

MINUTES OF THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION MEETING HELD THURSDAY, APRIL 22, 2021, AT 6:00 P.M. THE MEETING WAS HELD ELECTRONICALLY, WITHOUT A PHYSICAL LOCATION, AS AUTHORIZED BY UTAH CODE ANNOTATED §52-4-207(4).

Members Present: Chair Scott Peters, Niels Valentiner, Scott Henriksen, Stephen Harmon

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

BUSINESS MEETING

Chair Scott Peters called the meeting to order at approximately 6:00 p.m. The meeting was held electronically without a physical location as authorized by the Governor's Executive Order dated March 18, 2020, and related legislation enacted by the Utah Legislature since that date.

1.0 Welcome and Acknowledgements.

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 Discussion Items

2.1 (Project SPL-21-001) Action on a Request from Savory Swig Stores, LLC for a Certificate of Design Compliance for a New Drive-Thru Soda Shop at 2029 East Fort Union Boulevard.

Senior City Planner, Andrew Hulka presented the staff report and gave an overview of the request for a new Swig drive thru soda shop. The proposed location was identified. The area has been used previously as accessory businesses. The site includes a 600 square-foot building storage container use with a drive thru. It was noted that the existing drive approach on Fort Union Boulevard is further to the east. As part of the traffic study that was submitted with the project, one of the recommendations was to align the drive approach with the street across Fort Union Boulevard to avoid conflicts with customers coming and going. An analysis was also submitted for the queuing for the drive-thru lanes. After reviewing four existing Swig locations in Salt Lake County, the average peak drive-thru queue was 13 vehicles. The highest observed queue was at the Draper location at 16 vehicles. One of the concerns the City had early on was that the business is very busy and they wanted to ensure that there is adequate space for cars. The proposed site plan shows space for 13 vehicles and additional space for cars to wrap around if needed. Mr. Hulka reported that the applicants are removing the existing landscaping, which includes trees, and replacing them with new planting materials. In response to a question raised, Mr. Hulka stated that the area between the curb and the sidewalk is proposed to be turf.

The building elevations were next presented. A shipping container structure was proposed with a light and dark grey scheme simulated with siding. There will be perforated steel panels above to

1 screen the equipment and dark bronze aluminum around the drive-thru window. The lighting
2 proposed along the sides of the building will be wall-mounted and directed downward. There will
3 be a menu sign as well with a downward-directed LED light bar. Staff was working with the
4 applicant to ensure that they comply with Code. Mr. Hulka commented that outdoor seating could
5 be considered. Staff recommended approval.

6
7 The applicant, Cass Tenney, commented that with regard to the walk-up window, she did not feel
8 that around the building was a safe place to encourage people to park and congregate. Their goal
9 is to keep the drive-thru moving as quickly as possible to avoid stacking and disturbances on the
10 site. As result, adding a walk-up window would not be efficient.

11
12 The area to the north has a significant grade and will be used as a transition zone. It was noted
13 that the building is intended to be permanent construction. Commissioner Valentiner commented
14 that the building appears to be temporary in nature and asked what can be done to provide more
15 shielding, such as a wall. It was noted that the facility is licensed through the Board of Health and
16 is permanent. A foundation will be poured and the building is pre-fabricated. It will be built in
17 Saint George and shipped to the site. Similar buildings exist in several other locations and have
18 been well received and attractive.

19
20 A question was raised as to whether there needs to be a gravel area against the building. It was
21 suggested that there be more screening around the site. The comment was made that the building
22 looks similar to a construction trailer. Details of the site were described. It was suggested that the
23 building be elevated a few inches with a skirt around the bottom to set it apart and make it look
24 intentional. Examples were shown of buildings using shipping containers that have a nice
25 aesthetic. They are treated as buildings rather than a box with accouterments.

26
27 It was suggested that more architectural treatments be added so that it looks more like a building.
28 Renderings of other Swig locations were described. Ms. Tenney stated that their target market is
29 young adults. Their marketing strategy has been to use shipping containers, which are part of their
30 brand. She stated that it is essentially a building with corrugated metal on the outside. Other cities
31 have asked that they add more glazing to the exterior but every inch of the inside of the building
32 is maximized with equipment allowing it to be as small as possible.

33
34 Commissioner Valentiner requested that additional screening and a setback be added to the
35 building. He did not want to see haphazard development along major streets in the City. He
36 recommended tying the project together for a more uniform look. Issues were identified with the
37 container door on the end. Ms. Tenney remarked that they are not functional and there is a regular
38 door on the backside.

39
40 Ms. Tenney presented another rendering of a structure that was used in Taylorsville where they do
41 not allow metals on building exteriors. The footprint would remain the same. The Commission
42 preferred the alternative. The applicant was encouraged to continue to utilize the shipping
43 container but add elements that enhance it. Doing so will help with their branding efforts.
44 Ms. Tenney stated that if the original plan is not approved, she will likely come back with the
45 second option. A Commission Member did not agree with the applicant that it would be cost-
46 prohibitive to have their architects manipulate the materials slightly and add screening on top in

1 an effort to get a better composition. It was suggested that there be a better connection to the
2 ground. It was also suggested that the box on the top be moved back slightly to serve as an offset.
3 The option of using the wood siding to create a low wainscot around the bottom. The Commission
4 was generally supportive of the proposal but thought it needed work.

5
6 ***Commissioner Valentiner moved to continue the matter and ask the applicant to go back and***
7 ***consider how the building connects to the ground to get a sense of a floating separation and tie***
8 ***the screening together in a fashion other than two separate screened pockets. Commissioner***
9 ***Henriksen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the***
10 ***Commission.***

11
12 In response to a question raised, Ms. Tenney stated that they entered into a partnership with
13 Associated Foods and this will be their seventh location with them.

14
15 **2.2 (Project SPL-21-003) Action on a Request from Sandra Rudolph for a**
16 **Certificate of Design Compliance for Exterior Alterations to the Property at**
17 **1399 East Fort Union Boulevard.**
18

19 Mr. Hulka presented the staff report and stated that the use involves a State Farm Insurance Office
20 to be operated from a home office. Exterior alterations were proposed to the existing building.
21 Currently, there is a standard driveway on the east side. The proposal would expand that into a
22 circular driveway with a second drive approach on the opposite side of the property. The intent
23 was to prevent people from having to back out onto Fort Union Boulevard and instead allow them
24 to circle around and exit. The proposal was to place gravel and flowers in the areas set aside for
25 landscaping. Staff requested feedback from the Commission on an appropriate level of live
26 vegetation and recommendations on types of plants and flowers that would be appropriate.

27
28 The applicant was proposing to paint the exterior of the home white, add a new black soffit and
29 fascia, add a new black front door, a new black garage door, and add lpe composite cladding to
30 the front porch area. With regard to signage, monument signs are allowed in this location at a
31 maximum of 36 square feet. The proposed sign will be wood paneling to match the building with
32 the State Farm logo and address. Staff recommended approval.

33
34 In response to a question raised, Mr. Hulka stated that there is not a specific percentage of
35 landscaping that is required. The preliminary discussions included the idea of paving but the
36 applicant eventually decided to go with a circular approach that would leave room for landscaping
37 around the edges and in between. It was noted that there are landscaping requirements for buffers
38 that are adjacent to residential. In this case, there is commercial on both sides and a residential
39 neighborhood behind the property to the north. The design guidelines, however, recommend high-
40 quality landscaping. Possible options were discussed to prevent the entire front yard from being
41 concrete. Concern was expressed with the large amount of concrete and only a small planter in
42 front for a sign.

43
44 Mr. Hulka explained that there are no specific percentages provided in the zoning ordinance that
45 are required to be landscaped areas. Staff was looking to the Commission for feedback on what

1 would be appropriate at this location. Commissioner Valentiner suggested that an overabundance
2 of concrete should be discouraged.

3
4 The applicant, Sandra Rudolph stated that the structure will serve as her home as well as her
5 business. Currently, she has no access to the backyard and it is dangerous to back out onto Fort
6 Union Boulevard. She tried to incorporate as much landscaping as possible. She stated that the
7 majority of the front yard will still be landscaped. Circulation issues were discussed. Ms. Rudolph
8 stated that she has one employee. Her intent was to improve the home, which has been neglected.
9 As an insurance agent, she wants to make the site as safe as possible for visitors.

10
11 It was suggested that there not only be flowers in the front but shrubs as well. It was noted that
12 due to the number of cars owned by the applicant, her employee's vehicle, and customers, the site
13 will be tight in terms of parking. The comment was made that if the applicant wants two
14 driveways, another option was to narrow at least one of the driveways and pull the landscaping out
15 in front of the home.

16
17 Ms. Rudolph was open to suggestions with respect to landscaping, however, her biggest concern
18 was getting out onto Fort Union Boulevard safely. She did not object to extending the greenery
19 out further. A Commission Member expressed concern with five or six cars being parked in front
20 and considered it too much for the site. Prior to purchasing the property, there were six cars in the
21 driveway. A Commission Member commented that if there are cars parked in front, a buffer is
22 needed between the cars and the sidewalk. Ms. Rudolph expressed her strong support for the
23 circular driveway.

24
25 A hammerhead was suggested by Commissioner Valentiner and considered to be a better use of
26 the site. However, if a double driveway is pursued, it was recommended that the amount of paving
27 be reduced significantly. The applicant was encouraged to hire a Landscape Architect to help
28 develop the site plan and the landscaping for the site.

29
30 Commissioner Valentiner explained that with the hammerhead concept, Ms. Rudolph will be able
31 to park five cars and have less hard surface with just one driveway. He did not recommend she
32 lose the side yard. The Commission Members agreed with Commissioner Valentiner's suggestion.
33 Timing issues were discussed. Ms. Rudolph stated that she needs to be out of her current location
34 by the end of May and would like to complete the renovation prior to that time.

35
36 ***Commissioner Valentiner moved to approve the Certificate of Design Compliance subject to the***
37 ***following:***

- 38
39 ***1. One driveway shall be maintained with a hammerhead on the grass and leaving***
40 ***the existing concrete drive as-is including the side yard.***
41
42 ***2. The elevations shall be approved as illustrated.***
43
44 ***3. The request may be approved by staff.***
45

- 1 4. *The landscaping shall include bushes and trees and not only flowers and have a*
2 *greater green mass in some areas.*

3
4 *Commissioner Harmon seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent*
5 *of the Commission.*

6
7 **3.0 Consent Agenda**

8
9 **3.1 Approval of Minutes of April 22, 2021.**

10
11 *Commissioner Henriksen moved to approve the minutes of April 22, 2021, after the following*
12 *process has been met. The Recorder will prepare the minutes and email them to each member*
13 *of the Commission. Members will have five days to review the minutes and provide any changes*
14 *to the Recorder. If, after five days, there are no changes, the minutes will stand approved. If*
15 *there are changes, the process will be followed until the changes are made and the Commission*
16 *agrees at which time the minutes shall be deemed approved. Commissioner Harmon seconded*
17 *the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.*

18
19 **4.0 Adjournment**

20
21 *Commissioner Harmon moved to adjourn. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of*
22 *the Commission.*

23
24 The Architectural Review Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 7:43 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, April 22, 2021.*
3
4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes

7 T Forbes Group

8 Minutes Secretary

9
10 Minutes Approved: May 12, 2021