

**MINUTES OF THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS ARCHITECTURAL COMMISSION
MEETING HELD THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 2022, 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 Chapman, Commissioner Stephen Harman, Commissioner Scott Henriksen, Commissioner Scott Peters, Commissioner Sarah Kovac

Staff Present: Senior City Planner Andrew Hulka, Associate Planer & Sustainability Analyst Samantha DeSeelhorst, System Administrator Alex Earl

BUSINESS MEETING

Commissioner Scott Chapman 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-22-010) Action on a Request by Range Architecture, on Behalf of Block Builders, LLC for Approval of a Certificate of Design Compliance for Cosmetic Improvements and an Alternative Parking Plan for an Existing Site at 6826 South Highland Drive.

Associate City Planner and Sustainability Analyst, Samantha DeSeelhorst, presented the staff report and displayed a rendering of the subject property, which is located at 6826 South Highland Drive. The applicants are requesting a Certificate of Design Compliance for minor exterior changes to the existing building as well as an alternative Parking Plan. Staff recommended approval with a few additional conditions. The project was reviewed by the Planning Commission earlier in the month and approved a Conditional Use Permit (“CUP”) for a professional office in the existing building. It will be an office for general contracting staff and Block Builders, LLC, which is a general contractor specializing in commercial and retail construction. It was noted that no clients will visit the office and it will be for staff only. There will also be no storage of construction materials or vehicles on the site.

Ms. DeSeelhorst reported that the building has been vacant for several years and has deteriorated. The minor exterior changes include porch work and replacing trim replacement that fell off. Two-tone warm gray paint will also be applied to the building façade and the trim painted white. The roof shingles will be redone in charcoal gray and the door repainted white. A current rendering of the building was displayed along with a rendering of what the final product will look like.

1 A history of the project was presented. The site was developed in the 1950s, well before the City
2 of Cottonwood Heights was incorporated. It has legal non-conformities that have been vested due
3 to its age. One is a legal non-conforming parking lot. Per the City zoning ordinance, the applicant
4 is required to add four additional parking stalls to the three that exist currently. It was noted that
5 the building has been used as a pharmacy and a home for individuals with disabilities. The
6 applicant is proposing an alternative Parking Plan. The City Code requires the City Engineer to
7 recommend approval of an alternative Parking Plan but the Architectural Review Commission
8 (“ARC”) must formally approve it.

10 The site circulation was described. To make the proposed circulation plan work, a non-conforming
11 garage will be removed. The layout also preserves the landscaping buffer that is located between
12 the residential property to the rear. To the north, there will be a few parking stalls laid out parallel.
13 The exit will be a single curb cut with one parking stall on the frontage on Highland Drive. The
14 plan includes all seven required spaces and there has been a great effort to make it as conforming
15 and compliant as possible. Six employees will work on site. Staff considered what is proposed to
16 be a significant improvement to the site and recommended approval with the conditions set forth
17 in the staff report.

19 The applicant indicated that when they were originally approached by the owner they considered
20 investigating a mixed-use project with a professional office and residential. They have changed
21 their scope of work to improve the existing building instead.

23 A comment was made that the proposal is an improvement over what exists currently. It was
24 suggested that something more than is proposed be done with the existing park strip area. The
25 applicant stated that a landscape design was prepared previously without a loop and four parking
26 stalls in front. The current plan includes a revision that came out of the Planning Commission
27 Meeting. Originally, they redesigned the front, however, now that they are redoing the additional
28 hardscape and work in the back, they would like to keep the curb and gutter the same but add new
29 landscaping.

31 Ms. DeSeelhorst commented that from a zoning perspective, the percentage of landscaping that is
32 required has been met as well as the existing buffer between the residential property. The owner’s
33 intent was to have xeriscaping in the front and in the landscaping buffer to meet all applicable
34 requirements without doing a new landscape design without knowing the outcome of tonight’s
35 meeting. Ms. DeSeelhorst stated that the ARC could require that landscaping be incorporated as
36 a condition of approval.

38 The importance of having a Landscape Plan was stressed. It was noted that the existing
39 landscaping has exceeded its life expectancy and should be completely replaced. The ARC Chair
40 offered to work with staff in that regard. He was also concerned with the alignment of the north
41 driveway with the first two parking stalls, which creates a potential conflict and will appear to be
42 a two-way entrance. He recommended that the driveway not be changed but narrowed and the
43 new north curb moved further south to align with the parking stall. The intent was to avoid
44 potential conflicts.

1 City Engineer, Adam Ginsberg, wanted the 22 feet and the pinch point pushed the third stall onto
2 the street. In theory, the applicant indicated that the stalls could pull them down next to the
3 building. The only place the parallel parking stalls could be placed would be to the east since in
4 the back of the home there is a jog to the north and not enough width. Ms. DeSeelhorst suggested
5 that if the ARC recommends changing an element of the Parking Plan that it be contingent on the
6 City Engineer recommending approval.

7
8 One problem identified with the parking was that the orientation opens the door to a fence, which
9 will cause people to park further into the drive lane. It was suggested that the situation be reviewed
10 with the City Engineer. To the left of the gate is a condensing unit that the applicant would prefer
11 to not move. It was noted that it makes no sense to narrow it if the stalls are on the opposite side.
12 There was discussion about moving the north parking stalls to the side of the building so that they
13 align with the plane. If they remain in place, the curb could be dropped. The importance of
14 directional signage was stressed.

15
16 ***Commissioner Henriksen moved to issue a Certificate of Design Compliance for Project CUP-***
17 ***22-010 subject to the following conditions:***

- 18
19 ***1. Provide a complete Landscape Plan.***
- 20
21 ***2. Work with the City Engineer and City Staff to look at narrowing the exit drive or***
22 ***moving the parking closer to the building.***
- 23
24 ***3. Provide directional signage, particularly striping, and one “Do Not Enter” sign.***
- 25
26 ***4. Any future signage added to the building must obtain a Certificate of Design***
27 ***Compliance from the Architectural Review Commission.***
- 28
29 ***5. Directional striping and signage shall be added to the site to clarify the proper***
30 ***flow of traffic, as approved by the City Engineer.***

31
32 ***Commissioner Kovac seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of***
33 ***the Commission.***

34 35 **3.0 Consent Agenda**

36 37 **3.1 Approval of Minutes of September 22, 2022.**

38
39 ***Commissioner Henriksen moved to approve the minutes of September 22, 2022, after the***
40 ***following process has been met. The Recorder will prepare the minutes and email them to each***
41 ***member of the Commission. Members will have five days to review the minutes and provide any***
42 ***changes to the Recorder. If, after five days, there are no changes, the minutes will stand***
43 ***approved. If there are changes, the process will be followed until the changes are made and the***
44 ***Commission agrees at which time the minutes shall be deemed approved. Commissioner Kovac***
45 ***seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.***

1 **4.0 Adjournment**

2
3 *Commissioner Chapman to adjourn. Commissioner Henriksen seconded the motion. The*
4 *motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.*

5
6 The Architectural Review Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 6:30 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, September 22,*
3 *2022.*

4
5
6 Teri Forbes

7 Teri Forbes
8 T Forbes Group
9 Minutes Secretary

10
11 Minutes Approved: October 13, 2022