



Provo City Planning Commission

Report of Action

June 12, 2019

Item 6 Bruce Cameron requests Project Plan approval for an office building to be located at 3765 N 40 East in a Professional Office (PO) Zone. Riverbottoms neighborhood. Brian Maxfield (801) 852-6429 PLPPA20190103

The following action was taken by the Planning Commission on the above described item at its regular meeting of June 12, 2019:

CONDITIONAL APPROVAL

On a vote of 5:1, the Planning Commission approved this item with the condition that all CRC (Coordinators Review Committee) requirements are met and that the DRC (Design Review Committee) requirements are met including the addition of a hip-roof to the building.

Motion By: Shannon Ellsworth

Second By: Maria Winden

Votes in Favor of Motion: Shannon Ellsworth; Maria Winden; Dave Anderson; Robert Knudsen; Deborah Jensen

Votes Opposed: Jamin Rowan

Deborah Jensen was present as Chair.

The motion includes facts of the case, analysis, conclusions and recommendations outlined in the Staff Report, with any changes noted.

RELATED ACTIONS

The City's Design Review Committee (DRC) met on this item on two occasions, with the recommendation made at their meeting of May 6, 2019, to approve the building and general design with the conditions that it have a pitched roof and that the brick colors be brought back to the DRC for review.

STAFF PRESENTATION

Staff presented background information on the project and the specific determinations needed from the Planning Commission regarding the proposed building's compliance with the design standards of the North University Avenue Design Corridor and of the SDP-6 Olde Ivy Specific Development Plan Overlay Zone.

CITY DEPARTMENTAL ISSUES

None

NEIGHBORHOOD MEETING DATE

This item was presented at a neighborhood meeting on April 16, 2019. Additional meetings have been held with the Neighborhood Chair and neighborhood representatives.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION AND RESPONSE

Bruce Cameron presented his project and the reasons for the selected architectural treatments, including the changes he has made since the first meetings with the neighborhood. Ken Harris, the architect of the proposed building, and Jon Anderson, a commercial real estate broker, were included in the presentation, to establish an economic hardship to satisfy the allowance for the Planning Commission to approve alternative designs to those specified for the design corridor. Mr. Harris addressed the building's architecture and stated architectural considerations were limited due to costs. Jon Anderson commented regarding the large number of tenants who now desire taller windows and natural light

for their work areas and the need for this office design to be different than that of the Jamestown office park to the north. In response to a question from Mr. Rowan of the Planning Commission, Mr. Cameron noted that based on meetings with his contractor, the estimated cost of adding the hip-roof was about \$45,000, and that because of his need to provide a 4-sided architecture, he doesn't have a lot of room to adjust his costs.

In response to the public comments, Mr. Cameron stated that he's tried to make a nice development and that he's made changes to addresses 90% of what the neighborhood said they wanted. In a survey he took of neighbors along Edgewood Drive and other areas, he did not find a uniform or consistent opinion regarding the design of the building and the need for a pitched roof.

NEIGHBORHOOD AND PUBLIC COMMENT

Dave Rosen, the Riverbottoms Neighborhood Chair, gave a brief history of the site and the project, and emphasized the need to have a cohesive design with the other elements of the project. He believes the proposed building would need the hip-roof to meet the design requirements for the zone. Robert Hammond, the assistant chair of the Riverside Neighborhood commented that when Jamestown was developed, the emphasis was on a residential look, and therefore, the pitched roof. He stated he understood the comment regarding the need for light, but reported Jamestown is currently 95% occupied. Sharon Memmott, vice-chair of the Edgemont Neighborhood said she would like to echo Mr. Rosen's comments. Additional comments were made by George Nelson; Linda Wakefield; Wayne Tanner; John Dester; Pam Jones; and Leslie Nelson who voiced the general belief that the proposed building is a beautiful building, but does not provide the cohesive design sought for the Olde Ivy project.

PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION

Deborah Jensen stated the language of the design corridor and the zone seemed pretty straight forward, and that although the design corridor allows other considerations, she doesn't see there is an economic hardship as there are many things that could be done to offset the additional costs. Jamin Rowan stated he felt the zoning ordinance and the Planning Commission have stated what the common design elements are. Shannon Ellsworth stated that she prefers the modern design, but believes the Planning Commission is bound by the adopted design standards.



Planning Commission Chair



Director of Community Development

See Key Land Use Policies of the Provo City General Plan, applicable Titles of the Provo City Code, and the Staff Report to the Planning Commission for further detailed information. The Staff Report is a part of the record of the decision of this item. Where findings of the Planning Commission differ from findings of Staff, those will be noted in this Report of Action.

Legislative items are noted with an asterisk (*) and require legislative action by the Municipal Council following a public hearing; the Planning Commission provides an advisory recommendation to the Municipal Council following a public hearing.