

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

3                                   **Wednesday, September 30, 2015**

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

5                                   **Cottonwood Heights City Council Conference Room**

6                                   **1265 East Fort Union Boulevard, Suite 250**

7                                   **Cottonwood Heights, Utah**

8  
9   **Members Present:**       Chair Scott Chapman, Vice Chair Scott Peters, Robyn Taylor-Granda

10  
11   **Staff Present:**           Senior Planner Glen Goins

12  
13   **Excused:**                 Stephen K. Harman, Neils Valentiner, Jonathan Oldroyd

14  
15   **Others Present:**         Tony Baros, Bob Meyer

16  
17   **BUSINESS MEETING**

18  
19   **1.0    DISCUSSION ITEMS**

20  
21   Chair Scott Chapman participated in the meeting via telephone conference call. Vice Chair Scott  
22   Peters assumed the Chair and called the meeting to order at 6:24 p.m.

23  
24   **1.1    REVIEW ACTION ITEMS**

25  
26   Mr. Goins reminded the Architectural Review Commission Members that the Administrative  
27   Office Buildings were visited by the ARC once before and changes were made to the architecture  
28   as requested. He noted that both Tony Baros and Bob Meyer were present and available for  
29   questions. Modifications made to the architecture were summarized in the Staff Memo.

30  
31   Mr. Goins summarized the Staff Memo and described the main points addressed, which were as  
32   follows:

- 33  
34       1. The elimination of turf on the property and the development of a zero-scape concept to  
35       replace trees, if possible.
- 36  
37       2. A better transition between the stone and stucco on Buildings 1 and 2.
- 38  
39       3. A continued, consistent treatment of architecture treatment on all four sides of Build 1.
- 40  
41       4. A greater amount of detail on the vestibule on Building 2.

42  
43   Mr. Goins presented a graphic to the Commission and highlighted the proposed changes. He stated  
44   that in reviewing the changes, staff believed they were significant enough to be readdressed with  
45   the Architectural Review Commission.

1 Vice Chair Peters requested additional information on the Landscape Plan. Mr. Baros explained  
2 that the turf was removed and replaced with gravel and cobble. He displayed a graphic showing  
3 that they were attempting to preserve the existing trees and will transition around the existing  
4 landscaping. Vice Chair Peters asked if the shrubs were all of the same type. Mr. Baros responded  
5 that there were about eight different shrub types proposed. Vice Chair Peters recommended there  
6 be more variety and stated that more shrubs are needed because the density of planting is too  
7 sparse. He recommended the density be increased within the basin. Mr. Meyers asked him to  
8 define how much more density was recommended. Vice Chair Peters explained that the plan  
9 currently shows about 30% coverage. He suggested it be increased to 50%.

10  
11 Mr. Meyers expressed concern with the west end of the property, which backs an area with dense  
12 trees. Because the neighbor will not allow him to trim the branches and he has a large canopy, the  
13 building does not get a lot of sunlight. Mr. Meyers commented that anything new that is planted  
14 on the west side of the property will not get enough sunlight. Vice Chair Peters requested that  
15 actual photographs of the site be obtained. Mr. Baros commented that another row of trees on the  
16 west end, as required by the ordinance, would look out of place.

17  
18 Vice Chair Peters asked staff for options since the ordinance requires new trees around the  
19 perimeter. Mr. Goins explained that the standard applies to new development, but there is some  
20 leeway for a redeveloped site. He stated that if the Commission accepts the plan, they can note  
21 that additional trees are not needed based on existing landscaping. Chair Chapman stated that they  
22 would not want to overdo the trees based on the existing landscaping. Vice Chair Peters  
23 recommended that two trees be added in the front and stated that the Commission would give  
24 Messrs. Baros and Meyers the freedom to eliminate the trees along the west property line. He did,  
25 however, recommend the placement of large shrubs along the property line. Mr. Meyers requested  
26 a decorative tree instead of a shrub, such as a weeping mulberry, which would provide a more  
27 sculpted design.

28  
29 Vice Chair Peters summarized the discussion and commented that the building needs trees in the  
30 two planter areas, larger shrubs along the west, two trees in the front, and an increase in shrub  
31 plantings in the front by 20 to 30 percent. Commissioner Taylor-Granda asked Mr. Meyers why  
32 he did not keep the existing trees in the front. He responded that they were removed and they were  
33 doing their best to preserve the trees along the south side of the property.

34  
35 Mr. Baros asked if the Commission could change the eight-foot buffer so that the parking stalls  
36 would be zig-zagged and allow for more landscaping. Mr. Goins indicated that that was a function  
37 of the Planning Commission. Vice Chair Peters thought it was a good suggestion but warned that  
38 it would be more costly. Mr. Meyers supported the idea because it would break up the monotony  
39 of the area.

40  
41 Vice Chair Peters reviewed Building 1 and noted that the concerns were addressed. Commissioner  
42 Taylor-Granda asked to see a graphic of the rear of the building and noted that more detail had  
43 been added.

44  
45 Vice Chair Peters asked about Building 2, particularly the vestibule. Mr. Baros presented the  
46 additional plans for the vestibule to ensure that it was clearly defined.

1  
2 Commissioner Taylor-Granda asked about signage. Mr. Baros explained that there would not be  
3 signage on that side of the property and the sign would be in the front. It would be three to four  
4 feet in size and would not be lit.

5  
6 Vice Chair Peters returned to the Landscape Plan and noted that perhaps three trees would be better  
7 in the front so that the property will be balanced.

8  
9 **2.0 ACTION ITEMS**

10  
11 **2.1 (Project #CUP-15-011) Action on a Request from Tony Baros for a Certificate of**  
12 **Design Compliance for Two Administrative Office Buildings located at 7884 South**  
13 **Highland Drive.**

14  
15 **MOTION:** Commissioner Taylor-Granda moved to approve the site plan and the architecture and  
16 issue a Certificate of Design Compliance for Project CUP-15-011, for the two Administrative  
17 Office Buildings located at 7884 South Highland Drive subject to the following conditions:

- 18  
19 1. The density of plantings in the front retention basin must be increased 20 to 30 percent;  
20  
21 2. Three trees shall be planted in the front area.  
22  
23 3. Trees shall be added in the planter islands on the west side of the property.  
24  
25 4. Massings of larger shrubs or decorative trees shall be added.

26  
27 The Commission also expressed support for a staggered parking lot along the west side and a  
28 decreased minimum setback of six feet provided that the landscaping is extended into the parking  
29 area equal or more to what they currently have.

30  
31 Chair Chapman seconded the motion. All present voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed  
32 unanimously.

33  
34 **2.2 Approval of September 30, 2015 Minutes.**

35  
36 **MOTION:** Commissioner Taylor-Granda moved to approve the minutes of September 30, 2015,  
37 after the following process is met. The Recorder will prepare the minutes and email them to each  
38 Member of the Commission. The Members will have five days to review the minutes and provide  
39 changes to the Recorder. If, after five days there are no changes, the minutes will stand approved.  
40 If there are changes, the process will be followed until the changes are made and the Commission  
41 is in agreement at which time the minutes shall be deemed approved.

42  
43 Chair Chapman seconded the motion. All present voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed  
44 unanimously.

45  
46 **3.0 ADJOURNMENT**

1  
2 **MOTION:** Commissioner Taylor-Granda moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Chair  
3 Chapman. All present voted in favor of the motion. The motion passed unanimously.  
4  
5 The Architectural Review Commission Meeting adjourned at 6:49 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 Wednesday, September 30,*  
3 *2015.*

4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

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

11 Teri Forbes  
12 T Forbes Group  
13 Minutes Secretary

14  
15

16 Minutes approved: