To: Salt Lake City Planning Commission

From: Linda Mitchell, Principal Planner, 385-386-2763, linda.mitchell@slcgov.com

Date: September 18, 2020

Re: PLNSUB2020-00230 - East Liberty Commons Planned Development
   PLNSUB2020-00231 – East Liberty Commons Preliminary Subdivision

Planned Development and Preliminary Subdivision

PROPERTY ADDRESS: Approximately 2052 East Michigan Avenue
PARCEL ID: 16-10-303-001-0000
MASTER PLAN: East Bench – Neighborhoods (Foothill/Sunnyside)
ZONING DISTRICT: RMF-30 Low Density Multi-Family Residential

REQUEST: Jessica Sluder from Alta Development Group, LLC, representing the property owner, is requesting approval for a new residential development at the above listed address. The proposal includes demolishing the discontinued pool area on the site and subdividing the property into four (4) lots for a proposed construction of three (3) single-family attached dwelling units. The proposed project is subject to the following petitions:

a. **Planned Development** – Planned Development is requested to modify the required front yard setback, grade changes greater than four feet (4’) within a required yard, and the required minimum lot area for the new lots.

b. **Preliminary Subdivision** – Preliminary Plat approval is needed to create four (4) new lots.

RECOMMENDATION: Based on the information in this staff report, Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the Planned Development and Preliminary Subdivision requests as proposed, and subject to complying with the following conditions:

1. Compliance with all Department/Division comments and conditions as noted in Attachment J.
2. Documentation that establishes an entity to manage the private infrastructure and Common Area Maintenance for the subdivision shall be recorded with the final plat.

ATTACHMENTS:

A. **Vicinity Map**
B. **Plans**
C. **Preliminary Subdivision Plat**
D. **Additional Applicant Information**
E. **Site Visit Photographs**
PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Project Site
The project site recently obtained preliminary subdivision approval under petition number PLNSUB2020-00349 for the amendment to The Townes Condominium plat to subdivide the common area and sell the lot for the proposed development. The Townes Condominium amendment is pending final plat approval. Currently, there is a discontinued pool area on the site, which has fallen into disrepair. The project site is zoned RMF-30 Low Density Multi-Family Residential with the total square footage of approximately 0.269 acres (11,696 square feet).

The surrounding properties are zoned R-1/7,000 Single-Family Residential District to the west and south, RMF-30 Low Density Multi-Family Residential District to the north, and OS Open Space District to the east (Figure 1).

Proposal
The applicant is seeking to demolish the existing pool area and create four (4) new lots for the proposed construction of three (3) single-family attached dwelling units (townhomes), with the fourth (4th) lot dedicated as common area (Figure 2). The proposed development requires Planned Development approval because the proposed lots will not meet the required minimum lot area of 3,000 square feet; however, the overall development does meet the minimum area required for three (3) dwelling units in the RMF-30 zone. In addition, the proposed townhomes will not meet the required front yard setback of 20 feet and have grade changes greater than four feet (4') within the required yard. The applicant has not requested relief from any other zoning requirements; thus, all other project elements would need to comply with standard requirements of the zoning ordinance and RMF-30 zoning district. The Planned Development process includes standards related to whether any modifications will result in a better final product, whether the proposal aligns any one of a variety of City policies and goals, and whether the development is compatible with the area or the City's master plan development goals for the area. The full list of standards is located in Attachment F.

The proposal requires a subdivision process to create the new lots. The buildable lots do not comply with all applicable zoning standards as noted above; therefore, a Planned Development approval is requested for the subdivision. The full list of standards is located in Attachment H.
The applicant has provided a narrative about their proposal and design considerations in Attachment D.

The proposed 3-story townhomes are modern in design. The front facades of the proposed townhomes would be oriented towards Foothill Drive to provide interaction with the sidewalk to be compatible with character of the neighborhood (Figure 3). The average building height would be approximately 26 feet, where a maximum height of 30 feet is allowed with an average building footprint of approximately 1,053 square feet. Each townhome would provide two (2) off-street parking spaces within the attached garage. The proposed materials for each structure would consist primarily of brick and durable materials for accent purposes. The proposal includes a common area, pedestrian walkway, and
landscape buffering between the driveways and between the proposed building and adjacent properties (Figure 4).

**KEY CONSIDERATIONS:**
The key considerations listed below have been identified through the analysis of the project, neighbor and community input and department review comments.

1. Front Yard Encroachments
2. Grade Change Greater Than Four Feet (4’) Within a Required Yard
3. Minimum Lot Size Reduction
4. Neighborhood Compatibility
5. Development Potential without Planned Development Approval
6. Private Infrastructure and Common Area Maintenance

**1. Front Yard Encroachments**
The required front yard setback in the RMF-30 zoning district is twenty feet (20’). Given the odd angle of the setback line, the applicant is proposing approximately eighteen feet (18’) front yard setback for the building façade and approximately five feet (5’) front yard setback for the stairs, meeting all other required yards (side and rear) for all the lots. The front yard encroachments are to accommodate building articulations on the second and third levels, and stairs leading to the building entrance (Figures 5 and 6).
The building articulations provide both for façade and pedestrian interest along Foothill Drive. The reduced front yard setback would promote harmony with the condominium units immediately to the north of Foothill Drive and to help maintain the harmony of the development pattern on the block face. The front yard reduction for the building encroachment is generally consistent with setbacks along the block face (east side of Foothill Drive) as shown in Attachment D.

In regard to design, there are very limited design criteria required in the RMF-30 zoning district. The only design requirements, which are imposed on all residential districts, are front façade controls:

*Front Façade Controls: To maintain architectural harmony and primary orientation along the street, all buildings shall be required to include an entrance door, and such other features as windows, balconies, porches, and other such architectural features in the front façade of the building, totaling not less than ten percent (10%) of the front façade elevation area, excluding any area used for roof structures. For buildings constructed on a corner lot, only one front façade is required in either the front or corner side façade of the building.*

The stairs leading to the main (second) level allow each building entrance to be oriented towards the street and further promotes visual and pedestrian interest through its orientation to the street (Figure 7).
2. Grade Change Greater Than Four Feet (4’) Within a Required Yard

For properties outside of the H Historic Preservation Overlay District, changes of established grade greater than four feet (4’) within a required yard are normally processed administratively as special exceptions but it is included as part of the Planned Development request. The grade change greater than four feet (4’) is requested to accommodate a retaining wall to create drive-in garages that are at street grade with the hill rising around the garage. Therefore, creating below grade garages with the main living level at about the grade of the existing pool. The grade change and retaining walls over four feet (4’) in height along the north property would encroach approximately 4.39 feet into the required front yard and along the driveway for lot 3, it would encroach approximately 8.32 feet into the required front yard (Sheet C2-0 in Attachment B). The grade change and retaining walls greater than four feet (4’) within the required front yard is generally consistent with the structures along the block face (east side of Foothill Drive) (Figure 8).
3. Minimum Lot Size Reduction
For single-family attached dwelling units, the RMF-30 zoning district requires 3,000 square feet lot area per dwelling unit. The proposal includes an average lot size of 2,923 square feet (Table 1). While the lots are undersized, the overall square footage of the subject property meets the density requirement of 9,000 square foot minimum for three (3) single-family attached units.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot #</th>
<th>Lot Area (sq. ft.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>2,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2</td>
<td>2,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 3</td>
<td>2,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 4</td>
<td>4,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,696</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Proposed Lot Size

4. Neighborhood Compatibility
The purpose of the RMF-30 (Low Density Multi-Family Residential District) is to:

The purpose of the RMF-30 low density multi-family residential district is to provide an environment suitable for a variety of housing types of a low density nature, including single-family, two-family, and multi-family dwellings, with a maximum height of thirty feet (30’). This district is appropriate in areas where the applicable master plan policies recommend multi-family housing with a density of less than fifteen (15) dwellings units per acre. Uses are intended to be compatible with the existing scale and intensity of the neighborhood. The standards for the district are intended to provide for safe and comfortable places to live and play, promote sustainable and compatible development patterns and to preserve the existing character of the neighborhood.

