To: Salt Lake City Planning Commission
From: Casey Stewart; 801-535-6260
Date: April 2, 2020 (for April 8, 2020 hearing date)
Re: PLNSUB2019-00963 & PLNSUB2020-00169 The Ellie Planned Development & Subdivision

PLANNED DEVELOPMENT & PRELIMINARY PLAT

PROPERTY ADDRESS: approximately 347, 353, and 359 North 700 West
PARCEL ID: 08-35-279-024, 08-35-279-023, 08-35-279-022
MASTER PLAN: Northwest Community
ZONING DISTRICT: SR-1 (Special Development Pattern Residential)

REQUEST: The applicant, CW Urban Land Co., requests approval of a planned development and related preliminary subdivision plat for a proposed four building, 24-unit multi-family residential development. Each unit footprint will be its own lot that does not front a public street. The project as proposed is subject to a pending zoning change from SR-1 (Special Development Pattern Residential) to RMF-35 (Moderate Density Multi-Family Residential) that is being considered by the Salt Lake City Council. The applicant seeks to modify the restriction of one principal building per lot considering the number of buildings in the overall project, the restriction that new lots for the individual units front a public street and placing a sidewalk in the required landscape buffer. The Planning Commission has final decision-making authority for planned development applications.

RECOMMENDATION: Based on the information in this staff report, planning staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the requested planned development and related preliminary plat subject to the following conditions:

1. Approval is subject to the related zoning map amendment PLNPCM2019-00638 being adopted by the City Council, thereby changing the zoning of the subject parcels to RMF-35.
2. This approval is limited to the identified modifications in the report and all other zoning regulations continue to apply.
3. The applicant shall submit and record a final subdivision plat for the creation of the lots as proposed.

ATTACHMENTS:
A. Vicinity Map
B. Site & Landscape Plan
C. Building Elevations
D. Preliminary Plat
E. Applicant’s Project Narrative
F. Existing Conditions & Photograph
G. Analysis of Standards
H. Department Comments
I. Public Process and Comments

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:
Proposal Details
The three subject properties adjoin each other and are all vacant. The applicant has requested to change the zoning district for the three lots to RMF-35 (Residential Multi-family). If the zoning map amendment is
approved, the applicant intends to construct the proposed multi-family project (24 units) as described in this report. For reference, the zoning amendment key dates and actions:

- November 13, 2019 - Planning Commission recommended approval
- February 11, 2020 – City Council held briefing/work session
- March 24, 2020 – City Council to hold public hearing
- April 7, 2020 – City Council to conduct final vote

The project consists of four separate buildings, approximately 30 feet in height, each with six units. The units will have three levels, with a two-car garage on the ground level and living space on the upper levels. Vehicle access, including fire truck access, is proposed from 700 West via one private driveway that will serve as ingress and egress. All required yard areas will be landscaped per code requirements, including a landscape buffer on the north lot line adjacent to single family residential uses.

In regard to zoning standards like building setbacks, building coverage limits, etc, this proposal complicates assessment of those standards with its 24 individual units/lots in four buildings. Each lot/unit would have no setbacks, 100% building coverage, and would not front a public street. However, when considering the overall project as four buildings on one larger lot, which it will appear and function as, the layout complies with building setbacks and other standards as detailed in the table in the next paragraph. The planned development allows the project to be considered as a whole with the “perimeter” (meaning the large, single site) dimensional standards as proposed. Planning staff has taken this view and reviewed the project primarily as four buildings on one large lot when determining dimensional zoning compliance, excluding the individual lots and their lack of public street frontage which will be handled as a separate modification in this planned development application.

The proposal, with its building locations of the four buildings, comply with all setback, building height, landscaping, and parking requirements of the RMF-35 zone. The applicant seeks to modify the following zoning regulations:

1. restriction of one principal building per lot (21A.36.010.B.2): four separate buildings are proposed.
2. the requirement that new lots front a public street (21A.36.010.C): all units (24) will have their own lot matching the footprint of each unit and none of them front a public street.
3. placing a sidewalk in the required landscape buffer (21A.48.080.B): a pedestrian sidewalk will be located along the north property line within the landscape buffer to provide access to each of the unit’s entrances for the two north buildings.

### Project Details (assuming RMF-35 zoning district)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item (for the project as a whole, not individual lots)</th>
<th>Zone Regulation</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>35 feet maximum</td>
<td>30 feet (complies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Setback</td>
<td>20 feet minimum</td>
<td>26 feet (complies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Setback</td>
<td>10 feet minimum</td>
<td>11 feet (complies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard Setback</td>
<td>25 feet minimum</td>
<td>53 feet (complies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking (residential)</td>
<td>24 stalls minimum / 30 stalls maximum</td>
<td>24 stalls (complies)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### KEY ISSUES:
The key issues listed below are discussed further in the following paragraphs and were identified through the analysis of the project materials, review of standards, ([Attachment “G”](#)) and department review comments:

**Issue 1: Lots not fronting a public street**
The proposal includes creating lots for each unit, coinciding with the footprint of each unit. That would result in 24 lots, all surrounded by common area, and all of them would front the private driveway, rather than 700 West, which is the nearest public street. This layout acts as a multi-family use and complies with the unit density limits for the RMF-35 zoning district, which would be maximum 26 units on this size parcel.
All lots will have access to 700 West via the private driveway that will serve the project and be maintained as common area by a homeowner’s association. Staff has no concerns or objections to this aspect of the project given that the design reduces the number of access driveways to one, which will adequately service all lots and provide the necessary fire protection access.

**Issue 2: Front façade and pedestrian engagement along 700 West**
The applicant has designed the façade along 700 West to include architectural detailing by way of material changes and design, color changes, and balconies to improve visual interest and contribute to pedestrian engagement. This aspect is a review standard for planned developments and staff determined the design complies with the standard.

**DISCUSSION:**
The project overall, and with the recommended conditions, complies with the planned development standards and results in a development that will support the goals of the master plan for this area and those of the 5-year housing plan (Growing SLC). Also, staff found no comments from city departments that could not be addressed or resolved during a construction permit review.

