different from their typical design for this type of streetlight on an arterial. Typically, they have a
17 taller fixture at 25 feet and the arm over the pedestrian sidewalk at 16 feet. Here, the arm over the
18 sidewalk is around 12 feet, with the fixture at approximately nine feet. Additionally, the existing
19 base does not include the City logo, which led him to surmise that these fixtures were part of an
20 older project.

21
22 Mr. Hulka concluded by stating that staff was making the same recommendation regarding the
23 design and presenting it to the Commission for final approval. The recommendations include
24 requiring matching paint and the addition of the City logo to the decorative base. Additionally,
25 the lights must meet City lighting requirements and the applicant must obtain the correct street and
26 building permits.

27
28 Chair Peters recognized that the removal of the exterior equipment from the designed poles
29 involved the removal of antennas for future additional carriers. He stated that they can anticipate
30 that at some point someone may request additional antennas be placed on the pole. Mr. Hulka
31 confirmed this understanding as correct and referred back to this same issue involving another
32 application at the prior meeting. Future designs or additions would have to come back to the
33 Commission for approval.

34
35 Chair Peters noted that one of their recommendations was a fluted pole. Mr. Hulka stated that he
36 did not follow up on that recommendation and would defer to the applicant. It was noted that the
37 redesigned base appeared to be fluted.

38
39 Commissioner Harman commented that at the Highland Drive location, he prefers the light fixtures
40 be at the same elevation rather than staggered.

41
42 Chair Peters remarked that the existing pedestrian light over the sidewalk on Highland Drive is too
43 low. He stated that there is value to lowering the proposed light so that there is a pedestrian scale
44 to it, but aesthetically, having the two lights at the same elevation seemed better.

1 It was noted by Commissioner Harman that having the pedestrian fixture up higher tends to spread
2 the light out more.

3
4 The applicant, Paul Slotemaker, presented additional information regarding the revisions made to
5 this project. He reported that they have added a second light to the Highland Drive location and
6 added a light to the location at East Fort Union Boulevard. In response to an inquiry as to why
7 there is not a second light proposed at East Fort Union Boulevard, Mr. Slotemaker stated that
8 unlike the location on Highland Drive, the location on Fort Union does not have a parking strip,
9 therefore, a single light can cover the sidewalk and the street.

10
11 Mr. Slotemaker reported that they worked with Mountain States Lighting to come up with the
12 proposed design. They also removed the future 5G antennas and radio equipment shrouds.
13 Originally, they wanted to show that equipment as part of their proposal since this pole is being
14 built to accommodate future co-locaters to reduce the total need for new poles in the right of way.
15 The Commission's approval would be required for a future co-locator, so they simply removed
16 this exterior equipment at the Commission's suggestion.

17
18 Mr. Slotemaker explained that the pole design remained the same. Integrating the equipment into
19 the pole would result in a much wider pole of 12 inches. Because the Commission suggested that
20 the poles look similar to the existing light poles, they proposed to stay with the same diameter
21 pole. While Mountain States Lighting's pole design is narrower, Mr. Slotemaker explained that
22 they want to keep the original design for structural purposes in order to support the wireless
23 facilities. Mountain States' pole tapers from seven inches to four. The proposed pole is 8 5/8
24 inches in diameter and does not taper.

25
26 Mr. Slotemaker stated that they explored the varying pole designs and felt that the proposed pole
27 was a good compromise between structural support, equipment, and the decorative streetlights
28 already in place.

29
30 Commissioner Harman preferred to see a 12-inch pole rather than an eight-inch pole.
31 Mr. Slotemaker added that if they go with the larger diameter pole, he does not know whether they
32 will be able to include the decorative base, because a 12-inch diameter integrated pole requires a
33 24-inch base that is decorative but not fluted like the City has on their decorative poles. With the
34 24-inch base, most of the equipment will be contained within the base.

35
36 Commissioner Jonathan Oldroyd preferred the fluted base with the narrower pole but did not want
37 to see a bunch of other equipment on the pole at a future date. He felt that nothing had really
38 changed on the application except for the inclusion of the fluted base and the added lights. He
39 would be very resistant to approve a bunch of carriers being put on the pole at a future date when
40 they could require a larger pole now that would accommodate those carriers within the pole at a
41 later date.

42
43 Mr. Slotemaker confirmed that the integrated pole would accommodate future equipment within
44 the pole.