The RMF-30 zoning district encourages a variety of residential uses. While moderately scaled residential structures are located to the north, the immediate neighborhood context primarily includes low scale single-family structures. These structures range from 1 to 3 stories in height, with a variety of roof types. The addition of these townhouse units within the neighborhood is architecturally compatible with the surrounding buildings, as well as the existing uses. The integration of materials that are commonly utilized within the direct context, as well as a moderate massing of the proposed structure will aid in transition of new development within the existing neighborhood.

The subject property is located within the East Bench Neighborhood, identified in the East Bench Master Plan, 2017. The applicable guiding principal for residential development is stated, below:

Guiding Principle N-01: Neighborhood Compatibility – Development and infrastructure improvements complement the unique architectural styles and development patterns that define individual neighborhoods.

The proposed development is in compliance with the adopted East Bench Master Plan as discussed in Attachment F. The proposed development of the townhomes attempts to limit the disruption of the existing grade and significant slope. The development recognizes the existing development pattern that characterizes the neighborhood.
5. Development Potential without Planned Development Approval
If the project does not receive Planned Development approval, the property owner may develop the
property in a way that meets all requirements of the zoning ordinance and RMF-30 zoning district.

- The property owner may construct a multi-family dwelling (up to 3 dwelling units),
  which requires a minimum lot area of 9,000 square feet and minimum lot width of 80
  feet. In other words, the applicant could build a similar proposal as apartments or
  condominiums.
- The property owner may construct a single-family detached, twin home or two-family
dwellings.

6. Private Infrastructure and Common Area Maintenance
The proposed development includes common areas. The applicant has drafted a CC&R’s for
ongoing maintenance and funding for these areas of common ownership. This should be noted
on the plat and the agreements should be recorded to perpetuate those obligations.

Staff is recommending that a condition be included that a document showing that ongoing
maintenance and funding for areas of common ownership be provided in order to finalize the
planned development and that this agreement must be recorded with the plat.

DISCUSSION:
The proposed design and layout of the single-family attached dwelling units have taken the scale of
adjacent properties and the existing neighborhood into consideration. By providing relief from certain
zoning regulations through this Planned Development process, a project that is compatible with the
existing zoning and neighborhood can be constructed while more efficiently utilizing the property.

Staff recommends approval of the proposed project based on the following findings:

- The proposal generally meets the standards in terms of Master Plan Policies and Zoning Ordinance
  standards (Attachment F), Planned Development standards (Attachment G) and Subdivision
  Ordinance standards (Attachment H);
- The proposal will provide housing that meets the intent of the multi-family zone and that provides
  increased home ownership opportunities in the City, which is a policy goal of multiple City master
  plans.
- The proposed project meets the density of the subject zoning district; and
- The proposed project would be compatible with the existing zoning district and surrounding
  neighborhood.

NEXT STEPS:
- If approved, the applicant may proceed with the project, subject to all conditions imposed by City
departments and/or the Planning Commission and will be required to obtain all necessary permits.
  A final plat application will need to be submitted for approval. Certificate of occupancy for the
  buildings would not be issued until the conditions are met and the final subdivision plat is recorded.

- If denied, the applicant would be permitted to develop the lot in a way that is compliant with
development standards and requirements of the RMF-30 zoning district.
May 13, 2020

Salt Lake City Planning
451 S State Street
Salt Lake City, UT, 84101

Re: Project Description for Stanford Commons

Dear Planning,

The Townes Condominium Association, Inc. (the “Townes”) is the owner of the property located at 2092 E Michigan Avenue, Salt Lake City, UT, as depicted on the record of survey map of The Townes recorded on May 23, 1973, as entry number 2541615 in the Salt Lake County Recorder’s Office (the “Townes Property”). We are submitting a planned development application, along with a plat amendment for The Townes, a condominium project, and a preliminary plat and site plan application for Stanford Commons.

The Townes Property includes a swimming pool as part of its common area on the southern end of the property. The Townes voted to discontinue use and maintenance of the pool years ago. The pool has fallen into disrepair. Since that time, the Townes voted to subdivide their common area and sell the pool area to a developer. Stanford Commons, LLC has entered a contract with the Townes to purchase the pool area. The application for a plat amendment is to amend the Townes Property to remove the pool from the common area of the Townes. The plat amendment does not show the individual units because we are only trying to amend the exterior boundary of common area. The units in the Townes will not change.

Once the pool area has been subdivided from the rest of the Townes Property, we intend to build three single-family attached dwellings on that property. The planned development application is for the new development, which we are calling Stanford Commons. We intend to build high end single-family attached dwellings. We request an exception to the following zoning requirements as part of the planned development application:

1) Required minimum lot size of 3,000 square feet; and
2) Exterior stairs are greater than four feet above grade in the front yard setback and a portion of the second and third floor area extends into the front yard setback.

1) Minimum Lot Size

The property is zoned RMF-30, which requires 3,000 square feet per lot. We request the ability to subdivide the parcel into three buildable lots that are smaller than 3,000 square feet. The entire Stanford Commons property, once subdivided, will be subdivided into four different lots—three lots for single-family attached dwellings and one lot of common area. The entire project will consist of 11,696 square feet, broken down as follows: (a) Lot 1 (buildable lot) – 2,593 square feet; (b) Lot 2 (buildable lot) – 2,046 square feet; (c) Lot 3 (buildable lot) – 2,539 square feet; and (d) Lot 4 (Common Area) – 4,717 square feet. This development exceeds the overall minimum planned development size (9,000 square feet) as established in 21A.55.060 of the Salt Lake City Code, but distributes a portion of that land as common area rather than directly to individual lots. This request meets the planned development requirements as described below.
2) Front Yard Setback

We request the ability to build a portion of the front staircase and a cantilevered portion of the second and third floors of the main structure in the front yard setback. City code required a twenty-foot front yard setback. It restricts constructing a staircase in the setback that rises more than four feet above grade and it restricts the construction of a portion of the main dwelling in the setback. While staircase and main structures extend into the twenty-foot front yard setback, there is actually a large portion of city owned land between the property line and the edge of the road. From the edge of the road to the property line is 25.5 feet, consisting mostly of landscaping. While the corner of each residence extends two feet into the front yard setback, that extended portion is still about 43.5 feet from the edge of the road. Additionally, given the odd angle of the setback line, a portion of each dwelling is not built all the way to the setback line. The amount of the building area pulled back from the setback line is actually greater than the amount of the area pushed out beyond the setback line. Pushing and pulling the front facade along the setback provides architectural interest.

The requirements of the planned development ordinance are met as follows:

A. **Planned Development Objectives.** This project meets the planned development objectives by (a) clustering development to preserve open space; (b) including higher density housing types (single-family attached) that are not commonly found in the Harvard-Yale neighborhood but appropriately match the density and scale of the Townes next door; and (c) implement the master plan, as further discussed below. Additionally, this plan meets the objectives of the planned development process by eliminating the blighted swimming pool area which has been occupied, on occasion, as a living space for the transient population and using design and architectural features to add to the beauty of the neighborhood. The swimming pool itself has been unused for years and has pieces of plywood boarding it up. This project will take this unused area which has become an eyesore and will redevelop it into high end, single-family attached dwellings.