**Master Plan:**
A point made in the Northwest Community Master Plan is that higher density developments abutting single family uses have created negative impacts, not necessarily because of the density, but because of poor design. The proposed design keeps the building heights at a level similar to what is allowed for a single-family dwelling. The height combined with a proposed 11-foot landscape buffer including a fence, shrubs, and trees along the north lot line will help mitigate visual and noise impacts for the adjacent single-family dwellings.

The proposal also furthers the goals of the newly completed housing plan for the city (Growing SLC: A Five Year Housing Plan 2018-2022), by providing a “missing middle” housing type similar to row houses, increasing the choices for a wider variety of household sizes (Growing SLC, p. 19).

Furthermore, the City’s general plan (Plan Salt Lake) and housing plan (Growing SLC) policies support the higher density development. The proposal promotes infill development of an underutilized site, expands housing stock, and increases the number of medium density housing types, all of which are stated goals of the Plan Salt Lake and the City’s 5-year housing plan.

Specifically: Plan Salt Lake and the City’s 5-year housing plan have goals to:
- Promote infill and redevelopment of underutilized land.
- Accommodate and promote an increase in the City's population,
- Increase the number of medium density housing types and options.
- Enable moderate density increases within existing neighborhoods where appropriate.

**Planned Development Objectives**

To obtain approval of a Planned Development, at least one of six city objectives must be met as indicated in section 21A.55.010 of the Salt Lake City zoning code. The applicant has provided written reasons (Attachment E) that this petition complies with the *Housing* objective:

**Housing:** Providing affordable housing or types of housing that helps achieve the City's housing goals and policies:

The proposal includes housing types that are increasing in numbers in the area and are of a scale that is compatible with the neighborhood via building height, setback and scale, matching the height and setbacks of the RMF-35 zoning district, and similar to height and setbacks of the existing SR-1 zoning district. As stated in the previous Master Plan discussion, the proposal promotes infill development and increases medium density housing types.

**NEXT STEPS:**

If approved, and subject to the City Council changing the zoning district to RMF-35, the applicant could proceed with the final subdivision plat of the project, subject to any conditions, and would be required to obtain all necessary city permits and make all required improvements. If denied, and the zoning is changed to RMF-35, the applicant would still be able to develop the property but it would be subject to developing the project as one building on one lot, rather than 4 buildings and 24 lots surrounded by common area. If denied and the zoning district remains as SR-1, the applicant could still develop the property but subject to the SR-1 standards and the number of units would be limited to approximately 10.
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ATTACHMENT C: Building Elevations
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I, NAME OF SURVEYOR, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I, AS A PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR, AND THAT I HAVE MAINTAINED THE SKILLS AND ABILITIES REQUIRED TO PERFORM THE SURVEY SERVICES FOR WHICH I HAVE BEEN RETAINED, HAVE PERFORMED THE SERVICES STATED ABOVE TO THE BEST OF MY KNOWLEDGE AND ABILITY. I am further bound to the conditions of said contract and to the terms and conditions of any professional code of ethics to which I am a member, and I do hereby certify that I have fulfilled the duties and requirements of said contract and said code of ethics. This certificate is issued for ARCHIVES and RECORDS.
ATTACHMENT E: Applicant’s Project Narrative
The ELLIE
Planned Development Proposal

C.W. URBAN

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The existing property is located in the Northwest Community Master Plan, at 347, 353, & 359 N 700 W has been largely vacant for more than a decade. It is currently zoned as SR-1 after being changed from RMF-35 in the late ‘90s. The current property owner is in the process rezoning the land back to RMF-35, which is the same as the parcels directly south, and west of the property.

CW Urban is proposing is a set of four (4) buildings consisting of six (6) townhomes each. The proposed use is under the maximum allowable density of the RMF-35 zone and is compatible with the neighboring Country Oaks community. The project will provide a transition of uses between single-family detached homes to the north and apartments to the south and west.

These townhomes will be sold to owner-occupants. The price point for these homes will be in the mid 300,000’s. Single-family residences are much needed in the area, and the proposed project provides opportunity for attainable home ownership to a wide socioeconomic circle.
PLANNED DEVELOPMENTS

Housing (21A.55.C.2)

“The proposal includes housing types that are not commonly found in the existing neighborhood but are of a scale that is typical to the neighborhood.”

The Northwest Community Master Plan demonstrates a variety of intermingled housing types that are compatible with each other, including single-family detached, apartment complexes, multi-unit homes, and ADU’s.

Single-family detached residences are the most common, but they are becoming more financially unattainable for residents in the area, and more impractical for growth projections.

The “urbanesuqe” nature of Fairpark demands a housing type that is progressively more responsible in addressing density, while expanding home ownership to an underserviced socioeconomic group. This project maintains a responsible level of both density and scale, which qualify it for a planned development.

Planned Development Objectives (21A.55.050.A)

“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. To determine if a planned development objective has been achieved, the applicant shall demonstrate that at least one of the strategies associated with the objective are included in the proposed planned development. The applicant shall also demonstrate why modifications to the zoning regulations are necessary to meet the purpose statement for a planned development. The Planning Commission should consider the relationship between the proposed modifications to the zoning regulations and the purpose of a planned development and determine if the project will result in a more enhanced product than would be achievable through strict application of the land use regulations.”

Traditional single-family parcels in this area have limited street frontage with a “shotgun-style” configuration. To provide more residences in this situation, the best solution is to take several of these large, deep lots and combine them, then build a long center drive with a series of small lots facing outboard from it.

This plan will require a PD application, for the purpose of permitting two (2) exceptions to the existing code:

1. A lot width reduction to allow the new lots to be twenty feet (20’) wide rather than twenty-two feet (22’).
   This is NOT for the purpose of increasing density – but rather to have more open/green space while still being wide enough for a two-car garage. It should be noted that the project is below the allowable density of twenty-six (26) units.

2. An exception to build units that don’t face the public street.
   Without this exception, the project would be large condominium buildings with the main entrance on 700 W. Condominiums are more difficult for homebuyers to obtain financing, and one of the major goals of this project is to increase occupant home ownership in the area.

Without these two exceptions the project could still be possible, with the same density but with very limited green space, poor circulation, and a less engaging façade. It would also be less desirable, and harder to finance for owner-occupants. These exceptions provide a project which is both more appropriate, and more compatible with the vision of the neighborhood without compromising the spirit of the city code.
**Master Plan Compatibility (21A.55.050.B)**

“The proposed planned development is generally consistent with the adopted policies set forth in the city-wide, community, and/or small area master plan that is applicable to the site where the planned development will be located.”

The Northwest Community Master Plan states that new housing should be emphasized, but preservation of existing housing stock is also of paramount importance.

This site is vacant, and no existing structures are at risk.

This property was also within the Jackson Target Area which received grant money to redevelop and revitalize the neighborhood. While this program has expired and funds are no longer available, this project serves the intention behind that program by providing much needed owner-occupant housing.

**Design and Compatibility (21A.55.050.C)**

“The proposed planned development is compatible with the area where 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:

1. 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 site and design.”

As stated, the project is below the allowable density and laid-out in such a way as to maintain appropriate scale to the area, to its location between an apartment complex and single-family homes, and as part of a downtown-adjacent community.

2. “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.”

As stated, the buildings are oriented and designed specifically with the goal of responsible density.

3. “Whether building setbacks along the perimeter of the development:
   a. Maintain the visual character of the neighborhood or the character described in the master plan.”

   The architectural style is modern and minimal, creating a contrast to the craftsmanship and charms of the older homes – rather than compete with them in an anachronistic “faux-traditional” architecture.

   b. “Provide sufficient space for private amenities.”

   The site plan allows for significant green space with the potential for a variety of uses and quality circulation. It is anticipated that the residents will make the best determination on that usage. Some suggestions may include garden space, additional trees, picnic areas, or open space for other recreational activities. The forthcoming CC&Rs will dictate how those decisions are made by the members of the community.

   c. “Provide sufficient open space buffering between the proposed development and neighboring properties to minimize impacts related to privacy and noise.”
Specific landscape buffer requirements including setbacks, fencing, privacy hedges, trees, and additional vegetation are all included on the site plan of this proposal.

d. “Provide adequate sight lines to streets, driveways and sidewalks.”

All units have a clear line of site from their front entrance landing to 700 W. The separation of vehicular and pedestrian access will help contribute to safety, navigability, and visibility across the site without compromising privacy.

e. “Provide sufficient space for maintenance.”

The drive is twenty-four feet (24’) wide and meets all spacing requirements for safe and efficient access for multiple vehicles.

4. “Whether building facades offer ground floor transparency, access, and architectural detailing to facilitate pedestrian, interest and interaction.”

The two (2) end units are oriented and designed specifically to engage the pedestrian and present the project as part of the neighborhood – rather than exclusive from it.

5. “Whether lighting is designed for safety and visual interest while minimizing impacts on surrounding property.”

All lighting on this project will be downlit and pedestrian oriented.

6. “Whether dumpsters, loading docks and/or service areas are appropriately screened.”

The dumpsters located at the rear of the project will be screened effectively but with inconspicuous design.

7. “Whether parking areas are appropriately buffered from adjacent uses.”

There is no proposed surface parking; each of the units will have a two-car garage.

**Landscaping** *(21A.55.050.D)*

“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:

1. Whether mature native trees located along the periphery of the property and along the street are preserved and maintained.
2. Whether existing landscaping that provides additional buffering to the abutting properties is maintained and preserved.
3. Whether proposed landscaping is designed to lessen the potential impacts created by the proposed planned development.
4. Whether proposed landscaping is appropriate for the scale of the development.”

The landscape plan lays out the addition of roughly twenty-one (21) new trees, and the preservation of seven (7) mature trees. The project will necessitate the removal of several existing mature trees that have not been properly maintained and are a potential liability for future residents. It also includes the addition of grassy areas, and a hedge along the northern boundary.
**Mobility (21A.55.050.E)**

“The proposed planned development supports city-wide transportation goals and promotes safe and efficient circulation within the site and surrounding neighborhood. In determining mobility, the Planning Commission should consider:

1. Whether drive access to local streets will negatively impact the safety, purpose and character of the street.
2. Whether the side design considers safe circulation for a range of transportation options including:
   a. Safe accommodating pedestrian environment and pedestrian oriented design.
   b. Bicycle facilities and connections where appropriate, and orientation to transit where available.
   c. Minimizing conflicts between transportation modes.
3. Whether the site design of the proposed development promotes or enables access to adjacent uses and amenities.
4. Whether the proposed design provides adequate emergency vehicle access.
5. Whether loading access and service areas are adequate for the site and minimize impacts to the surrounding area and public rights-of-way.”

This project not only promotes safety but facilitates significant pedestrian access to the neighborhood by providing a clear distinction between vehicular and pedestrian traffic areas.

**Existing Site Features (21A.55.050.F)**

“The proposed planned development preserves natural and built features that significantly contribute to the character of the neighborhood and/or environment.”

The landscape plan preserves as many mature trees as possible. There are no other significant existing features.

**Utilities (21A.55.050.G)**

“Existing and/or planned utilities will adequately serve the development and not have a detrimental effect on the surrounding area.”

The various city departments involved with review of the project have confirmed that utilities are available and adequate to service the project. Details to the needed improvements and upgrades are forthcoming.

**Minimum Area (21A.55.060)**

“A planned development proposed for any parcel or tract of land under single ownership or control in certain zoning districts shall have a minimum net lot area as set forth in table 21A.55.060 of this section.”

The required minimum standard required of a planned development is nine thousand (9,000) square feet. This project parcel is over forty thousand (40,000) square feet.

---

**ZONING REVIEW**
(21A.24.130 RMF-35)

A. Purpose Statement

“The purpose of the RMF-35 Moderate Density Multi-Family Residential District is to provide an environment suitable for a variety of moderate density housing types, including single-family, two-family, and multi-family dwellings with a maximum height of thirty-five feet (35’). This district is appropriate in areas where the applicable master plan policies recommend a density of less than thirty (30) dwelling units per acre. This district includes other uses that are typically found in a multi-family residential neighborhood of this density for the purpose of serving the neighborhood. 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 a variety of housing types, and to preserve the existing character of the neighborhood.”

The proposed project meets this standard by providing medium density at twenty-four (24) units per acre. It is compatible with the density of neighboring properties to the south and west (21 units/acre).

B. Uses

“Uses in the RMF-5 Moderate Density Multi-Family Residential District, as specified in section 21A.33.020, “Table of Permitted and Conditional Uses for Residential Districts,” of this title, are permitted subject to the general provisions set forth in section 21A.24.010 of this chapter and this section.”

Residential townhomes are a permitted use.

C. Minimum Lot Area and Lot Width

The minimum lot area required in this district is 26,000 square feet for 12 units, plus 1,000 square feet for each additional dwelling unit. The minimum lot width is 22 feet.

This property's total area is 40,897 Square feet.

40,897 – 26,000 = 14,897 (allows 12 units, with 14,897 square feet of remaining)

14,897/1,000 = 14.897 (allow 14 units)

This site allows for twenty-six (26) total possible units; the project features only twenty-four (24).

It would be possible to construct condo-ownership buildings with thirteen (13) units each without planning commission review. But a lot width reduction from twenty-two feet (22’) to twenty feet (20’) is requested to provide a more pedestrian friendly, architecturally pleasing project, achieving more green space. (see Planned Development Objectives section above for more details on these requested exceptions.)

D. Maximum Building Height

“The maximum building height permitted in this district is thirty-five feet (35’).”

The proposed buildings are twenty-nine feet four inches (29’ 4”) tall.

E. Minimum Yard Requirements
1. “Front yard: twenty feet (20’).
2. Corner side yard: ten feet (10’).
3. Interior side yard: ten feet (10’).
4. 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”).

The proposed front yard setback is twenty feet (20’), the side yards are a little over eleven feet (11’) wide, and the rear yard setback is fifty-two feet (52’).

F. Required Landscape Yards

“The front yard, corner side and, for interior multi-family lots, one of the interior side yards shall be maintained as landscape yards.”

The project CC&R’s will provide guidance on maintaining yards and landscaping.

G. Maximum Building Coverage

“Single-family attached dwellings: the surface coverage of all principal and accessory buildings shall not exceed sixty percent (60%) of the lot area.”

The proposed buildings cover forty-one (41%) of the buildable area.

LANDSCAPE BUFFERS

(21A.48.080)

A. Applicability

“The regulations of this section shall establish the dimensions and improvement requirements of landscape buffers as required for transitions between dissimilar uses.”

B. General Restrictions

“Landscape buffers shall be reserved for planting and fencing as required within this section. No parking, driveways, sidewalks, accessory buildings or other impervious surfaces shall be permitted, unless specifically authorized through the site plan review process. Landscape buffers may be located within required yards or required landscape yards as established in the applicable district regulations. Where both landscape buffers and parking lot landscaping is required the more restrictive shall apply.”

Sidewalks accessing the front entrances of the units are within the landscape buffer as shown on the site plan. This aspect has been explored during the site plan review process and is authorized as it is considered a critical feature for the project.

C. Size of Landscape Buffers

“The minimum size of landscape buffers for RMF-35 is shall provide a ten foot (10’) wide landscape buffer.”
The landscape buffer of the proposed project is a little more than eleven feet (11’) wide.
ATTACHMENT F: Existing Conditions & Photographs

The subject site consists of three vacant interior lots, 40,877 square feet in total area. The site is generally level and adjacent to multi-family and single-family uses.

Uses adjacent to the Property
North: single family
South: multi-family
East: Interstate-15
West: multi-family

Zoning adjacent to the Property
North: R-1/5,000 (single family)
South: RMF-35 (multi-family)
East: n/a
West: RMF-35

View of the subject property looking west across 700 West.

Assuming the subject properties are rezoned to RMF-35:

RMF-35 (Moderate Density Multi-Family)
The RMF-35 permits the following uses: multi-family, single-family attached, single-family detached, twin homes, and two-family dwellings. Multi-family structures require 9,000 square feet for the first 3 units, and 2,000 square feet for each additional dwelling unit up to 11 units. Any development over 11 units is calculated at 26,000 square feet for 12 units, plus 1,000 square feet for each additional dwelling unit.

The allowed building height for the RMF-35 is 35 feet. The permitted height accounts for both pitched and flat roofs.

The yard requirements are:
20 feet for the front
10 feet for corner side yard and
10 feet for one interior side yard for multi-family structures
The RMF-35 permits 60% lot coverage for multi-family dwellings.

If the properties were to be rezoned to RMF-35, a 26-unit multi-family building could potentially be constructed, as opposed to potentially 10 units under the existing SR-1 zone.

The stated purpose of the RMF-35 zoning district “...is to provide an environment suitable for a variety of moderate density housing types, including single-family, two-family, and multi-family dwellings with a maximum height of thirty-five feet (35’). This district is appropriate in areas where the applicable Master Plan policies recommend a density of less than thirty (30) dwelling units per acre. This district includes other uses that are typically found in a multi-family residential neighborhood of this density for the purpose of serving the neighborhood. 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.
## ATTACHMENT G: Analysis of Standards

### 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>Standard</th>
<th>Finding</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **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. To determine if a planned development objective has been achieved, the applicant shall demonstrate that at least one of the strategies associated with the objective are included in the proposed planned development. The applicant shall also demonstrate why modifications to the zoning regulations are necessary to meet the purpose statement for a planned development. The planning commission should consider the relationship between the proposed modifications to the zoning regulations and the purpose of a planned development, and determine if the project will result in a more enhanced product than would be achievable through strict application of the land use regulations. | Complies | Previously in this report, staff discussed how the proposal satisfies the housing objective: 

**Housing:** Providing affordable housing or types of housing that helps achieve the City’s housing goals and policies: 

2. The proposal includes housing types that are already found in the existing neighborhood, contribute to the “missing middle” of medium density housing, and are of a scale that is typical to the neighborhood. |
| **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.** | Complies | The City’s general plan (Plan Salt Lake) and housing plan (Growing SLC) policies support the proposed medium density development. The proposal promotes infill development of an underutilized site, expands housing stock, and increases the number of medium density housing types, all of which are stated goals of the Plan Salt Lake and the City’s 5-year housing plan. |
| **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: | Complies | The proposal is compatible, by virtue of the use, height, setback, and landscaping, with the neighborhood in which it is located and will provide a more enhanced and functional product than what would be achieved by allowing only one building on the lot. More specifics are provided below. |
| **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; | | There are existing multi-family developments to the south and west of the site. Single-family dwellings are north of the site, while the elevated freeway (I-15 is to the east). The proposed development scale is compatible with the neighborhood via building height, setback and massing, matching the height and setbacks of the RMF-35 zoning district, and similar to height and setbacks of the existing SR-1 zoning district. These elements reduce the impact to adjoining properties. |
| **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; | | **Building Orientation** 
The buildings have multiple orientations: toward 700 West and the public way with the end unit design, toward the south and north (side yards) with the unit primary entrances on those sides, and the interior of the project with vehicles utilizing the single private driveway. The proposed buildings are compatible with the neighborhood development pattern and will greatly improve the underutilized parcel by providing medium density and actively engaging the public street. |
### Building Materials
The proposed buildings utilize materials of stucco (EIFS) and fiber cement siding and panels. These are common siding materials in modern construction and similar to materials used on both single- and multi-family projects. The materials are compatible with the neighborhood.

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

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Maintain the visual character of the neighborhood or the character described in the applicable master plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Provide sufficient space for private amenities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Provide sufficient open space buffering between the proposed development and neighboring properties to minimize impacts related to privacy and noise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Provide adequate sight lines to streets, driveways and sidewalks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Provide sufficient space for maintenance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposal creates building setbacks that comply with the anticipated RMF-35 zoning district and are close in size to surrounding single family zoning districts, demonstrating compatibility with surrounding properties. Sufficient buffering via distance and landscaping is provided between adjacent uses. The unit entrances will be accessed via sidewalks in the side yard areas. The setbacks offer more than adequate space for maintenance.

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

The street-facing facade of the building complies with all of these design aspects along 700 West. The design includes changes in materials, balconies, changes in depth, and windows to facilitate pedestrian interest.

### C5 Whether lighting is designed for safety and visual interest while minimizing impacts on surrounding property;

The proposal indicates all lighting will be down-lit and pedestrian oriented, resulting in minimal impacts to surrounding properties.

### C6 Whether dumpsters, loading docks and/or service areas are appropriately screened; and

The dumpsters will be fully screened with fencing and located in the rear yard.

### C7 Whether parking areas are appropriately buffered from adjacent uses.

Parking is all within enclosed garages that are part of the principal buildings.

### D. Landscaping: 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Complies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D1</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>D2</td>
<td>Any existing perimeter vegetation is comprised of invasive Siberian elm shoots which will be removed and replaced with more compliant landscaping, including grass, shrubs, trees and fencing, with a substantial landscape buffer along the north lot line, adjacent to single family dwellings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3</td>
<td>The proposed landscaping is designed to lessen potential impacts created by the proposed planned development; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D4</td>
<td>The proposed landscaping is designed to enhance the pedestrian interest along 700 West, provide open space in the rear yard for residents, and buffer impacts to adjoining uses, particularly the single-family dwellings to the north. All landscaping must meet the requirements of the landscaping chapter (21A.48) of the zoning code.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D1 Whether mature native trees located along the periphery of the property and along the street are preserved and maintained;

The proposal indicates seven existing trees proposed to be retained, with 21 trees being added to the site and park strip. Tree installation will be coordinated with the city’s urban forestry department.

### D2 Whether existing landscaping that provides additional buffering to the abutting properties is maintained and preserved;

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### D3 Whether proposed landscaping is designed to lessen potential impacts created by the proposed planned development; and

The proposed landscaping is designed to enhance the pedestrian interest along 700 West, provide open space in the rear yard for residents, and buffer impacts to adjoining uses, particularly the single-family dwellings to the north. All landscaping must meet the requirements of the landscaping chapter (21A.48) of the zoning code.

### D4 Whether proposed landscaping is appropriate for the scale of the development.

The proposed landscaping is appropriate for the development, will reduce impacts to neighboring properties, and will enhance the site for the neighborhood, improving a vacant site.

### E. Mobility: The proposed planned development supports citywide transportation goals and promotes safe and efficient circulation within the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Complies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

See below for specific criteria.
In determining mobility, the planning commission should consider:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E1</th>
<th>Whether drive access to local streets will negatively impact the safety, purpose and character of the street;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The one driveway proposed is located 700 West, which has relatively little vehicle traffic. No traffic study was required for this proposal due to its minimal impact to existing traffic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E2</th>
<th>Whether the site design considers safe circulation for a range of transportation options including:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. Safe and accommodating pedestrian environment and pedestrian oriented design;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Bicycle facilities and connections where appropriate, and orientation to transit where available; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Minimizing conflicts between different transportation modes;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There will be minimal transportation within the confines of the development, merely vehicles accessing their garages. Bicycle parking will be provided within the units. The site is not on any mass transit routes. No conflicts between transportation modes are anticipated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E3</th>
<th>Whether the site design of the proposed development promotes or enables access to adjacent uses and amenities;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The site design indicates private sidewalks connecting to existing public sidewalks, or installation of new sidewalks if required by the city, enabling access to adjacent uses. Adjacent uses are already easily accessible via existing sidewalks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E4</th>
<th>Whether the proposed design provides adequate emergency vehicle access; and</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The design allows for adequate fire and emergency vehicle access from 700 West, the nearest public street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E5</th>
<th>Whether loading access and service areas are adequate for the site and minimize impacts to the surrounding area and public rights-of-way.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The nature of the project requires no loading or service areas, creating no impacts to surrounding properties or public way.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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.</th>
<th>Complies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No existing unique natural or built features on site contribute to the character of the neighborhood or the environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G. Utilities: Existing and/or planned utilities will adequately serve the development and not have a detrimental effect on the surrounding area.</th>
<th>Complies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public facilities may be required to be upgraded for any new development and the applicant would be responsible for those upgrades. Public facilities exist for the adjacent multi-family and single-family buildings. Adding additional dwelling units will not impair the ability for those services to continue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STANDARDS OF APPROVAL FOR PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLATS

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Finding</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. The subdivision complies with the general design standards and requirements for subdivisions as established in Section 20.12</td>
<td>Requires Planned Development approval</td>
<td>The proposed subdivision complies with the design standards and requirements for subdivisions except that none of the unit lots will front a public street. The planning commission has the authority to modify this standard as part of the planned development application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. All buildable lots comply with all applicable zoning standards;</td>
<td>Requires Planned Development approval</td>
<td>The lots would not meet the standards for lot size, which is being considered as part of the planned development application. The lots are being created to allow legal sale of each unit separately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. All necessary and required dedications are made;</td>
<td>Complies</td>
<td>No dedications are necessary for this subdivision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Water supply and sewage disposal shall be satisfactory to the Public Utilities Department director;</td>
<td>Complies</td>
<td>The Public Utilities department has provided options and direction to the applicant on how to address water and sewer disposal. The specifics of those facilities will be addressed during building permit review if the project is approved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Provisions for the construction of any required public improvements, per section 20.40.010, are included;</td>
<td>Complies</td>
<td>Public improvements are already in place for this subdivision, no additional public improvements were noted or required by the city engineering division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. The subdivision otherwise complies with all applicable laws and regulations.</td>
<td>Complies</td>
<td>The subdivision otherwise complies with all applicable laws and regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Complies</td>
<td>The proposed subdivision is not an amendment to an existing subdivision nor does it involve vacating a street, right-of-way way, or easement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT H: City Department Comments

Transportation:
Each DU shall have two off street parking spaces. The two-car garages shall have a minimum interior clear width of 18.5 feet and a minimum depth of 17.5 feet. No traffic impact study will be required for this project.

Engineering:
Engineering has no objections to this project on the west side of 700 West, having new lots fronting only a private driveway.

Fire:
There are a few fire code related items that need to be addressed. They are the following:

- The measurement for the fire department access road begins at the street, not property lines.
- If they wish to restrict the depth of the drive aisle to less than 150-feet an Alternate Means and Methods (AM&M) will need to be submitted, reviewed and approved for this modification of the fire code. There will need to be a visual indicator of where the fire apparatus cannot pass beyond. This is usually done with signs and restricting the width of the roadway.
- An Alternate Means and Methods will need to be submitted for the proposal of fire sprinklers in the buildings to meet the requirement of access roads to within 150-feet of all first story exterior portions of the buildings.
- Also, need to verify that the proposed access road has a minimum clear width of 20-feet and clear unobstructed height of 13-feet 6-inches.

I suggest that the developer provide a separate AM&M application for the items mentioned above.

Public Utilities:
(Waiting for final comments from Jason Draper to insert here)

Zoning:
PLNSUB2019-00963, Planned Development application for 24 dwelling unit multifamily development proposal for lots currently addressed 347, 353 and 359 No. 700 West and currently zoned SR-1; application to change zoning designation to RMF-35 per application PLNPCM2019-00638; this review has been prepared based upon RMF-35 zoning designation that is being sought; prepared by Anika Stonick, Development Review Planner II;

Planned Development process needed as not all buildings of proposal will have frontage on public street;

Required yards of RMF-35 (21A.24.130) are front- min. 20 feet (being met or exceeded), sides, for multifamily-10’ each (being met or exceeded though site plan notes that the yards are greater than 4 feet, which is minimum requirement for attached single family buildings not multifamily), rear- 25% of lot depth to be no less than 20 feet no greater than 25 feet (being met or exceeded);
To provide entrance door at each end unit of buildings with street frontage, oriented to street (see 21A.24.010.I, see requirements for front façade controls there too);

Building height outside FR, FP, R-1, R-2 AND SR districts means the vertical distance, measured from the average elevation of the finished lot grade at each face of the building, to the highest point of the coping of a flat roof or to the deck line of a mansard roof or to the average height of the highest gable of a pitch or hip roof; to document compliance to this requirement, please identify the finished lot grade elevation at each corner on each face of the building and the average height of each face on the elevation drawings;

To document coverage of parcel by buildings, not to exceed 60% (see 21A.24.130.G.4);
Landscape buffer is required on north side of development- required per 21A.24.130.E.3.d(1), to be improved per 21A.48.080.C.1 and 21A.48.080.D, as well as 21A.48 generally; to provide street trees and minimum park strip landscaping per 21A.48.060; to have reviewed by Urban Forestry any removal of trees from private property (21A.48.135); Front yard and one of two interior side yards are to be landscaped per 21A.48.090 (see requirement for interior side yard at 21A.24.130.F); all landscaping to be per 21A.48 generally, including to be per 2A.48.055 Water Efficient Landscaping;
Interior space of attached garages to be at least 18.5 feet wide by 17.5 feet deep, in order to provide required parking for 2 vehicles for each dwelling unit; to propose required bicycle parking and required electric vehicle charging station(s) (see 21A.44.050); to propose loading per 2A.44.070, if applicable per 21A.44.080;

To propose recycling collection station as well as to seek review of construction waste management per 21A.36.250; to propose ground mounted utility boxes (power transformers most often) per 2A.40.160);

To arrange avigation easement(s) with Department of Airports and provide documentation of with submittals turned in for building permit request;

To demolish existing buildings through required pre-demolition application process

**Urban Forestry:**
[The department provided tree planting and preservation policies to applicant for consideration before applying for building permits]

**Police:**
Here are the comments from the Police Department Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) review:

1. This area has a lot of transient, drug, and some gang activity. The proposed development utilizes land that has a lot of undeveloped space around it. The development will need to ensure there is strong territorial reinforcement concepts to the landscaping or fencing for the property. If fencing its used, it would be recommended that it utilize a style that allows line of site through the fence to allow the natural surveillance of the residents to police the undeveloped areas.

2. On the design of the project, options should be considered regarding the gap between the buildings that have no windows. This creates a blind spot in the natural surveillance provided by the townhomes. Staggering the gaps so windows from the units can overlook these areas or utilizing these spaces as positive activity generators (playground, fire pit, bbq area, or residential gardens, ect.). Another option would be to restrict access to these areas through fencing or hostile vegetation (thorny bushes).
Interior space of attached garages to be at least 18.5 feet wide by 17.5 feet deep, in order to provide required parking for 2 vehicles for each dwelling unit; to propose required bicycle parking and required electric vehicle charging station(s) (see 21A.44.050); to propose loading per 2A.44.070, if applicable per 21A.44.080;

To propose recycling collection station as well as to seek review of construction waste management per 21A.36.250; to propose ground mounted utility boxes (power transformers most often) per 2A.40.160);

To arrange avigation easement(s) with Department of Airports and provide documentation of with submittals turned in for building permit request;

To demolish existing buildings through required pre-demolition application process

**Urban Forestry:**
[The department provided tree planting and preservation policies to applicant for consideration before applying for building permits. The applicant has prepared a forestry plan based on these policies, see [Attachment A](#) for trees site plan.]

**Police:**
Here are the comments from the Police Department Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) review:

1. This area has a lot of transient, drug, and some gang activity. The proposed development utilizes land that has a lot of undeveloped space around it. The development will need to ensure there is strong territorial reinforcement concepts to the landscaping or fencing for the property. If fencing its used, it would be recommended that it utilize a style that allows line of site through the fence to allow the natural surveillance of the residents to police the undeveloped areas.

2. On the design of the project, options should be considered regarding the gap between the buildings that have no windows. This creates a blind spot in the natural surveillance provided by the townhomes. Staggering the gaps so windows from the units can overlook these areas or utilizing these spaces as positive activity generators (playground, fire pit, bbq area, or residential gardens, etc.). Another option would be to restrict access to these areas through fencing or hostile vegetation (thorny bushes).
Public Notice, Meetings, Comments
The following is a list of public meetings that have been held, and other public input opportunities, related to the proposed project:

**December 3, 2019:** Notice of application and request for comments sent to the Fair Park Community Council and other recognized organizations per city ordinance.

**Notice of the Planning Commission public hearing for the proposal include:**
- Notices mailed on March 12, 2020
- Property posted on March 12, 2020
- Agenda posted on the Planning Division and Utah Public Meeting Notice websites March 13, 2020

**COMMENTS**
No comments were received from the community council prior to this report being published. General public comments were received in the form of a signed petition and emails which are included in the next pages. The public comments received are opposed to the project based on its size or claim the project is motivated by profits and will force neighboring owners and renters out of the neighborhood due to increased property values.

In response to the public comments, planning staff points out that the proposal complies with all building setback, height, and landscaping requirements of the pending RMF-35 zoning district. No dimensional aspect is being modified. For property value increase, this site is vacant and most any development will increase its value, whether it be 10 single family homes or a multi-family project as proposed. The city has no requirement restricting the development to a certain monetary value or income level.
SIGN PETITION TO STOP DENSE HOUSING  
(SPOT ZONING)
CONDO PLANNING TO GO UP SOON VERY CLOSE TO CURRENT RESIDENCE. WILL BE 35 FEET HIGH, CAUSING:
• LOSS OF PRIVACY: THREE STORY WINDOWS WILL FACE CURRENT APARTMENT
• NO GARDENS: REDUCED LIGHT AT WINDOW
• ICE IN BACK YARD DURING THE WINTER TIME DUE TO LACK OF SUNLIGHT
• MORE TRAFFIC / LESS PARKING (ADDED TO ALREADY CROWDED STREETS)

Salt Lake City Planning Division  
451 S State Street, Room 406, P.O. Box 145480, Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-5480

Salt Lake City Planning Commission Wednesday, March 25, 2020, 5:30 p.m.  
City and County Building 451 S State Street, Room 326

PLEASE BE ADVISED: DUE TO RAPID PROTOCOL CHANGES REGARDING COVID-19; CHANGES IN THE AGENDA MAY BE MADE. STAY CONNECTED & VISIT SLC.GOV/PLANNING FOR THE LATEST UPDATES.

A public hearing will be held on the following matter. Comments from the Applicant, City Staff and the public will be taken.

The Ellie Planned Development and Preliminary Plat at approximately 347, 353 & 359 North 700 West – A request by CW Land Co., representing RECIM Investments, LLC, for approval of a planned development petition and related preliminary subdivision plat for a proposed 24-unit residential project at approximately 347, 353, and 359 N 700 W. The proposal includes four separate principal buildings with six units in each building. The buildings will be approximately 30 feet tall, and each unit footprint will be its own lot that does not front a public street. The project as proposed is subject to a pending zoning change from SR-1 (Special Development Pattern Residential) to RMF-35 (Moderate Density Multi-Family Residential) that is being considered by the Salt Lake City Council. The site is located in Council district #2, represented by Andrew Johnston (Staff contact: Casey Stewart at 801-535-6260 or casey.stewart@slcgov.com) Case numbers PLNSUB2019-00963 & PLNSUB2020-00169

Salt Lake City Corporation complies with ADA guidelines. People with disabilities may make requests for reasonable accommodations no later than 48
SEE PROPOSED CONDO PLANS BELOW.
WANT TO CHANGE REQUIRED VARIANCE OF 15-25 FEET TO ONLY 10 FEET.

PLEASE SIGN PETITION WITH ADDRESS TO STOP DENSE HOUSING:
FOR MORE INFORMATION CALL MIKE REED: 385-271-8683

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kira Waters</td>
<td>709 W 400 N, 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brock Waters</td>
<td>709 W 400 N, 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACKENZIE HEALEY</td>
<td>727 W 400 N, 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Healey</td>
<td>727 W 400 N, 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Schneider</td>
<td>717 W 400 N, 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zulma Deren</td>
<td>712 West 400 N, 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>719 West 400 N, 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Maxwell</td>
<td>730 W 400 N, 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Bulson</td>
<td>749 W 400 N, 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Orwela Ranzani</td>
<td>743 W 400 N, 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werner K. Reed</td>
<td>735 W 460 N, 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Reed</td>
<td>763 W 480 N, 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>325, 331, 337, 355 N, 700 W, 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando Missing</td>
<td>743 W 400 N 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Smith</td>
<td>767 N 400 W 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany Thompson</td>
<td>767 W 400 N 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Rodriguez</td>
<td>405 N 700 W 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Anderson</td>
<td>355 N 700 W 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Moore</td>
<td>355 W 700 W 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne K. VanSavage</td>
<td>337 N 700 W 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemmi Summer</td>
<td>337 N 700 W 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergio Perez</td>
<td>355 N 700 W Apt 127 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Turner</td>
<td>355 N 700 W Apt 27 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arneh Delabel</td>
<td>355 N 700 W Apt 2 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnie K. Kovale</td>
<td>337 N 700 W Apt 13 E 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaschka Konopka</td>
<td>337 N 700 W Apt 13 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Marotta</td>
<td>335 N 700 W Apt 14 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Kamai</td>
<td>331 N 700 W Apt 25 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Shy</td>
<td>355 N 700 W Apt 35 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>331 N 700 W Apt 25 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert R. Clark</td>
<td>355 N 700 W Apt 7 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lloyd Everson</td>
<td>355 N 700 W Apt 7 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Quinn</td>
<td>355 N 700 W Apt 7 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Nicholas</td>
<td>355 N 700 W Apt 34 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucio</td>
<td>355 N 700 W Apt 34 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Harris</td>
<td>355 N 700 W Apt 34 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Rea</td>
<td>325 W 700 W Apt 33 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Lee</td>
<td>325 W 700 W Apt 33 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark S.</td>
<td>325 W 700 W Apt 33 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Langford</td>
<td>231 N 700 W Apt 23 84116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Jones</td>
<td>33 W 700 W Apt 23 84116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alberto Rodríguez  325 N 700 W Apt. 41
Miguel Cornelio  325 N 700 W Apt. 41
Melinda Arredondo  325 N 700 W Apt. 41
Teresa Alired  325 N 700 W Apt. 32
Monica Berg  331 N 700 W #27
Steven Norman  331 N 700 W #12
W. B. C. Normal  331 N 700 W #12
Candace Stetson  355 N 700 W #21
Victor Hinz  355 N 700 W #21
Jamie Stetson  355 N 700 W #6
Jenni Parry  331 N 700 W #16
Alberto Antonio  355 N 700 W #4
Alejandro Gregorio  327 N 700 W #17
Edgardo Marin  327 N 700 W #17
Eztli,

The developer responded to your questions. See below.

Regards,

**CASEY STEWART**
Senior Planner

TEL 801-535-6260
casey.stewart@slcgov.com

**PLANNING DIVISION**
**SALT LAKE CITY CORPORATION**
[www.slc.gov/planning](http://www.slc.gov/planning)

---

**From: Andrew Black <andrew@builtbycw.com>**
**Sent: Thursday, March 26, 2020 2:15 PM**
**To: Stewart, Casey <Casey.Stewart@slcgov.com>**
**Cc: Christian McMullin**
**Subject: (EXTERNAL) Re: Gentrification**

Sure thing! I’m happy to answer.

These townhomes are going to be for sale, not rentals. The price point is mid-$300s. And as with all of our projects we are applying for approval from the FHA to allow FHA loans for the buyers. We are trying to keep them as low as possible.

There are lots of people who are priced out of downtown, but who work and have lived in the area for a long time, and want to stay around here -- this project is for people like that. It is also for people in the west side of salt lake who have been renters for a long time and want to own a home in the area.

I hope that kind of helps.

Thanks!

---

**From: Eztli Cortez-Trujillo**
**Sent: Thursday, March 26, 2020 10:52 AM**
**To: Stewart, Casey <Casey.Stewart@slcgov.com>**
**Subject: (EXTERNAL) Gentrification**
Just three questions, who are these apartments for in Rosepark? What income level bracket do you have to be to able to afford an apartment like the ones you are building? Why in this community/space?
Dear Casey Steward,

We are the Rose Park Brown Berets and we are writing this letter to oppose the proposed Ellie Development and Preliminary Plat plan at 347, 353 & 359 North 700 West. Our neighborhood is being gentrified and working-class and poor families are being pushed out of the community. This new development would create an influx of more affluent residents and businesses. Creating upward rent pressure that will lead to the displacement of Rose Park residents. We cannot continue to repair neighborhoods at the cost of residents who have devoted their lives to creating these spaces. We cannot continue to increase attraction to an area by people with higher incomes spilling over from neighboring cities, towns, or states. We need more affordable housing complexes and not fancy, expensive apartments and condos. If this project is built, the first to be affected would be the Country Oaks Apartments I and II, a Section 8 housing complex that is home to more than thirty families. To preserve the integrity, character, and culture of Rose Park, please reconsider the development of this project.

Sincerely,

Rose Park Brown Berets
IVE RECIVED NEWS THAT THERE IS A PLANNING TO BUILD NEW APARTMENTS IN THE ROSE PARK AREA NEXT TO ALREADY OCCUPIED SECTION 8 HOUSING BUILDINGS, AND IM GUESSING THESE NEW APARTMENTS ARE NOT GONA BE AFFORDABLE FOR THE POPULATION LIVING IN ROSE PARK. THIS IS NOT OKAY. I WORK WITH CHILDREN IN THIS AREA AND THIS IS NOT ACCEPTABLE, THIS PROJECT FOR PROFIT WILL HURT LOTS OF FAMILIES THAT ALREADY NEED ASSISTANCE! THIS IS NOT OKAY! PEOPLE OVER PROFIT!
MAYBE YALL THINK ROSE PARK IS AN AREA THAT CAN EASILY BE MANIPULATED, USED AND ABUSED BUT NO MORE. PEOPLE OVER PROFIT.
I SAID WHAT I SAID.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME.
To whom it may concern,

I am a resident of Salt Lake City and I want to urge you to halt any work on the Ellie Development and Preliminary Plat Plan. The Rose Park area does not need fancy condos and apartments so that rich white people can move in, they need affordable housing!

Gentrification is harmful to our most vulnerable communities, and you have the power to prevent it. Please do not put profits over people.

Sincerely,
Sam Murdock
Hi,

I am emailing in regards to the Ellie Development and Preliminary Plat Plan. Rose park has a unique characteristic as it is home to predominantly communities of color and poor whites and still maintains cheaper rent compared to other parts of the city. Rose park has built communities and solidarity among people of different ethnic groups and economic background. The people in the community DO NOT want more development and gentrification that will exacerbate poverty and economic tensions in the region. This plan will create an influx of people of higher economic margins and displace preexisting communities from their own space. Our government should not be shaking hands with developers and building for profit condos or apartments, we should be making more plans for affordable housing and focus on housing as many people as possible. I urge you to listen to the community and choose people over profit! Please please please! Take care of our people!!!

Thank you,
Diya
Rose park does not need luxury apartments or condos! Listen to the people that live there!! Rose park needs more affordable housing! Please, please listen to the working class people that this pertains to!
Dear Planning Commission of SLC,

I am writing to express my opposition to the Ellie Development and Preliminary Plat Plan. This development would contribute to gentrification of the surrounding area and push local residents out of Rose Park. What the community needs is more affordable housing options. Please stop the Ellie Development.

Best,
L-E Baldwin

Sent from my iPhone