1 It was noted that the fluted base adds a lot to the aesthetics of the pole. Commissioner Harman
2 asked if the canister at the top of the integrated pole is 12 inches. Mr. Slotemaker stated his belief
3 that it might flare out slightly larger. He presented to the Commission with a concept rendering
4 for an integrated pole from another jurisdiction with a pole base that sits 5 feet high. The pole is
5 12 inches in diameter and the canister at the top is 16 inches, which houses the antennas. The
6 particular model that he is showing has a 20-inch diameter base.

7
8 Commissioner Oldroyd preferred to see an integrated pole with the light fixtures on it. He felt it
9 was much more aesthetic and less industrial than a pole with a bunch of equipment on it. It was
10 noted that there is some architectural detailing at the top of the base that adds a lot to the overall
11 aesthetic. Mr. Slotemaker acknowledged the Commission's suggestion to have poles that are
12 similar to the decorative light poles that are narrower, which is why they proposed the narrower
13 pole in their design.

14
15 Because there were only three Commission Members in attendance, a unanimous vote was
16 required for approval. Commissioner Harman commented that the 12-inch pole with a 20-inch
17 base is far different from a light pole, however, he would prefer to see the larger pole, even if it
18 did not have the fluted base. He would agree on a design that had all of the equipment on the
19 inside. It was clarified that a light fixture could still be included with the larger diameter pole.
20 Mr. Slotemaker added that they typically use a Cobra-style light; he would have to ask if the pole
21 could support a more decorative fixture.

22
23 Commissioner Harman would support the integrated pole with a decorative light that is consistent
24 with the City's design on the pole. The diameter of the pole is not a big concern because the height
25 of the pole is so high.

26
27 Mr. Slotemaker stated that he will have to go back to the light manufacturer to see if the requested
28 design can be accomplished.

29
30 Chair Peters invited a motion to approve the application with the integrated pole and decorative
31 lights per the City standards and painted black. Mr. Slotemaker inquired as to what would happen
32 if the manufacturer cannot attach a light that complies with City design standards. It was agreed
33 amongst the Commission that the light fixture is an important design element and advised Mr.
34 Slotemaker that he would have to come back to the Commission if the manufacturer cannot
35 accommodate the requested fixture.

36
37 The scope of the motion was clarified to include everything discussed at today's meeting, including
38 use of the 12-inch pole with equipment integrated inside the pole and the base feature.
39 Additionally, the pole must be painted with textured black paint to match the City's streetlights.
40 It was pointed out that the staff recommendation that the pole includes the City logo might not be
41 something that the pole manufacturer can accommodate. Commissioner Harman confirmed that
42 that recommendation would not be part of his motion. Additionally, the applicant will be required
43 to obtain a Building Permit and a Right-of-Way Permit from the City.

44
45 It was clarified and confirmed that the Commission was agreeable to having the two lights at the
46 Highland Drive location be the same height.

1
2 **Commissioner Harman moved to issue a certificate of design compliance for Project WT-20-**
3 **001, consistent with their discussions at today's hearing and subject to the following conditions:**
4

- 5 **1. The project must incorporate the 12-inch integrated pole and 24-inch base**
6 **feature as presented by the Applicant at this hearing.**
7
- 8 **2. The poles are to include streetlights, fixtures, and paint to match City's**
9 **streetlights as identified by staff.**
10
- 11 **3. The applicant must obtain the proper building and right-of-way permits from the**
12 **City for each location prior to construction.**
13

14 It was noted that there would be no need to return to the Commission in January 2021 if the
15 applicant can comply with the conditions stated.
16

17 **Commissioner Oldroyd seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent**
18 **of the Commission.**
19

20 **3.0 Consent Agenda**

21

22 **3.1 Approval of Minutes for December 17, 2020.**

23

24 **Commissioner Oldroyd moved to approve the minutes of December 17, 2020, after the following**
25 **process is met. The recorder will prepare the minutes and email them to each member of the**
26 **Commission. The members will have five days to review the minutes and provide any changes**
27 **to the recorder. If, after five days there are no changes, the minutes will stand approved. If**
28 **there are changes, the process will be followed until the changes are made and the Commission**
29 **agrees, at which time the minutes shall be deemed approved. Commissioner Harman seconded**
30 **the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.**
31

32 **4.0 Adjournment**

33

34 **Commissioner Harman moved to adjourn. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of**
35 **the Commission.**
36

37 The Architectural Review Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 6:50 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, December 17,*
3 *2020.*

4
5
6 Teri Forbes

7 Teri Forbes
8 T Forbes Group
9 Minutes Secretary

10
11 Minutes Approved: _____