

**MINUTES OF THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION  
MEETING HELD THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 2021, AT 6:00 P.M. THE MEETING  
WAS HELD IN-PERSON AT 2277 EAST BENGAL BOULEVARD (CITY COUNCIL  
WORK ROOM), COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS, UTAH, 84121**

**Members Present:** Chair Scott Peters, Commissioner Stephan Harman, Commissioner Sarah Kovac, Commissioner Scott Henriksen

**Staff Present:** Senior City Planner Andrew Hulka, Deputy City Recorder Heather Sundquist, IT Technician Jill Cohen

**BUSINESS MEETING**

Chair Peters called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

**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-19-007) Action on a Request by Joe Johnsen for Approval of a Revised Certificate of Design Compliance for a New Retaining Wall Design and Minor Façade Changes at 1674 East Fort Union Boulevard.**

Senior City Planner, Andrew Hulka, reported that the request is for minor changes to the retaining wall and façade at the Cottonwood Townhomes project. The original Architectural Review Commission (“ARC”) approval was dated September 24, 2019. It went on to receive approval from the Planning Commission in October 2019. The Building Permit was approved in January 2021. The specific requirements for the retaining wall were an integral concrete colored wall with steps every 10 to 30 feet and two-foot minimum steps jogging in and out. It was noted that retaining walls should match the design materials of the primary building and trees will break up the blank wall.

The applicant was requesting a modification to the approved plan by changing the concrete wall to a grey Verti-Block wall. The applicant, Mr. Johnsen, was not the original developer of the project. Some of his concerns pertained to a flat blank wall and he came up with design ideas to make it more esthetically pleasing by adding some curves, landscaping, and using the Verti-Block. Staff displayed images of the proposed wall and landscaping compared to the original plan. It was noted that none of the frontage improvements will be modified as part of the proposed change to the wall.

The façade modifications included changing the sliding windows to the upper-level master bedroom to plate glass windows and eliminating the railing because it does not serve a purpose

1 since there is no balcony. The applicant explained that he inherited the plans and would like to  
2 eliminate the sliding door and replace it with a 5'x 6' window with a screen. There was no need  
3 for the railing outside the window as there is no balcony.

4  
5 The question was raised as to whether the parapets extend above the main height of the structure.  
6 It was clarified that they do not and that the picture in the presentation shows an error. Mr. Johnsen  
7 explained the reasoning behind his desire to change the wall design. When the wall around the  
8 project was originally designed, the architect did not take into consideration the footings necessary.  
9 The size of the footing required for the wall will encroach on the neighbors' property up to eight  
10 feet in some places. This requires the builder to change the wall to the Verti-Block along the rear  
11 of the property. The proposal was to keep the wall consistent with what exists currently along the  
12 rear border and make it look esthetically pleasing. He would like to add some architectural design  
13 to the wall to give it additional character. The landscaping was enhanced and the bike lane, curb,  
14 gutter, and sidewalk will not change. This still provides a buffer at Fort Union Boulevard, which  
15 was the original intent.

16  
17 A question was raised regarding the wall and the details surrounding it. Mr. Johnsen explained  
18 that the wall has texture and is a concrete color with the appearance of stone. Chair Peters  
19 requested that the material be integrally colored so that it has the same pallet as the project itself.  
20 Staff agreed with that as well. Discussion continued as to whether this type of block is used in  
21 other areas of the valley and if it comes in varied colors or if it is actually stained after it is installed.  
22 It was determined that the material would be fine but the color should be varied as stated in the  
23 original approval.

24  
25 A question was raised as to whether the rear wall modification had been approved. It was  
26 mentioned that Staff approved it as a minor material change.

27  
28 The original Landscaping Plan included approximately 15 trees and it appeared that the current  
29 plan only allows for three trees. Concern was expressed regarding the lack of trees. The plant  
30 schedule in the packet includes the precise types of trees that are proposed. The applicant stated  
31 that they would be willing to add more trees in the area to soften the façade. Chair Peters stated  
32 that with the change in the wall design a row of shrubs can be added between the edge of the  
33 sidewalk and the wall to help soften the height of the wall and provide a buffer. Additional trees  
34 would still be nice in the larger planter areas and some of the landscape areas in front of the  
35 individual units.

36  
37 ***Commissioner Kovac moved to APPROVE a revised Certificate of Design Compliance for***  
38 ***Project SPL-19-007 subject to the following:***

39  
40 ***Conditions:***

- 41  
42 ***1. Add an additional six to seven trees along Fort Union Boulevard.***  
43  
44 ***2. Stain the block retaining wall to give a more varied look.***  
45

1 *Commissioner Harman seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent*  
2 *of the Commission.*

3  
4 **3.0 Consent Agenda**

5  
6 **3.1 Approval of Minutes for September 23, 2021.**

7  
8 *Commissioner Harman moved to APPROVE the minutes of September 23, 2021, after the*  
9 *following process has been met. The Recorder will prepare the minutes and email them to each*  
10 *member of the Commission. Members will have five days to review the minutes and provide any*  
11 *changes to the Recorder. If, after five days, there are no changes, the minutes will stand*  
12 *approved. If there are changes, the process will be followed until the changes are made and the*  
13 *Commission agrees at which time the minutes shall be deemed approved. Commissioner*  
14 *Henriksen seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the*  
15 *Commission.*

16  
17 **4.0 Adjournment**

18  
19 *Commissioner Henriksen moved to adjourn. The motion passed with the unanimous consent*  
20 *of the Commission.*

21  
22 The Architectural Review Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 6:36 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,*  
3 *September 23, 2021.*  
4  
5

6 Teri Forbes

7 Teri Forbes  
8 T Forbes Group  
9 Minutes Secretary  
10

11 Minutes Approved: February 23, 2022