B. **Master Plan Compatibility.** This project also meets the stated purpose of the East Bench Master Plan. Guiding Principle N-03 states that some of the purposes of the area are to "[p]romote ... redevelopment of underutilized land," to "[i]nterate the number of medium density housing types and options," and to "[a]ccommodate and promote an increase in City’s population." The Townes Property is currently zoned RMF-30. This is one of the few opportunities to increase the number of medium density housing options in this area and provide additional housing for population growth while still fitting the overall feel of the neighborhood. The exterior of the buildings will primarily be brick, similar to many of the single-family dwellings in the area, and will be of a similar density to the existing dwellings in the Townes.

C. **Design and Compatibility.** By clustering the construction of the homes, the individual lots are smaller than required by the zoning ordinance, but it leaves a larger open space thereby meeting one of the planned development objectives. This is compatible with the neighboring Townes development to the north.

Also, as described above, allowing a portion of the buildings, the decks/patios, and the front entry stairway to be constructed in the front setback will still provide sufficient open space between the road and the front of the buildings given the unique layout of the lots and the large existing landscaped area. As mentioned, the corner of each residence extends two feet into the front yard setback, but that extended portion is still about 43.5 feet from the edge of the road. The orientation of the buildings and the setback from the road will closely mirror the existing attached dwellings in the Townes. Additionally, allowing
this construction in the setback will provide for additional variations in the front of the homes and create greater architectural interest.

We originally planned to make the entrances on the side of the homes rather than having the stairs in the front setback, but we changed the plans and made the stairway in the front of the homes to meet the desires of some of the neighboring property owners, including the Townes.

D.  **Landscaping.** Our plans leave as many of the mature native trees in place as possible and include planting additional trees to replace those trees that are being removed.

E.  **Mobility.** The development incorporates a walkable path that connects the streets on the west and the east side of the property. Additionally, the development will not negatively impact the safety, purpose or character of the street. The main access will be provided along Foothill Drive (to the west of the property) that ends in a cul-de-sac shortly after the development. The development will only consist of three, single-family attached homes that should not contribute any significant amount of additional traffic on the dead-end street.

F.  **Existing Site Features.** To the extent possible, the project attempts to leave as much of the existing trees and topography in place, and attempts to replace any removed trees and vegetation. The existing access road (Foothill Drive) is lower in elevation than the top of the existing pool. We plan to cut into the hill and create drive-in garages that are at street grade with the hill rising around the garages, creating below grade garages with the main living level at about the grade of the existing pool.

G.  **Utilities.** The addition of three, single-family attached dwellings will not create a significant burden on the existing utility lines in the area.

The Townes has voted on this project and has fully approved the subdivision and sale of the property. They have also had the opportunity to review our plans and we have made adjustments to meet their concerns.

We’re excited to move forward with this project and to add to the beauty of the neighborhood. Please reach out to me if you have any questions.

Best,

Stanford Bell
ATTACHMENT E: SITE VISIT PHOTOGRAPHS

Top Left: Southwest view of street frontage along Foothill Drive

Top Right: East view of the discontinued pool area

Bottom Left: View of the neighboring property to the northeast

Bottom Right: North view of the discontinued pool area
**Top Left:**
Proposed common area and adjacent neighboring property to the north (left)

**Top Right:**
Southwest corner from interior lot with adjacent property to the south (left)

**Bottom Left:**
Walkway between The Townes Condominium (right) and proposed development (left)

**Bottom Right:**
North view of the street frontage along Foothill Drive
**ATTACHMENT F: MASTER PLAN POLICIES AND ZONING ORDINANCE STANDARDS**

**Master Plan**
The subject property is located within the East Bench (adopted February 21, 2017) and is designated on the future land use map as “Neighborhoods”. Below is an excerpt from the master plan about Neighborhoods and specifically the Foothill/Sunnyside neighborhood:

**Neighborhoods**
The East Bench Neighborhoods are comprised of predominantly single-family homes and pockets of multifamily, commercial, recreation, and institutional uses that complement the low-density residential neighborhood character. Future development fits into the unique architectural styles and development patterns that define individual neighborhoods; provides a diverse mix of housing choices for all stages of life and income ranges; and creates friendly, safe and welcoming neighborhoods that encourage interaction through all stages of life.

**Foothill/Sunnyside Neighborhood**
The Foothill/Sunnyside neighborhood is predominantly single-family residential with some multi-family housing along the Foothill corridor. The earliest developed areas of the neighborhood follow a grid street pattern but more recently developed portions of the neighborhood follow a curving street pattern. Street trees line most of the park strips within the neighborhood and homes generally have similar setbacks. Activity centers include the Anderson-Foothill Library, Bonneville Elementary, and the northern portion of the 13th and 21st commercial node.

**Policies**
- **Neighborhood Compatibility**: Development and infrastructure improvements complement the unique architectural styles and development patterns that define individual neighborhoods.
  - Preserve and Enhance Neighborhood Identity (N-1.1)
- **Housing Choices**: Provide a diverse mix of housing choices for all stages of life and income ranges.
  - No Net Loss in Housing (N-3.1)
  - Housing Affordability, Access, and Choices (N-3.2)

**Challenges within the East Bench Community**
- Maintaining Neighborhood Character
- Meeting the Needs of Future Generations

**Staff Discussion**: The proposed development provides in-fill housing on underutilized land. The property is located in an area zoned and intended for multi-family development in the City but is limited to single- or two-family due to the lot frontage requirements. The limited modifications promote the redevelopment of this underutilized land to help meet City growth and housing goals. The project also provides an increase in moderate density housing type (townhomes) that is not common with the City. Recent planning best practices have discussed the lack of a “missing middle” housing types in urban areas. The “missing middle” housing type is generally viewed as multifamily or clustered housing which is compatible in
scale with single-family homes that help meet the growing demand for walkable, lower scale
urban living. This proposed development helps to meet the goals of the master plan as well as
providing needed housing.

Growing SLC: A Five-Year Housing Plan
The City recently adopted a citywide housing master plan title Growing SLC: A Five-Year
Housing Plan 2017-2021 focuses on ways the City can meet its housing needs in the next five
years. The plan includes policies that relate to this development, including:

- 1.1.1 Develop flexible zoning tools and regulations, with a focus along significant
  transportation routes.
- 1.1.2 Develop in-fill ordinances that promote a diverse housing stock, increase
  housing options, create redevelopment opportunities, and allow additional units
  within existing structures, while minimizing neighborhood impacts.

The planned development process is a zoning tool that provides flexibility in the zoning
standards and a way to allow development that would normally pose difficulty. The planned
development process allows for an increase in creative housing stock, housing stock that
would otherwise not be aesthetically creative or not be allowed through the strict application
of the zoning ordinance. This process allows for additional housing options and provides a
way to minimize neighborhood impacts through the review and assurance of the compatibility
standards. The proposed development is utilizing this process to provide new single-family
attached dwelling units on a unique site configuration.

Purpose Statement for RMF-30 (Low Density Multi-Family Residential District)
The purpose of the RMF-30 low density multi-family residential district is to provide an
environment suitable for a variety of housing types of a low density nature, including single-
family, two-family, and multi-family dwellings, with a maximum height of thirty feet (30').
This district is appropriate in areas where the applicable master plan policies recommend
multi-family housing with a density of less than fifteen (15) dwellings units per acre. Uses
are intended to be compatible with the existing scale and intensity of the neighborhood. The
standards for the district are intended to provide for safe and comfortable places to live and
play, promote sustainable and compatible development patterns and to preserve the
existing character of the neighborhood.

Staff Discussion: The proposed project is allowed in the zone and would meet the intent of
the zone with the approval of requested modifications, as it still maintains conformance with
the density and scale/intensity of the neighborhood.

21A.24.120: RMF-30 Low Density Multi-Family Residential District:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Area: Single-Family attached dwelling (3 or more):</td>
<td>3,000 square feet</td>
<td>Approximate Lot Area (square feet)</td>
<td>Modifications requested through the Planned Development process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 1 2,393 SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 2 2,046 SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 3 2,539 SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural open space and conservation areas, public or private:</strong></td>
<td>No Minimum</td>
<td><strong>Approximate Lot Area (square feet)</strong></td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 4</td>
<td>4,717 SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Minimum Lot Width**  
Single-Family attached dwelling (3 or more): | Interior: 25 feet  
Corner: 35 feet | **Approximate Lot Width (feet)** | Complies |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>31 feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 2</td>
<td>27 feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 3</td>
<td>27 feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Natural open space and conservation areas, public or private:</strong></th>
<th>No Minimum</th>
<th><strong>Approximate Lot Width (feet)</strong></th>
<th>Complies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 4</td>
<td>6.45 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Maximum Building Height**  
The vertical distance measured from the average elevation of the finished lot grade at each face of the building, to the average height of the gable on a shed roof. | 30 feet | **North Elevation:** 26’-10”  
**West Elevation:** 29’ – 10 ⅛”  
**South Elevation:** 24’ – 8 ½”  
**East Elevation:** 23’ – 2 ⅞” | Complies |

| **Minimum Front Yard** | 20 feet | • Approximately 18 feet from building façade  
• Approximately 5 feet from entry stairs | Modifications requested through the Planned Development process. |

| **Minimum Interior Side Yard** | No yard is required, however if one is provided it shall not be less than four feet (4’). | Lot 1: Four feet (4’)  
Lot 2: No interior side yards  
Lot 3: Zero feet (0’) | Complies |

| **Minimum Rear Yard** | Twenty-five percent (25%) of the lot depth, but not less than twenty feet (20’) and need not exceed twenty-five feet (25’). | Lot 1: 20 feet  
Lot 2: 20 feet  
Lot 3: 26.68 feet | Complies |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Maximum Building Coverage</strong></th>
<th>The surface coverage of all principal and accessory buildings shall not exceed fifty percent (50%) of the lot.</th>
<th><strong>Approximate Building Envelope Coverage</strong></th>
<th>Complies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 1</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 2</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 3</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lot 4</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Required Landscape Yards

| Required Landscape Yards | The front and corner side yards shall be maintained as landscaped yards. | The front yards of the double frontage lot will be maintained as a landscape yard. Sidewalks and driveways are allowed through landscaped yards. However, due to the way the development is configured, the townhomes have minimal landscaped front yards along Foothill Drive. | Complies |

### Landscape Buffer

| Landscape Buffer | For multi-family uses where a lot abuts a lot in a single-family or two-family residential district, a landscape buffer shall be provided in accordance with chapter 21A.48 of Zoning Ordinance. | The proposed development is not a multi-family use; therefore, the landscape buffer is **not** required. | Complies |

### 21A.36.020B: Obstructions in Required Yards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes of Established Grade Greater than 4 feet</strong></td>
<td>For properties outside of the H Historic Preservation Overlay District, changes of established grade greater than 4 feet [in any required yards] are special exceptions subject to the standards and factors in chapter 21A.52 of this title [Title 21A Zoning Ordinance].</td>
<td>The grade change and retaining walls over four feet (4’) in height along the north property would encroach approximately 4.39 feet into the required front yard and along the driveway for lot 3, it would encroach approximately 8.32 feet into the required front yard.</td>
<td>Modifications requested through the Planned Development process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ATTACHMENT G: ANALYSIS OF STANDARDS – PLANNED DEVELOPMENT**

**21A.55.050: Standards for Planned Developments**

The planning commission may approve, approve with conditions, or deny a planned development based upon written findings of fact according to each of the following standards. It is the responsibility of the applicant to provide written and graphic evidence demonstrating compliance with the following standards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Finding</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Planned Development Objectives: The planned development shall meet the purpose statement for a planned development (section 21A.55.010 of this chapter) and will achieve at least one of the objectives stated in said section:</td>
<td>Complies</td>
<td>The proposed planned development would result in three (3) new townhomes. Townhomes are a low to medium density type of development that is called for on this property by the associated zoning district’s purpose statement and the number of units is allowed by the zone’s density limitations. However, without this process and associated zoning modifications, the property would be limited to a single-family detached or duplex, due to the minimum lot size and yard requirements. The resulting development is a more efficient and enhanced use of land and resources, providing additional home ownership opportunities in the City than would otherwise not be possible through strict application of the standards, while remaining relatively compatible with adjacent property and maintaining compliance with the zoning district purposes. The applicant has stated that the project meets objective C. (The applicant’s narrative regarding these objectives is located in Attachment D). Staff also finds that the project generally meets this objective. Only one objective must be met to go through the planned development process. While duplexes, triplexes and other multifamily buildings are found in this neighborhood, not many take the form of townhomes that tend to be a desirable housing type in Salt Lake City and provide opportunity for home ownership. The East Bench Master Plan also specifically encourages “a diverse mix of housing choices for all stages of life and income ranges,” which this development generally offers. See discussion and analysis in Attachment F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Open Space And Natural Lands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Historic Preservation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Housing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Mobility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F. Master Plan Implementation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. The proposed planned development is generally consistent with adopted policies set forth in the citywide, community, and/or small area master plan that is applicable to the site where the planned development will be located.

| B1 | Complies | Staff finds that the proposal is generally consistent with a number of different adopted overall City policies related to housing and more specific community master plan policies related to housing and compatibility. The proposal is also consistent with the future land use map applicable to the property, which designates this property for future development of residential uses. See discussion and analysis in Attachment F. |

C. Design and Compatibility: The proposed planned development is compatible with the area the planned development will be located and is designed to achieve a more enhanced product than would be achievable through strict application of land use regulations. In determining design and compatibility, the planning commission should consider:

| C1 | Complies | The proposed project generally complies with all design and compatibility considerations. |

| C1 | Whether the scale, mass, and intensity of the proposed planned development is compatible with the neighborhood where the planned development will be located and/or the policies stated in an applicable Master Plan related to building and site design; | Complies | The proposed development is located within a zoning district that anticipates the size, scale and intensity of the proposed development and meets the zoning standards related to density. The proposed planned development would be compatible with the existing zoning district and the neighboring condominium development to the north. See discussion and analysis in Attachment F. |

| C2 | Whether the building orientation and building materials in the proposed planned development are compatible with the neighborhood where the planned development will be located and/or the policies stated in an applicable Master Plan related to building and site design; | Complies | • Building Orientation  
The construction of the new single-family homes would be oriented toward Foothill Drive. The orientation of the buildings and the setback from the street will closely mirror the existing condominiums to the north. The applicant originally planned to make the entrances on the side of the home rather than having the stairs in the front setback, but changed their plans and made the stairway in the front of the homes to meet the desires of some of the neighboring property owners. The rear yards of the proposed lots would be located on the periphery of the project site. This orientation is typical for a single-family residential development pattern and would be compatible with the surrounding area.  

• Building Materials  
Many existing single-family homes near the project site are constructed of masonry in the form of brick and stone, |
stucco, and various types of siding. The proposed building façade would consist of brick and other durable building materials for accent purposes.

The design of the new home is more modern than homes typically found in that immediate block; however, the single-family attached homes are similar in scale to the adjacent condominiums to the north.

### C3 Whether building setbacks along the perimeter of the development:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complies</th>
<th>a. The proposed development does not disrupt the existing visual character of the neighborhood. The proposed setbacks of the development provide adequate spacing between existing structures and the proposal.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. Lot 4 dedicated as common area provides sufficient space for the private amenities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The proposed development includes approximately 4 to 6-foot setback on the sides of the development, creating some separation for privacy and windows. The rear yards of each lot will be enclosed with fences to minimize impacts related to privacy and noise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. The private driveway for each lot provides sufficient sight lines to Foothill Drive. Additionally, the sidewalk is approximately 16 feet from the front property line which provides adequate sight lines to the street and sidewalks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. The provided setbacks and spacing will be adequate for any future maintenance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given constraints of the property, the design layout is compatible with adjacent and surrounding properties. The proposal would meet all the requirements listed in this section [C3].

### C4 Whether building facades offer ground floor transparency, access, and architectural detailing to facilitate pedestrian interest and interaction;

| Complies | The primary elevations have been designed to provide for architectural detailing to facilitate pedestrian interest and interaction through the building articulations. While the first floor of the street facing facades, contain the garage door and exterior stairs, the entry is recessed, and a large overhanging second story balcony extends beyond the building façade. The integration of a variation of glass, materials and |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Architectural features help in creating pedestrian interest at the street level.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C5</strong></td>
<td>Whether lighting is designed for safety and visual interest while minimizing impacts on surrounding property;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C6</strong></td>
<td>Whether dumpsters, loading docks and/or service areas are appropriately screened; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C7</strong></td>
<td>Whether parking areas are appropriately buffered from adjacent uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Landscaping:</strong> The proposed planned development preserves, maintains or provides native landscaping where appropriate. In determining the landscaping for the proposed planned development, the Planning Commission should consider:</td>
<td>Generally Complies. The proposed project generally complies with all landscape considerations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D1</strong></td>
<td>Whether mature native trees located along the periphery of the property and along the street are preserved and maintained;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D2</strong></td>
<td>Whether existing landscaping that provides additional buffering to the abutting properties is maintained and preserved;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>Whether proposed landscaping is designed to lessen potential impacts created by the proposed planned development; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>Whether proposed landscaping is appropriate for the scale of the development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Mobility: The proposed planned development supports Citywide transportation goals and promotes safe and efficient circulation within the site and surrounding neighborhood. In determining mobility, the Planning Commission should consider:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>Whether drive access to local streets will negatively impact the safety, purpose and character of the street;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| E2 | Whether the site design considers safe circulation for a range of transportation options including:  
   a. Safe and accommodating pedestrian environment and pedestrian oriented design;  
   b. Bicycle facilities and connections where appropriate, and orientation to transit where available; and  
   c. Minimizing conflicts between different transportation modes; | • The proposed private walkway through the common area provides a safe pedestrian between the two street frontages and vehicle access onto Foothill Drive and complies with the sight distance requirements.  
• The proposed development is located within proximity to the following public transit:  
|   | Nearest Transit | Approx. Distance | |
|   | Bus Stop | 350 feet |  
• There are not any anticipated conflicts between transportation modes with the proposed development. |
| E3 | Whether the site design of the proposed development promotes or enables access to adjacent uses and amenities; | Complies | The project has a shared open space common area with a pedestrian walkway. This promotes access to adjacent uses and surrounding neighborhood. |
| E4 | Whether the proposed design provides adequate emergency vehicle access; and | Complies | Fire department review did not identify any issues with the proposed development. |
| E5 | Whether loading access and service areas are adequate for the site and minimize impacts to the surrounding area and public rights-of-way. | Complies | There are not any proposed loading access or service areas. |
| F. Existing Site Features: The proposed planned development preserves natural and built features that significantly contribute to the character of the neighborhood and/or environment. | Complies | There are not any significant natural or built features that contribute to the character of the neighborhood or environment. |
| G. Utilities: Existing and/or planned utilities will adequately serve the development and not have a detrimental effect on the surrounding area. | Complies | The Public Utilities department had no comments on the proposed development. Public Utilities may require upgrades to the public utilities in order to adequately service the property without degrading services to adjacent properties. Any such upgrades would be required to be installed as part of the building permit and final subdivision process. |
### 20.16.100: Standards of Approval for Preliminary Plats

*All preliminary plats for subdivisions and subdivision amendments shall meet the following standards:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Finding</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. The subdivision complies with the general design standards and</td>
<td>Complies</td>
<td>The proposed preliminary plat generally complies with the general design standards and requirements for a subdivision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requirements for subdivisions as established in chapter 20.12 of this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>title;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. All buildable lots comply with all applicable zoning standards;</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>The proposal does not comply with the standard found in section 21A.24.120 RMF-30 Low Density Multi-Family Residential District (i.e.,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>minimum lot size and minimum yard requirements) and grade changes greater than four feet (4') within a required yard; therefore, a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>approval</td>
<td>Planned Development approval is requested. All other applicable zoning standards are met as noted in Attachment F.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>required for the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planned Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>request.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. All necessary and required dedications are made;</td>
<td>Complies</td>
<td>Any necessary or required dedications shall be made prior to recordation of the final plat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Water supply and sewage disposal shall be satisfactory to the public</td>
<td>Complies</td>
<td>The Public Utilities department had no comments on the proposed development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>utilities department director;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Provisions for the construction of any required public improvements,</td>
<td>Complies</td>
<td>No public improvements are required for this development. Any alterations to elements in the public way, including curb, gutter, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per section 20.40.010 of this title, are included;</td>
<td></td>
<td>sidewalk as part of the construction of this development will be reviewed by Engineering. Any alterations to the roadway and driveway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>access point on 2100 East will be subject to UDOT approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. The subdivision otherwise complies with all applicable laws and</td>
<td>Complies</td>
<td>The project will need to apply for Final Subdivision approval; therefore, prior to final plat approval, staff will ensure the proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulations;</td>
<td></td>
<td>subdivision complies with all other applicable laws and regulations. The plat will need to comply with the conditions for the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>subdivision plat noted in Attachment J. This includes providing the necessary “declaration”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
documentation that establishes a Home Owners Association or other entity that will share financial responsibility for the shared private infrastructure and services (utility lines, driveway, sidewalk, waste pickup) for the subdivision.

| G. If the proposal is an amendment to an existing subdivision and involves vacating a street, right of way, or easement, the amendment does not materially injure the public or any person who owns land within the subdivision or immediately adjacent to it and there is good cause for the amendment. | Complies | The final plat approval of the proposed subdivision, *Stanford Commons*, is contingent on the final plat recording for *The Townes Condominium* amendment. The proposed subdivision is a subsequent amendment to *The Townes Condominium* amendment, but it does **not** involve vacating a street, right-of-way, or easement. |
ATTACHMENT I: PUBLIC PROCESS AND COMMENTS

Meetings:
- On June 17, 2020 – Notice of the project was provided to the Foothill/Sunnyside Community Council as well as property owners and residents within 300 feet of the subject property. Foothill/Sunnyside Community Council has provided formal input on the proposal, which is attached on the following page.

Public Notice:
- Early notice of application mailed on June 17, 2020
- Public hearing notice mailed on September 11, 2020
- Public hearing sign posted on the property on September 11, 2020
- Agenda posted on the Planning Division and Utah Public Meeting Notice websites on September 11, 2020

Public Comments:
As of the publication of this Staff Report, Staff has received several letters in opposition of the proposal which are included on the following pages. In addition, staff has received a phone call from Sean O’Brien, property owner of 1005 S Foothill Drive, expressing support of the proposal.

Any public comments received up to the public hearing meeting will be forwarded to the Planning Commission.
Dear Ms. Mitchell,

I am the Chair of the Foothill/Sunnyside Community Council where the Townes/Stanford Commons property is located. The officers of our Community Council have become aware of the request for a zoning change at this property and I want to address opposition to it for the following reasons:

- This development is the most dense in our neighborhood. Allowing a key amenity and open space at this location to be removed will make our neighborhood even denser and exacerbate our parking and traffic problems.
- When this property was originally developed, neighbors were presented with a less dense, amenity-enhanced property. To change this years later is a bit of a "fait accompli". This proposed change may be small, but it would have made a big difference to the neighbors who were originally presented with this development.
- This proposal is for a single residential building of three units. We do not have triplexes in our neighborhood and this is an escalation towards denser residential development in a part of Salt Lake City that is known for its strong single family homes. We need to maintain the character of this neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration of our opposition to this proposal.

Best regards,

Devon W. Olson
Foothill/Sunnyside Community Council Chair
1443 Laird Drive
Salt Lake City, Utah 84108
801-232-3066

From: Devon Olson
To: Mitchell, Linda
Cc: Devon.Dog.Sunnyside.MCC
Subject: [FUTURALLY] Opposition to the Townes/Stanford Commons Petition PLNSUB2020-00234
Date: Thursday, September 17, 2020 12:51:57 PM
Attachments: Image.png
June 8, 2020

BY Email: linda.mitchell@slcgov.com
Linda Mitchell
Salt Lake City Planner
Salt Lake City Planning Dept.
451 S. State St.
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Re: Opposition to Petition No. PLNSUB2020-00349

Dear Ms. Mitchell:

We reside on 1020 S. Foothill Drive, across the street from the current, proposed, land use change. We have many dear friends that reside in The Townes Condominium Project. We plan to continue to be friends after City action is taken to deny, approve or table Petition No. PLNSUB2020-00349 although recognizing that this petition and its after-effects may cause uncomfortable feelings in our neighborhood. Hence, we do not lightly send you this letter. Yet, we feel that we must write to voice our strong opposition to Petition No. PLNSUB2020-00349 and the corresponding application for the proposed de-annexation of The Townes Condominium Project in order to create the Stanford Commons (the “Application”). There are a number of reasons why the Application should be rejected.

First, The Townes Condominium Project is dense. After excluding the swimming pool and common areas requested to be transferred to the Stanford Commons, the preliminary plat for the Stanford Commons purports to show the remaining Townes Condominium Project to consist of 83,241 s.f. of which 63,882 s.f. allegedly is Open Space. In other words, if the Stanford Common project were approved, supposedly 76.74% of The Townes would consist of Open Space. Section 21A.62.040 of the Salt Lake City Zoning Ordinance defines “Open Space” as, “Any area of a lot which is completely free and unobstructed from any structure or parking areas.” Interior roads also are excluded from this definition of “Open Space”. Included with this letter is an aerial photo of the Townes Condominium Project from the Salt Lake County Tax Assessor downloaded today. Any close examination of this aerial photo shows that the structures, buildings, parking areas, and interior roads take up a substantial portion, if not a majority, of The Townes total square footage. We strongly doubt that there truly will be 63,882 s.f. of Open Space remaining in The Townes if the Stanford Commons de-annexation and subdivision is approved. The actual open space for The Townes after the proposed Stanford Commons de-annexation and subdivision should be accurately re-measured and if it proves to take in less than 75.00% Open Space as it would have been originally approved then the Application must be denied.

Second, the property that is proposed to be de-annexed from The Townes Condominium Project is the condominium project’s principal amenity, its swimming pool, and its integral block of common area. The Townes property managers may not have maintained the swimming pool well. Yet, The Townes non-profit corporation should not be allowed to use this decline in its swimming pool as a
reason to sell its key amenity and the surrounding grounds to turn a profit. Rather than selling its swimming pool and common area, The Townes might consider transitioning this key recreational property into a lower maintenance, replacement amenity. This would be better than letting a crucial amenity entirely disappear.

Third, would The Townes have been originally approved without its swimming pool and green space amenity? That seems unlikely. No condominium project, particularly a higher density project surrounded by single family detached homes, should be allowed after obtaining City approval to subsequently sell off amenities and open space that would have been key to the City’s grant of its original approval. If actions like these were allowed, any developer may approach the City promising great amenities and open spaces, only to sell and delete these amenities and open spaces for additional units when the timing is right.

Fourth, Section 21A.48.080 of the Salt Lake City Zoning Ordinance requires landscape buffers when transitioning from a denser residential parcel to less dense residential parcels. This change in density is easily seen in the properties surrounding the Stanford Commons. To illustrate, the adjacent property owned immediately to the south of the proposed Stanford Commons is a beautiful, single family, detached home parcel owned by the Emery family. The properties to the immediate west of the proposed Stanford Commons are lovely, single family, detached home parcels except for religious facilities. To the east of the proposed Stanford Commons are other elegant, single family homes and the Bonneville golf course. And adjoining the proposed Stanford Commons to the north is The Townes, formed of stately duplexes and twin homes with no 3-plexes. Therefore, in order to comply with Section 21A.48.08 and transition from this most unique and dense housing product in the neighborhood proposed by the Stanford Commons for its large triplex, a landscape buffer of 10’ must be built on the Stanford Commons’ south border (1,285.40 s.f.), the west border (861.40 s.f.), the east border (813.60 s.f.), and the north border (2,300 s.f.). Once these 10’ buffer areas totaling 5,260 s.f. are deducted from the 11,666 s.f. available within the proposed Stanford Commons, that will only leave 6,436 s.f., not nearly enough to build the Stanford Commons triplex with its 9,000 s.f. minimum demanded by Section 21A.24.120.

Finally, can a proposed triplex in a neighborhood where no other triplexes are located, truly comply with Section 21A.24.120’s requirement that all uses within the Low Density Multi-Family Residential “are intended to be compatible with the existing scale and intensity of the neighborhood?” That does not seem to be so. Can Stanford Common’s triplex even match the requisite setbacks, scale, massing, open space and buffers? Almost certainly not.

For all of these reasons and many others, we respectfully request that the City deny the Application.

Very truly yours,

David P. Rose

Lisa S. Rose

Enclosure
Mitchell, Linda

From: lynn pershing <...>
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2020 2:42 PM
To: Mitchell, Linda
Subject: (EXTERNAL) number PLNPCM2020-00230, 00231

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

No, I do not support the changes in setbacks. Destroying a neighborhood dictates that the Development LLC work within the confines of the lot. Deal with it and stop the madness.

Lynn K PersHING
District 6

Sent from my iPhone
Scott & Laura Jones  
1030 Foothill Dr  
Salt Lake City, UT 84108  

By Email: Linda.mitchell@slcgov.com  
Linda Mitchell  
Salt Lake City Planner  
Salt Lake City Planning Department  
451 S State St.  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111  

Re: Opposition to Petition Number PLNSUB2020-00349  

My family and I live on 1030 S Foothill Drive which is across the street currently proposed land use change. I am writing this letter in opposition to Petition Number PLNSUB2020-00349 and the corresponding application for the proposed de-annexation of The Townes Condominium Project that would create the Stanford Commons.  

We have lived in this community for approximately 13 years now. We enjoy the neighborhood very much and have developed many close relationships with our neighbors. Knowing that, we have been reluctant to be involved in opposing the petition. The last thing we want is to create any type of hostility with our friends. With that in mind, we decided it was in ours and we hope our neighbor’s best interest to oppose PLNSUB202-00349.  

We love our neighborhood and fear that this development could create density issues that we are very opposed to.  

Thank you,  
Scott Jones
September 3, 2020

Dear Ms. Mitchell:

I am writing today to voice concern about the Stanford Commons Planned Development and Subdivision located at 2052 East Michigan.

I am not providing my name as I live in the neighborhood and don’t want to create contentions.

I have a number of concerns listed below:

1. Changing the original zoning from the property which both owners in the Townes and neighborhood homes purchased in the area understanding the property lines and environment.
2. Opening the area up to be a single dwelling property which could open the places up for rental properties versus maintaining the Harvard Yale quaint neighborhood.
3. Potential issues arising from the construction i.e. water/sewage pipes cracking/breaking due to the age of the pipes in the area, road damage due to the construction.
4. The Townes property currently doesn’t maintain the property to the standards of the neighborhood and we do not need more similar properties.
5. The change will take away 1-2 of the current Towne homeowners’ property and natural environments.
6. The Townes area in question they are selling had a fully functioning pool which was cared for, for years and updated and about a year after they upgraded it, it was closed and the property has been an eye sore since, very unkempt. As I understand some owners want some of the proceeds for personal use versus putting the sale of the property back into updating the property which in this neighborhood would be appreciated as their lack of care depreciates the properties in this neighborhood.

Thank you for considering my feedback when making a decision on this proposed development.
Linda Mitchell,

I am writing, on behalf of myself, my wife (Brigette), and my three children, to formally voice our concerns to the planned development and preliminary subdivision, as numbered above. We have spoken over the phone on a few occasions and have discussed the city ordinances that seem to be violated by the current proposition. Namely, section 21A.62.040 and 21A.48.080 of the city zoning ordinance. In addition to these possible ordinance violations, the proposed subdivision raises additional concerns pertaining to the planned development and the configuration of the proposed structures.

Firstly, as I have previously voiced with you, I don’t see any way the remaining parcel will meet the required green space requirement by city ordinance. I would request that the calculations be presented, with a detailed plot map, showing how the calculations were derived.

Secondly, I submit that, as the homeowner most nearly adjacent to the proposed parcel (1065 foothill Drive), there would be zero buffer between my property and the new structure. The plans which I have seen, both from the developer and in the documents provided by the city, show the proposed structures abutting directly up to my lot. I have serious concerns that ordinance 21A.48.08 would be impossible to be met. I would like to see how the city proposes that this would be met. I purchased my home, approximately four years ago, with the intention to live on a quiet cul-de-sac street with low traffic in a walkable neighborhood. The addition of 3-4 more homes on our street is too much to allow, we already have two churches and a pre-school (within the Lutheran church) in one block and there is over-flowing street traffic from both congregations on Sundays and days of community events from activities. Our street can't support another large subdivision. The addition of these homes, and the subdivision of the property itself, dramatically changes the flavor of our back and the community that we live in.

Lastly, we are adamantly opposed to this annex being approved and the addition of this triplex (with an additional plot that can be developed as well). The Townes has not kept up the current property and has done a great disservice to our community in letting the existing amenity deteriorate to a point that not only detracts from our street appearance, but also gives a dark, unattended area for mischief and crime. We have found dirty, torn clothing and used condoms thrown over the fence from the existing pool on more than one occasion. I have also been told from a home owner in The Townes that people were squatting in the old pump house this year. Instead of maintaining the area, The Townes looks to apportion off the property and make a profit. This was not the intention of the original development, nor the city officials that approved this large complex in our neighborhood. I would submit that The Townes needs to uphold the original intention of their property and restore the amenity or restructure it to meet the same standard. We have spent the last 4 years doing all we can to improve our lot and have put our hearts into our street and our property. We have discussed this as a whole family and we ask that the city also take this opportunity to support us in preserving our street and it's current plan. We ask that the property not be subdivided or developed as a new, multi-home structure that has no place on our street or in our neighborhood.

Kind Regards,

Benjamin R. Emery
Mitchell, Linda

From: Dave Babcock <dave.babcock@company.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 5, 2020 11:01 PM
To: Mitchell, Linda
Subject: (EXTERNAL)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Linda,

It's our understanding that concerns regarding the new development of four condominiums on Foothill Blvd should be directed to you. We live across the street at 1046 Foothill Blvd and are worried about the prospect of the addition of that many new residents, traffic flow, noise, and rental fluctuations. We’ve been in the neighborhood for decades and this wouldn’t have even been possible years ago when the street went all the way through and merged into Foothill Dr. When that change was made it was our understanding that things would remain as they are permanently. Years later it seems opportunistic for a developer to squeeze in these units when it was so far from possible in the original planning and usage.

We’re confident that all angles will be considered and fairness will prevail. We support any outcome but wanted to voice our opinion and concern.

Best,

Dave Babcock

Sent from my iPhone
Hi Linda,

My name is Christian Dunbar, I have lived on 2070 E. Michigan Ave for the past 18 years, neighboring the proposed development of new condos.

We are against the proposed development of the condos on this property, as are several other people. At the time of moving in we did not initially agree to be living next to new neighbors, it is not fair for us and the people on our block.

This development will reduce our privacy, increase noise levels, & burden our general well-being as a community. We do not need new developments and several new neighbors on our block. We are deeply concerned that the buyers will end up renting, our peaceful block cannot have an endless supply of new neighbors.

The original proposition has also changed since the first time it was proposed. We were told that we could keep our front yard and recently our HOA management said it cuts into our already small yard, leaving our yard fully removed.

The new additions will dramatically decrease public parking, which is currently utilized by the existing neighbors.

Our HOA manager, Bill Christansen, abruptly closed our community pool in 2012. We immediately suggested that the closed pool be turned into a community garden for the towns, he ignored our requests and continues to push for the sale of the property.

Several Towns residences are not happy with Bill’s management of the Towns Condominiums. During these 8 years since the pool’s closure I have personally changed several light bulbs on our property that management has failed to safely address, which is ignoring public safety. I feel that Bill is selling the property with his own interests in mind, and not those of other residences.

Best,

Christian Dunbar
Hello Ms. Mitchell, my name is YounDeok Kong, and I currently own and reside at 2072 E Michigan Ave, Salt Lake City, Utah, 84108. I would like to voice a few concerns with the upcoming construction project within our neighborhood. Our residence is located only 20 ft east from the construction area. Due to the proximity, we would be affected by the noise from the construction site. Needless to say, there will be construction vehicles, drilling, sirens, and all sorts of loud noises will be created by the construction. I am currently a full-time Nurse at the U of U hospital, where I dedicate many hours to helping those who are ill and unwell. Needless to say with COVID 19, my workload is not subsiding, rather it has become more hectic. After a hard day at work, I would like to have time to relax and rest. I believe that the noise from the construction would be simply unbearable and it will be a major stressor to me and my family. Moreover, I also have concerns with all of the dust and waste that will be produced during the construction. The dust and other particulates traveling through the air and protruding through our windows, it would pose a health risk to the neighborhood and constantly dwindle the air quality in the vicinity. If this construction does occur and is completed, it would ruin our view. Currently we are able to look out the window and see the gorgeous sky and the sunset shining down accompanied by the view of my neighborhood. However, at the end of the construction, our view would be at another person's glass window or a brick wall. This construction would seriously impede on the views of our house. Another concern is with the safety of the children that are playing in the neighborhood. On the street that the construction and delivery vehicles will be constantly using to get to the construction site, it is a residential area with many households with young children. Additionally, on that street alone, we observe many children riding bikes, playing basketball, or simply running around. Therefore, with vehicles and trucks passing on that street on a regular basis, only the lord knows what disaster awaits. It is obvious that this construction project has many issues and concerns, which will diminish the wellbeing and the quality of life for residents within the region. Additionally, as we are in close proximity, we are the most heavily affected by this construction site. We strongly oppose this construction project/planning and ask you to reconsider. Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

YounDeok Kong, Neighborhood resident
Mitchell, Linda

From: seodam kwok <seodam.kwok@yaml.org>
Sent: Saturday, September 5, 2020 11:53 PM
To: Mitchell, Linda
Subject: (EXTERNAL) SLC planning

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I would also like to voice that this construction project and the resultant buildings would largely affect our privacy due to the proximity. Our household would really lose our privacy not just during construction but also after as well.
Mitchell, Linda

From: Anderson, John
Sent: Tuesday, September 8, 2020 4:35 PM
To: Susan Wurtzburg, Planning Public Comments
Cc: Mitchell, Linda
Subject: RE (EXTERNAL) Case number PLNPCM2020-00230 & Case number PLNSUB2020-00231

Follow Up Flag: Follow Up
Flag Status: Flagged

Susan,

Your comments are appreciated and will be shared with the Planning Commission at their public hearing tomorrow night. If you would like to participate in the meeting there are instructions on how to do so in the agenda:
Please let me know if you have additional comments.

JOHN ANDERSON
Planning Manager

PLANNING DIVISION
COMMUNITY and NEIGHBORHOODS
SALT LAKE CITY CORPORATION

TEL 801-535-7214
FAX 801-535-6174

www.SLC.GOV

From: Susan Wurtzburg [mailto:]
Sent: Tuesday, September 8, 2020 4:25 PM
To: Planning Public Comments <planning.comments@slc.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Case number PLNPCM2020-00230 & Case number PLNSUB2020-00231

Re: Stanford Commons Planned Development & Preliminary Subdivision at approximately 2052 E Michigan Avenue – Jessica Sluder from Alta Development Group, LLC, representing the property owner.

A request has been made for several variances:

a. Planned Development – Planned Development is requested to modify the required front yard setback, grade changes greater than four feet (4') within a required yard, and the required minimum lot area for the new lots. Case number PLNPCM2020-00230
b. Preliminary Subdivision – Preliminary Plat approval is needed to create four (4) new lots. Case number PLNSUB2020-00231

---

Greetings Planning Committee,
As a property owner in the area (1567 Laird Ave E.), I oppose the above requests for this proposed project. Increasing the amount of building, and decreasing the lot size / building has the potential to change completely the attractiveness of this community.

Once one exception is made, it opens the door for additional ones, and I oppose this precedent in the area.

What is the point of having plans, if developers have the ability to step outside the plans, with the goal of increasing profit, and with no concern about the neighborhood, where they do not live?

I oppose short-sighted exceptions allowing developer profit, at the expense of our rights as property owners, who enjoy the historic character of this district, along with extensive yards, rather than hard surface building.

Thanks,

Susan J. Wurtzburg

--

Susan J. Wurtzburg, Ph.D.
Owner: 1567 E Laird, SLC, 84105

[Redacted]
From: Lanette Dunbar
To: Mitchell Lindes
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Case #PLNPCM2020-00230 and PLNSUB2020-00231
Date: Saturday, September 5, 2020 7:28:57 PM

Hello Linda,
My name is D. Lanette Dunbar, I live at 2070 Michigan Ave. The above case numbers if approved will dramatically affect me. When the proposal was originally proposed to the Towns HOA members we were assured that the space slated for purchase would be at the existing fence line. As per the proposal before you, that has changed and now if approved I will lose most of the green space I presently have out my front area, will be reduced dramatically. I have enclosed two photos that show the present space, if this is allowed to proceed I will lose most of it. The other concern I have is the increased traffic on this dead-in street, as well as a decrease in public street parking. Our street is very popular for walkers and bike riders. This proposal will seriously disrupt our neighborhood.

I strongly ask that the proposed Case PLNPCM2020-00230 not be allowed to be modified.

Sincerely,
Lanette Dunbar
**Engineering** (Scott Weiler at scott.weiler@slcgov.com or 801-535-6159)
See attachments for redlines.

1) “Plat_Stanford Commons.pdf”
2) “Stanford Commons_rdlns.pdf”.

**Planning Staff Note:** These will need to be completed for the final plat application. No changes are required at this time.

**Building** (Bryan Romney at bryan.romney@slcgov.com or 801-535-7670)
1. The project has subdivided the property into three separate parcels. As such, a recorded property description/deed and separate addresses will need to be provided.
2. Given the three separate properties, it will need to be clarified that a single permit is allowed.
3. Each of the three properties will be reviewed for compliance with the 2015 IRC as Single-family Dwellings. The current plans do not show a Code Analysis with this requirement.
4. All design professionals are to seal, sign and date each drawing and the cover sheet of the specifications.
5. If this project is to be submitted as a phased permit, then appropriate approvals need to be made.

**Planning Staff Note:** The applicant updated their plans to document their compliance with these comments. Final compliance review will be done during building permit stage.

**Urban Forestry** (Cory Davis at cory.davis2@slcgov.com or 801-972-7839)
A mitigation fee would be required as a condition of plan approval. The [park strip] tree in question is 10” dbh so if they plant two (2) 2” trees they would owe for 6” of mitigation which is $1200.00 The tree would have to be removed via permit issuance to an ISA Certified Arborist.

Additionally, a public right of way tree planting permit is required.

**Planning Staff Notes:** Any requirements provided by the Urban Forester shall be addressed during the building permit review process.

**Zoning** (Anika Stonick at patriciaanika.stonick@slcgov.com or 801-535-6192)

**Preliminary Plat**
No comments

**Planned Development**
Site plan has not been provided (only plat and grading/drainage type site plans); a site plan should be provided that shows: stairs and upper floor levels proposed to project into required front yard (should show all projections from building as well- any balconies, canopies, awnings, roof edge, etc.); show both the required yards of RMF-30 and also the modified yards proposed;
show rear yards for each lot that are per 2A.24.120.E.4, per the equation given there (and not rounded up or down) and to be provided for each side property line length (and not per one or another; and, to be given as polygon addressing different side property line lengths); show minimum required side yard of 4 feet for northern unit to side property line (per 21A.24.120.E.3.b); any yards not being met by proposal should also be addressed in planned development application;

To relate lot coverage that is proposed, to be per 21A.24.040.G.2 (maximum 50%);

More concrete is proposed in the front yard than leads to garage door opening and to walkway to stairs/landing at stairs so is not per 21A.48.090 allowing driveways and walkways in front yard instead of required landscaping; to correct design or have included as modification requested via planned development and to make specific replacement landscaping proposal (21A.55.100.B.4); in case of planned development modification, to also design and dimension all excess hard surfaces so that no front yard parking would be accommodated (including at/over property lines);

About driveway/approach from street, appear will be exceeding maximum driveway width (21A.44.020.F.7.b) and will not meet required distance to side property lines (21A.44.020.F.7.a(2);

To address access to and use of sidewalk/walkway and stairs at south end of planned development- who may use, etc. and arrange and record cross access and any other necessary agreements;

To arrange revocable lease with Real Estate Services division for stairs and end of retaining wall to land in public way;

Treatment of existing trees on site to be per 21A.48.135; to provide landscaping plans addressing requirements of 21A.48 as are applicable to project;

Proposed height is being compared to finished grade in elevation drawings, instead should be compared to average finished grade per 21A.62.040 “Height, Building- Outside FR, FP, R-1, R-2 and SR Districts” and 21A.62.050 Illustration B;

No dimensions included on floor plans- to design and dimension plans to provide parking for two vehicles in attached garage that has minimum 17.5’ deep by 18.5’ wide interior space;

To obtain and use certified addresses (get from SL Engineering Department);

To pay Impact Fees when pulling building permit for structure.

**Planning Staff Note:** The applicant made several revisions to address these comments in their plans attached to this report. A full zoning review will be done during the building permit review phase.