



# MEMORANDUM

PLANNING DIVISION  
DEPARTMENT of COMMUNITY and NEIGHBORHOODS

To: Salt Lake City Planning Commission

From: Caitlyn Tubbs, Principal Planner, 385-315-8115, [caitlyn.tubbs@slcgov.com](mailto:caitlyn.tubbs@slcgov.com)

Date: February 24, 2021

Re: Modifications to Design Review approval at approximately 534 East 2100 South  
Izzy South: Design Review - PLNPCM2020-00222

---

**PROPERTY ADDRESS:** 534 East 2100 South  
**PARCEL ID:** 16-19-227-005-0000  
**MASTER PLAN:** Sugar House (inside); Central Community (adjacent)  
**ZONING DISTRICT:** CB (Community Business District)

**REQUEST:** The project received Design Review approval from the Planning Commission on December 2, 2020. The applicant has requested modifications to the approved design. These changes involve different exterior materials and are required by ordinance to be reviewed by the Planning Commission as only minor modifications can be approved administratively.

**ACTION REQUIRED:** Review the proposed changes to the design of the project. If the Planning Commission denies the changes, the project will be required to comply with the original approval.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Planning Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the modifications to PLNPCM2020-00222 Design Review at approximately 534 East 2100 South.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- A. Applicant Submittal Information and Updated Plans
- B. Original Planning Commission Staff Report, December 2, 2020
- C. Minutes from December 2, 2020

**BACKGROUND:** Ryan McMullen, representing AJC Architects and the property owner, requested Design Review approval for the Izzy South project, located at a mid-block location in the CB Community Business District. In the CB Zone projects over 15,000 gross square feet in size are required to go through the Design Review process. The project consists of 71 units of varying size.



The applicant also requested an additional 3 feet (10%) of building height for the building. Primary structures in the CB Zone can be a maximum height of 30 feet and an additional ten percent (10%) of building height may be authorized through the Special Exception process. The applicant obtained special exception approval for the requested additional height (PLNPCM2020-00655) from the Planning Commission on December 2, 2020.

The project was first reviewed at the September 23, 2020 Planning Commission meeting where the Planning Commission tabled the item to allow the Applicant time to respond to concerns raised during the meeting. It was revisited and approved at the December 2, 2020 Planning Commission meeting. The December Planning Commission approval granted the requested Design Review and additional three feet of building height through the Special Exception process with the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall comply with all other Department/Division conditions.
2. All other applicable zoning standards not modified by the design review or special exception approval shall apply to the proposed development.
3. Final approval authority for the development shall be delegated to Planning staff based on the applicant's compliance with the standards and conditions of approval as noted within the staff report.
4. The applicant shall obtain the required demolition permits for the existing buildings. Prior to issuance of any permit to demolish the existing buildings or begin construction of the building, the applicant shall schedule a DRT meeting with Development staff.

The above conditions of approval have not yet been addressed and the applicant has not yet submitted building plans seeking a permit. The applicant has revisited the exterior building materials and has requested permission to use building materials which deviate from what was previously approved by the Planning Commission. The Applicant is not requesting any modification to the approved Special Exception for additional building height. The approval process for modifications to approved plans is described in the zoning ordinance:

**21A.59.080: MODIFICATIONS TO APPROVED DESIGN REVIEW PLANS:**

- A. Minor Modifications: The Planning Director may authorize minor modifications to approved design review applications as listed below.
  1. Dimensional requirements that are necessary in order to comply with adopted Building Codes, Fire Codes, or engineering standards. The modification is limited to the minimum amount necessary to comply with the applicable Building Code, Fire Codes, or engineering standard.
  2. Minor changes to building materials provided the modification is limited to the dimension of the material, color of material, or texture of material. Changes to a different material shall not be considered a minor modification.
- B. Other Modifications: Any other modifications not listed in subsection A of this section shall require a new application.

Some minor changes can be approved administratively by the Planning Director, but those changes are limited. The requested modifications are related to the composition of the building materials themselves, not the dimension, color, or texture as laid out in the ordinance. The requested modifications are not considered minor in nature, and therefore, the Commission must review the updated plans.

**APPLICANT'S REQUESTED MODIFICATIONS:**

The applicant seeks to swap some wood siding for EIFS on the third story of the north façade (street facing) and swap wood siding for metal panel on portions of the projecting bays on the north façade. Additionally, they seek to swap wood lap siding for EIFS on the first and third stories on the south façade. The proposed modifications to the approved design are found in the drawings located in Attachment B and are outlined in their submitted narrative found in Attachment A. Specifically, the following design changes have been proposed by the applicant:

**Exterior Building Materials**

***Approved by the Planning Commission:*** The Planning Commission approved wooden lap siding in the porch alcoves and the upper stories with accents of metal siding in the

projecting building sections. The overall coloring of the building was of a light wood with smaller areas of light-colored metal.

**Revised Proposal:** The proposed materials include EIFS and metal paneling. The materials on the eastern and western facades of the project will remain the same as originally approved by the Planning Commission. The proposed overall color scheme of the project is a darker-toned gray with focal points of light-colored wood. The materials change amounts are as follows:

	Total Façade Area (square feet)	Materials Change Area (square feet)	Total Percentage Change (%)
North (Front) Façade	11,798	2,871	24.3
Siding to Metal Panel		1,906	16.2
Siding to EIFS		965	8.1
South (Rear) Façade	9,630	1,721	17.9
Siding to EIFS		1,721	17.9



APPROVED LAP SIDING



PROPOSED EIFS & METAL PANEL

**STAFF ANALYSIS & DISCUSSION:**

The modified design does not affect the overall form of the building nor its siting on the subject property. The lapsiding and metal paneling as originally approved by the Planning Commission were compared with the Design Review criteria and were found to be a suitable quality material –neither are considered truly “durable” according to 21A.37.050.B. The proposed metal paneling is not considered a durable material and use of metal panel in place of wood lap siding is considered a like-for-like swap. EIFS is also not considered a durable material but is notably less durable than wood: it is softer than stucco (though comparable in appearance) and more prone to damage, and it is less resistant to water and snow therefore more prone to rot and deterioration. Part of the purpose of the Design Review is “to ensure high



APPROVED LAP SIDING



APPROVED LAP SIDING



PROPOSED EIFS

PROPOSED EIFS

quality outcomes for larger developments that have a significant impact on the City” (21A.59.010). Exchanging a higher grade material for a lesser grade material would be in conflict with the purpose statement.

The CB Community Business District zone does not regulate ground floor or upper story building materials. The Standards for Design Review (21A.59.050) does not specify use of durable building materials. Standard E regulates buildings longer than 200 feet (Izzy South is approximately 300 feet in length) and requires changes in vertical plane, material changes, and massing changes. The approved design meets this standard. The decision must be based on whether EIFS meets the purpose statement of the Design Review to ensure a high quality outcome.

The proposed modifications to the Design Review application must be in substantial conformity to the original request or should be reviewed as a separate application. In this case, staff asserts that the revised overall design is in substantial conformity with the original approval.

#### **NEXT STEPS:**

##### **Modification of a Design Review Approval**

If the modification is approved, the applicant may proceed with the project after meeting all standards and conditions required by all City Departments and the Planning Commission to obtain all necessary building permits.

##### **Modification of a Design Review Denial**

If the major modification is denied, the applicant will be required to develop the property as was originally approved by the Planning Commission on December 2, 2020.



**Attachment A: Applicant Submittal Information and Updated Plans**





# HIGH BOY VENTURES | IZZY SOUTH

DESIGN REVIEW | MATERIAL UPDATES

## MATERIAL UPDATE REQUEST



Izzy South Design Review Application was approved during the December 2nd Planning Commission Meeting. During public comment period, we received feedback that the building materials felt too simplified. As a result we are proposing a few minor modifications to finish material mix to add one more layer of contrast to the architectural massing.

Proposed updates are shown as simple gray EIFS finish on upper terraces on both the front and back of the building, along with some minor modifications to the metal panel vs. lap siding locations.

These minor changes add more contrast to the building and break down the scale of the building even more than previously proposed.

Total proposed material changes represent approximately 16% of the entire building facade.

### NORTH ELEVATION - FRONT FACADE

Total Area	11,798 sq. ft.
Siding to Metal	1,906 sq. ft.
Siding to EIFS	965 sq. ft.

### SOUTH ELEVATION - REAR FACADE

Total Area	9,630 sq. ft.
Siding to EIFS	1,721 sq. ft.

EAST & WEST ELEVATIONS - NO CHANGE



# HIGH BOY VENTURES | IZZY SOUTH

DESIGN REVIEW | MATERIAL UPDATES



APPROVED LAP SIDING



PROPOSED EIFS & METAL PANEL



# HIGH BOY VENTURES | IZZY SOUTH

DESIGN REVIEW | MATERIAL UPDATES



PROPOSED EIFS

PROPOSED METAL PANEL



# HIGH BOY VENTURES | IZZY SOUTH

DESIGN REVIEW | MATERIAL UPDATES

SOUTH ELEVATION | NEIGHBORHOOD



APPROVED LAP SIDING



PROPOSED EIFS



# HIGH BOY VENTURES | IZZY SOUTH

DESIGN REVIEW | MATERIAL UPDATES

NEIGHBORHOOD ELEVATION



APPROVED LAP SIDING



PROPOSED EIFS

**Attachment B: Original Planning Commission Staff Report,**  
**December 2, 2020**





# MEMORANDUM

PLANNING DIVISION  
DEPARTMENT of COMMUNITY and NEIGHBORHOODS

---

To: Salt Lake City Planning Commission

From: Caitlyn Miller, Principal Planner  
(385)-315-8115 or [caitlyn.miller@slcgov.com](mailto:caitlyn.miller@slcgov.com)

Date: December 2, 2020

Re: PLNPCM2020-00222 – Izzy South Design Review  
PLNPCM2020-00655 – Izzy South Special Exception

---

**PROPERTY ADDRESS: 534 East 2100 South**  
**PARCEL ID: 16-19-227-005-0000**  
**MASTER PLAN: within Sugar House and adjacent to Central Community**  
**ZONING DISTRICT: Community Business (CB)**

**REQUEST:** Ryan McMullen requests Design Review and Special Exception approval to construct a mixed-use retail building with 71 dwelling units at approximately 534 East 2100 South within the Community Business (CB) zoning district. Design Review approval is needed because the project is larger than 15,000 square feet in size. The Applicant has requested Special Exception approval to allow an additional 3' (10%) of building height to accommodate the peaked roof structure. The maximum height permitted in the CB zone is 30' and the proposed building would be 33' in height.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Based on the public input received and the analysis of the adopted standards included in the Staff Report, Planning Staff is recommending that the Planning Commission approve the requests with the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall comply with all other Department/Division conditions.
2. All other applicable zoning standards not modified by the design review or special exception approval shall apply to the proposed development.
3. Final approval authority for the development shall be delegated to Planning staff based on the applicant's compliance with the standards and conditions of approval as noted within this staff report.
4. The applicant shall obtain the required demolition permits for the existing buildings. Prior to issuance of any permit to demolish the existing buildings or begin construction of the building, the applicant shall schedule a DRT meeting with Development staff.

**BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:** On September 23, 2020, the Planning Commission heard this request for Design Review and Special Exception approval for the Izzy South project located at approximately 534 East 2100 South. The Planning Commission heard public comment and tabled the item to allow the Applicant time to address the Commission's concerns regarding the

building's massing adjacent to the single family neighborhood to the south and the delineation of the "neighbor space" patios between the public right of way along 2100 South and the building itself. The Applicants have made the requested revisions and are returning to the Planning Commission for a final decision on their requests.



*Figure 1: Rendering of Izzy South project as viewed looking southwest from 2100 South.*

Ryan McMullen, Applicant, is requesting Design Review approval for a new mixed-use multi-family residential building located at approximately 534 East 2100 South. The proposal, Izzy South, would include 71 units of varying size and would be within a 33' tall building. There would be three levels to the building and the associated parking is fully enclosed within the building. The project includes a small landscaped yard at the rear of the property where the Applicant has proposed the planting of trees and the construction of a 6' tall privacy wall to mitigate the visual impacts of the project to the neighbors to the south. The project also includes a retail tenant space at the western end of the building.

During the September 23<sup>rd</sup> public hearing, thirteen people spoke in opposition and two in support. Those in opposition stated they were opposed to the overall density of the project, the amount of parking provided and the overall height of the project at the rear of the building adjacent to the single-family neighborhood to the south. Subsequent public comments can be found in Attachment B of this memo. The project was tabled at the September 23<sup>rd</sup> Planning Commission meeting to allow the Applicant sufficient time to address the Planning Commission's two primary concerns with the project, as follows: The Planning Commission expressed concern over the height of the project nearby the rear property line and encouraged the Applicant to provide deeper step-backs for the upper floors to reduce the visual impact of the second and third stories. The Planning Commission also recommended the Applicant provide a buffer or transition feature to delineate the separation between the private patios and the public right of way along 2100 South.



## KEY ISSUES:

- **Building Massing Adjacent to Neighborhood** – The Planning Commission voiced their concern over the original step-backs of the upper levels of the project indicating they still towered over the single-family neighborhood to the south. The original design included a step back of the second and third levels of the same depth with some units on the second level having balconies over the parking garage. The second and third floors were set back approximately 18' 5" in the original design. The Applicant has since revised this design to step the second floor 16' 7" and the third floor 22' back from the southern (rear) property line to reduce the sense of the height of the building as seen from the single-family backyards to the south.
- **Preservation of Neighbors' Privacy** – One of the primary concerns brought up by the members of the public in attendance at the hearing was the preservation of their backyard privacy. The neighbors worried that the upper levels of dwelling units would be able to look directly into their private yards and requested the construction of a 12' tall concrete wall as a condition of approval. The Applicant indicated at the hearing they were open to constructing a privacy wall at the rear of the development to mitigate the neighbors' concerns but would have to request an additional special exception to build a wall in excess of 6'; the maximum rear yard fence height allowed in the CB zoning district. The Applicant has included the requested 6' privacy wall in the updated project renderings. Planning staff does not support a fence or wall taller than 6'.

The Applicant has also included a shallow landscaped yard along the rear property line where they will plant a species of columnar trees which, at their mature height, will provide a seasonal screen from even the top floor units. Phases of the growth of these trees is shown in the Applicant's updated renderings as well showing height at planting, height at adolescence, and height at maturity.

- **"Neighbor Space" Patios** – The Planning Commission recommended the Applicant add some features to the ground floor patios along 2100 South to help delineate the private patios from the public right of way. The Applicant has included the installation of planters between the private patios and the public sidewalk to establish a "neighbor space" area—a semi-private transition that promotes casual observation of the public sidewalk and defined separation of the public and private realms. These planters will be 5' long, 2.5' wide and 2.5' tall and will be located at the rear of the public sidewalk on the subject property. These planters will increase the amount of landscaping out front of the Izzy South project and will provide privacy to the tenants as they utilize the patio spaces. The Applicant's landscape architect has selected plant species which are acclimated to the local climate and which grow well in container spaces.
- **Western and Eastern Facades** – The Planning Commission expressed concern regarding the plainness of the western and eastern facades of the Izzy South project. The proposed Izzy South building would be the tallest building among the abutting properties and the Planning Commission recommended adding some architectural features or other treatment to beautify these blank facades which would be visible from 2100 South. The Applicant has incorporated additional horizontal lap siding along the rear halves of the eastern and western facades which adds variety to the building materials on these faces. This wooden lap siding is the same found on the front façade of the project.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- A. Updated Izzy South Renderings
- B. Updated Izzy South Landscaping Plan
- C. Updated Izzy South Site Plan
- D. Additional public comment
- E. September 23, 2020 Planning Commission Minutes
- F. September 23, 2020 Planning Commission Staff Report

**ATTACHMENT A:**  
**UPDATED IZZY SOUTH RENDERINGS**



# HIGH BOY VENTURES | IZZY SOUTH

DESIGN REVIEW | PLANNING COMMISSION

DECEMBER 2020



71 MULTI-FAMILY UNITS | MIXED-USE PROJECT



# HIGH BOY VENTURES | IZZY SOUTH

DESIGN REVIEW | PLANNING COMMISSION

HUMAN SCALE



Renowned urban planner / architect **Jan Gehl** defines **human scale** in architecture as 'the key to making cities more **human-centered**, **user-friendly**, and **livable**.'

Key '**Human Scale**' features include:


- **Undulating building forms** in both plan and elevation
- Three story building - **entire building is walkable**
- **Publicly engaged street-front** at ground level
- **Private outdoor spaces** (patios) on upper levels
- **Contextually appropriate** on 2100 South on both vehicular and pedestrian levels



# HIGH BOY VENTURES | IZZY SOUTH

DESIGN REVIEW | PLANNING COMMISSION


NEIGHBORHOOD SCALE



# HIGH BOY VENTURES | IZZY SOUTH

DESIGN REVIEW | PLANNING COMMISSION

## EAST ELEVATION | UINTA GOLF



### NEIGHBORHOOD SIDE

- Additional terracing / setbacks
- Additional material transitions
- Additional detailing with handrails and privacy screens between tenants

### 2100 SOUTH SIDE


- Additional detail added to landscaping
- 2-Hour Fire Rated building separation does NOT allow windows or penetrations
- Adjacent Commercial Building (Uinta Golf) covers this building elevation



# HIGH BOY VENTURES | IZZY SOUTH

DESIGN REVIEW | PLANNING COMMISSION

## WEST ELEVATION | OFFICE & GAS STATION



### NEIGHBORHOOD SIDE

- Additional terracing / setbacks
- Additional material transitions
- Additional detailing with handrails and privacy screens between tenants

### 2100 SOUTH SIDE

- Additional detail added to landscaping
- 2-Hour Fire Rated building separation does NOT allow windows or penetrations
- Adjacent Commercial Building (in former residence) covers this building elevation



# HIGH BOY VENTURES | IZZY SOUTH

DESIGN REVIEW | PLANNING COMMISSION

2100 SOUTH ENGAGEMENT





# HIGH BOY VENTURES | IZZY SOUTH

DESIGN REVIEW | PLANNING COMMISSION

2100 SOUTH ENGAGEMENT







# HIGH BOY VENTURES | IZZY SOUTH

DESIGN REVIEW | PLANNING COMMISSION

SEPTEMBER 2020



71 MULTI-FAMILY UNITS | MIXED-USE PROJECT




## VISION

To reinvigorate underutilized property consistent  
with the goals outlined in various  
Salt Lake City Master Plans


Sugarhouse Master Plan (2000) | Plan Salt Lake (2015) | Growing SLC (2018) | SLC Transit Master Plan (2017)

- **Reinvigorate underutilized property**
- **Increase housing density** near public transit
- **Create a unique walkable experience** along both sides of 2100 South
- **Provide attainable housing options** for millennials and young families





INCREASE HOUSING DENSITY  
NEAR PUBLIC TRANSIT



CREATE UNIQUE  
WALKABLE EXPERIENCE



REINVIGORATE  
UNDERUTILIZED PROPERTY





# SUGAR HOUSE



## INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the Sugar House Community Master Plan is to present a comprehensive plan that guides the future development of Sugar House. The plan is to be used by the citizens of the community, developers and property owners, the staff of the various departments of the City, the Planning Commission, and the City Council as the policy guide for decisions made on the type and intensity of new development. The master plan must be consulted in the consideration of zoning changes, subdivisions, annexations, conditional uses, and other land use matters.

This Master Plan will help those with the intent to invest and develop a project in the Sugar House Community and to better understand the desires of the community. Defining the community's desires will increase the identity and name recognition of Sugar House and market it in a way that will attract investors. This Master Plan communicates the general desires and attitudes of the community and can streamline the design phases of project planning if consulted in a timely manner.

The members of the Sugar House Community Council, Salt Lake City Planning Commission, and the Salt Lake City Council change every few years. A well articulated Master Plan is important to easily convey what the goals and policies of the Sugar House Community are to new members of the area.

### Scope and general goals

This community plan updates the existing Sugar House Community Master Plan that was adopted in 1985. It also incorporates into this document the Sugar House Business District Master Plan, adopted in 1995. The plan provides:

- Policies to help protect the stable, well-kept residential neighborhoods of Sugar House;
- Programs that support neighborhoods with infrastructure, parks, trails, convenient commercial services, and housing improvements to sustain the quality of life in the neighborhoods;
- A reiteration of a direction for the Sugar House Business District that promotes a vibrant character compatible with the historical character of the area, and directs new development to create the synergy necessary to support a light rail station, encouraging "pedestrian-first" development;
- A renewed commitment to a mixed land use strategy in the Business District through incentives for residential development;
- Policies that support the maintenance and enhancement of recreational and natural resources such as parks, open space and trails;
- An integrated program for mobility throughout the community with a commitment toward optimizing the pedestrian experience and alternatives to automobile travel, particularly in the Sugar House Business District, which is a necessary element of a viable commercial center;
- Policies that support the preservation of neighborhood character as well as historic and natural resources; and
- Implementation strategies for accomplishing the goals and policies of this master plan.

### The Planning Process

The Sugar House Master Plan has its roots in the first Salt Lake City Master Plan dated 1943. Updating the Sugar House Research Report was the first step in the planning process of this latest plan. The Planning Division staff began updating the research report in 1996. The Sugar House Community Master Plan Research Report provides basic information from which the master plan can be analyzed. The document is also used in evaluating the implementation of the master plan.

## Contents

Introduction.....	1
Residential.....	2
Commercial.....	4
Parks & Open.....	7
Mobility.....	10
Future Land Use Map.....	12-13
Urban Design Element.....	15
Historic Preservation.....	17
Public Facilities.....	19
Annexation.....	20
Implementation.....	21
Appendix.....	22

## SUGARHOUSE MASTER PLAN

- Direct **higher density housing** in locations served within **walking distance to transit**, commercial services, and parks

- Provide a **mix of housing types, densities, and costs** to allow residents to work and live in the same community

- Locate **higher density housing near public transportation routes** to afford residents the ability to reduce their reliance on the automobile

- Promote the **development of underutilized property** by supporting opportunities for conversion and **development of Medium-High Density Housing**





## SLC TRANSIT MASTER PLAN

- Create **economically vibrant, livable places** that support use of transit
- Align transit investments with transit-supportive land use policies and development
- **Highest ridership bus corridors** include State Street, Redwood Road, **500 East**, 900 East, and **2100 South**

## PLAN SALT LAKE

- Density and compact development are important principles of sustainable growth

- **Density** in appropriate locations, including **near existing infrastructure**, compatible development, and **major transportation corridors**

- Accommodate and promote an increase in the City's population

- Promote **high density residential** in areas **served by transit**

- Locate **new development** in areas with existing infrastructure and amenities, such as **transit** and **transportation corridors**

- Encourage **transit-oriented development**

- Promote            and redevelopment of **under-utilized land**





## GROWING SLC: A FIVE YEAR HOUSING PLAN 2018-2022



Salt Lake City  
Housing and Neighborhood Development



### GROWING SLC

- Nearly 4 of every 10 Salt Lake residents is an adult millennial (between 18 and 34 years old)...  
...demanding a new way of living preferring **walkable communities** with **access to transit**, and **smaller living spaces**

transportation routes... **allow for greater density in existing neighborhoods** and reduced parking requirements to bring down the cost of new housing units

- **Focus on new residential and commercial development along transportation corridors** to

where the city needs it most

- Promote a diverse and balanced community by ensuring that a **wide range of housing types and choices exist**
- **Emphasize value of transit-oriented development**, transit accessibility, and proximity to services



# EXISTING CONDITIONS | CONTEXT 2

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW | PLANNING COMMISSION





# DESIGN REVIEW ANALYSIS 3

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW | PLANNING COMMISSION

## PURPOSE STATEMENT



### 21A.59.010 - Design Review Purpose

The intent of the design review process is:

- 1 - verify new developments are **compatible with their surroundings**
- 2 - impacts to public infrastructure and **public spaces are addressed**
- 3 - new development helps **achieve development goals** outlined in the adopted **master plans of the City** **purpose statements of each zoning district**



21A.26.03 | COMMUNITY BUSINESS DISTRICT  
BUILDING SIZE CONSIDERATIONS

review process. Planning Commission shall consider the following:

COMPATIBILITY

visually compatible with buildings on block face

ROOFLINE

shape shall be similar to roof shapes on block face

VEHICULAR ACCESS

provide continuous street wall of buildings with minimal breaks for vehicular access

FACADE DESIGN

break up mass of larger buildings so they appear to be multiple smaller scale buildings  
varied roof-lines, facade planes, upper story step backs, and lower building heights next to less intensive zoning districts

BUFFERS

may require larger setbacks, landscape buffers, and/or fencing to minimize site noise, light trespass, or parking impacts

STEP BACKS

may require that any story above ground be stepped back from building foundation

# DESIGN REVIEW ANALYSIS 3

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW | PLANNING COMMISSION

COMMUNITY BUSINESS ZONING



## BUILDING SIZE CONSIDERATIONS

**COMPATIBILITY** - large transparent connection to street front, varied scale, and varied materials compliment street

**ROOFLINE**  
existing building roof forms along 2100 S

**VEHICULAR ACCESS** - four current vehicular access points consolidated to one



# DESIGN REVIEW ANALYSIS 3

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW | PLANNING COMMISSION



## BUILDING SIZE CONSIDERATIONS

- FACADE DESIGN** - building forms broken into  
Includes varied roof lines, building depths, and upper level roof top patios
- BUFFERS** - includes solid perimeter fence, increased landscaping, and larger building setback than required by code
- STEP BACKS** - design incorporates building steps on both front and rear facades



# DESIGN REVIEW ANALYSIS 3

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW | PLANNING COMMISSION

COMMUNITY BUSINESS ZONING



## BUILDING SIZE CONSIDERATIONS

- FACADE DESIGN** - building forms broken into  
Includes varied roof lines, building depths, and upper level roof top patios
- BUFFERS** - includes solid perimeter fence, increased landscaping, and larger building setback than required by code
- STEP BACKS** - design incorporates building steps on both front and rear facades





BUILDING SIZE CONSIDERATIONS

**FACADE DESIGN** - building forms broken into  
Includes varied roof lines, building depths, and upper level roof top patios

**BUFFERS** - includes solid perimeter fence, increased landscaping, and larger building setback than required by code

**STEP BACKS** - design incorporates building steps on both front and rear facades



PROPOSED TREE BUFFER



# DESIGN REVIEW ANALYSIS 3

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW | PLANNING COMMISSION

## COMMUNITY BUSINESS ZONING



### MINIMUM YARD REQUIREMENTS

**FRONT YARD** - NO minimum yard is required

**SIDE YARD** - NO minimum yard is required

**REAR YARD** - 10'-0" minimum yard is required  
7'-0" landscape buffer included

### ACTUAL YARD SETBACKS

**FRONT YARD** - 5'-0" - 13'-0" setbacks

**SIDE YARD** - 0'-0" - 5'-0" setbacks

**REAR YARD** - 10'-8" ground level setback  
18'-8" - 22'-8" upper level setback




# DESIGN REVIEW ANALYSIS 3


IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW | PLANNING COMMISSION

## COMMUNITY BUSINESS ZONING


1



2



3



### MINIMUM YARD REQUIREMENTS

**FRONT YARD** - NO minimum yard is required

**SIDE YARD** - NO minimum yard is required

**REAR YARD** - 10'-0" minimum yard is required  
7'-0" landscape buffer included

### ACTUAL YARD SETBACKS

**FRONT YARD** - 5'-0" - 13'-0" setbacks

**SIDE YARD** - 0'-0" - 5'-0" setbacks

**REAR YARD** - 10'-8" ground level setback  
18'-8" - 22'-8" upper level setback




# DESIGN REVIEW ANALYSIS 3

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW | PLANNING COMMISSION

## TECHNICAL ZONING ELEVATION


Zoning allows for a 30'-0" building height on this property based CB Zone. Izzy South site slopes approximately 4'-0" from end to end, and per the 30'-0" height is measured from the average elevation of the lot grade. For sloped roofs, the center point of the pitch is required to 30'-0". We are proposing a 33'-0" building height to top of parapet / center of pitched roof. The elevation and diagrams below outline the technical breakdown of this request.

Interior ceiling heights directly affect quality of space in the units, and the additional 3'-0" of height will allow the units to have healthier living spaces with more natural light.



SLC ZONING - 21A.62.050  
GABLE HEIGHT ILLUSTRATION

SLC ZONING - 21A.62.050  
GABLE HEIGHT APPLICATION



SPECIAL EXCEPTION  
BUILDING ELEVATION DIAGRAM




# SITE PLAN 4

## SETBACKS

FRONT	0' REQ'D	5'-10' ACTUAL
SIDE	0' REQ'D	0' ACTUAL WEST 6' ACTUAL EAST
REAR	10' REQ'D	10'-7" ACTUAL 18'-5" ACTUAL LVL 2 7'-0" LANDSCAPE BUFFER INCLUDED

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW | PLANNING COMMISSION

## PROPOSED SITE PLAN






# FLOOR PLANS 5

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW | PLANNING COMMISSION


LEVEL 01 | FLOOR PLAN



# FLOOR PLANS 5

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW | PLANNING COMMISSION

LEVEL 01 | FLOOR PLAN





# FLOOR PLANS 5

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW | PLANNING COMMISSION



## IZZY PUB

Anchoring the west end of Izzy South, this 3-story coffee shop / restaurant / bar space will act as the project lobby and public gathering place for the surrounding neighborhood.

Vision to create a community connection with residents and neighbors in a modern, open gathering space.

- 3,000 sq. ft. of public space
- 500 sq. ft. roof-top patio





District	Land Use	Minimum
D-1, D-2, D-4	Residential	1/2 space per dwelling unit
	Nonresidential	No spaces required up to 25,000 square feet usable floor area. 1 space per 1,000 usable square feet over 25,000 square feet thereafter
D-3, GMU	Residential	1/2 space per dwelling unit. 1 space per single-family, two-family and twin home dwellings
	Nonresidential	No spaces required up to 10,000 square feet usable floor area. 1 space per 1,000 usable square feet over 10,000 square feet thereafter
TSA core	All uses	No spaces required
TSA transition	All uses	50% of required in table 21A.44.030 of this section minimum requirements
FB-SC	All uses	No spaces required
FB-SE	All uses	50% of required in table 21A.44.030 of this section minimum requirements
FB-UN	All uses	No spaces required
MU, R-MU	Residential	1/2 space per multi-family dwelling unit. 1 space per single-family, two-family and twin home dwellings
R-MU-35	Residential	1 space per dwelling unit
R-MU-45	Residential	1 space per dwelling unit
CB	Residential	1 space per dwelling unit
CN	Residential	1 space per dwelling unit
SR-3	Residential	1 space per dwelling unit

IZZY SOUTH PARKING  
CALCULATIONS

71 Units Total

0.5 Stalls per Unit Req'd w/in 1/4  
mile of mass transit stop

35.5 Stalls Req'd

58 Stalls Provided

21A.44.040: ALTERNATIVE PARKING REQUIREMENTS AND OFF STREET PARKING REDUCTIONS:


- A. Purpose And Scope: The number of required off street parking spaces may be met via alternative means or reduced in some circumstances. Alternatives and reductions help prevent land from being devoted unnecessarily to parking spaces when other parking solutions respond better to the parking needs of the use of the property, the enjoyment of neighboring property rights and the general neighborhood compatibility. These options are intended to allow satisfying a portion of parking requirements by means other than on site parking or by reducing the number of required parking spaces when there is documentation that actual parking demand is less than the number required by section 21A.44.030, table 21A.44.030 of this chapter.
7. Parking Exemptions For Proximity To Mass Transit: For any new multi-family residential, commercial, office or industrial development within one-fourth (1/4) mile of a fixed transit station, the minimum number of parking spaces required according to section 21A.44.030 of this chapter can be reduced by fifty percent (50%).



# FLOOR PLANS 5

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW | PLANNING COMMISSION


LEVEL 02 | FLOOR PLAN



# FLOOR PLANS 5

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW | PLANNING COMMISSION

LEVEL 03 | FLOOR PLAN






# EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS 6

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW | PLANNING COMMISSION

NORTH ELEVATION | 2100 SOUTH



EAST ELEVATION | UINTA GOLF




Project palate will be clean, contemporary, and simple: primarily architectural cast concrete around the parking garage, with a mix of vertical metal panel and horizontal lap siding

This building elevation is 6'-0" from the adjacent Uinta Golf building, and will be a wall with no openings. Uinta Golf is approximately 25'-0" tall and will cover a majority of this elevation.

The parking garage is to be naturally ventilated with no noisy fans or forced air systems.


The building will step an additional 8'-0" - 12'-0" on the second story along the neighborhood elevation (left side of this image) to provide more relief in the building massing as well as provide outdoor patios for level 02 studio tenants





# EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS 6

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW | PLANNING COMMISSION




# EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS 6

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW | PLANNING COMMISSION



PROPOSED TREE BUFFER





# EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS 6

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW | PLANNING COMMISSION


## WEST ELEVATION | RESIDENCE & GAS STATION



This building elevation is 0'-0" from the adjacent property line, and will be a wall with no openings. Additional detailing of the coffee shop trellis will soften this elevation, along with minor steps between building material elements

Zoning allows for a 30'-0" building height on this property. For sloped roofs, the center point of the pitch is required to 30'-0". We are proposing a 33'-0" building height to top of parapet, and have held the building back from the neighborhood a total of 20'-0" minimum (10'-0" req'd) to account for this increased height request.

Interior ceiling heights directly affect quality of space in the units, and the additional 3'-0" of height will allow the units to have healthier living spaces with more natural light.





# PERSPECTIVE RENDERS 7

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW | PLANNING COMMISSION

2100 SOUTH | OVERALL PROJECT





# PERSPECTIVE RENDERS 7

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW | PLANNING COMMISSION

2100 SOUTH | STUDIOS | GARAGE ENTRY





# PERSPECTIVE RENDERS 7

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW | PLANNING COMMISSION

2100 SOUTH | OVERALL PROJECT





# PERSPECTIVE RENDERS 7

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW | PLANNING COMMISSION

2100 SOUTH | GATEWAY





# PERSPECTIVE RENDERS 7

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW | PLANNING COMMISSION

NEIGHBORHOOD | OVERALL PROJECT





# PERSPECTIVE RENDERS 7

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW | PLANNING COMMISSION

NEIGHBORHOOD | OVERALL PROJECT





# PERSPECTIVE RENDERS 7

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW | PLANNING COMMISSION

COFFEE SHOP | ENTRY





# PERSPECTIVE RENDERS 7

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW | PLANNING COMMISSION

COFFEE SHOP | ROOF-TOP PATIO






**ATTACHMENT B:**  
**UPDATED IZZY SOUTH LANDSCAPING**  
**PLAN**



4/2/2020 2:25:00 PM C:\Users\rmcmullen\Documents\1948 - Izzy South - V20\_V2\_mcmullen.rvt

ALL SCALE DIMENSIONS AND AREAS INDICATED BY THIS DRAWING ARE OWNED BY AND THE PROPERTY OF A&C ARCHITECTS PC AND MUST BE USED AS SHOWN. NO PART OF THIS DRAWING MAY BE REPRODUCED OR TRANSMITTED IN ANY FORM OR BY ANY MEANS, ELECTRONIC OR MECHANICAL, WITHOUT PERMISSION IN WRITING FROM A&C ARCHITECTS PC. ANY UNAUTHORIZED DISCLOSURE MAY CONSTITUTE TRADE SECRET VIOLATION IN VIOLATION OF U.S.C. 1836 AND OTHER LAWS. THIS DRAWING IS THE PROPERTY OF A&C ARCHITECTS PC AND MUST BE USED AS SHOWN. NO PART OF THIS DRAWING MAY BE REPRODUCED OR TRANSMITTED IN ANY FORM OR BY ANY MEANS, ELECTRONIC OR MECHANICAL, WITHOUT PERMISSION IN WRITING FROM A&C ARCHITECTS PC. ANY UNAUTHORIZED DISCLOSURE MAY CONSTITUTE TRADE SECRET VIOLATION IN VIOLATION OF U.S.C. 1836 AND OTHER LAWS.



ajc architects

703 east 1700 south  
salt lake city, ut 84105  
ajcarchitects.com

**GREAT BASIN ENGINEERING**

5746 SOUTH 1475 EAST SUITE 200  
OGDEN, UTAH 84403 MAIN (801)394-4515  
S.L.C. (801)521-0222 FAX (801)392-7944  
WWW.GREATBASINENGINEERING.COM

ARCHITECT / CONSULTANT

NOT FOR  
CONSTRUCTION

AUTHORITY HAVING JURISDICTION

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

THE IZZY - SOUTH

542 East 2100 South  
Salt Lake City, UT 84106

SHEET NAME:

Landscape Plan

REVISIONS	MARK	DATE	DESCRIPTION
-----------	------	------	-------------

ISSUE DATE: 11/16/20

ISSUE TYPE: Progress Set

DRAWN BY: JZ

CHECKED BY: JZ




PROJECT#: 1948.01

SHEET NUMBER:

**LP101**



C:\Users\rmcmullen\Documents\1948 - Izzy South - V20\_V2 mcmullen.rvt 4/2/2020 2:25:00 PM  
ALL SCALE, DESIGN, AND DIMENSIONS ARE OWNED BY AND THE PROPERTY OF AEC ARCHITECTS PC AND ARE NOT TO BE REPRODUCED OR USED IN ANY MANNER WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF AEC ARCHITECTS PC. ANY REPRODUCTION OR USE OF THIS DRAWING WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF AEC ARCHITECTS PC IS A VIOLATION OF THE PROFESSIONAL ETHICS OF THE ARCHITECTURAL PROFESSION AND MAY CONSTITUTE A VIOLATION OF THE PROFESSIONAL ETHICS OF THE ARCHITECTURAL PROFESSION. ANY REPRODUCTION OR USE OF THIS DRAWING WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF AEC ARCHITECTS PC IS A VIOLATION OF THE PROFESSIONAL ETHICS OF THE ARCHITECTURAL PROFESSION. ANY REPRODUCTION OR USE OF THIS DRAWING WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF AEC ARCHITECTS PC IS A VIOLATION OF THE PROFESSIONAL ETHICS OF THE ARCHITECTURAL PROFESSION.



ISSUE DATE: 11/16/20  
ISSUE TYPE: Progress Set  
DRAWN BY: JZ  
CHECKED BY: JZ  
PROJECT#: 1948.01

SHEET NUMBER:

LP501

### PLANTING NOTES

1. EXAMINE THE SITE CONDITIONS, THE SUBGRADE AND VERIFY THE DEPTHS OF TOPSOIL AND MULCH. NOTIFY THE ARCHITECT IN WRITING OF ANY UNSATISFACTORY CONDITIONS. DO NOT BEGIN LANDSCAPE WORK UNTIL UNSATISFACTORY CONDITIONS HAVE BEEN RESOLVED.
2. VERIFY LOCATIONS OF ALL UTILITIES PRIOR TO ANY DIGGING. ANY DAMAGE TO EXISTING UTILITIES CAUSED BY THIS CONTRACTOR SHALL BE REPAIRED AT NO ADDITIONAL EXPENSE TO THE OWNER.
3. TOPSOIL IS TO BE IMPORTED TO THE SITE. SCREEN AND AMEND AS NECESSARY TO MEET "ACCEPTABLE" STANDARDS FOR TOPSOIL AS DESCRIBED IN "TOPSOIL QUALITY GUIDELINES FOR LANDSCAPING" (KOEING, ISAMAN, UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY) <http://extension.usu.edu/files/publications/publication/AG-S0-02.pdf> CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR PROVIDING 6" OF TOPSOIL FOR TURF AND 12" OF TOPSOIL FOR SHRUBS AND TREES.
4. THE LANDSCAPE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR FINISH GRADE ELEVATIONS. ALLOW FOR A MINIMUM OF 4" THICK MUGH LAYER. COORDINATE ROUGH GRADING WITH THE GENERAL CONTRACTOR.
5. ALL PLANT MATERIAL MUST MEET THE SIZES AS INDICATED ON THE PLANT SCHEDULE. PLANT MATERIAL THAT DOES NOT MEET THE QUALITY STANDARDS OF THE PROJECT WILL BE REFUSED BY THE LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT.
6. TURFGRASS SOD SHALL BE CERTIFIED NUMBER 1 QUALITY/PREMIUM SOD - SEE SPECIFICATIONS

### PLANT SCHEDULE

TREES	CODE	QTY	BOTANICAL / COMMON NAME	SIZE	CONT./RB.	HT.	HYDROZONE
	AME ROB	10	Amelanchier x 'Robin Hill' / Robin Hill Serviceberry	2" Cal.			
	CER HEA	8	Cercis canadensis 'Hearts of Gold' / Hearts of Gold Redbud	2" Cal.	B&B		Td4
	QUE FAS	19	Quercus robur fastigiata / Columnar English Oak	2" CAL.	B&B		
SHRUBS	CODE	QTY	BOTANICAL / COMMON NAME	CONT.	HYDROZONE		
	PHY LIT	2	Physocarpus opulifolius 'Little Devil' TM / Dwarf Ninebark	5 gal	Sd4		
	RIB RED	55	Ribes rubrum 'Red Lake' / Red Lake Red Currant	5 gal			
	SYM MAG	31	Symphoricarpos x doorenbosii 'Magic Berry' / Snowberry	5 gal	Sd3		
GRASSES	CODE	QTY	BOTANICAL / COMMON NAME	CONT.	HYDROZONE		
	CAL KAR	6	Calamagrostis x acutiflora 'Karl Foerster' / Feather Reed Grass	1 gal.	Tw2		
	PEN MOU	37	Pennisetum alopecuroides 'Moudry' / Moudry Fountain Grass	1 gal.	Tw2		

### PLANT SCHEDULE

GROUND COVERS	QTY	BOTANICAL / COMMON NAME	CONT.	TYPE	DEPTH	SPACING
	2,832 sf	DECORATIVE GRAVEL MULCH / 1.5"-2" WASHED ROUND GRAVEL Staker Parsons Calico Cobble, Place 3" deep over 12" deep topsoil and weed barrier fabric.	-	STONE	3"	
	1,139 sf	DWARF FESCUE SOD / BIO TURF DWARF FESCUE SOD MIX BioGrass BioTurf Sod or Approved Equal. Place over 6" deep topsoil.	SOD	SOD		
		Planter: 60"Lx30"Wx30"T				



**ATTACHMENT C:**  
**UPDATED IZZY SOUTH SITE PLAN**




**ZONING:**  
MAX BUILDING HEIGHT: 30'  
ELEVATOR/STAIRWAY TOWER BULKHEAD: 16'  
MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT PARAPET WALL: 5'

— TO 500 EAST

2100 SOUTH


TO 600 EAST ———•



**PROO**



**ZONING:**  
MAX BUILDING HEIGHT: 30'  
ELEVATOR/STAIRWAY TOWER BULKHEAD: 16'  
MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT PARAPET WALL: 5'



**SITE**



**ATTACHMENT D:**  
**ADDITIONAL PUBLIC COMMENT**

**From:** [Anderson, John](#)  
**To:** [Joe Mason: Planning Public Comments](#)  
**Cc:** [Miller, Caitlyn](#)  
**Subject:** RE: (EXTERNAL) izzy South - Code reminders  
**Date:** Wednesday, September 23, 2020 10:03:53 PM

---

We received your comment after the public hearing had ended but because the item was tabled to a future agenda I will have these comments placed in the report for the Planning Commission's review.

JOHN ANDERSON  
Planning Manager

PLANNING DIVISION  
COMMUNITY *and* NEIGHBORHOODS  
SALT LAKE CITY CORPORATION

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

[www.SLC.GOV](http://www.SLC.GOV)

---

**From:** Joe Mason [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 23, 2020 9:38 PM  
**To:** Planning Public Comments <planning.comments@slcgov.com>  
**Subject:** (EXTERNAL) izzy South - Code reminders

Please refer to submitted information for details. IS is an option to reduce, not a guarantee

---

Chapter 21A.44 OFF STREET PARKING, MOBILITY AND LOADING 21A.44.010: PURPOSE AND SCOPE:

A. Purpose Statement: The regulations of this chapter are intended to promote the orderly use of land and buildings by identifying minimum and maximum standards

G. Submission Of A Site Plan: Any application for a building permit shall include a site plan, drawn to scale and fully dimensioned, showing any off street parking or loading facilities to be provided in compliance with this title.

**Proposal Statements:**

Parking & Access The parking for the Izzy South project will be fully enclosed in a structure located behind the ground floor units and commercial space and underneath the upper floors. The parking garage will be 17,614 square feet in size and will have openings on the southern and eastern sides to allow daylight to enter and help light the parking area while also providing much-needed ventilation. The project includes sixty (60) parking stalls and an area to park bicycles and scooters. Table 21A.44.030 requires residential developments in the CB Zone to provide one (1) parking stall per dwelling unit, however, section 21A.44.040.B.7 allows developments within a quarter-mile of a fixed transit station to reduce the parking by up to 50%. The proposed development is located within two fixed transit stops along the S-Line and qualifies for this reduction.

21A.44.020: GENERAL OFF STREET PARKING REGULATIONS:

A. Location Of Parking Spaces: All parking spaces required to serve buildings or uses shall be located on the same lot as the building or use served, unless off site parking is approved.

C. Utilization Of Required Parking Spaces: Except as otherwise provided in this section, required off street parking facilities provided for uses listed in section 21A.44.030 of this chapter shall be solely for the parking of passenger automobiles of guests, patrons,



occupants, or employees of such uses.

d. Credit for on street parking shall be limited to the number of spaces provided along the street frontage adjacent to the use.

**Table 21A.44.030** requires residential developments in the **CB Zone to provide a minimum of one (1) parking stall per dwelling unit, (Parking Ordinances – Chapter 44 – Page 15)**

**[Izzy Pub/Coffee Shop** 1,150 SF Ground Floor 783 SF level 2 + Office 119 sf Level 3 estimate 500 SF –  
Total 2500 SF

(Parking Ordinances – Chapter 44 – Page 19) **B7. Parking Exemptions For Proximity To Mass Transit:** For any new multi-family residential, commercial, office or industrial development within one-fourth (1 /4 ) mile of a fixed transit station, the minimum number of parking spaces required according to section 21A.44.030 of this chapter CAN be reduced by fifty percent (50%).

(Parking Ordinances – Chapter 44 – Page 20) **D. Other Eligible Alternatives:** Any alternative to off street parking spaces not outlined in this section may be considered. Such alternatives shall be processed as special exceptions in accordance with the provisions of chapter 21A.52 of this title and as follows:

1. **Application:** In addition to the materials required by chapter 21A.52 of this title, the applicant for an alternative parking requirement must also submit:

a. A written statement specifying the alternative parking requirement requested and the rationale supporting the application;

b. A **professionally prepared parking study** for alternative parking requirements requested for unique nonresidential uses and intensified parking reuse; and

c. A site plan of the entire alternative parking property drawn to scale at a minimum of one inch equals thirty feet (1" = 30') showing the proposed parking plan.

2. **Notice And Hearing:** As a special exception, all requests for alternative parking requirements shall require a public notice and a public hearing in conformance with the requirements of chapter 21A.10 of this title.

### **3. City Internal Review:**

a. The zoning administrator shall obtain comments regarding the application from all interested city departments or divisions.

b. The city transportation director may, if it is determined that the proposal may have an adverse material impact on traffic, require the applicant to submit a professionally prepared traffic impact study prior to the hearing on the application.

c. The city transportation director may **require a professionally prepared parking study**, where deemed appropriate, for applications for unique residential populations and single room occupancy residential uses.

4. General Standards And Considerations For Alternative Parking Requirements: Requests for alternative parking requirements shall be granted in accordance with the standards and considerations for special exceptions in section 21A.52.060 of this title. In addition, an application for an alternative parking requirement shall be granted only if the following findings are determined:

a. That the proposed parking plan will satisfy the anticipated parking demand for the use, up to the maximum number specified in section 21A.44.030, table 21A.44.030 of this chapter; 5/24/2019 Sterling Codifiers, Inc. [https://www.sterlingcodifiers.com/codebook/index.php?book\\_id=672](https://www.sterlingcodifiers.com/codebook/index.php?book_id=672) 21/33

b. That the proposed parking plan will be at least as effective in maintaining traffic circulation patterns and promoting quality urban design as would strict compliance with the otherwise applicable off street parking standards;

c. That the **proposed parking plan does not have a materially adverse impact on adjacent or neighboring properties;**

d. That the proposed parking **plan includes mitigation strategies for any potential impact on adjacent or neighboring properties**; and

e. That the proposed alternative parking requirement is consistent with applicable city master plans and **is in the best interest of the city. (Ord. 62-13, 2013)**

---

**21A.52.060: GENERAL STANDARDS AND CONSIDERATIONS FOR SPECIAL EXCEPTIONS:**

No application for a special exception shall be approved unless the planning commission, historic landmark commission, or the planning director determines that the proposed special exception is appropriate in the location proposed based upon its consideration of the general standards set forth below and, where applicable, the specific conditions for certain special exceptions.

A. Compliance With Zoning Ordinance And District Purposes: The proposed use and development will be in harmony with the general and specific purposes for which this title was enacted and for which the regulations of the district were established.

B. No Substantial Impairment Of Property Value: The proposed use and development will not substantially diminish or impair the value of the property within the neighborhood in which it is located.

C. No Undue Adverse Impact: The proposed use and development will not have a material adverse effect upon the character of the area or the public health, safety and general welfare.

D. Compatible With Surrounding Development: The proposed special exception will be constructed, arranged and operated so as to be compatible with the use and development of neighboring property in accordance with the applicable district regulations.

E. No Destruction Of Significant Features: The proposed use and development will not result in the destruction, loss or damage of natural, scenic or historic features of significant importance.

F. No Material Pollution Of Environment: The proposed use and development will not cause material air, water, soil or noise pollution or other types of pollution.

G. Compliance With Standards: The proposed use and development complies with all additional standards imposed on it pursuant to this chapter. (Ord. 10-16, 2016)

**21A.52.070: CONDITIONS ON SPECIAL EXCEPTIONS:**

Conditions and limitations necessary or appropriate to prevent or minimize adverse effects upon other property and improvements in the vicinity of the special exception or upon public facilities and services may be imposed on each application. These conditions may include, but are not limited to, conditions concerning use, construction, operation, character, location, landscaping, screening and other matters relating to the purposes and objectives of this title. Such conditions shall be expressly set forth in the approval record of the special exception. (Ord. 73-11, 2011)

**21A.52.080: RELATION OF SPECIAL EXCEPTION:**

A special exception shall be deemed to relate to, and be for the benefit of, the use and lot in question rather than the owner or operator of such use or lot. (Ord. 73-11, 2011)



**ATTACHMENT E:**  
**SEPTEMBER 23, 2020 PLANNING**  
**COMMISSION MINUTES**

**SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**This meeting was held electronically pursuant to the**  
**Salt Lake City Emergency Proclamation**  
**Wednesday, September 23, 2020**

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:30:09 PM](#). Audio recordings of the Planning Commission meetings are retained for a period of time.

Present for the Planning Commission meeting were: Chairperson, Adrienne Bell; Vice Chairperson, Brenda Scheer; Commissioners; Maurine Bachman, Amy Barry,Carolynn Hoskins, Matt Lyon, Sara Urquhart, and Crystal Young-Otterstrom.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Wayne Mills, Planning Manager; Molly Robinson, Planning Manager; John Anderson, Planning Manager; Allison Parks, Attorney; Linda Mitchell, Principal Planner; Krissy Gilmore, Principal Planner; Sara Javoronok, Senior Planner; Caitlyn Miller, Principal Planner; Nannette Larsen, Principal Planner; and Marlene Rankins, Administrative Secretary.

**REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR [5:31:11 PM](#)**

Chairperson Bell stated she had nothing to report.

Vice Chairperson Scheer stated she had nothing to report.

**REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR [5:31:22 PM](#)**

Wayne Mills, Planning Manager, provided the public with information on how to join and participate during the meeting.

Chairperson, Adrienne Bell read the Salt Lake City Emergency Proclamation for holding a virtual meeting.

[5:36:34 PM](#)

**Stanford Commons Planned Development & Preliminary Subdivision at approximately 2052 E Michigan Avenue** – 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. **Case number PLNPCM2020-00230**
- b. Preliminary Subdivision** – Preliminary Plat approval is needed to create four (4) new lots. **Case number PLNSUB2020-00231**

The property is zoned RMF-30 (Low Density Multi-Family Residential) and is located within Council District 6, represented by Dan Dugan (Staff contact: Linda Mitchell at (385) 386-2763 or [linda.mitchell@slcgov.com](mailto:linda.mitchell@slcgov.com))



Linda Mitchell, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff recommended that the Planning Commission approve the Planned Development and Preliminary Subdivision requests with the conditions listed in the staff report.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- Clarification on distance of stairs from sidewalk
- Setback of the lot line to the end of the stairs
- Clarification on homeownership

Stanford Bell, applicant, provided a presentation along with further design details.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- Clarification on apartment complex meaning for the applicant
- Whether there are other design options for homeownership
- Clarification on purpose of the stair placement
- Clarification on front door placement
- Entrances to units

#### **PUBLIC HEARING [6:04:28 PM](#)**

Chairperson Bell opened the Public Hearing;

Devon Olson, Community Council Chairperson – Stated his opposition of the request. He also raised concerns with the density in the neighborhood and traffic problems.

Ben Emery – Stated the proposal is not compatible with the neighborhood and stated his opposition of the request.

David Rose – Stated his opposition of the request.

Zachary Dussault – Stated his support of the request. He also raised concern with the stair placement.

Soren Simonsen – Stated his support of the request.

Bill Christiansen – Stated his support of the request.

Scott Jones – Stated his opposition of the request.

Susan Wurtzburg – Provided an email comment stated opposition of the request.

Seeing no one else wished to speak; Chairperson Bell closed the Public Hearing.

Stanford Bell addressed the public comments and concerns.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant further discussed the following:

- Whether the applicant explored other staircase designs or placement
- Clarification on the proposal for the townhome development to the North of the property

The Commission made the following comments:

- I'm not comfortable moving forward to approve the petition without seeing the possible changes to the stairs

- Suggestions were provided to make changes to the staircase
- Suggestions of adding greenery or landscaping around the stairs

**MOTION [6:38:00 PM](#)**

Commissioner Scheer stated, based on the findings listed in the staff report, the information presented, and input received during the public hearing, I move that the Planning Commission approve the Planned Development and Preliminary Subdivision requests (PLNPCM2020-00230 & PLNSUB2020-00231) as proposed, subject to complying with the conditions listed in the staff report and subject to a design review by staff concerning the stairs and front landscaping of the project, subject to the discussion of the Planning Commission in the meeting.

Commissioner Urquhart seconded the motion. Commissioners Bachman, Hoskins, Barry, Scheer, and Urquhart voted “Aye”. Commissioners Lyon, and Young-Otterstrom voted “Nay”. The motion passed 5-2.

[6:43:32 PM](#) Adrienne Bell, read the online meeting public announcement.

**[6:44:45 PM](#)**

**Conditional Use ADU at approximately 952 S Windsor Street** – Alexis Suggs, property owner representative, is requesting Conditional Use approval for an approximate 644 square foot accessory dwelling unit (ADU) above a new detached 3-car garage at the above listed address. The property is zoned R-1/5,000 (Single-Family Residential) and is located within Council District 5, represented by Darin Mano. (Staff Contact: Linda Mitchell at (385) 386-2763 or linda.mitchell@slcgov.com) **Case number PLNPCM2020-00451**

Linda Mitchell, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff recommended that the Planning Commission approve the Conditional Use as proposed and with the listed conditions in the staff report.

**PUBLIC HEARING [6:49:52 PM](#)**

Chairperson Bell opened the Public Hearing;

Zachary Dussault – Stated his support of the request.

Seeing no one else wished to speak; Chairperson Bell closed the Public Hearing.

**MOTION [6:51:43 PM](#)**

Commissioner Barry stated, based on the findings listed in the staff report, the information presented, and input received during the public hearing, I move that the Planning Commission approve the Conditional Use request (PLNPCM2020-00451) as proposed, subject to complying with the conditions listed in the staff report.

Young-Otterstrom requested an amendment to add lighting to the alley side of the property. Commissioner Barry accepted the amendment.

Commissioner Scheer seconded the motion. Commissioners Urquhart, Scheer, Young-Otterstrom, Lyon, Barry, Hoskins, and Bachman voted “Aye”. The motion passed unanimously.



[6:54:56 PM](#)

**Twenty Ones at approximately 2105 E 2100 S** - Tom Henriod, with Rockworth Companies, is requesting approval for a new mixed-use development at the above listed address. The development includes two buildings with approximately 21,000 SF of commercial space and 107 residential units. A total of 168 parking spaces will be provided on site. Currently the land is used for commercial businesses and is zoned CB (Community Business). This type of project requires Design Review and Special Exception approval. The subject property is located in Council District 6, represented by Dan Dugan (Staff Contact: Krissy Gilmore at (801) 535-7780 or [kristina.gilmore@slcgov.com](mailto:kristina.gilmore@slcgov.com))

- a. **Design Review:** The development requires Design Review approval due to building size limits in the CB: Community Business zoning district as well as requested additional height on the south building. **Case number PLNPCM2019-01170**
- b. **Special Exception:** The development requires Special Exception approval due to additional height requested on the north building. **Case number PLNPCM2020-00200**

Krissy Gilmore, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff recommended that the Planning Commission approve the request with the conditions listed in the staff report.

Tom Henriod, applicant, provided a presentation along with further design details.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING** [7:12:10 PM](#)

Chairperson Bell opened the Public Hearing;

Judi Short, Sugar House Land Use Chairperson – Stated there aren't any bike racks that should be included in front of the restaurant, to compensate for limited parking and encourage people to visit by bike. We don't see evidence of outside tables for ice cream or restaurants. She also stated it doesn't look very inviting.

Soren Simonsen – Stated his support of the request.

Stephen Dibble – Raised a concern with the number of units to the number of parking.

Zachary Dussault – Stated his support of the request.

Jennifer Jensen – Provided an email comment stating her opposition of the request.

Zachary Hildebrand – Provided an email comment raising concerns.

James & Jeanne Jardine – Provided an email comment stated their opposition of the request.

Kelly – Provided an email comment stating opposition of the request.

Landon Clark – Provided an email comment stating opposition of the request.

Bob Bereskin – Provided an email comment stating his opposition of the request.

Seeing no one else wished to speak; Chairperson Bell closed the Public Hearing.

The applicant addressed the public comments and concerns.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant further discussed the following:

- Whether a traffic study was submitted
- Clarification on parking requirements
- Clarification on the request for additional 3 feet of height

**MOTION [7:49:37 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Scheer stated, Based on the information in the staff report, the information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, I move that the Planning Commission approve Petitions PLNPCM2019-01170 & PLNPCM2020-00200 The Twenty Ones Design Review and Special Exception with the conditions listed in the staff report.**

**Commissioner Bachman seconded the motion. Commissioners Bachman, Hoskins, Barry, Lyon, Young-Otterstrom, Scheer, and Urquhart voted “Aye”. The motion passed unanimously.**

[7:51:40 PM](#) The Commission took a small break.

**[7:53:42 PM](#)**

**Planned Development request for The Abbie at approximately 1739 S Main Street** - A request by Andrew Black of CW Urban for Planned Development approval for two buildings with 13 multi-family residential units at the above address. The subject property is located in the CC (Commercial Corridor) zoning district. The applicant is requesting Planned Development approval for a building without street frontage. The subject property is located within Council District 5, represented by Darin Mano (Staff contact: Sara Javoronok at (801) 535-7625 or sara.javoronok@slcgov.com) **Case number PLNPCM2020-00378**

Sara Javoronok, Senior Planner, reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff recommended that the Planning Commission approval with the conditions listed in the staff report.

Jon Galbraith, applicant, provided a presentation with further design details.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- Clarification on reduction of trees and green space
- Front entrance and street engagement

**PUBLIC HEARING [8:06:05 PM](#)**

Chairperson Bell opened the Public Hearing;

Zachary Dussault – Stated his support of the request.

Seeing no one else wished to speak; Chairperson Bell closed the Public Hearing.

**MOTION [8:08:13 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Bachman stated, based on the information in the staff report, the information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, I move that the Commission approve The Abbie Planned Development PLNPCM2020-00378 with the conditions listed in the staff report.**

**Commissioner Hoskins seconded the motion. Commissioners Urquhart, Young-Otterstrom, Lyon, Barry, Hoskins, and Bachman voted “Aye”. Commissioner Scheer voted “Nay”. The motion passed 6-1.**



[8:09:34 PM](#)

**Izzy South Design Review and Special Exception at approximately 534 East 2100 South** - Ryan McMullen, Applicant, is requesting Design Review and Special Exception approval for a proposed 71-unit mixed use building located at approximately 534 East 2100 South by the name of "Izzy South." The Applicant is requesting a modification of the maximum height requirement to accommodate architectural features on the front-facing façade of the proposed building through the Special Exception process. This project also triggers the Design Review process because the building is larger than 15,000 gross square feet in size. The property is zoned CB (Community Business) and is located within Council District 7, represented by Amy Fowler (Staff Contact: Caitlyn Miller at (385) 202-4689 or [caitlyn.miller@slcgov.com](mailto:caitlyn.miller@slcgov.com))  
**Case numbers PLNPCM2020-00222 and PLNPCM2020-00655**

Caitlyn Miller, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file).

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- Clarification on rear-yard setback

Justin Heppler, applicant, provided a presentation with further details.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- Clarification on street engagement
- Whether the applicant explored fencing

#### **PUBLIC HEARING [8:38:37 PM](#)**

Chairperson Bell opened the Public Hearing;

Judy Short, Sugar House Land Use Chairperson – Stated there has been a lot of community engagement for the proposal. She stated there aren't enough trees or landscaping. The residence of the South building are to share the 20 feet of green space on the North side of the North building.

Scott Doutre – Stated his opposition of the request.

Soren Simonsen – Stated he supports the staff recommendations. He raised concerns with the color and that there needs to be bikes lanes on 2100 South.

Zachary Dussault – Stated his support of the request.

Wanda – Provided an email comment stating her opposition of the request.

Joe Mason – Raised concerns regarding street parking.

Shane – Raised concerns regarding parking.

Ben – Provided an email comment stating his opposition.

Travis Smith – Raised concern with high density.

Lynn Schwarz – Provided an email comment stating opposition of the request.

Cotterill – Provided an email comment stating opposition of the request.

Donna Bradshaw – Provided an email comment stating opposition of the request.

Russell Grover – Provided an email comment stating opposition of the request.

Shannon Legge – Provided an email comment stating opposition of the request.

Dayna McKee – Provided an email comment. Raised concerns with parking and stated opposition of the request.

Seeing no one else wished to speak; Chairperson Bell closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant further discussed the following:

- Clarification on current rear property line setback

The applicant addressed the public comments and concerns.

The Commission and Staff further discussed the following:

- Whether there has been any consideration on the City level to consider pedestrian enhancements in order to access the transit from the project
- Clarification on the Special Exception request
- Whether there are elements of the Design Review that would allow the Commission to simply turn down the application
- Discussion was made regarding the conditions listed in the staff report

#### **MOTION [9:41:17 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Lyon stated, based on the information in the staff report, the information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, I move that the Planning Commission table petition numbers PLNPCM2020-00222 and PLNPCM2020-00655 and give the applicant some time to revise their designs in a way to better match standard “D” and standard “G”, particularly how it relates to human scale and how it relates to the current neighborhood zone.**

**Commissioner Urquhart seconded the motion. Commissioners Urquhart, Scheer, Young-Otterstrom, Lyon, Barry, Hoskins, and Bachman voted “Aye”. The motion passed unanimously.**

[9:44:23 PM](#) Chairperson Bell proposed to move forward with agenda item number 6 and suggested to reschedule the work session.

#### **[9:50:08 PM](#)**

**Gateway Storage at approximately 134 South 700 West** - Austin Lundskog, Applicant, is requesting approval of a proposed self-storage facility 130,500 sq. ft. in size at approximately 134 South 700 West. The property is zoned GMU (Gateway Mixed Use) and is located within Council District 4, represented by Analia Valdemoros (Staff contact: Caitlyn Miller at (385) 202-4689 or [caitlyn.miller@slcgov.com](mailto:caitlyn.miller@slcgov.com))

- a. Planned Development** – Planned Development approval is needed due to the proposed building being an increase of size larger than 25% of the existing buildings on site. **Case number PLNPCM2020-00182**
- b. Design Review** – Design Review approval is needed due to self-storage facilities in the G-MU Zone being required to undergo this process and the Applicant’s request for



modifications to the exterior building materials and blank wall requirements. **Case number PLNPCM2020-00399**

- c. **Special Exception** – Special Exception approval is needed due to the Applicant’s request to allow a modified parking arrangement based off of a traffic generation study provided by the Applicant. **Case number PLNPCM2020-00655**

Caitlyn Miller, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff recommended that the Planning Commission approve the requests with the conditions listed in the staff report.

Austin Lundskog, applicant, provided further detailed information.

**PUBLIC HEARING [10:00:17 PM](#)**

Chairperson Bell opened the Public Hearing;

Zachary Dussault – Stated he would prefer a better use for this space.

Seeing no one else wished to speak; Chairperson Bell closed the Public Hearing.

**MOTION [10:06:12 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Scheer stated, based on the information in the staff report, the information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, I move that the Planning Commission approve petition numbers PLNPCM2020-00182, PLNPCM2020-00399 and PLNPCM2020-00668, a Planned Development, Design Review and Special Exception request, respectively, for Gateway Storage located at approximately 134 South 700 West with the conditions listed in the staff report.**

**Commissioner Barry seconded the motion. Commissioners Bachman, Hoskins, Barry, Lyon, Young-Otterstrom, Scheer, and Urquhart voted “Aye”. The motion passed unanimously.**

The following are Q&A’s that were received during the meeting:

Q&A Session for Planning Commission Meeting September 23,2020

Session number: 1463184201

Date: Wednesday, September 23, 2020

Starting time: 5:00 PM

---

Soren Simonsen (soren@communitystudio.us) - 5:27 PM

Q: I would like to speak during the public comment periods for item #3 - Twenty Ones, and item #5 - Izzy South

Priority: N/A-

-Molly Robinson - 5:45 PM

A: Call in number: 408-418-9388

---

Devon Olson (devon.olson@urs.org) - 5:39 PM

Q: Do you have a call in number?

Priority: N/A-

-Wayne Mills - 5:45 PM

A: 408-418-9388. access code 146 318 4201

---

Devon Olson (devon.olson@urs.org) - 5:51 PM

Q: Thanks

Priority: N/A-

-Wayne Mills - 5:59 PM

A: I'm not sure what you see on your end. Who are you looking for.

---

Joe Mason (jdmason65@hotmail.com) - 5:56 PM

Q: Are attendees hidden from one another? I can't see people who say they are on the call.

Priority: N/A-

-John Anderson - 5:59 PM

A: Attendees are not able to see others on the list

---

Joe Mason (jdmason65@hotmail.com) - 6:16 PM

Q: Shane Stroud, Dayna McKee

Priority: N/A-

-John Anderson - 6:17 PM

A: They are both logged on to the meeting. -

-Molly Robinson - 6:20 PM

A: Joe --both are present

---

Zachary Dussault (zacharytdussault@gmail.com) - 6:26 PM

Q: To the other commenters, is the garagama hall 1020 foothill?

Priority: N/A

---

Lynn Pershing (lkpershing@gmail.com) - 6:30 PM

Q: Front yard setback is all Cement-Not compatible with neighborhood. Aesthetically looks like a commercial building: flat roof, long Front open iron stairs. Greenspace could be used for detached garages compatible with neighborhood, then landscape front

Priority: N/A-

-Wayne Mills - 6:33 PM

A: The public hearing has been closed

---

Zachary Dussault (zacharytdussault@gmail.com) - 6:34 PM

Q: I love it Brenda!

Priority: N/A

---

Zachary Dussault (zacharytdussault@gmail.com) - 6:42 PM

Q: The encroachment is the building not the stairs

Priority: N/A

---

Cassandra Tավolarella (casstav@gmail.com) - 6:46 PM



Q: Have you considered decreasing the stair length with widening the landing for a patio for what I am assuming is the living room on the main floor?

Priority: N/A

---

Soren Simonsen (soren@communitystudio.us) - 7:30 PM

Q: I might add to the concern with parking and traffic relative to kids walking and biking to school. I have walked to Dilworth with my three children almost every school day for the past 12 years.

Priority: N/A

---

Soren Simonsen (soren@communitystudio.us) - 7:31 PM

Q: I can probably count on both of my hands the number of times we have had any conflict with cars coming and going from any of the 3 large scale apartments between 2100 S and Dilworth over those many years.

Priority: N/A

---

Soren Simonsen (soren@communitystudio.us) - 7:38 PM

Q: Thank you for the clarification on the bike racks and bus stop. Fantastic!

Priority: N/A

---

Joe Mason (jdmason65@hotmail.com) - 8:20 PM

Q: Is Dayna and Shane still online?

Priority: N/A-

-Caitlyn Miller - 8:27 PM

A: It looks like both are in attendance

---

Joe Mason (jdmason65@hotmail.com) - 8:27 PM

Q: Thanks.

Priority: N/A

---

Travis Smith (travsmith1307@gmail.com) - 8:42 PM

Q: What are the opinions of the panel regarding the small businesses which have been negatively impacted by the massive amounts of re-zoning in the area do to high density buildings in the neighborhood? IE-the scooter shop, unable to remain in the area

Priority: N/A-

---

Joe Mason (jdmason65@hotmail.com) - 8:44 PM

Q: Counting those parking spaces only shows 58. Didn't they say 60?

Priority: N/A

---

Soren Simonsen (soren@communitystudio.us) - 8:44 PM

Q: The west facade is a zero lot line, so no openings will be permitted by building code.

Priority: N/A

---

Soren Simonsen (soren@communitystudio.us) - 8:45 PM

Q: The west facade is a zero lot line, so no openings will be permitted by building code.  
Priority: N/A

---

Joe Mason (jdmason65@hotmail.com) - 8:58 PM

Q: I keep raising my hand... so has shane  
Priority: N/A

---

Zachary Dussault (zacharytdussault@gmail.com) - 9:02 PM

Q: Highly encourage those concerned about parking to check out this article.  
<https://www.vox.com/videos/2017/7/19/15993936/high-cost-of-free-parking>  
Priority: N/A

---

Soren Simonsen (soren@communitystudio.us) - 9:10 PM

Q: Can Blue Planet Scooter move up to the Twenty-Ones when that opens?  
Priority: N/A

---

Joe Mason (jdmason65@hotmail.com) - 9:15 PM

Q: Landon submitted a comment, which hasn't been read  
Priority: N/A

---

-Joe Mason (jdmason65@hotmail.com) - 9:16 PM

Q: HE CC'd me on the response. Please make sure it is read. It is important.  
Priority: N/A-

---

-Soren Simonsen (soren@communitystudio.us) - 9:16 PM

Q: The biggest deterrent to transit use is that we're missing much of our first-mile/last mile infrastructure. We're missing bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. Wider sidewalks and bike lanes are essential to TOD.  
Priority: N/A-

---

-Travis Smith (travsmith1307@gmail.com) - 9:21 PM

Q: I spoke, thank you.  
Priority: N/A-

---

-Joe Mason (jdmason65@hotmail.com) - 9:21 PM

Q: Was the Trax Line utilization report included and mentioned?  
Priority: N/A-

-John Anderson - 9:22 PM

A: Joe, I shared those comments from Landon about the trax utilization. They were the last comments that I read aloud

---



Joe Mason (jdmason65@hotmail.com) - 9:22 PM

Q: None of us heard it. Are you sure?

Priority: N/A-

-John Anderson - 9:23 PM

A: Yes, I am very sure that I read them.

---

Soren Simonsen (soren@communitystudio.us) - 9:33 PM

Q: Our target sidewalk widths in Sugar House are 10'. Wider sidewalks and a reduced park strip (maybe with tree grates or narrow planters) would be helpful to the pedestrian.

Priority: N/A

---

Joe Mason (jdmason65@hotmail.com) - 9:33 PM

Q: Thank you,

Priority: N/A

---

Joe Mason (jdmason65@hotmail.com) - 9:34 PM

Q: How do we make sure the council understands the parking "MAY be reduced. There isn't a set rule or guarantee.. Is everyone aware?

Priority: N/A-

---

-Joe Mason (jdmason65@hotmail.com) - 9:34 PM

Q: Should I email the code?

Priority: N/A-

---

Soren Simonsen (soren@communitystudio.us) - 9:35 PM

Q: The sidewalks in front of the Urbana project recently completed at 10th E and 2100 South maintained the existing narrow sidewalks and they are very inadequate -- highly pedestrian congested at times.

Priority: N/A

---

Aabir Malik (aabir@colmenagroup.com) - 10:00 PM

Q: So is the Sears work session officially being postponed to Friday at noon?

Priority: N/A-

-John Anderson - 10:03 PM

A: It is being postponed. We will work with the commission and your group to schedule a date ASAP. –

---

Zachary Dussault (zacharytdussault@gmail.com) - 10:16 PM

Q: Have a great night everyone, that was a doozy!

Priority: N/A-

**The meeting adjourned at [10:07:58 PM](#)**

**ATTACHMENT F:**  
**SEPTEMBER 23, 2020 PLANNING**  
**COMMISSION STAFF REPORT**





# Staff Report

PLANNING DIVISION  
COMMUNITY AND NEIGHBORHOODS

To: Salt Lake City Planning Commission  
From: Caitlyn Miller, Principal Planner  
Date: September 23, 2020  
Re: PLNPCM2020-00222—Izzy South Design Review and  
PLNPCM2020-00655 Izzy South Special Exception

## Design Review and Special Exception

**PROPERTY ADDRESS:** 534 East 2100 South  
**PARCEL ID:** 16-19-227-005-0000  
**MASTER PLAN:** Sugar House  
**ZONING DISTRICT:** CB – Community Business

**REQUEST:** Ryan McMullen, applicant, is requesting Design Review approval for a proposed 71-unit mixed use building located at approximately 534 East 2100 South in the CB – Community Business zoning district. The property is over 15,000 gross square feet in size and is thus required to proceed through the Design Review process prior to submitting for a building permit. The Applicant has also included a request for modification of the maximum height requirement to accommodate architectural features on the front-facing façade of the proposed building through the Special Exception process.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Based on the information in this staff report, planning staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the design review and special exception requests with the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall comply with all other Department/Division conditions.
2. All other applicable zoning standards not modified by the design review or special exception approval shall apply to the proposed development.
3. Final approval authority for the development shall be delegated to Planning staff based on the applicant's compliance with the standards and conditions of approval as noted within this staff report.
4. The applicant shall obtain the required demolition permits for the existing buildings. Prior to issuance of any permit to demolish the existing buildings or begin construction of the building, the applicant shall schedule a DRT meeting with Development staff.

### ATTACHMENTS:

- A. Vicinity Map
- B. Photos
- C. Site Drawings and Building Elevations
- D. Applicant Project Description and Submittal Materials
- E. Analysis of Standards
- F. Public Process and Comments
- G. Department Review Comments

## **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

### **Overview**


The proposed project for a 71-unit mixed-use building on a 0.792 acre (approximately 34,500 square feet) parcel located at approximately 534 East 2100 South in the CB – Community Business zoning district. The CB district limits building height to 30-feet in height but allows additional height of ten percent (10%) or less to be approved through the special exception process. The applicant is proposing a building that is 33-feet tall to accommodate architectural detailing along the front (northern) face of the proposed building and so it can correspond in height with a proposed sister project across the street to the north; Izzy North. The project is required to proceed through the Design Review process due to its size; developments larger than 15,000 square feet in gross floor area in the CB Zone are required to go through Design Review.





The proposed building will nearly fill the entire parcel. The building is oriented northward to face 2100 South directly. The building face is approximately 300 feet long and the building will be constructed between five feet (5') and twelve feet eleven and three-quarter inches (12' 11 ¾") from the property line. This setback will be landscaped with plants and shrubs and street trees will be provided in the park strip along 2100 South. Some of the units within the building will be constructed in the "townhome style" and will have direct walk-up access from 2100 South. The Applicant has also proposed approximately 2,000 square feet of commercial/retail amenity space which will be accessible to the general public as well as the tenants and visitors of Izzy South. Vehicular access to the property will be through one driveway at the center of the building, which will lead to the structured parking behind the ground floor units. Pedestrians will be able to easily access the project from the public sidewalk and through entry patios.

The proposed project includes a request for a modification of the maximum height standard in the zone to accommodate architectural features on the front (northern) face of the building. The maximum height of a building as set forth in section 21A.26.030 (CB Zone) is thirty feet (30'). The requested height is thirty-three feet (33'). The requested additional height would span across the entire building; the rear of the building has a flat roof which will reach thirty-three feet (33') in height. The second and third floors of the building step back from the rear property line by 18' 5". The front-facing façade of the building (along 2100 South) includes peaked architectural features which help break up the massing of the overall building. These peaks at their pinnacle would reach thirty-seven feet (37') in height. Although portions of the peaked roof features extend over the requested 33' height the ordinance defines the building height of a pitched roof as "the average height of the highest gable" for pitched roofs.



## The Site & Context

The property currently has existing commercial buildings which the Applicant intends to demolish to make way for the new mixed-use residential building. The subject property is adjacent to Uinta Golf to the east, a single-family residence to the west and a single-family neighborhood to the south. The Uinta Golf building is twenty-five feet (25') tall. The single-family home is zoned CB and is approximately twenty feet (20') in height. To the west of the single-family home is a flat-roofed gas station of approximately the same height. The adjacent neighborhood to the south is zoned R-1-5,000. This adjacency requires a 10-foot setback/landscaped setback from the southern property line which the Applicant has provided in the form of a landscaped rear yard ten feet seven inches (10'7") in width. The Applicant has also proposed the construction of a fence and the planting of columnar trees to help mitigate concerns about the privacy of the neighbors.



Although the proposed building is taller than the surrounding buildings on the same block face and in the neighborhood to the south it is staff's assessment that it is still comparable and compatible with the surrounding development. The Applicant has proposed "stepping-back" the building from the rear property line (adjacent to the single-family neighborhood) to minimize

the visual impact the new building could have on the neighbors.

## **Parking & Access**

The parking for the Izzy South project will be fully enclosed in a structure located behind the ground floor units and commercial space and underneath the upper floors. The parking garage will be 17,614 square feet in size and will have openings on the southern and eastern sides to allow daylight to enter and help light the parking area while also providing much-needed ventilation. The project includes sixty (60) parking stalls and an area to park bicycles and scooters. Table 21A.44.030 requires residential developments in the CB Zone to provide one (1) parking stall per dwelling unit, however, section 21A.44.040.B.7 allows developments within a quarter-mile of a fixed transit station to reduce the parking by up to 50%. The proposed development is located within two fixed transit stops along the S-Line and qualifies for this reduction.

## **KEY CONSIDERATIONS:**

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

### **Issue 1: Design Review Objectives**

The proposed building will be located along 2100 South in an area of other residential and commercial development. It will be taller than the existing buildings located directly to both the east and west along 2100 South but in line with the anticipated height limits in the zoning district in this area. Developments in the CB Zone which are larger than 15,000 square feet in gross size are required to proceed through Design Review prior to their construction. Staff will review the proposal's compliance with these design review standards in Attachment E.

The proposed building incorporates ground-floor glass along 2100 South to support visual interest for pedestrians and drivers along the arterial street while also providing adequate privacy for the tenants living in the ground floor units. The exterior building materials provide a variety of color and texture which aid in breaking up the overall mass of the building as a whole. The proposal reduces vehicular access points from the four driveways currently existing to one singular point of vehicular access, thus furthering pedestrians' comfort as they travel east or west out front of the building. Additionally, multiple units and the local commercial amenity space may be accessed directly from entry patios adjacent to the public sidewalk. Street trees will be installed along the 2100 South frontage in accordance with Urban Forestry standards and high-quality landscaping will be provided behind the sidewalk to further beautify the site. Further description of these can be found in the applicant's narrative in Attachment D. The applicant's narrative demonstrates how the design elements of the building relate to the scale and context of existing buildings and how these elements address the human scale of the building and its interface with the overall area. These elements address the Design Review standards related to additional building height as codified in 21A.59.050.D and G.

### **Issue 2: Special Exception Request for Additional Height**

While the proposed project at 33-feet tall will create some shadowing of the public sidewalk along 2100 South, that impact would not be significantly different if the new development were built to a height of 30-feet tall. A building of 30-feet that met all zoning requirements of the CB district would be allowed by right without a public hearing process. It is staff's opinion that the increase in height of three feet (3') will not result in a project that is incompatible with surrounding neighborhood and will not introduce additional impacts over what could be built on the parcel by-right.

### **Issue 3: Effect on Single-Family Neighborhood to the South**





preserving the privacy of the neighbors.

The Applicant met early on in the process with the Liberty Wells Community Council and the Sugar House Community Council to discuss the Izzy South project. During these meetings concerns were brought up regarding the privacy of the single-family homeowners to the south along with concerns about light and noise pollution emanating from the parking garage. The Applicant and his development team voiced their support of constructing a fence at the southern property line and incorporating trees to aid in

#### **NEXT STEPS:**

If approved, the applicant may proceed with the project and will be required to obtain all necessary permits. If denied the applicant would need to revise their design and proceed through the Design Review and Special Exception applications again or meet all zoning requirements as set forth in adopted ordinances. The applicant is proposing a use that is allowed in the zoning district and that is compatible with the neighborhood. The applicant's narrative is included in Attachment D of this report. Staff recommends that the Design Review and Special Exception applications be approved by the Planning Commission.

# ATTACHMENT A: Vicinity Map

Vicinity Zoning Map



Salt Lake City Planning Division, 8/19/2020



## **ATTACHMENT B: Photos**

---







## **ATTACHMENT C: Site Drawings and Building Elevations**



# HIGH BOY VENTURES | IZZY SOUTH

DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

SEPTEMBER 2020





# PROJECT DESCRIPTION 1

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

## PROJECT VISION

IZZY SOUTH is a multi-family building on the south side of 2100 South between 500 & 600 East. A mirrored version of this design is being planned on the North side of the street to create a clean gateway experience along 2100 South.

The project will consist of mixed town-homes, studios, and one bedroom apartments with a three-story neighborhood restaurant / coffee shop component on the west end of the development. Cental parking access divides the stepped massing along the front elevation, and the undulating building facade frames walkable front entries into each unit creating a strong, active community connection to the street.

## CONSTRUCTION NARRATIVE

IZZY SOUTH will be a three-story wood framed structure with a concrete podium over the on-grade parking garage. A simple material pallet of vertical metal panels and horizontal lap siding makes up a majority of the building exterior. Varying roof forms, heights, and depths of the buidling along both 2100 South and the adjacent neighborhood break down the scale

The building systems are being designed as **all electric**, with water heaters, unit heaters, and unit cooling systems all tied to electrical main-frame. A solar panel array is being studied on the roof



PROJECT DESCRIPTION 1

EXISTING CONDITIONS 2

SITE PLAN 3

FLOOR PLANS 4

EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS 5

PERSPECTIVE RENDERS 6

DESIGN REVIEW ANALYSIS 7



# PROJECT DESCRIPTION 1

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION



## PROJECT GOALS | HIGHLIGHTS

- Create a **pedestrian friendly** mixed-use development on the fringe of Sugarhouse.
- Provide a variety of housing types / sizes to **enhance economic diversity** of the project
- Provide a public amenity / coffee shop that can become a **central community gathering place**.
- **Reduce project carbon footprint** by pursuing an all electric building infrastructure - NO GAS.

## UNIT MIX - 71 TOTAL UNITS

Offering a variety of unit types and sizes is a driving priority in the project matrix / proforma to create diversity of tenants. We have found these are the unit types everyone is looking for:

- **(40)** Studios Apartments - 450 - 600 s.f. ea
- **(21)** 1-Bedroom Apartments - 650 - 800 s.f. ea
- **(10)** 2 Bedroom Townhomes - 1,000 - 1,250 s.f. ea



# EXISTING CONDITIONS | CONTEXT

## IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

### EXISTING SITE SURVEY

#### DESCRIPTION PER TITLE REPORT

THE SOUTH 113.9 FEET OF LOTS 78, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, AND 90, GLENWOOD, ACCORDING TO THE OFFICIAL PLAT THEREOF ON FILE AND OF RECORD IN THE OFFICE OF THE SALT LAKE COUNTY RECORDER.

TOGETHER WITH ONE HALF OF THE VACATED ALLEY ABUTTING ON THE SOUTH.

ALSO TOGETHER WITH ONE HALF OF THE VACATED ALLEY BEING APPROXIMATELY 5 1/2 FEET IN WIDTH ABUTTING THE FOLLOWING PROPERTY ON THE NORTH.

ALL OF LOT 58 AND THE EAST HALF OF 56, GLENWOOD SUBDIVISION, ACCORDING TO THE OFFICIAL PLAT THEREOF ON FILE AND OF RECORD IN THE OFFICE OF THE SALT LAKE COUNTY RECORDER.

#### TITLE INFORMATION

THIS SURVEY DOES NOT CONSTITUTE A TITLE SEARCH BY THE SURVEYOR. ALL INFORMATION REGARDING RECORD EASEMENTS, ADJOINERS AND OTHER DOCUMENTS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE QUALITY OF TITLE TO TRACT SHOWN HEREON WAS GAINED FROM TITLE COMMITMENT NO. 0070 PREPARED BY METRO NATIONAL TITLE COMPANY, EFFECTIVE DATE: FEBRUARY 14, 2018, AT 7:45 AM.

#### SURVEY NARRATIVE

THE PURPOSE OF THIS SURVEY IS TO PROVIDE AN "ALTANSPS LAND TITLE SURVEY" ON THE SUBJECT PROPERTY PER CLIENTS REQUEST. THE BASIS OF BEARING FOR THIS SURVEY IS NORTH 89°50'14" WEST ALONG THE MONUMENT LINE OF COMMONWEALTH AVENUE, AS SHOWN ON THIS SURVEY. THE SURVEYED PROPERTY LINES WERE ESTABLISHED PER THE SALT LAKE CITY ATLAS PLAT AND THE RECORDED SUBDIVISION PLAT.

#### SCHEDULE B-2 EXCEPTIONS

EASEMENTS, SETBACKS, NOTES AND RESTRICTIONS, AS SHOWN ON THE SUBDIVISION PLAT.

RECORDED: OCTOBER 13, 1989  
ENTRY NO.: 156044  
BOOK/PAGE: F OF PLATS 123  
SURVEY FINDINGS: SUBDIVISION PLAT SHOWN HEREON; NO EASEMENTS TO PLOT, BLANKETS PARCEL.

EASEMENT, AND THE TERMS AND CONDITIONS THEREOF:

IMPOSED BY VACATION ORDINANCE  
OF AN "L" SHAPED ALLEY LOCATED BETWEEN 2100 SOUTH STREET AND COMMONWEALTH AVENUE AT 600 EAST, BEING WEST AND SOUTH TO COMMONWEALTH AVENUE AT APPROXIMATELY 300 EAST  
PURPOSE: RESERVES EASEMENTS FOR EXISTING UTILITIES THAT MAY HAVE BEEN CONSTRUCTED ACROSS THE VACATED STREET OR ALLEY.

DATED: OCTOBER 13, 1989  
ENTRY NO.: 372982  
BOOK/PAGE: 5421/1974  
SURVEY FINDINGS: ALLEY SHOWN HEREON

#### GENERAL NOTES

1. M&M ENGINEERING OR M&M ENGINEERING, SURVEYING L.C. MAKES NO REPRESENTATIONS AS TO THE EXISTENCE OF ANY OTHER RECORDED DOCUMENTS THAT MAY AFFECT THIS PARCEL OTHER THAN THOSE SHOWN IN THE EXCEPTIONS OF SCHEDULE B-2 AS SHOWN HEREON.

2. CORNER MONUMENTS WERE SET WITH A 5/8" REBAR & CAP OR NAIL & WASHER STAMPED "M&M, ENG." UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE HEREON.

3. THIS MAP MAKES NO ASSUMPTIONS AS TO ANY UNWRITTEN RIGHTS THAT MAY EXIST BY AND BETWEEN THE ADJOINING LANDOWNERS.

4. COURSES AND DISTANCES SHOWN ON THIS MAP ARE MEASURED DIMENSIONS UNLESS SHOWN WITHIN PARENTHESES, INDICATING A RECORD COURSE OR DISTANCE. RECORD INFORMATION IS TAKEN FROM CITED TITLE COMMITMENT, DEEDS OF RECORD, SUBDIVISION PLATS, ROADWAY DEDICATION PLATS, CITY ATLAS PLATS, FILED SURVEYS OR OTHER SOURCES OF RECORD INFORMATION.

5. NO OBSERVED EVIDENCE OF CEMETERIES OR BURIAL GROUNDS.

6. BY SCALED MAP LOCATION AND GRAPHIC PLOTTING ONLY, THE SUBJECT PARCEL LIES WITH FLOOD ZONE X, AN AREA OF MINIMAL FLOOD HAZARD, PER MAP 4905C0282R, EFFECTIVE ON 08/02/2012 & MAP 4905C0300G, EFFECTIVE ON 09/15/2009.

7. PARCEL CONTAINS 17 REGULAR PARKING STALLS, 1 ADA PARKING STALL, TOTALING 18 OVERALL PARKING STALLS.

#### ZONING INFO

PER ZONING REPORT DATED JUNE 8, 2018, PROJECT NUMBER 701800734.002, PREPARED BY ROCK & CLARK, SUPPLIED BY CLIENT.

ZONE: CB (COMMERCIAL BUSINESS)

SETBACKS:

FRONT: NO MINIMUM IS REQUIRED 15 FT. MAXIMUM ALONG 75% OF THE BUILDING FACADE

SIDE: NONE REQUIRED

REAR: 10 FT. MINIMUM


HEIGHT: 30.0 FEET

COVERAGE: NO REQUIREMENT NOTED

PARKING:

GENERAL OFFICE: 3 SPACES PER 1,000 SQ. FT. OF USABLE FLOOR AREA FOR THE MAIN FLOOR PLUS 1 % SPACES PER 1,000 SQ. FT. OF USABLE FLOOR AREA FOR EACH ADDITIONAL LEVEL, INCLUDING THE BASEMENT  
RETAIL GOODS ESTABLISHMENT: 2 SPACES PER 1,000 SQ. FT. OF USABLE FLOOR AREA  
AUTO REPAIR: 1 SPACE PER SERVICE BAY PLUS 3 SPACES PER 1,000 SQ. FT. FOR OFFICE AND RETAIL AREA

NORTH



SCALE: 1" = 20'

0 10' 20' 40' 60'

#### LEGEND

RIGHT OF WAY LINE	⊗	WATER METER
LOT LINE	⊗	ELECTRIC METER
LOT LINE	⊗	LIGHT POLE
PROPERTY LINE	⊗	POWER POLE
MONUMENT LINE	⊗	GAS METER
EXISTING FENCE	⊗	IRRIGATION CONTROL VALVE
POWER LINE	⊗	SEIN
COMCAST LINE	⊗	CONCRETE
FIBER OPTIC LINE	⊗	BUILDING
WATER LINE	⊗	PROPERTY CORNER (SEE GENERAL NOTE 1)
SANITARY SEWER LINE	⊗	
STORM DRAIN LINE	⊗	
GAS LINE	⊗	
SETBACK LINE	⊗	

SITE



VICINITY MAP  
SCALE: N.T.S.

UTILITY COMPANY	CONTACT	CONTACT INFO	STATUS
COMCAST	JEFF HOUSTON	435-224-2356	SHOWN
ELECTRIC LIGHT & POWER HOLDINGS, INC./ZAYO FIBER SOLUTIONS	SYLVAN STEWART	801-808-7385	SHOWN
GOOGLE FIBER	KENT STEINBACH	913-416-9639	NOT RECEIVED
DOMINION ENERGY	SL MAPPING DEPT.	800-524-3070	SHOWN
CENTURYLINK	TERESA HINTON	801-974-8181	NOT RECEIVED
ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER	JOEL SIMMONS	505-813-0993	SHOWN
SOUTH SALT LAKE CITY	ED RUPNER	801-412-3210	SHOWN
SLC PUBLIC UTILITIES	NICK KRYGER	801-483-0834	SHOWN
UDOT REGION II	GOLDEN HOLT	801-887-3403	SHOWN
STRONGA NETWORKS	ENGINEERING	800-454-7214	SHOWN

#### SURVEYOR'S CERTIFICATE

TO ALTA INVESTMENTS, LLC, METRO NATIONAL TITLE, FIDELITY NATIONAL TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY:

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT THIS MAP OR PLAT AND THE SURVEY ON WHICH IT IS BASED WERE MADE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE 2016 MINIMUM STANDARD RETAIL REQUIREMENTS FOR ALTANSPS LAND TITLE SURVEYS, JOINTLY ESTABLISHED AND ADOPTED BY ALTA AND NSPS. THE FIELD WORK WAS COMPLETED ON MAY 17, 2018.

DATE OF PLAT OR MAP: MAY 24TH, 2018

DAVID B. DRAPER  
LICENSE NO. 6861599

McNEIL ENGINEERING

Professional Surveyors, Planners, Engineers, Architects, and Environmental Scientists  
8418 South 2000 West, Suite 200, Sandy, Utah 84070 801.265.7700  
CMI Engineering - Consulting & Landscapes Architecture  
Structural Engineering - Land Surveying & HDS

ISLINGTON SOUTH

526-558 EAST 2100 SOUTH  
SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

LOCATED IN THE NE 1/4 OF SECTION 19, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 1 EAST, SLB & M

#### REVISIONS

REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION
1	6-13-18	ADD ZONING
2	10-24-18	ADD TOPOGRAPHIC INFORMATION
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		

PROJECT NO: 19637

CAD FILE: 19637 ALT TOPO

DRAWN BY: NAE

CALC BY: EAD

FIELD CREW: SB

CHECKED BY: DBD/EAD

DATE: 5/24/2018

ALTA/NSPS  
LAND TITLE  
SURVEY

1 OF 1



# EXISTING CONDITIONS | CONTEXT 2

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION





# EXISTING CONDITIONS | CONTEXT 2

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION



## BLUE PLANET SCOOTERS | TOP CHOICE

The project site is currently a vacant commercial auto repair shop and building, along side an active scooter sales business. The buildings are currently aligned to zero setback property lines on the East, West, and South Property lines. The 2100 South frontage is primarily an asphalt parking lot with four separate curb cuts and grass planters along the street.

IZZY SOUTH will remove all existing buildings, and reduce the four curb cuts to one central entrance. Landscaping will be compliant with Salt Lake City standards, to create a walkable vibrant project. Individual unit entrances will be staggered across the property with landscaped entries. The neighborhood elevation is terraced and stepped beyond setback minimums to create more visual interest and lessen impact.






# SITE PLAN 3

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

PROPOSED SITE PLAN

## SETBACKS


FRONT	0' REQ'D	5'-10' ACTUAL
SIDE	0' REQ'D	0' ACTUAL WEST 6' ACTUAL EAST
REAR	10' REQ'D	10'-7" ACTUAL 18'-5" ACTUAL LVL 2 7'-0" LANDSCAPE BUFFER INCLUDED





## IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION


## LEVEL 01 | FLOOR PLAN



# FLOOR PLANS 4

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION


LEVEL 02 | FLOOR PLAN





## IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION


## LEVEL 03 | FLOOR PLAN



# EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS 5

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

NORTH ELEVATION | 2100 SOUTH





# EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS 5

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

## EAST ELEVATION | UINTA GOLF




Project pallate will be clean, contemporary, and simple. Primarily architectural cast concrete around the parking garage, with a mix of vertical metal panel and horizontal lap siding

This building elevation is 6'-0" from the adjacent Uinta Golf building, and will be a wall with no openings. Uinta Golf is approximately 25'-0" tall and will cover a majority of this elevation.


The parking garage is to be naturally ventilated with no noisy fans or forced air systems.

The building will step in an additional 8'-0" - 12'-0" on the second story along the neighborhood elevation (left side of this image) to provide more relief in the building massing as well as provide outdoor patios for level 02 studio tenants



# EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS 5

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION






# EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS 5

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION



PROPOSED TREE BUFFER



# EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS 5

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION


## WEST ELEVATION | RESIDENCE & GAS STATION



This building elevation is 0'-0" from the adjacent property line, and will be a wall with no openings. Additional detailing of the coffee shop trellis will soften this elevation, along with minor steps between building material elements

Zoning allows for a 30'-0" building height on this property. For sloped roofs, the center point of the pitch is required to 30'-0". We are proposing a 33'-0" building height to top of parapet, and have held the building back from the neighborhood a total of 20'-0" minimum (10'-0" req'd) to account for this increased height request.

Interior ceiling heights directly affect quality of space in the units, and the additional 3'-0" of height will allow the units to have healthier living spaces with more natural light.





# PERSPECTIVE RENDERS 6

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

2100 SOUTH | OVERALL PROJECT





# PERSPECTIVE RENDERS 6

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

2100 SOUTH | STUDIOS | GARAGE ENTRY





# PERSPECTIVE RENDERS 6

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

2100 SOUTH | OVERALL PROJECT





# PERSPECTIVE RENDERS 6

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

2100 SOUTH | GATEWAY






# PERSPECTIVE RENDERS 6

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

NEIGHBORHOOD | OVERALL PROJECT





# PERSPECTIVE RENDERS 6

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

NEIGHBORHOOD | OVERALL PROJECT





# PERSPECTIVE RENDERS 6

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

NEIGHBORHOOD | OVERALL PROJECT





# PERSPECTIVE RENDERS 6

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

COFFEE SHOP | ENTRY





# PERSPECTIVE RENDERS 6

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

COFFEE SHOP | ROOF-TOP PATIO





# DESIGN REVIEW ANALYSIS 7

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

## PURPOSE STATEMENT



### 21A.59.010 - Design Review Purpose

The intent of the design review process is:

- 1 - verify new developments are **compatible with their surroundings**
- 2 - impacts to public infrastructure and **public spaces are addressed**
- 3 - new development helps **achieve development goals** outlined in the adopted **master plans of the City** **purpose statements of each zoning district**



**21A.26.03 | COMMUNITY BUSINESS DISTRICT  
PURPOSE STATEMENT**

The CB Community Business District is intended to provide for the close integration of moderately sized commercial areas with adjacent residential neighborhoods. The design guidelines are intended to facilitate retail that is pedestrian in its orientation and scale, while also acknowledging the importance of transit and automobile access to the site.

Multi-family Housing is a permitted use.

21A.26.03 | COMMUNITY BUSINESS DISTRICT  
BUILDING SIZE CONSIDERATIONS

review process. Planning Commission shall consider the following:

COMPATIBILITY

visually compatible with buildings on block face

ROOFLINE

shape shall be simlilar to roof shapes on block face

VEHICULAR ACCESS

provide conintuous street wall of buildings with minimal breaks for vehicular access

FACADE DESIGN

break up mass of larger buildings so they appear to be multiple smaller scale buildings

BUFFERS

may require larger setbacks, landsacpe buffers, and/or fencing to minimize site noise, light trespass, or parking impacts

STEP BACKS

may require that any story above ground be stepped back from building foundation



# DESIGN REVIEW ANALYSIS 7

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

## COMMUNITY BUSINESS ZONING



### BUILDING SIZE CONSIDERATIONS

**COMPATIBILITY** - large transparent connection to street front, varied scale, and varied materials compliment street

**ROOFLINE**  
existing building roof forms along 2100 S

**VEHICULAR ACCESS** - single point vehicular access - reduce current site from **4 to 1**

**FACADE DESIGN** - building forms broken into  
  
Includes varied roof lines, building depths, and upper level roof top patios

**BUFFERS** - includes perimeter solid fence, increased landscaping, and larger building setback than required by code

**STEP BACKS** - design incorporates building steps on both front and rear facades



# DESIGN REVIEW ANALYSIS 7

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

## COMMUNITY BUSINESS ZONING



### BUILDING SIZE CONSIDERATIONS

**COMPATIBILITY** - large transparent connection to street front, varied scale, and varied materials compliment street

**ROOFLINE**  
existing building roof forms along 2100 S

**VEHICULAR ACCESS** - single point vehicular access - reduce current site from **4 to 1**

**FACADE DESIGN** - building forms broken into  
  
Includes varied roof lines, building depths, and upper level roof top patios

**BUFFERS** - includes perimeter solid fence, increased landscaping, and larger building setback than required by code

**STEP BACKS** - design incorporates building steps on both front and rear facades





PROPOSED TREE BUFFER

**BUILDING SIZE CONSIDERATIONS**

**COMPATIBILITY** - large transparent connection to street front, varied scale, and varied materials compliment street

**ROOFLINE**  
existing building roof forms along 2100 S

**VEHICULAR ACCESS** - single point vehicular access - reduce current site from **4 to 1**

**FACADE DESIGN** - building forms broken into  
  
Includes varied roof lines, building depths, and upper level roof top patios



**BUFFERS** - includes perimeter solid fence, increased landscaping, and larger building setback than required by code

**STEP BACKS** - design incorporates building steps on both front and rear facades

# DESIGN REVIEW ANALYSIS 7

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

## COMMUNITY BUSINESS ZONING



### MINIMUM YARD REQUIREMENTS

**FRONT YARD** - NO minimum yard is required

**SIDE YARD** - NO minimum yard is required

**REAR YARD** - 10'-0" minimum yard is required  
7'-0" landscape buffer included

### ACTUAL YARD SETBACKS

**FRONT YARD** - 5'-0" - 13'-0" setbacks

**SIDE YARD** - 0'-0" - 5'-0" setbacks




**REAR YARD** - 10'-8" ground level setback  
18'-8" - 22'-8" upper level setback



# DESIGN REVIEW ANALYSIS 7

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

## COMMUNITY BUSINESS ZONING



### MINIMUM YARD REQUIREMENTS

**FRONT YARD** - NO minimum yard is required

**SIDE YARD** - NO minimum yard is required

**REAR YARD** - 10'-0" minimum yard is required  
7'-0" landscape buffer included

### ACTUAL YARD SETBACKS

**FRONT YARD** - 5'-0" - 13'-0" setbacks

**SIDE YARD** - 0'-0" - 5'-0" setbacks

**REAR YARD** - 10'-8" ground level setback  
18'-8" - 22'-8" upper level setback


# DESIGN REVIEW ANALYSIS 7

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

## TECHNICAL ZONING ELEVATION


Zoning allows for a 30'-0" building height on this property based CB Zone. Izzy South site slopes approximately 4'-0" from end to end, and per the 30'-0" height is measured from the average elevation of the lot grade. For sloped roofs, the center point of the pitch is required to 30'-0". We are proposing a 33'-0" building height to top of parapet / center of pitched roof. The elevation and diagrams below outline the technical breakdown of this request.

Interior ceiling heights directly affect quality of space in the units, and the additional 3'-0" of height will allow the units to have healthier living spaces with more natural light.



SLC ZONING - 21A.62.050  
GABLE HEIGHT ILLUSTRATION

SLC ZONING - 21A.62.050  
GABLE HEIGHT APPLICATION



SPECIAL EXCEPTION  
BUILDING ELEVATION DIAGRAM



## **ATTACHMENT D: Application Materials**



# special exception

number   name	date	sent by
1948.00   Izzy South	20 0825	Ryan McMullen
recipient	contact	email
Salt Lake City Planning Dept Salt Lake City Planning Dept	Caitlyn Miller Molly Robinson	<a href="mailto:caitlyn.miller@slcgov.com">caitlyn.miller@slcgov.com</a> <a href="mailto:molly.robinson@slcgov.com">molly.robinson@slcgov.com</a>

## description – project vision

Izzy South is a multi-family building on the south side of 2100 South between 500 & 600 East. A mirrored version of this design is being planned on the North side of the street to create a clean gateway experience along 2100 South.

The project will consist of 71 units (40 studios, 21 one bedroom apartments, and 10 two room town-homes) with a three-story neighborhood restaurant / coffee shop component on the west end of the development. Central parking access divides the stepped massing along the front elevations, and the undulating building façade frames walkable front entries into each unit creating a strong, active community connection to the street.

## description – construction narrative

Izzy South will be a three-story wood framed structure (Type V-B Construction) with a concrete podium over the on-grade parking garage. A simple material palette of vertical metal panels and horizontal lap siding makes up a majority of the building exterior. Varying roof forms, heights, and depths of the building along both 2100 South and the adjacent neighborhood break down the scale.

## description – special exception request – 3'-0" additional height (10% above CB zone)

Izzy South is in the Commercial Business (CB) Zone, which has a maximum allowable height of 30'-0". The sister project to Izzy South is directly across 2100 South and located on a Residential Mixed Use 35 (RMU-35) lot that allows for building height of up to 35'-0". For both projects, careful attention to building massing, materiality, site setbacks, and form has been studied to break down the massing of each building. As outlined in the design review application for Izzy South, the architectural design features of each building directly address the design standards of each zone. The additional 3'-0" of building height (10% above zoning regulation) allows for slightly taller interior spaces to accommodate exterior building undulation including outdoor patios, rooftop terraces, varying building depths, and architectural interest on the elevation. These are all target goals of the CB zone, and the additional 3'-0" of height accommodates the required construction assemblies to achieve these usable outdoor spaces and maintain healthy interior living spaces.



# design review

number   name	date	sent by
1948.01   Izzy South SLC   PLNPCM   2020-00222	2020 0901	Ryan McMullen

Please see below responses in red concerning the above referenced project, we have reviewed 021A.59.050 Standards for Design Review and provided written responses to each item below.

## Project Intro

Any new development shall comply with the intent of the purpose statement of the zoning district and specific design regulations found within the zoning district in which the project is located as well as the City's adopted 'urban design element' and adopted

## 21A.59.050 – Standards for Design Review

- A.** Any new development shall comply with the intent of the purpose statement of the zoning district and specific design regulations found within the zoning district in which the project is located as well as the City's adopted 'urban design element' and adopted master plan policies and design guidelines governing the specific area of the proposed development.  
**RESPONSE:** Project is compliant with all zoning specific regulations. Zoning regulation responses are below.
- B.** Development shall be primarily oriented to the sidewalk, not an interior courtyard or parking lot.  
**RESPONSE:** Compliant. Development is oriented directly along 2100 South and has primary vehicular entrances, residential entrances, and public amenity entrances on the sidewalk.
- B.1** - Primary Entrances shall face the public sidewalk  
**RESPONSE:** Compliant. All public, tenant pedestrian, and vehicular entrances face the public sidewalk.
- B.2** - Building shall be sited close to the public sidewalk, following and responding to the desired development patterns of the neighborhood.  
**RESPONSE:** Compliant. CB building zone technically allows a zero set-back along the front property line, however Izzy South is set back between 5'-0" and 13'-0" to provide pedestrian friendly interface between the residential units and the sidewalk. This setback range is still considered 'close' to the sidewalk and intended to engage residents with the neighborhood fabric.
- B.3** - Parking shall be located within, behind, or to the side of buildings.  
**RESPONSE:** Compliant. Parking structure is integrated into the architecture behind the ground floor units.
- C.** Building facades shall include detailing and glass in sufficient quantities to facilitate pedestrian interest and interaction  
**RESPONSE:** Compliant. Street level façade includes large picture window openings into residential units, and double story glazing at the public amenity / coffee shop.
- C.1** – Locate active ground floor uses at or near the public sidewalk.  
**RESPONSE:** Compliant. Public coffee shop & resident entries are along public sidewalk.

**C-2** – Maximize transparency of ground floor facades.

**RESPONSE:** Compliant. Street level façade includes large picture window openings into residential units, and double story glazing at the public amenity / coffee shop.

**C-3** – Use or reinterpret traditional storefront elements like sign bands, clerestory glazing, articulation, and architectural detail at window transitions.

**RESPONSE:** Compliant where applicable. Window systems will have clean minimal metal trim details, and at public entries into the parking garage and amenity space are integrated into trellis details to highlight entry.

**C-4** – Locate outdoor dining patios, courtyards, plazas, habitable landscaped yards, and open spaces so that they have a direct visual connection to the street and outdoor spaces.

**RESPONSE:** Compliant. Each ground floor residential unit will have a dedicated front porch with a walking connection to the public sidewalk. Outdoor dining layout is still pending, but the ground level will include direct connection to sidewalk, with majority of outdoor dining space taking place on third level roof-top patio.

**D.** Large building masses shall be divided into heights and sizes that relate to human scale

**RESPONSE:** Compliant. Building massing is split into approximately 16'-0" widths with varying rooflines, materiality, detailing, and depth in regards to the set-back / street frontage. In addition to plan variation to relate to human scale, the building steps back at different levels in elevation to bring the overall scale of the building down as it terraces back.

**D-1** – Relate building scale and massing to the size and scale of existing and anticipated buildings, such as alignments with established cornice heights, building massing, step-backs, and vertical emphasis.

**RESPONSE:** Compliant. The building massing is split into smaller volumes with varying roof lines, steps backs, and varied horizontal versus vertical orientations depending on building element. Flat roof elements are similar in scale to the adjacent Uinta Golf Building, and vertical gable roof forms relate to the adjacent residential form directly east and the church building across 500 east.

**D-2** – Modulate the design of a larger building using a series of vertical or horizontal emphases to equate with the scale (heights and widths) of the buildings in the context and reduce the visual width or height.

**RESPONSE:** Compliant. The building was designed as a series of modulated gable roof forms with two different depths and finishes to break up their mass. Between the gable volumes are lower height 2-story horizontal forms with roof-top patios to activate the spaces between modules.

**D-3** – Include secondary elements such as balconies, porches, vertical bays, belt courses, fenestration, and window reveals.

**RESPONSE:** Compliant. The project design includes a series of balconies and porches at different levels to engage the street frontage and break up vertical volumes where appropriate. Window fenestration patterns vary depending on the building mass they are connected to but are intentionally designed to relate to the detailing of their specific volume.

**D-4** – Reflect the scale and solid-to void ratio of windows and doors of the established character of the neighborhood or that which is desired in the master plan.

**RESPONSE:** Compliant. The entire front façade is a series of solid to void relationships on the gable roof module mentioned above. The corrugated metal volumes stand proud as solid elements, while the further recessed wood gable elements are voids in the gable form and add contrasting character to the building layout. This will be experienced by users at both the pedestrian and vehicular scale as the two buildings will intentionally present themselves differently depending on the side of the road you are approaching from.



- E. Building facades that exceed a combined continuous building length of two hundred feet (200') shall include:
- E-1 – Changes in vertical plane (breaks in façade).**  
**RESPONSE:** Compliant. Izzy South exceeds the two hundred linear foot mark but is broken up by a series of vertical breaks and roof modules with four different setback depths from 2100 south. Along the neighborhood side, the building breaks into three different setbacks with clean vertical volumes above the parking garage base.
  - E-2 – Material Changes.**  
**RESPONSE:** Compliant. The building's material pallet is a simple clean relationship of metal panel, wood siding, and architectural finished concrete. Material changes directly relate to changes in volume and help define the modularity of the design to break down building length and scale.
  - E-3 – Massing Changes.**  
**RESPONSE:** Compliant. As mentioned above, the building has a series of massing changes that modulate down the overall length of the site.
- F. If provided, privately-owner public space shall include at least (3) of the six (6) following elements:
- RESPONSE:** N/A – Not Applicable. The coffee shop / public area will have a small outdoor seating area that will be open to the public, but the design team's interpretation of this requirement is for large expansive public plazas / public spaces.
- G. Building height shall be modified to relate to human scale and minimize negative impacts. In downtown and in the CSHBD Sugar House Business District, building height shall contribute to a distinctive City skyline.
- RESPONSE:** Compliant. This building is out of both the Downtown and Central Sugar House Business District, but the building scale is broken down to relate to human scale, and compliments a very distinctive City skyline of gable roof forms that can be found through-out Salt Lake City and Sugarhouse.
- H. Parking and onsite circulation shall be provided with an emphasis on making safe pedestrian connections to the sidewalk, transit facilities, or midblock walkway.
- RESPONSE:** Compliant. Site vehicular circulation is isolated to a single point vehicle entry and internal parking garage with simple double loaded drive aisle. Resident / pedestrian entrances on the ground level have direct access to both 2100 South and the parking garage. The public entrance to the amenity space is clearly marked with a different architectural canopy feature, and slightly recessed off the sidewalk for pedestrian safety and clean site circulation.
- I. Waste and recycling containers, mechanical equipment, storage areas, and loading docks shall be fully screened from public view and shall incorporate building materials and detailing compatible with the building being served. Service uses shall be set back from the front line of building or located within the structure. (See subsection 21A.37.050K of this title).
- RESPONSE:** Compliant. Waste containers will be stored inside the parking garage, and pick-up operations is being coordinated with selected private waste company. All mechanical equipment and storage areas will be internal, with the exception of the electrical transformer that Rocky Mountain Power is requiring to be along 2100 South for serviceability and infrastructure.
- J. Signage shall emphasize the pedestrian / mass transit orientation.
- RESPONSE:** Compliant. Izzy South is intended as a pedestrian friend development, with close ties to multiple mass transit lines (2100 So Bus, 500 E Bus, and main S-Line), although it is not directly connected to any transit stations. The current signage design is integrated into the architecture in a minimal fashion, but emphasizes legibility to both pedestrian and vehicular orientation along 2100 South.

**J-1** – Define specific spaces for signage that are integral to building design, such as commercial sign bands framed by material change, columns for blade signs, or other clearly articulated band on the face of the building.

**RESPONSE:** Compliant. Primary building entrances are demarcated by wooden trellis elements that contrast the solid/void forms of the building rooflines. These softer moments mark entry to parking garages, lobbies, and public coffee shop spaces. The signage is currently integrated into the trellis design and clearly articulated as a separate architectural moment on the building.

**J-2** – Coordinate signage locations with appropriate lighting, awnings, and other projections.

**RESPONSE:** Compliant. See response J-1.

**J-3** – Coordinate sign location with landscaping to avoid conflicts.

**RESPONSE:** Compliant. All signage will be building mounted and avoid conflicts with landscaping below. Final tree placements and species selections in front of public pedestrian entrances (lobby & coffee shop) will be coordinated to limit height and increase street presence / visibility at these specific areas.

**K.** Lighting shall support pedestrian comfort and safety, neighborhood image, and dark sky goals.

**RESPONSE:** Compliant. Exterior building lighting will be localized to resident units with small wall-mounted sconces that provide down-light only and are dark sky compliant. Public entrances will have linear down lights integrated into the trellis elements and will safely light public areas for pedestrian comfort and safety.

**K-1** – Provide streetlights as indicated in the Salt Lake City Lighting Master Plan.

**RESPONSE:** Compliant. Existing streetlights will be coordinated with Salt Lake City streets department to determine lighting requirements to either keep as-is or reimagine as integrated into the architecture. The owner and architect would like to relocate the power lines that feed the existing light poles and bury below grade as part of surface improvements. This process will be coordinated with Salt Lake City during design / permitting.

**K-2** – Outdoor lighting should be designed for low-level illumination and to minimize glare and light trespass onto adjacent properties and up lighting directly to the sky.

**RESPONSE:** Compliant. See response K.

**K-3** – Coordinate lighting with architecture, signage, and pedestrian circulation to accentuate significant building features, improve sign legibility, and support pedestrian comfort and safety.

**RESPONSE:** Complaint. See response K.

**L.** Streetscape improvements shall be provided as follows

**L-1** – One street tree from the street tree list consistent with the City's urban forestry guidelines and with the approval of the City's Urban Forester shall be placed for each thirty feet (30') of property frontage on a street. Existing street trees removed as the result of a development project shall be replaced by the developer with trees approved by the City's Urban Forester.

**RESPONSE:** Compliant. Landscape plan along 2100 South is currently showing a series of serviceberry trees at a minimum of 2" caliper. Nate Orbock with Salt Lake City Urban Forestry has reviewed and approved the landscape plan.

**L-2** – Hardscape (paving material) shall be utilized to differentiate privately-owned public spaces from public spaces. Hardscape for public sidewalks shall follow applicable design standards. Permitted materials for privately-owned public spaces shall meet the following standards:

**L-2-A** – Use materials that are durable (withstand wear, pressure, damage), require a minimum of maintenance, and are easily repairable or replaceable should damage or defacement occur.

**RESPONSE:** Compliant. All surface hardscape will be concrete.



**L-2-B** – Where practical, as in lower-traffic areas, use materials that allow rainwater to infiltrate into the ground and recharge the water table.

**RESPONSE:** Compliant. Vehicular and pedestrian traffic areas will be concrete and all other areas will be planters or soft scape to allow rainwater infiltration.

**L-2-C** – Limit contribution to urban heat island effect by limiting use of dark materials and incorporating materials with a high Solar Reflective Index (SRI).

**RESPONSE:** Compliant. A dark corrugated metal product has been selected as an accent material, with most of the building being wood siding. All horizontal surfaces are either concrete, pavers, or white single ply membrane roof material.

**L-2-D** – Utilize materials and designs that have an identifiable relationship to the character of the site, the neighborhood, or Salt Lake City.

**RESPONSE:** Compliant. The materials of concrete, wood, and metal siding are prevalent in both residential and commercial projects throughout Sugar House and much of Salt Lake City.

**L-2-E** – Use materials (like textured ground surfaces) and features (like ramps and seating at key resting points) to support access and comfort for people of all abilities.

**RESPONSE:** Compliant. The public access points will include small gathering / seating areas. In addition, each resident entrance will have a change in grade to provide opportunities for integrated seating and access for visitors.

**L-2-F** – Asphalt shall be limited to vehicle drive aisles (ORD. 14-19, 2019).

**RESPONSE:** Compliant. Currently the project contains no asphalt.

## 21A.26.030 – Community Busines District Analysis

- A. Purpose Statement: The CB Community Business District is intended to provide for the close integration of moderately sized commercial areas with adjacent residential neighborhoods. The design guidelines are intended to facilitate retail that is pedestrian in its orientation and scale, while also acknowledging the importance of transit and automobile access to the site.

**RESPONSE:** Compliant. Izzy South is a mixed-use residential project with a public amenity element and a mix of housing unit types including studios, 1-bedroom, and 2-bedroom apartments. This is a considered a moderate use with close pedestrian connections to multiple public transit lines, major bike routes, and easy automobile / vehicular access to 2100 South. The project scale has been broken down to relate to adjacent commercial and residential building types with a modular gable roof design and overall clean building form. The public amenity / coffee shop space is intended for a local business, and the owner has already begun talking to several notable local tenants.

- B. Uses: Uses in the CB Community Business District as specified in section 21A.33.030, "Table of Permitted and Conditional Uses for Commercial Districts", of this title are permitted subject to the general provisions set forth in section 21A.26.010 of this chapter and this section..

**RESPONSE:** Compliant. Multi-family residential is a permitted use in the Community Business District.

- C. Planned Development Review: Planned developments, which meet the intent of the ordinance, but not the specific design criteria outlined in the following subsections, may be approved by the Planning Commission pursuant to the provisions of chapter 21A.55 of this title.

**RESPONSE:** N/A – Not Applicable. A Planned Development application is not required for this project.

- D. Lot Size Requirements: No minimum lot area or lot width is required, however any lot exceeding four (4) acres in size shall be allowed only through the design review process (chapter 21A.59 of this title)

**RESPONSE:** N/A – Not Applicable. No minimum lot area requirements, and site does not exceed four acres.

- E. Building Size Limits: Buildings in excess of seven thousand five hundred (7,500) gross square feet of floor area for a first floor footprint or in excess of fifteen thousand (15,000) gross square feet floor area overall, shall be allowed only through the design review process (chapter 21A.59 of this title). An unfinished basement used only for storage or parking shall be allowed in addition to the total square footage. In addition to the design review standards in chapter 21A.59 of this title, the Planning Commission shall also consider the following standards:

**RESPONSE:** Project exceeds 15,000 sq. ft. area and has been submitted for the Design Review Process.

**E-1 – Compatibility –** The proposed height and width of new buildings and additions shall be visually compatible with buildings found on the block face.

**RESPONSE:** Compliant. Building forms and height relate to adjacent commercial, residential, and religious buildings along 2100 South.

**E-2 – Roofline –** The roof shape of a new building or addition shall be like roof shapes found on the block face.

**RESPONSE:** Compliant. Izzy South roof lines have a combination of flat and pitched gable roofs to relate to adjacent commercial, residential, and religious buildings along 2100 South.

**E-3 – Vehicular Access –** New buildings and additions shall provide a continuous street wall of buildings with minimal breaks for vehicular access.

**RESPONSE:** Compliant. Izzy South has been designed with a single vehicular entrance reducing four existing curb cuts into one single centralized curb cut.



**E-4 – Façade Design** – Façade treatments should be used to break up the mass of larger buildings, so they appear to be multiple, smaller scale buildings. Varied rooflines, varied façade planes, upper story step backs, and lower building heights for portions of buildings next to less intensive zoning districts may be used to reduce the apparent size of the building.

**RESPONSE:** Compliant. The building mass is a series of modulated gable roof volumes playing on solid/void with materials and detailing. This design incorporated varied rooflines at different façade planes, with upper story steps, and perimeter lower building heights. Against the neighboring residential lots, the building has been stepped more than the required 10'-0" setback to reduce impact on the neighbors and provide usable outdoor areas for tenants. The additional 8'-0" – 12'-0" of setback along this property line breaks down the building scale in both height and overall volume. The entire building façade design was an exercise in responding directly to this code.

**E-5 – Buffers** – When located next to low density residential uses, the Planning Commission may require larger setbacks, landscape buffers, and/or fencing than what are required by this title if the impacts of the building mass and location of the building on the site create noise, light trespass, or impacts created by parking and service areas.

**RESPONSE:** Compliant. In addition to the larger building setback currently provided, a solid 6'-0" perimeter fence is proposed (final design pending) to control noise and light transfer from the parking area to adjacent residents. The landscape buffer along this property line has double the amount of required trees (15'-0" spacing as opposed to the 30'-0" code requirement), and utilize a Columnar Oak tree that will grow approximately 50'-0" tall, and maintain a majority of leaves year-round as an additional privacy buffer between Izzy South and adjacent residences.

**E-6 – Step Backs** – When abutting single-story development and/or a public street, the Planning Commission may require that any story above the ground story be stepped back from the building foundation at grade to address compatibility issues with the other buildings on the block face and/or uses.

**RESPONSE:** Compliant. As mentioned in response E-4, the required setback along the rear property line is 10'-0". Currently Izzy South is 10'-8" from this property line on the main level, and on the second level the building steps back to 18'-8" on a portion of the architecture and 22'-8" on other areas of the building. These additional step-backs are intentional design elements to lessen the impact on the adjacent single-family residences and reduce the overall building mass against the property line.

## F. Minimum Yard Requirements

**F-1 – Front or Corner Side Yard:** No minimum yard is required. If a front yard is provided, it shall comply with all provisions of this title applicable to front or corner side yards, including landscaping, fencing, and obstructions.

**RESPONSE:** Compliant. Although no setback is required along 2100 South, Izzy South steps in and out from 5'-0" to 13'-0" from the property line. This design promotes a pedestrian friendly street interface with more individualized unit entrances, resident porches at ground level, and a nicer public entrance for the coffee shop feature.

**F-2 – Interior Side Yard:** None Required

**RESPONSE:** Compliant. Izzy South has a zero-lot line set-back on the East, and a +/- 4'-6" west set-back for egress.

**F-3 – Rear Yard:** Ten Feet (10')

**RESPONSE:** Compliant. As mentioned in response E-6, Izzy South is currently set 10'-8" from the rear property line on the main level, with additional 8'-0" – 12'-0" setbacks on the upper level (18'-8" – 22'-8" total).

**F-4 – Buffer Yards:** Any lot abutting a lot in a Residential District shall conform to the buffer yard requirements of chapter 21A.48 of this title.

**RESPONSE:** Compliant. Within the 10'-8" established setback along the rear property line is a 7'-0" landscape buffer (per code) that includes a row of Columnar Oak trees at 15'-0" on center. This exceeds city requirements with double the density of trees as an additional project buffer.

**F-5 – Accessory Buildings and Structures in Yards:** Accessory buildings and structures may be located in a required yard subject to section 21A.36.020, table 21A.36.020B of this title.

**RESPONSE:** N/A – Not Applicable. No accessory buildings or structures exist on this project.

**F-6 – Maximum Setback:** A maximum setback is required for at least seventy-five percent (75%) of the building façade. The maximum setback is fifteen feet (15'). Exceptions to this requirement may be authorized through the design review process, subject to the requirements of chapter 21A.59 of this title, and the review and approval of the Planning Commission. The Planning Director, in consultation with the Transportation Director, may modify this requirement if the adjacent

**RESPONSE:** Compliant. As previously described, building setbacks are above the zero-foot lot line requirement, but below the maximum setback of 15'-0". Along 2100 South, the building varies in setback from 5'-0" to 13'-0" for most of the façade, and at no point on ground level exceeds 15'-0".

**F-6-A –** The architecture of the addition is compatible with the architecture of the original structure or the surrounding architecture

**RESPONSE:** Compliant. The scale of the proposed buildings is like buildings found on the surrounding street scape of 2100 South and has architectural elements (both flat and pitched roofs) that match directly adjacent structures.

**F-6-B –** The addition is not part of a series of incremental additions intended to subvert the intent of the ordinance.

**RESPONSE:** N/A – Not Applicable.

**F-7 – Parking Setback:** Surface parking is prohibited in a front or corner side yard. Surface parking lots within an interior side yard shall maintain a twenty-foot (20') landscape setback from the front property line or be located behind the primary structure. Parking structures shall maintain a thirty-five foot (35') minimum setback from a front or corner side yard property line or be located behind the primary structure. There are no minimum or maximum setback restrictions on underground parking. The Planning Director may modify or waive this requirement if the Planning Director finds the following:

**RESPONSE:** Compliant. Parking garage is integrated into the building architecture and contains no exposed surface parking. As such, there is no parking in either the front or corner side yard.

**G. Landscape Yard Requirements:** If a front or corner side yard is provided, such yard shall be maintained as a landscape yard. The landscape yard can take the form of a patio or plaza, subject to site plan review approval.

**RESPONSE:** Compliant. Per response F-1, although no front yard is required, one has been provided for pedestrian and resident benefit. This landscaping has been designed in accordance with Salt Lake City design standards and has already been approved by the Urban Forester. Final site plan review approval pending permit submittal.

**H. Maximum Height:** Thirty Feet (30'). (Ord. 14-19, 2019; Ord. 12-17, 2017)

**RESPONSE:** Izzy South is currently designed at 33'-0" to align with the requirements of Izzy North on the opposite side of 2100 South (zoned RMF-35). The additional three feet (3'-0") of height allow for additional architectural character and undulation along all elevations while still providing adequate interior.



**21A.26.03 | COMMUNITY BUSINESS DISTRICT  
PURPOSE STATEMENT**

The CB Community Business District is intended to provide for the close integration of moderately sized commercial areas with adjacent residential neighborhoods. The design guidelines are intended to facilitate retail that is pedestrian in its orientation and scale, while also acknowledging the importance of transit and automobile access to the site.

Multi-family Housing is a permitted use.

21A.26.03 | COMMUNITY BUSINESS DISTRICT  
BUILDING SIZE CONSIDERATIONS

review process. Planning Commission shall consider the following:

COMPATIBILITY

visually compatible with buildings on block face

ROOFLINE

shape shall be simlilar to roof shapes on block face

VEHICULAR ACCESS

provide conintuous street wall of buildings with minimal breaks for vehicular access

FACADE DESIGN

break up mass of larger buildings so they appear to be multiple smaller scale buildings

BUFFERS

may require larger setbacks, landsacpe buffers, and/or fencing to minimize site noise, light trespass, or parking impacts

STEP BACKS

may require that any story above ground be stepped back from building foundation



# DESIGN REVIEW ANALYSIS 7

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

## COMMUNITY BUSINESS ZONING



### BUILDING SIZE CONSIDERATIONS

**COMPATIBILITY** - large transparent connection to street front, varied scale, and varied materials compliment street

**ROOFLINE**  
existing building roof forms along 2100 S

**VEHICULAR ACCESS** - single point vehicular access - reduce current site from **4 to 1**

**FACADE DESIGN** - building forms broken into  
  
Includes varied roof lines, building depths, and upper level roof top patios

**BUFFERS** - includes perimeter solid fence, increased landscaping, and larger building setback than required by code

**STEP BACKS** - design incorporates building steps on both front and rear facades



# DESIGN REVIEW ANALYSIS 7

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

## COMMUNITY BUSINESS ZONING



### BUILDING SIZE CONSIDERATIONS

**COMPATIBILITY** - large transparent connection to street front, varied scale, and varied materials compliment street

**ROOFLINE**  
existing building roof forms along 2100 S

**VEHICULAR ACCESS** - single point vehicular access - reduce current site from **4 to 1**

**FACADE DESIGN** - building forms broken into  
  
Includes varied roof lines, building depths, and upper level roof top patios

**BUFFERS** - includes perimeter solid fence, increased landscaping, and larger building setback than required by code

**STEP BACKS** - design incorporates building steps on both front and rear facades





PROPOSED TREE BUFFER

**BUILDING SIZE CONSIDERATIONS**

**COMPATIBILITY** - large transparent connection to street front, varied scale, and varied materials compliment street

**ROOFLINE**  
existing building roof forms along 2100 S

**VEHICULAR ACCESS** - single point vehicular access - reduce current site from **4 to 1**

**FACADE DESIGN** - building forms broken into  
  
Includes varied roof lines, building depths, and upper level roof top patios



**BUFFERS** - includes perimeter solid fence, increased landscaping, and larger building setback than required by code

**STEP BACKS** - design incorporates building steps on both front and rear facades

# DESIGN REVIEW ANALYSIS 7

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

COMMUNITY BUSINESS ZONING



## MINIMUM YARD REQUIREMENTS

**FRONT YARD** - NO minimum yard is required

**SIDE YARD** - NO minimum yard is required

**REAR YARD** - 10'-0" minimum yard is required  
7'-0" landscape buffer included

## ACTUAL YARD SETBACKS

**FRONT YARD** - 5'-0" - 13'-0" setbacks

**SIDE YARD** - 0'-0" - 5'-0" setbacks




**REAR YARD** - 10'-8" ground level setback  
18'-8" - 22'-8" upper level setback



# DESIGN REVIEW ANALYSIS 7

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

## COMMUNITY BUSINESS ZONING



### MINIMUM YARD REQUIREMENTS

**FRONT YARD** - NO minimum yard is required

**SIDE YARD** - NO minimum yard is required

**REAR YARD** - 10'-0" minimum yard is required  
7'-0" landscape buffer included

### ACTUAL YARD SETBACKS

**FRONT YARD** - 5'-0" - 13'-0" setbacks

**SIDE YARD** - 0'-0" - 5'-0" setbacks

**REAR YARD** - 10'-8" ground level setback  
18'-8" - 22'-8" upper level setback


# DESIGN REVIEW ANALYSIS 7

IZZY SOUTH | DESIGN REVIEW APPLICATION

## TECHNICAL ZONING ELEVATION


Zoning allows for a 30'-0" building height on this property based CB Zone. Izzy South site slopes approximately 4'-0" from end to end, and per the 30'-0" height is measured from the average elevation of the lot grade. For sloped roofs, the center point of the pitch is required to 30'-0". We are proposing a 33'-0" building height to top of parapet / center of pitched roof. The elevation and diagrams below outline the technical breakdown of this request.

Interior ceiling heights directly affect quality of space in the units, and the additional 3'-0" of height will allow the units to have healthier living spaces with more natural light.



SLC ZONING - 21A.62.050  
GABLE HEIGHT ILLUSTRATION

SLC ZONING - 21A.62.050  
GABLE HEIGHT APPLICATION



SPECIAL EXCEPTION  
BUILDING ELEVATION DIAGRAM



# ATTACHMENT E: EXISTING CONDITIONS & ZONING ORDINANCE REQUIREMENTS

The subject property is located within the CB – Community Business zoning district. The purpose of the CB zoning district is described as follows:

*The CB Community Business District is intended to provide for the close integration of moderately sized commercial areas with adjacent residential neighborhoods. The design guidelines are intended to facilitate retail that is pedestrian in its orientation and scale, while also acknowledging the importance of transit and automobile access to the site.*

**ADJACENT LAND USES and ZONING** – see Area Zoning Map in Attachment A for more details.

The property currently has existing commercial buildings which the Applicant intends to demolish to make way for the new mixed-use residential building. The subject property is adjacent to Uinta Golf to the east, a single family residence to the west and a single family neighborhood to the south. The single family home is zoned CB. The neighborhood to the south is zoned R-1-5,000. This adjacency requires a 10-foot setback and 7-foot landscaped setback from the southern property line.

## SALT LAKE CITY ZONING ORDINANCE PROVISIONS

**Current Zoning Requirements – Chapter 21A.26.030: CB – Community Business District.**

Zoning Standard	CB Regulation Requirements and Proposed Development	Status
Maximum Building Height	Maximum – 30 feet. Additional building height of ten percent (10%) or less (equating to up to three feet (3') in this instance) may be approved through the special exception process.	Complies with special exception requirements for approval by the Planning Commission
Minimum Lot Size & Width	No minimum lot size or width.	Complies – 0.84 acre (approximately 36,590 square feet) property
Building Size Limits	Buildings in excess of seven thousand five hundred (7,500) gross square feet of floor area for a first floor footprint or in excess of fifteen thousand (15,000) gross square feet floor area overall, shall be allowed only through the design review process (chapter 21A.59 of this title). An unfinished basement used only for storage or parking shall be allowed in addition to the total square footage. In addition to the design review standards in chapter 21A.59 of this title, the Planning Commission shall also consider the following standards:  1. Compatibility: The proposed height and width of new buildings and additions shall be	Complies –  The building is in excess of 15,000 gross square feet and the Applicant has requested Design Review approval subject to the criteria herein:  1. There is an existing strip retail building, a single family dwelling, and a gas station on the same block face as the subject property. The existing strip

	<p>visually compatible with buildings found on the block face.</p>	<p>retail (Uinta Golf) is a similar height (approximately 25') to the proposed 33' tall building. Neither the single-family home nor the gas station are quite as tall as the proposed Izzy South building, however, the buildings increase in width and height as one travels east along 2100 South. The Applicant represents that Izzy South will be a gateway into the downtown Sugar House area from the west.</p>
	<p>2. Roofline: The roof shape of a new building or addition shall be similar to roof shapes found on the block face.</p>	<p>2. The roof of Izzy South will be flat with a few roof peaks at the front to add visual architectural interest. The flat roof is comparable to other flat roofed structures found on the block face: Uinta Golf, the gas station to the west, and the strip retail across 2100 South to the north of the subject property. The peaks at the front of the building are similar to the peak of the roof of the house adjacent to the subject property to the south.</p>
	<p>3. Vehicular Access: New buildings and additions shall provide a continuous street wall of buildings with minimal breaks for vehicular access.</p>	<p>3. The proposed building includes one point of vehicular access at the center of the structure. The remainder of the front façade</p>



	<p>4. Facade Design: Facade treatments should be used to break up the mass of larger buildings so they appear to be multiple, smaller scale buildings. Varied rooflines, varied facade planes, upper story step backs, and lower building heights for portions of buildings next to less intensive zoning districts may be used to reduce the apparent size of the building.</p> <p>5. Buffers: When located next to low density residential uses, the Planning Commission may require larger setbacks, landscape buffers and/or fencing than what are required by this title if the impacts of the building mass and location of the building on the site create noise, light trespass or impacts created by parking and service areas.</p>	<p>provides a continuous street wall with varying building relief (approximately 7' depth differences).</p> <p>4. The front façade is set back between five feet (5') and twelve feet and eleven and three quarter inches (12' 11 <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>") from the northern (front) property line. This variety of setbacks creates multiple façade planes. The upper stories of the building are stepped back from the southern (rear) property line to reduce the apparent size of the building to the adjacent single-family neighborhood to the south of the subject property.</p> <p>5. The proposed development meets all existing setback and buffering standards. A 10' 7" landscaped yard sits at the rear of the site between the southern property line and the proposed building. The Applicant has discussed the project with the neighboring residents and supports the construction of a privacy fence to minimize any noise or light trespass, privacy or security concerns. Any fencing will be required to be built</p>
--	--	---

	<p>6. Step Backs: When abutting single-story development and/or a public street, the Planning Commission may require that any story above the ground story be stepped back from the building foundation at grade to address compatibility issues with the other buildings on the block face and/or uses.</p>	<p>in accordance with adopted standards. The Applicant may choose to pursue a special exception request for additional fencing height if they so desire.</p> <p>6. The subject property abuts a single-family neighborhood to the south and the Applicant has stepped back the upper floors of their proposed building to minimize the visual impact of Izzy South on the neighborhood. The upper stories will be stepped back eighteen feet and five inches (18' 5") from the southern property line where the minimum setback is ten feet (10') and the main floor is set back ten feet seven inches (10' 7") from the property line.</p>
Yard Requirements	<p>Front &amp; Corner Side: None required but if a front yard is provided, it shall comply with all provisions of this title applicable to front or corner side yards, including landscaping, fencing, and obstructions..</p> <p>Interior Side Yard: None required.</p> <p>Rear Yard: ten feet (10')</p> <p>Buffer Yard: seven feet (7') landscaped</p> <p>Maximum Setback: 75% must be no more than fifteen feet (15') setback.</p>	<p>Complies</p> <p>Subject property is an interior lot – no corner side provisions apply.</p> <p>A landscaped front yard will be provided which complies with the adopted landscaping and access requirements.</p> <p>Interior side yard: 0' west side yard, 6' east side yard.</p> <p>Rear yard: 10'7" setback from footprint of building to southern property line.</p>



		<p>Buffer yard: 7' planted buffer at the southern property line.</p> <p>Maximum Setback: the front elevation of the building is setback between 5' and 12' 11 ¾ " from the front property line. The rear elevation is setback 10'7" from the rear property line. The building is set back 0' and 6' from the western and eastern property lines, respectively.</p> <p>100% of the building is within 15' of all property lines.</p>
Parking Setback	<p>Surface parking is prohibited in a front or corner side yard. Surface parking lots within an interior side yard shall maintain a twenty foot (20') landscape setback from the front property line or be located behind the primary structure. Parking structures shall maintain a thirty five foot (35') minimum setback from a front or corner side yard property line or be located behind the primary structure. There are no minimum or maximum setback restrictions on underground parking. The Planning Director may modify or waive this requirement if the Planning Director finds the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The parking is compatible with the architecture/design of the original structure or the surrounding architecture.</li> <li>b. The parking is not part of a series of incremental additions intended to subvert the intent of the ordinance.</li> <li>c. The horizontal landscaping is replaced with vertical screening in the form of berms, plant materials, architectural features, fencing and/or other forms of screening.</li> <li>d. The landscaped setback is consistent with the surrounding neighborhood character.</li> </ul>	<p>Complies</p> <p>The parking for the proposed project is located in a structure behind the primary structure.</p>

	e. The overall project is consistent with section 21A.59.050.	
<p>Parking</p> <p>Developments in the CB Zoning District are required to provide 1 parking stall per dwelling unit unless the project is located within ¼ mile of a fixed transit stop in which case the required parking may be reduced up to 50%.</p>	<p>The project includes 71 dwelling units and would require at least 71 parking stalls. This project is located within ¼ mile of two fixed transit stations: the 500 East and 700 East stations along the S-Line.</p>	<p>Complies</p>
<p>Landscape Yard Requirements</p>	<p>If a front or corner side yard is provided, such yard shall be maintained as a landscape yard. The landscape yard can take the form of a patio or plaza, subject to site plan review approval.</p>	<p>Complies</p> <p>A landscaped front yard is provided with some entry patios for units along 2100 South. This front yard begins at the front property line and continues until the front face of the building (between 5' and 12' 11¾").</p>

**21a.52.060: General Standards and Considerations for Special Exceptions:** No application for a special exception shall be approved unless the planning commission, historic landmark commission, or the planning director determines that the proposed special exception is appropriate in the location proposed based upon its consideration of the general standards set forth below and, where applicable, the specific conditions for certain special exceptions.

Standard	Complies (Y/N)	Reasoning
<p><b>A. Compliance with Zoning Ordinance and District Purposes:</b></p> <p>The proposed use and development will be in harmony with the general and specific</p>	<p>Yes, Complies</p>	<p>The purpose of Title 21A is “ <i>to promote the health, safety, morals, convenience, order, prosperity and welfare of the present and future inhabitants of Salt Lake City, to implement the adopted plans of the City, and to carry out the purposes of the</i></p>



<p>purposes for which this title was enacted and for which the regulations of the district were established.</p>		<p><i>Municipal Land Use Development and Management Act, title 10, chapter 9, of the Utah Code Annotated or its successor, and other relevant statutes.”</i> Specifically, it is intended to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>A. Lessen congestion in the streets or roads;</li><li>B. Secure safety from fire and other dangers;</li><li>C. Provide adequate light and air;</li><li>D. Classify land uses and distribute land development and utilization;</li><li>E. Protect the tax base;</li><li>F. Secure economy in governmental expenditures;</li><li>G. Foster the City's industrial, business and residential development; and</li><li>H. Protect the environment.</li></ul> <p>The subject property is located within the Community Business (CB) Zone which is “<i>intended to provide for the close integration of moderately sized commercial areas with adjacent residential neighborhoods.</i>” Multi-family housing is a permitted use by right in this zone and the project</p>
--	--	--

		incorporates commercial space within the primary building.
<p><b>B. No Substantial Impairment of Property Value:</b></p> <p>The proposed use and development will not substantially diminish or impair the value of the property within the neighborhood in which it is located.</p>	Yes, Complies	<p>The proposal is located within the Sugar House neighborhood which has experienced a steady boom of construction and development for many years. This project is primarily residential, but it includes a commercial component. This product is comparable with many other housing developments in the Sugar House neighborhood and along 2100 South.</p> <p>With the ongoing housing shortage along the Wasatch Front this project will help increase the supply of housing units within Salt Lake City where there is a markedly high demand. This project will replace 1960s-era buildings with a variety of market-rate housing units which will bring additional pedestrian activity along 2100 South and increase the number of eyes on the street.</p>
<p><b>C. No Undue Adverse Impact:</b></p> <p>The proposed use and development</p>	Yes, Complies	<p>The proposed development will have a singular access directly onto 2100 South which is classified as a City</p>



will not have a material adverse effect upon the character of the area or the public health, safety and general welfare.		Arterial street. The project is designed to be isolated from the single-family neighborhood to its south and is located at the middle of the block between 500 East and 600 East. The project's lack of connections to the neighborhood to the south will deter future residents and visitors from venturing into the surrounding area and causing traffic or parking problems.
<p><b>D. Compatible with Surrounding Development:</b></p> <p>The proposed special exception will be constructed, arranged and operated so as to be compatible with the use and development of neighboring property in accordance with the applicable district regulations.</p>	Yes, Complies	There is an existing single-family home to the west of the subject property and an existing commercial building to the east of the subject property. The proposed building has located its drive access in the center of the building so as to minimize the impact of residents and visitors entering or exiting the parking structure on the adjacent properties. The project includes a pedestrian walkway along the eastern side of the building (between the proposed building and the existing commercial building) to minimize pedestrian impact to the home to the west. Additionally, the building has been set back from the rear property line and the Applicant has provided a

		landscaped buffer between the building and the single-family neighborhood to the south.
<p><b>E. No Destruction of Significant Features:</b></p> <p>The proposed use and development will not result in the destruction, loss or damage of natural, scenic or historic features of significant importance.</p>	Yes, Complies	<p>The subject property is not located within a local or national historic district. There are existing strip retail buildings on the site which were constructed between 1961 and 1966. The existing buildings will be demolished to make way for the proposed building.</p> <p>There is minimal landscaping on-site currently; there are some islands of sod between the drive accesses onto the property. The Applicant has included a landscaping plan with the project proposal.</p>
<p><b>F. No Material Pollution of Environment:</b></p> <p>The proposed use and development will not cause material air, water, soil or noise pollution or other types of pollution.</p>	Yes, Complies	<p>The proposed development will primarily be a multi-family building with a small amount of commercial space within. The multi-family units are not anticipated to cause any material air, water, soil, noise or other pollution beyond what is generally anticipated for dwelling units.</p> <p>The future tenant(s) of the proposed commercial space will be required to comply with the City's</p>



		<p>adopted standards and ordinances and to operate within the scope of their business license. These regulations set a limit to the amount of air, water, soil, noise or other types of pollution that the future commercial tenant(s) must meet.</p>
<p><b>G. Compliance with Standards:</b></p> <p>The proposed use and development complies with all additional standards imposed on it pursuant to this chapter.</p>	<p>Yes, Complies</p>	<p>Section 21A.26.010(J)(1) holds that requests to modify the maximum height by ten percent (10%) or less may be approved through the special exception process. This code indicates there are conditions of approval associated in Chapter 21A.52, which governs special exceptions.</p> <p>Section 21A.52.030(4) in turn references the standards set forth in Chapter 21A.26, which governs commercial districts. Beyond this statement, special exceptions are required to meet the general standards enclosed within this table. Section 21A.52.070 allows the Planning Commission to impose any conditions of approval necessary to <i>“prevent or minimize adverse effects upon other property and improvements in the vicinity of the special exception or upon public facilities and services...</i></p>

		<i>[t]hese conditions may include, but are not limited to, conditions concerning use, construction, operation, character, location, landscaping, screening and other matters relating to the purposes and objectives of this title. Such conditions shall be expressly set forth in the approval record of the special exception."</i>
--	--	--

**21a.59.050: Standards for Design Review:** The standards in this section apply to all applications for design review as follows:

For applications seeking modification of base zoning design standards, applicants shall demonstrate how the applicant's proposal complies with the standards for design review that are directly applicable to the design standard(s) that is proposed to be modified.

For applications that are required to go through the design review process for purposes other than a modification to a base zoning standard, the applicant shall demonstrate how the proposed project complies with each standard for design review. If an application complies with a standard in the base zoning district or with an applicable requirement in chapter 21A.37 of this title and that standard is directly related to a standard found in this section, the Planning Commission shall find that application complies with the specific standard for design review found in this section. An applicant may propose an alternative to a standard for design review provided the proposal is consistent with the intent of the standard for design review.

Standard	Finding	Rationale
A) <b>Any new development shall comply with the intent of the purpose statement of the zoning district and specific design regulations found within the zoning district in which the project is located as well as the City's adopted "urban design element" and adopted master plan policies and design guidelines governing the specific area of the proposed development.</b>	<b>Complies</b>	<p>Section 21A.26.030: CB Community Business District's purpose is "<i>to provide for the close integration of moderately sized commercial areas with adjacent residential neighborhoods. The design guidelines are intended to facilitate retail that is pedestrian in its orientation and scale, while also acknowledging the importance of transit and automobile access to the site.</i>"</p> <p>The proposed building will house 71 multi-family units, which is a permitted use in the CB Zone. The project also includes a commercial space at the northwestern corner of the building which will be readily accessible from the ground floor and the public sidewalk out front.</p>



		<p>The Sugar House Master Plan (2005) indicates on its future land use map that the subject property should be a Mixed-Use Low Intensity use. In the body of the Master Plan Neighborhood Scale Mixed Use is “lower in scale but still orients directly to the street. Uses include residential, retail, and commercial businesses or primarily small tenants. It is focused around a transit/pedestrian oriented commercial/retail area with a strong street presence, wide sidewalks, street furnishings, lighting and landscaping. The street level businesses are commercial and retail in nature, while the upper level can be either residential or office depending on compatibility of the adjacent uses. Neighborhood Scale Mixed Use occurs along the perimeter of the Business District and acts as a transition to the adjacent residential and commercial uses.”</p> <p>The project provides a transition between the busy commercial corridor of 2100 South and the adjacent single family neighborhood to the south. The building is designed to minimize the visual impact on the surrounding neighbors while also providing an opportunity for additional infill housing as recommended in the Sugar House Master Plan (2005). The project is lower in scale than other similar projects located in the core of the Sugar House Business District and is oriented directly onto 2100 South.</p>
<p><b>B) Development shall be primarily oriented to the sidewalk, not an interior courtyard or parking lot.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Primary entrances shall face the public sidewalk (secondary entrances can face a parking lot).</b></li> <li><b>2. Building(s) shall be sited close to the public sidewalk, following and responding to the desired development patterns of the neighborhood.</b></li> <li><b>3. Parking shall be located within, behind, or to the side of buildings.</b></li> </ol>	<b>Complies</b>	<p>The proposed building faces immediately onto 2100 South, a public street. Multiple units will have walk-up access directly from 2100 South while other units may be accessed by walking into the parking garage. The building will be constructed between five feet (5') and twelve feet eleven and three-quarter inches (12' 11 ¾") behind the property line and will provide landscaping in this space between the building and the public sidewalk. Structured parking for this development will be enclosed within the building and accessed from 2100 South in the center of the proposed building.</p>
<p><b>C) Building facades shall include detailing and glass in sufficient quantities to facilitate pedestrian interest and interaction</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Locate active ground floor uses at or near the public sidewalk.</b></li> <li><b>2. Maximize transparency of ground floor facades.</b></li> </ol>	<b>Complies</b>	<p>Ground floor uses are adjacent to the public sidewalk and a walkway invites the public in. Multiple units have direct access onto the public sidewalk along 2100 South and create an engaged ground floor. Glass accounts for 59% of residential areas and 68% of commercial areas on the ground floor which increases the interest for passing pedestrians.</p>

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. <b>Use or reinterpret traditional storefront elements like sign bands, clerestory glazing, articulation, and architectural detail at window transitions.</b></li> <li>4. <b>Locate outdoor dining patios, courtyards, plazas, habitable landscaped yards, and open spaces so they have a direct visual connection to the street and outdoor spaces.</b></li> </ol>		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The project includes a commercial space which will be accessible from the ground floor of the Izzy South building. It will be located at the northwestern corner of the development and will have an entry patio accessible directly from the 2100 South sidewalk.</li> <li>2. Street level façade includes large picture window openings into residential units, and double story glazing at the commercial space.</li> <li>3. Window systems will have clean minimal metal trim details and at public entries into the parking garage and commercial space are integrated into trellis details to highlight entry points.</li> <li>4. The project includes multiple entry patios for ground-floor units. These patios are accessible directly from the 2100 South sidewalk. Units on upper floors have balconies which look out onto either 2100 South (northern units) and over the single-family neighborhood to the south (southern units).</li> </ol>
<p><b>D) Large building masses shall be divided into heights and sizes that relate to human scale.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Relate building scale and massing to the size and scale of existing and anticipated buildings, such as alignments with established cornice heights, building massing, step-backs and vertical emphasis.</b></li> <li>2. <b>Modulate the design of a larger building using a series of vertical or horizontal emphases to equate with the scale (heights and widths) of the buildings in the context that reduce the visual width or height.</b></li> <li>3. <b>Include secondary elements such as balconies, porches, vertical bays, belt courses, fenestration and window reveals.</b></li> <li>4. <b>Reflect the scale and solid-to-void ratio of windows and doors of the established character of the neighborhood or that which is desired in the master plan.</b></li> </ol>	<p><b>Complies</b></p>	<p>The building is approximately 300 feet long along the 2100 South façade and 33 feet tall. Massing is divided by six peak-roofed bays that project from the façade. Inset balconies on the third level are included.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The building massing is split into smaller volumes with varying roof lines, step backs, and varied horizontal versus vertical orientations depending on building element. Flat roof elements are similar in scale to the adjacent Uinta Golf Buiding, and vertical gable roof forms relate to the adjacent residential form directly east and the church building across 500 East.</li> <li>2. The building includes a series of modulated gable roof forms with two different depths and finishes to break up their mass. Between the gable volumes are lower height 2-story horizontal forms with roof-top patios to activate the spaces between modules.</li> <li>3. The project design includes a series of balconies and porches at different levels to engage the street frontage and break up vertical volumes where appropriate. Window fenestration patterns vary depending on the building mass they are connected to but are intentionally</li> </ol>



		<p>designed to relate to the detailing of their specific volume.</p> <p>4. The entire front façade is a series of solid to void relationships on the gable roof module mentioned above. The corrugated metal volumes stand proud as solid elements, while the further recessed wood gable elements are voids in the gable form and add contrasting character to the building layout. This will be experienced by users at both the pedestrian and vehicular scale as the two buildings will intentionally present themselves differently depending on the side of the road you are approaching from.</p>
<p>E) <b>Building facades that exceed a combined contiguous building length of two hundred feet (200') shall include:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Changes in vertical plane (breaks in façade);</b></li> <li>2. <b>Material changes; and</b></li> <li>3. <b>Massing changes.</b></li> </ol>	<b>Complies</b>	<p>The proposed building is approximately three hundred feet (300') wide along the 2100 South frontage. There are multiple vertical changes on the front façade which include architectural features mimicking a peaked roof and changes in materials and step backs of the building.</p>
<p>F) <b>If provided, privately-owned public spaces shall include at least three (3) of the six (6) following elements:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Sitting space of at least one sitting space for each two hundred fifty (250) square feet shall be included in the plaza. Seating shall be a minimum of sixteen inches (16") in height and thirty inches (30") in width. Ledge benches shall have a minimum depth of thirty inches (30")</b></li> <li>2. <b>A mixture of areas that provide seasonal shade.</b></li> <li>3. <b>Trees in proportion to the space at a minimum of one tree per eight hundred (800) square feet, at least two inch (2") caliper when planted.</b></li> <li>4. <b>Water features or public art.</b></li> <li>5. <b>Outdoor dining areas.</b></li> <li>6. <b>Other amenities not listed above that provide a public benefit.</b></li> </ol>	<b>Complies</b>	<p>Additionally multiple ground-floor units along the northern façade of the building and the proposed commercial space have entry patios.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2) There is a landscaped walkway/narrow open space at the southern property line which is considered a privately-owned public space. There are ample trees and sod to provide tenants a small and intimate open space that will be shaded by the building and the proposed trees. The purpose of this landscaping is both to beautify the project and provide tenants and visitors a secluded and shaded open space to enjoy.</li> <li>3) The landscaped walkway/narrow open space at the southern property line is approximately 3,000 square feet in size which would require four (4) trees of 2" caliper size. The proposed plans show ten (10) trees).</li> <li>5) The intended tenant of the commercial space within this development is a coffee shop. The Applicant has indicated outdoor dining areas will be available on the ground floor and upper floors to support this commercial use.</li> </ol>
<p>G) <b>Building height shall be modified to relate to human scale and minimize negative impacts. In downtown and in the CSHBD Sugar House Business District,</b></p>	<b>Complies</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Human scale: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The building utilizes stepbacks on the upper floors to minimize the visual impact of the building to the single-family neighborhood to the</li> </ol> </li> </ol>

<p><b>building height shall contribute to a distinctive City skyline.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Human scale:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <b>Utilize stepbacks to design a building that relate to the height and scale of adjacent and nearby buildings, or where identified, goals for future scale defined in adopted master plans.</b></li> <li>b. <b>For buildings more than three (3) stories or buildings with vertical mixed use, compose the design of a building with distinct base, middle and top sections to reduce the sense of apparent height.</b></li> </ol> </li> <li>2. <b>Negative impacts:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <b>Modulate taller buildings vertically and horizontally so that it steps up or down to its neighbors.</b></li> <li>b. <b>Minimize shadow impacts of building height on the public realm and semi-public spaces by varying building massing. Demonstrate impact from shadows due to building height for the portions of the building that are subject to the request for additional height.</b></li> <li>c. <b>Modify tall buildings to minimize wind impacts on public and private spaces, such as the inclusion of a wind break above the first level of the building.</b></li> </ol> </li> <li>3. <b>Cornices and Rooflines:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <b>Cohesiveness: Shape and define rooflines to be cohesive with the building's overall form and composition.</b></li> <li>b. <b>Complement Surrounding Buildings: Include roof forms that complement the rooflines of surrounding buildings.</b></li> <li>c. <b>Green Roof and Roof Deck: Include a green roof and/or accessible roof</b></li> </ol> </li> </ol>		<p>south while also complimenting the existing height of the Uinta Golf building and the general massing of development in the Sugar House downtown core.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. The proposed building has three (3) stories; not applicable.</li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. <b>Negative impacts:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The front façade of the building is modulated by the incorporation of a variety of building materials, varied setbacks, and architectural features to break up the overall massing of the main building.</li> <li>b. Modulation of building façade – setbacks and stepbacks, allow for light to reach the public sidewalk. The upper floors of the building are stepped back to reduce the shadow impact at the front and rear of the building.</li> <li>c. The proposed building is only 33' tall and is not expected to exacerbate wind impacts in the area.</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. <b>Cornices and rooflines</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The peaked roofline ties the proposed building in with the surrounding neighborhood and the incorporation of the same building materials on the "peak features" as are found on the remainder of the building tie the project together as a cohesive whole.</li> <li>b. The majority of the roofline is flat which is comparable to the Uinta Golf building directly to the east of the subject property and the gas station on the same block face to the west. Additionally, the project includes "peak features" on the roof near the front façade are similar to the peak of the roof of the single family home directly to the west of the subject property and those found in the single-family neighborhood to the south of the proposed development.</li> <li>c. This proposal does not include a green roof or deck.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>
--	--	--



deck to support a more visually compelling roof landscape and reduce solar gain, air pollution, and the amount of water entering the stormwater system.		
H) <b>Parking and on site circulation shall be provided with an emphasis on making safe pedestrian connections to the sidewalk, transit facilities, or midblock walkway.</b>	<b>Complies</b>	The parking for this project will be fully enclosed within a structured garage accessed from 2100 South. The garage access is centered in the proposed building and inset from the primary face of the building, which de-emphasizes parking and maintains a strong relationship between the building and the street. Pedestrian access to the sidewalk along 2100 South will be accessible from the mouth of the garage, the “walk-up” units along the ground floor, and at the commercial space.
I) <b>Waste and recycling containers, mechanical equipment, storage areas, and loading docks shall be fully screened from public view and shall incorporate building materials and detailing compatible with the building being served. Service uses shall be set back from the front line of the building or located within the structure.</b>	<b>Complies</b>	<p>All mechanical equipment for the project will be roof-top mounted. Building mechanical systems are all electric and will be relatively small in size. Each residential unit will have its own dedicated rooftop mechanical unit and all will be clustered in the center of the roof. As the units are centrally located on the roof no screening is currently planned as they will not be visible from the ground level.</p> <p>Dumpster storage is located in the first parking stall inside the parking garage. Interior screening may or may not be considered. Trash collection companies will roll the dumpster to the parking garage entry for pickup/collection.</p>
J) <b>Signage shall emphasize the pedestrian/mass transit orientation.</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Define specific spaces for signage that are integral to building design, such as commercial sign bands framed by a material change, columns for blade signs, or other clearly articulated band on the face of the building.</b></li> <li><b>Coordinate signage locations with appropriate lighting, awnings, and other projections.</b></li> <li><b>Coordinate sign location with landscaping to avoid conflicts.</b></li> </ol>	<b>Complies</b>	<p>Primary building entrances are demarcated by wooden trellis elements that contrast the solid/void forms of the building rooflines. These mark entry to parking garages, lobbies, and the commercial space. The proposed signage is currently integrated into the trellis design and are clearly articulated as separate architectural features. All signage will be building mounted and avoid conflicts with landscaping below. Final tree placements and species selections will be coordinated to limit height and increase the street presence/visibility at these areas.</p>
K) <b>Lighting shall support pedestrian comfort and safety, neighborhood image, and dark sky goals.</b>	<b>Complies</b>	The subject property is located along 2100 South where the Salt Lake City Lighting Master Plan states “continuous lighting systems” are needed. There are two existing street lights out front of the subject property along 2100 South. Any

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Provide street lights as indicated in the Salt Lake City Lighting Master Plan.</b></li> <li>2. <b>Outdoor lighting should be designed for low-level illumination and to minimize glare and light trespass onto adjacent properties and uplighting directly to the sky.</b></li> <li>3. <b>Coordinate lighting with architecture, signage, and pedestrian circulation to accentuate significant building features, improve sign legibility, and support pedestrian comfort and safety.</b></li> </ol>		<p>streetlights removed during the construction process will be replaced as part of the project's work in the public right of way. Exterior building lighting will be localized to residential units with small wall-mounted sconces that provide down-light only and are dark sky compliant. Public entrances will have linear down lights integrated into the trellis elements and will safely light public areas for pedestrian comfort and safety.</p>
<p><b>L) Streetscape improvements shall be provided as follows:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>One street tree chosen from the street tree list consistent with the City's urban forestry guidelines and with the approval of the City's Urban Forester shall be placed for each thirty feet (30') of property frontage on a street. Existing street trees removed as the result of a development project shall be replaced by the developer with trees approved by the City's Urban Forester.</b></li> <li>2. <b>Hardscape (paving material) shall be utilized to differentiate privately-owned public spaces from public spaces. Hardscape for public sidewalks shall follow applicable design standards. Permitted materials for privately-owned public spaces shall meet the following standards:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <b>Use materials that are durable (withstand wear, pressure, damage), require a minimum of maintenance, and are easily repairable or replaceable should damage or defacement occur.</b></li> <li>b. <b>Where practical, as in lower-traffic areas, use</b></li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p><b>Complies</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The plans indicate the sidewalk will be replaced and trees will be planted along the entire stretch of the subject property along 2100 South. Ten (10) trees will be required in accordance with the ordinances. No trees exist today. The Applicant has proposed the planting of serviceberry trees to meet this requirement and have received approval for such from Nate Orbock with Salt Lake City Urban Forestry (See Attachment X).</li> <li>ii. There is a private landscaped area at the rear of the property where there will be a durable, hardscaped walking path and additional landscaping and trees along the southern property line. This landscaped area will be approximately ten feet seven inches (10' 7") in width and will include a seven foot (7') wide landscaped buffer along the southern property line. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The project includes concrete as the hardscape material which will be durable, low-maintenance and is easily repaired or replaced.</li> <li>b. The Applicant has provided a 7' wide landscaped buffer at the rear property line and between 5' and 12' 11 ¾" of landscaping in the front yard. This landscaping will serve to beautify the development while also providing opportunity for rainwater to infiltrate into the ground.</li> <li>c. The light colors of building materials will serve to limit the contribution to the urban heat island effect. A dark corrugated metal product has been selected as an accent material with most</li> </ol> </li> </ol>



<p><b>materials that allow rainwater to infiltrate into the ground and recharge the water table.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c. <b>Limit contribution to urban heat island effect by limiting use of dark materials and incorporating materials with a high Solar-Reflective Index (SRI).</b></li> <li>d. <b>Utilize materials and designs that have an identifiable relationship to the character of the site, the neighborhood, or Salt Lake City.</b></li> <li>e. <b>Use materials (like textured ground surfaces) and features (like ramps and seating at key resting points) to support access and comfort for people of all abilities.</b></li> <li>f. <b>Asphalt shall be limited to vehicle drive aisles.</b></li> </ul>		<p>of the building being wood siding. All horizontal surfaces are either concrete, pavers, or white single ply membrane roof material.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>d. The materials of concrete, wood, and metal siding are prevalent in both residential and commercial projects throughout Sugar House and much of Salt Lake City.</li> <li>e. The public access points will include small gathering and seating areas. The commercial component of the project will be accessible at ground level and people of all abilities will be able to utilize the same entrance.</li> <li>f. The project contains no asphalt.</li> </ul>
---	--	--

## **ATTACHMENT F: Public Process and Comments**

---

The following is a list of public meetings that have been held, and other public input opportunities, related to the proposed project:

- May 13, 2020 – Staff attended the Liberty Wells Community Council meeting to answer questions about the project.
- May 18, 2020 – Applicant and Staff attended the virtual meeting of the Sugar House Community Council.
- June 25, 2020 – Staff sent an early notification announcement of the project to all residents and property owners located within 300 feet of the project site, providing notice about the project and information on how to give public input on the project.
- July 16, 2020 - An online open house was held beginning July 16, 2020. The public comment period for the open house expired on August 10, 2020. No questions were received as part of the public comment period for the open house.
- July 21, 2020 – Applicant and Staff attended the virtual meeting of the Sugar House Community Council.
- August 26, 2020 – Notice of the special exception petition and a formal letter requesting comments was sent to the Chairs of the Liberty Wells and Sugar House Community Councils.
- The 45-day recognized organization comment period expired on Tuesday September 8, 2020.
- Numerous public comments were received about the project. Those are discussed below in the Public Input section and written comments have been included on the following pages.

### **Notice of the public hearing for the proposal included:**

- Public hearing notice mailed: September 10, 2020
- Public hearing notice sign posted on property: September 11, 2020
- Public hearing notice posted on City and State websites and Planning Division list serve: September 10, 2020

### **Public Comments**

Both the Sugar House Community Council and the Liberty Wells Community Council have provided letters for the Planning Commission regarding the Izzy South proposal. Liberty Wells Community Council generally supports the proposal while the Sugar House Community Councils has some concerns mainly centered around parking. At the time this staff report was drafted over ninety (90) comments have been received by Staff and the Sugar House Community Council. of comments have been received regarding this proposal. The majority of these comments centered on concerns regarding parking and traffic in the surrounding area.

The comments received for the proposed project can be found on the following pages:



August 10, 2020



TO: Salt Lake City Planning Commission

From: Judi Short, Vice Chair and Land Use Chair  
Sugar House Community Council

RE: PLNPCM2020-00222 Izzy South Design Review

As we always do, we posted this project on our website in early July, with a form for residents to leave comments about the project. It was mentioned in the July and August newsletter, with a link to the project. We flyer'd the neighborhood around the project, to announce the Land Use and Zoning meeting (LUZ). We received so many comments about the project that we had two LUZ meetings in July, this one was by itself on July 21. There were at least 35 people at the Zoom meeting.

If we want to talk about design, if you read the pages of comments, from at least 96 people in the neighborhood, you will see some think the front of the building is wonderful and the rear is terrible. Others think the rear is the best part. Perhaps it is the color on the drawings, it reminds me of the rows and rows of houses and strip malls built in Herriman from the 1980s to now, that for some reason known only to the frogs, all have to be a dark brown in color. This building could be a number of different colors, and that alone would make it much more attractive. Paint it vertically different, so that it looks more like row houses, or town houses, built at different times. The drawings make it seem like the building has lots of windows, but from the outside, the drawings don't look like that at all, it looks very dark with smoky glass. Not sure why that is.

There aren't enough trees, or landscaping. For the south building, except for the narrow plot of land between the south lot line and the building, I am guessing 3-4') the rest is hardscape. The residents of the south building are to share the 20 Greenspace on the north side of the north building, for parties and barbeques. All they have to do is walk to either the corner of 500 East or 600 East and 2100 South, and cross that very busy street, hauling all their party things with them, to enjoy that wonderful space. We see that as a big design flaw. We think the south building could be made shorter so there is a grassy area on one end or the other for recreating.

Once again, we have a market rate development shoe-horned into a single-family neighborhood. The drawings presented show it in an empty, grassy field. It doesn't show the true impact of the building up against the surrounding neighborhood. There is a 7' rear setback up against the small homes that have been on Commonwealth for some 70 years. Parking for this new building will be 7' away with just a 6' fence to keep the carbon monoxide, and lights from their cars, out of their back yards. Original plans called for a dog walking area along that fence, but fortunately, that has been moved. The balconies on the rear looking into the neighbor's yards are a big intrusion into the privacy of those neighbors. And, the exhaust from the idling cars in the winter will be intolerable. The garage will need to be lit and cars will have headlights beaming into adjoining neighbors windows, to say nothing of loud radios. The adjoining neighbors will have no privacy as the rear apartments look right over into their properties. We are requesting a 12' fence. This will go just between the apartment building and the homes on the north side of Commonwealth. It will not extend out to the side streets. The extra height will also help protect the privacy of the neighbors from residents in the second floor of the apartment building. We also have not heard anything about the sort of security system the building will have.

Clearly, the biggest issue with this project is the lack of parking. 71 units and 58 or so stalls. The exact number is very hard to count on the drawings. We estimate, with the high cost of rent, that most of these units will have two occupants, each with a car. That is a shortage of 70 stalls at a minimum. In the five years since the streetcar was built, ridership has been pretty much flat. Even with the two-track system, ridership did not go up. That is in spite of the fact that many new apartment buildings opened up along the route. To give them credit for being eligible for the discounted requirement of

number of stalls is disingenuous. And then to read the comments attached about the lack of parking already on the streets in this area, it doesn't make sense to give them a pass. You will receive information about the exactly number of cars driven by the people who already live here, and the number of street parking stalls, and whether or not there are enough available to accommodate the 70 expected new cars for this project. This does not allow for any visitors to the pub or bodega who might drive.

We know about the Brixton Apartments, finished at Thanksgiving and about 1/3 occupied, on the SE corner of 700 East and the Streetcar. The neighbors say that really filled up available parking on the streets. What happens when that is fully rented? There is a townhouse complex with 70 units and 79 parking stalls. Another apartment building is going up on the west side of 500 east, and the Zellerbach building between 500 and 400 East at the Streetcar has 300 units and optional parking in the garage. The apartment buildings all have a charge for parking, so residents, particular those with two cars, don't put both in the garage, the other car goes on the street somewhere. Or, they both do.

Salt Lake City has no data to show that ridership goes up, that people who live close to a fixed rail station actually take the train. And yet, they continue to allow cutting parking stall requirements by 50%, just because the station is within a quarter mile of the building. We would be more sympathetic, if they could give us good solid data. And, this practice is being perpetuated in the next iteration of the Parking Ordinance, soon to reach the City Council for discussion. The bus system hasn't even increased in any dramatic way. We know that banks don't like to finance buildings without enough parking near a bus, because that bus line could change at a moment's notice, come the next change day.

I asked the owner of this Izzy complex if he would consider not charging for parking, and he said he couldn't do that. He could raise the rent and I bet new tenants wouldn't notice, they would just think they were getting free parking.

I understand the theory of granting reduced parking for buildings within ¼ mile of a fixed rail line. However, this particular group of houses and apartment buildings is already at capacity, and there isn't room to absorb another 30 or so cars, if we assume that half the units in the building will have two cars. The developers justify this lack of adequate parking by insisting some of their renters, and especially those renting studio apartments, won't have cars. But during one of our Zoom calls, the developers themselves admitted their own research indicates 85 to 90 percent of studio renters will have at least one car, with car ownership being even higher among renters of the one- and two-bedroom units. In other words, even the developers admit there will be far more cars than parking spaces. We think this lack of parking will be exacerbated by the fact these are brand new, market rate units in a desirable neighborhood; the demographic likely to rent these units, even if likely to use transit occasionally, will almost certainly have at least one car, and likely more than one. There needs to be a better parking analysis done at the time each of these buildings are approved, particularly when they are the last building in a chunk of land with no readily available overflow parking available on adjoining streets. (see report to be attached from the neighbors). This is a very cohesive neighborhood with many long-time homeowners with skin in the game. Their opinions should not be disregarded.

I just realized that I didn't even mention the fact that this adds another bunch of cars in and out on 2100 South, which is at a standstill every time the 700 East light changes. A right in, right out of the garage entrance might help, but that would just encourage those people to drive around the block to get to the direction they want to go.

In conjunction with the neighborhood, the Sugar House Community Council could approve this project, with the following conditions:

- A 12' fence be placed on the south property line, and
- Another level of parking is built to accommodate the tenants of the building and visitors to whatever retail ends up in the building.
- Some kind of solution for greenspace closer to the south building should be identified.

Enclosures

Comments from the neighborhood  
Flyer, Map and Data Report



## COMMENTS 542 EAST 2100 SOUTH (IZZY SOUTH)

From: wanda brown <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

I am a 15 year resident of the neighborhood whom this building will have a life changing impact on. Your plans to have only a car length (10feet) of green space between our back fences and the beginning of a building that contain balconies right above my back yard is outrageous. I get it you want the view of the mountains, but to have them starting at 10 feet from our fences leave us with no privacy.

You do realize that having a dog walking area butting up to yards that have dogs is simple disrespectfully to the people who live behind this building.

Just when we thought the squirrels where enough for them to deal with, now they get to deal with people and their dogs above them, walking their dogs chilling out. Let the bark fest begin! I hear the back fence is a great place for composting. I did start a garden....

From: Joshua E Lewis <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

My concerns are the balconies. The balconies will intrude on my back yard privacy, which is one of the main reasons I purchased my house.

I dont want to walk in my back yard and have to contend with people over looking my back yard.

Also, the balconies will hurt the resell value of my house. People want privacy in their back yard and they will not purchase a property where their privacy is intruded on.....

From: Scott Camburn <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

Traffic through surrounding neighborhood directly to the South will greatly increase. Specifically drivers looking to bypass the crowded intersection of 700 E and 2100 S. The addition of this many residents is impossible with out addressing the traffic it will cause.

From: Joe Mason <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

Please review and either reject or re-address the Izzy South building project.

This shows 71 units with only 60 parking spaces.

Our neighborhood is already being overrun with cars parked on the streets from the Brixton, which hasn't even rented out all of its units yet.

Most households have a minimum of one vehicle. When you short change parking spaces, it overflows into neighborhoods.

This is a recipe for disaster. We had issues this past winter already and the Brixton had barely begun filling it's units.

This week alone, I witnessed a yelling match between two occupants of the Brixton, which illustrates the problem well.

The woman passed the parking space to back in and parallel park..... the man pulled forward into the space she had intended to occupy.

She got out of her car and said I needed to park there. He said, your car was in the road but your back-up lights weren't on and I needed to park.

She said, you already have a parking space and I don't. He explained his wife used theirs, so he needs additional space too.

I live a few streets away and already have people parking in front of my house, so my guests have no place to park because of poor planning.

We can NOT continue to exacerbate this type of problem.

When I asked a council member from Salt Lake how many cars each average apartment building has, the average was 1.5.

Homes have a higher average.

With this model presented, even if they only had one car per unit, it would be short by 10.

This doesn't take into consideration the number of second cars. Then couple that with visiting guests and we are way overloaded. Condo's and apartments need to have ample parking for the units they provide, plus they need to have accommodation's for their tenants guests with ample visitor parking.

We do not have a need for housing yet, so we can take the time to plan and use fore-site in designing our future and neighborhoods rather than using short sited planning, which has negative rippling effects.

Growth can and should enhance our neighborhood, not create hardships for existing inhabitants, as well as creating problems for incoming people.

Judi, Personally I think developers (and I'm one myself) should be sensitive when they plan a building that is taller than surrounding buildings especially if they are single family homes (and for that matter other high density residential) to plan to have balconies, picture windows, even the placement of the footprint of the building and such, in a way that is respectful to your neighbors and minimizes privacy intrusion. Sadly not every developer feels the same way. Bill Davis

In regards to IZZY South, I really don't want to support another market rate complex in my neighborhood. Especially because I don't know if they city has a comprehensive plan for the repair and reworking of 2100 South. It is a mess. And adding more traffic and construction in our already overburdened neighborhood is quite irksome. If there was any indication that they would put in mixed income housing then I might be more Inclined to feel supportive. I am feeling overwhelmed with the Sugar House construction zone. Dayna McKee

From: Dave Ventrano <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

The parking in the area is like a bad dream. With Izzy being planned and if it is developed, it's going to turn into a nightmare. I've lived here for over 15 years. The houses around used to be filled with a lot of rentals. Families have begun to buy up the houses in the recent past making it a much more enjoyable place to live. If this is developed without plans for handling parking issues with not only the tenants, but visitors, it's going to be a problem. There is NO place to park on 2100 S. There is no place to park on right off 2100 S. on 500 and 600 E. This leaves Commonwealth to take the brunt of the parking problems with Elm taking the overflow from there. Please consider more thoroughly the potential parking issues before moving forward with this. Thank you.

From: Ladawn Mullenax <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

I think that it is b\*\*\*\*\* that you want to take a well-established neighborhood and disrupt it's over all well-being and peace so you can make a quick buck.

The noise and fall out/waste from construction will be especially problematic as I have people on oxygen and people in poor health in my home. How do they deal with it ?

It won't be just the construction that is an issue but also the parking lot-Car Alarms,screeching tires,people yelling and dogs barking but you don't have to deal with that cuz you're rich and have a big house and yard I will have a nice house and yard till this f\*\*\*\*\* s\*\*\* happens I am extremely displeased with what the hell is going to happen to my neighborhood and you don't understand and you don't f\*\*\*\*\* care to see it from my neighborhoods point of view

From: Steven Seftel <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Hello With the large influx of apartment buildings coming to Sugarhouse, this raises the question of whether the Commission has discussed putting a cap on population density?

From: Gwen Mitchell <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

0.81 parking spaces per unit us NOT adequate. As has been found with downtown apt units, most apartment dwellers have a car, and a 2 bedroom likely 2 cars. Even a couple living in a 1 BR could have 2 cars. Street parking is extremely limited and would spill over to



the residential streets, which isn't fair to those homeowners. AL NEW BUILDING IN THE CITY SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO HAVE AT LEAST 1 PARKING STALL PER APT

From: CHARLES HUBBERT <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

I DO NOT KNOW WHO WILL EVEN SEE THIS. I AM OLD AND NOT GOOD WITH COMPUTERS. I AM NOT MAD, I JUST TYPE IN ALL CAPS BECAUSE IT IS JUST EASIER FOR ME.

I LIVE ON ELM AVE. , EVERY CLOSE TO THE SITE FOR THIS PROJECT. I AM VERY CONCERNED WITH THE PROJECT AND THE EFFECT IT WILL HAVE ON MY NEIGHBORHOOD. I KNOW INVESTORS DO NOT CARE ABOUT THE NEIGHBORHOOD, BUT WE DO. THE APARTMENTS ON SIMPSON AND 6th EAST HAVE HAD A GREAT NEGATIVE EFFECT ON THE PARKING IN OUR NEIGHBORHOOD AND IT IS REALLY CAUSING PROBLEMS, AND IT IS ONLY 30 % OCCUPIED. WHAT WILL BE THE EFFECT WHEN IT IS FULLY RENTED? THERE IS ANOTHER SET OF APARTMENTS IN CONSTRUCTION ON 21th JUST WEST OF 5th EAST THAT WILL HAVE AN IMPACT AND IT IS NOT EVEN COMPLETE YET.

HAS THE DEVELOPER EVEN INVESTIGATED WHERE PEOPLE WILL PARK? I HAVE BEEN TOLD THAT THEY HAVE NOT EVEN PROVIDED A PARKING SPACE FOR EACH UNIT EVEN THROW THE AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD IN THIS VALLEY HAS 1.5 VEHICLES PER HOUSEHOLD. DO THE PEOPLE PROVIDING THE FUNDING FOR THIS PROJECT EVEN CARE ABOUT WHERE THE TENETS WILL PARK.? I UNDERSTAND THAT MAKING MONEY IS IMPORTANT TO SOME PEOPLE ,BUT AT WHAT COST TO THE PEOPLE IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD. THIS MUST BE ADDRESSED BEFORE THE PROJECT IS APPROVED. THE DEVELOPER STATED THAT PEOPLE ARE ENCOURAGED TO USE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION. THAT IS NOT REALISTIC. THE TENANTS HAVE A RIGHT TO HAVE A CAR. THIS WILL CAUSE THE CARS TO BE PARKED ON THE STREETS IN OUR NEIGHBORHOOD. WE UNDERSTAND THAT WE DO NOT CONTROL THE STREETS, BUT WITH THE CARS THAT CAN NOT PARK ON THE PROJECT SITE, THERE WILL NOT BE ROOM TO ACCOMMODATE THE OVERFLOW, NOT EVEN ADDRESSING THE CARS THAT PEOPLE IN OUR NEIGHBORHOOD HAVE. IT IS JUST GOING TO BE A MESS,;THIS NEEDS TO BE ADDRESSSED BEFORE THE PROJECT IS APPROVED. MONEY IS NOT THAT IMPORTANT.

I WOULD SUGGEST THAT THIS PROJECT BE DELAYED UNTIL THE FULL EFFECT OF THE TWO OTHER APARTMENT COMPLEXES, IN THE AREA CAN BE ASSESSED. I KNOW THAT DELAYING THIS PROJECT WILL WILL CAUSE A LOT OF TROUBLE FOR THE INVESTORS AND THE DEVELOPER, BUT IT IS SMALL COMPARED TO THE BAD EFFECT TO OUR NEIGHBORHOOD WHEN THERE ARE MORE CARS IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD THEN CAN PARK.. THIS IS OUR LIVES AND WE HAVE INVESTED EVERYTHING WE HAVE IN OUR HOMES AND IT IS NOT FAIR THAT SOMEONE, WITH A LOT OF MONEY, COMES IN AND FORCES A PROJECT THAT WILL GREATLY DAMAGE OUR NEIGHBORHOOD.

CHARLIE HUBBERT [REDACTED]

From: Sharon Cotterill [REDACTED]  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

NO, NO, NO!!! There is inadequate parking. Period. Are we on Commonwealth or 6th East to take up the slack for the inadequacy of apartment parking. You haven't improved the infrastructure for what has recently been built. I have a bus stop in front of my house. The garbage left there is atrocious now. 2100 south can't support the current traffic and now you want to introduce more. Everyone wants their buck at the expense of the current long term residences of the area. I live at the corner of Commonwealth and 5th East. The thought of having cars parked around my house who I don't know who they belong to is extremely unsettling. Our home has been totally ransacked twice, broken into a third time a gas Station next door where management does nothing to police the breezeway between our properties and now you want me to accept people parking on Commonwealth because YOU won't even require adequate parking for each unit. You know darn well there will be multiple vehicles per unit. You know this. The number of apartments is too many for that space. Why are you cramming this down our throats, because that is what it feels like. Commonwealth has already been experiencing traffic going too fast. Again, why are you doing this? Let m know how many new apartments are going into your area. Developers wanting quick bucks at the expense of the rest of us. Is this your answer to the lack of housing. I think this is a joke.



From: Joe DeGooyer <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

Don't change the zoning to allow this higher density housing, especially on the north side of 2100 south. Too much density is being developed in Liberty Wells and Sugarhouse without much thought to the strain on traffic, parking, stores, open spaces, etc. Remember The St. Joseph's Villa proposed expansion and how it was decided to not allow that to preserve the sanctuary of the neighborhood? Let's not develop every upcoming plot as high density housing, please.

From: Judith Patterson <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

Inadequate parking for the number of housing units. Figuring one person per studio and one bedroom unit ( 40 and 21 respectively) and two for each of the two-bedroom units (20), this would be 81 tenants. The proposal states there would be 58 parking stalls. In addition, the retail space would likely also require parking. Overflow parking of tenants, their possible guests, and customers of the retail establishments would spill into neighborhoods which are already currently crowded with residents' vehicles.

From: Jordan Kohl <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

I would just like to add my counter-voice to what I'm sure are a lot of complaints you'll be getting. Specifically, I know some people are unhappy about the parking requirements being too low and the building being unattractive. Let me just state that I would be thrilled if the parking allotments were even lower (huzzah for reduced auto traffic), and as for the design, well I am not a design architect. All I know is that Salt Lake City needs more affordable housing, and the best way to do that that I know is to have more housing available, period.

Dear Judi,

My house is located at [REDACTED] I just found out about the Izzy development plan on Monday evening. I'm cannot support more apartments in the area. They just completed two huge complexes near 2250 so and 600 E. The streets will not be able to handle the influx of new traffic. There's already gridlock on 2100 so., at certain times of the day. How many folks do they intend to stuff into the area.

Parking is also an issue. Currently, lots of cars park on the side streets. New developments tend to not provide enough parking stalls for the occupants, so they'll likely park in the neighborhoods.

I really hope they reconsider. I'd much rather see a small business or cafe, (not a homeless shelter). We want sugarhouse to be walkable... soon it'll be too crowded to walk anywhere.

Sincerely,  
Peggy Clark

From: nicole warner <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

Little by little the charm of this area is being stripped to make space for another unsightly, un-special, dime a dozen high rise of condos or apartments. