

1 **DRAFT**

2
3 **MINUTES OF THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY**
4 **ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION MEETING**

5 **Thursday, August 20, 2015**

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

7 **Cottonwood Heights City Council Conference Room**

8 **1265 East Fort Union Boulevard, Suite 250**

9 **Cottonwood Heights, Utah**

10
11 **Members Present:** Chair Scott Chapman, Vice Chair Scott Peters, Jonathan Oldroyd

12
13 **Staff Present:** City Planner, Mike Johnson

14
15 **Excused:** Stephen K. Harman, Neils Valentiner, Robyn Taylor-Granda,

16
17 **Others Present:** Ted Anderson, Tony Baros

18
19 **BUSINESS MEETING**

20
21 **1.0 DISCUSSION ITEMS**

22
23 Chair Scott Chapman called the meeting to order at 6:09 p.m.

24
25 **2.0 ACTION ITEMS**

26
27 **2.1 (Project #SPL-15-002) Action on a request from Ted Anderson Excel Trust for a**
28 **Certificate of Design Compliance for a restaurant located at 7269 South Union Park**
29 **Avenue.**

30
31 City Planner, Mike Johnson, presented the staff report and stated that the property is in the Gateway
32 Overlay District, which requires the Architectural Review Board to issue a Certificate of Design
33 Compliance before performing any external architectural work. Mr. Johnson showed visuals of
34 the property location, which is near Creek Road and Union Park Avenue. He noted that it is the
35 former Wingers property directly behind Mountain America Credit Union and has been vacant for
36 an extended period of time. Mr. Johnson described the proposed changes and stated that the
37 signage needs to be modified to comply with City Code. He explained that every sign on the
38 property will require a building permit. Those changes, however, will be dealt with at the building
39 permit stage.

40
41 Mr. Johnson explained that the actual footprint of the building is not changing much outside of the
42 additional front patio with outdoor dining and an awning. He stated that the material being utilized
43 on the building is brick with weathered wood acting as siding for the primary building and a metal
44 treatment along the roof. No changes were required to the site, with the exception that the area in
45 the front of the restaurant. The handicap ramp was being relocated and an outdoor patio area was
46 being created with trees and seating for to make the area more welcoming. There will also be an

1 interior remodel, which will also be handled at the building permit level. The rest of the site will
2 remain as-is with the bulk of the changes being to the façade of the building.

3
4 Chair Chapman asked if there is an existing site plan. In response, Mr. Johnson showed what was
5 existing and what will be removed. The existing ramp will be removed and the handicapped spaces
6 relocated. The area in front will be a plaza area.

7
8 Chair Chapman asked about the handicapped ramp and the handicap stalls. The handicap stalls
9 will be moved across the street, which will be subject to building code review in order to ensure
10 that there is still direct access. The area in front now turns into a plaza area.

11
12 Board Member Oldroyd asked if they were losing any landscaped area. Mr. Johnson responded
13 that they are actually gaining landscaped area.

14
15 Commissioner Peters asked if they are losing parking. Mr. Johnson explained that they are not
16 losing much and are just relocating it. He verified that there is adequate parking and confirmed
17 that much of the site will remain unchanged.

18
19 Comments were made off the microphone about the dumpster area on the site and how the
20 restaurant will manage cardboard disposal.

21
22 Commissioner Peters generally liked the direction the project was moving. He asked about the
23 rear elevation of the building because none of his materials included information about those
24 changes. A representative of the project, Ted Anderson, stated off microphone that the wood will
25 continue around the corner and proceed to the first kitchen door. The area outside of the sightline
26 will be painted stucco. In response to a question raised, Mr. Anderson stated that the wood would
27 take the turn on the building and proceed to the door. The area not visible to anyone will be painted
28 to match the scheme of the side of the wood.

29
30 Commissioner Oldroyd asked for more details on what match the scheme entailed. It was
31 confirmed that it would be painted to look like a wood. An artist will be utilized to provide shading.
32 The process will be substantially less costly than using all reclaimed wood.

33
34 Mr. Johnson explained that the City has a requirement that all sides of the building have a similar
35 design. Mr. Anderson indicated that they will meet the requirement. Mr. Johnson requested more
36 information on the rear of the property.

37
38 Mr. Anderson said that extensive changes were necessary to move away from the image left by
39 the former restaurant at that location. If significant changes are made, day one attendance will
40 increase substantially.

41
42 Commissioner Oldroyd liked the design but asked about the beams. He suggested they all be
43 symmetrical. Mr. Anderson indicated that the design will adjusted and all structure components
44 will be the same.

1 Commissioner Oldroyd inquired about the canopy and its space. He cautioned the applicant to be
2 careful with the spacing around the canopy and its structure. Mr. Anderson confirmed that they
3 only build premiere projects and will not build anything that is second rate. When it is completed
4 it will be impeccable and they will be a great member of the community. The infrastructure already
5 exists for the proposed restaurant, which will help with the budget, which is currently \$500,000.
6

7 **MOTION:** Commissioner Peters moved to approve the site plan and the architecture and issue a
8 Certificate of Design Compliance for Project SPL-15-002, a restaurant remodel at 7269 South
9 Union Park Avenue with the following stipulations:
10

- 11 1. That an elevation of the rear of the building, with the intent being that it is foresighted
12 architecture and that the themes of the other three sides are carried across and that it would
13 be sent to the Architectural Review Commission for review and approval.
14
- 15 2. On the front canopy, the canopy over the main entry, that the structural components shall
16 be pulled in so that there is a slight overhang with the actual roof component as opposed to
17 the structural components underneath it.
18
- 19 3. The Architectural Review Commission also recommended that the beams be similar in
20 proportion.
21

22 Commissioner Oldroyd seconded the motion. All present voted in favor of the motion. The motion
23 passed unanimously.
24

25 **2.2 (Project #CUP-15-0011) Action on a request from Tony Baros for a Certificate of**
26 **Design Compliance for two administrative office buildings located at 7884 South**
27 **Highland Drive.**
28

29 Mr. Johnson introduced the project and displayed photos of the property. He reported that the
30 property was previously used as a veterinary office. The property has been rezoned to Residential
31 Office and is wooded with numerous trees and landscaping. The proposal is for two office
32 buildings on the property. The landscaping plan shows a small amount of lawn with mulch and
33 plantings and existing trees lining the property. There are three large existing trees that the
34 applicants expect to save and that will remain on the property.
35

36 Mr. Johnson stated that Building 1 is the bigger building on the West End of the building. The
37 intent is to have both properties done at the same time. Building 1 is east facing but tucked in
38 behind Building 2. It is 9,700 square feet in size spread out over two floors. The proposed building
39 materials will be stone with stucco and a bronze metal roof. The east elevation faces Highland
40 Drive and the stone treatment is wrapped around the entire north end of the property. The south
41 elevation has stone. The west side of the property will consist of stucco.
42

43 Mr. Johnson introduced Building 2, which is oriented diagonally on the lot with frontage to
44 Highland Drive. The look is the same, but it is slightly smaller. The building is 7,600 square feet
45 in size on two floors, which is about 2,000 square feet smaller than Building 1. It also utilizes
46 stone on the bottom with stucco on top. It has a small dimension with a diagonal entryway on the

1 south side of the building. Mr. Johnson explained that there are aluminum canopies over the
2 windows. The building entrance is on the south with parking on the opposite side.

3
4 Commissioner Peters asked about Building 2 and specifically about the stone coming up the wall.
5 The applicant, Mr. Baros, admitted that it was a drafting error and stated that the stone was
6 supposed to have stopped. He noted that on the inside corner the stone will stop and will be stucco
7 all of the way back up.

8
9 Commissioner Peters next inquired about the headers over the windows. Specifically he wanted
10 to know why the header comes across and then stops. He recommended it go up a little higher on
11 the window.

12
13 Mr. Baros asked about Building 1 since the window was recessed back. Commissioner Peters
14 asked which windows were pulled forward and which were recessed back on the building. He was
15 concerned because the stone is heavy and holds the building. He suggested that the stucco be set
16 back and rest on the stone. Mr. Baros responded that he did not see a problem with the original
17 design aesthetically and stated that it is done all the time.

18
19 Commissioner Peters asked how the pieces stood out and how much they were recessed from each
20 other. The applicant responded that the stone base, was about three feet back on the bottom and
21 two feet back on the top. The original idea was to provide canned lights to wash the walls.
22 Mr. Baros agreed that the stucco should rest on the stone if this was built out of real stucco and
23 stone. Commissioner Peters did not like the raw stucco edge at the bottom with no treatment and
24 recommended there be some sort of treatment on the bottom edge.

25
26 Commissioner Peters did like the concept of the lights shining down and agreed that it was a nice
27 element. He thought, however, that it could be accommodated in another manner. He asked if the
28 stone would be brought out. Mr. Baros responded that it was already brought out in the one
29 elevation and is already stacked. Therefore, he suggested that the stucco go all the way down.
30 Commissioner Peters did not have a problem with that but would like to see the window detail.
31 Mr. Baros agreed and stated that it could be similar to the other treatments. He was inclined to
32 copy the detail on the left side of the building with headers on the windows. Commissioner Peters
33 stated that the proportions will be affected by doing so and he did no object to stucco the entire
34 way down or doing stone with a header on top. As a new design element, Mr. Baros suggested
35 that a stone band be placed over the top of the stone.

36
37 In response to a question raised, Mr. Baros stated that the main entrance to the building was under
38 the canopy and the material will be stone at the base. It will be a thickened column and the
39 windows will be recessed. In response to a question, Mr. Baros confirmed that the door was
40 centered on the building and will be bumped out.

41
42 Mr. Johnson indicated that staff needs to see more information, particularly on the back of the
43 property. Commissioner Peters agreed. Mr. Johnson reminded the applicant that the City has a
44 criteria that the building have the same design scheme all around the building and that the
45 information be submitted to the City. Commissioner Peters was concerned that there are huge
46 elevations with a stucco wall with striations. He remarked that the Commission needs to see four-

1 sided architecture. Mr. Baros commented that cost is a factor. The owner stated that the
2 neighboring property is dense with trees and the rear of the property cannot be seen.
3 Commissioner Peters was not suggesting they place stone around the back of the building but
4 suggested that something be done to break it up. He wanted to see more detail relative to the rest
5 of the architecture.

6
7 Commissioner Peters clarified that the window treatments on Building 1 will be addressed as on
8 Building 2.

9
10 Commissioner Oldroyd commented that it was a project he would like to see again before the
11 Commission votes on it. He specifically wanted to see more information on the design and
12 materials. Timing issues were discussed.

13
14 Commissioner Peters also asked about the landscaping plan and the neighboring trees. Mr. Baros
15 responded that the tree main pine trees will not be impacted. Commissioner Peters also asked
16 about the turf with adjacent planters. He suggested that the turf be removed because it becomes
17 difficult to maintain and water use is unnecessarily high. He recommended planting shrubs and
18 ground cover instead. Commissioner Peters also asked about the 30-foot setback area. Mr. Baros
19 stated that there is existing landscaping in the area which will remain untouched. The applicant
20 also informed the Commission that there is a creek in the rear. Mr. Baros confirmed that the
21 property line extends to the middle of the creek and there are boulders and existing landscaping
22 that they will utilize and leave. Commissioner Peters he did not object to that plan.

23
24 Commissioner Peters asked why trees were not used in the front of the property. He suggested
25 having some trees to soften the area out. The owner responded that they want to keep the view of
26 the mountains. Commissioner Peters suggested they place three trees in the front. It will soften
27 the front landscape while not blocking the view of the mountains. He recommended taking out all
28 of the turf and replacing it with trees, landscaping, and ground cover. He also suggested a
29 xeriscape design with massings of plant materials to create a design and to conserve water.

30
31 **MOTION:** Commissioner Peters moved to continue the discussion and bring the design back
32 before the Architectural Review Commission with the following recommendations:

- 33
34 1. The turf in the landscaping plan shall be eliminated and a xeriscape concept be
35 developed in those areas while protecting the existing trees.
36
37 2. On Building 1, the Commission recommended in the recessed areas where the windows
38 are located and that the stone be brought up to the height of the windows with a stone
39 cap over the top. Both the west and south elevations should also be addressed to avoid
40 the appearance of a mass of stucco and show four-sided architecture with all sides
41 relating to each other.
42
43 3. Building 2 shall have the same treatment with stone around the recessed windows and
44 included under the canopy. The vestibule shall be detailed so as to be bumped out to
45 include detailing on the corner.
46

1 Commissioner Oldroyd seconded the motion.

2

3 Timing and scheduling issues were discussed. Mr. Johnson stated that the Planning Commission
4 will implement a two-meeting process with a hearing and action. As a result, the Architectural
5 Review Commission could hear the matter again between the September hearing and the October
6 action. Chair Chapman indicated that approval could occur in two to three weeks. Mr. Johnson
7 agreed to follow-up with the applicant on the date.

8

9 The Architectural Review Commission Meeting adjourned at 7:18 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the*
2 *Cottonwood Heights Architecture Review Commission Meeting held Thursday, August 20, 2015.*

3
4
5
6
7
8
9

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Teri Forbes". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above a horizontal line.

10 Teri Forbes
11 T Forbes Group
12 Minutes Secretary
13
14
15 Minutes approved: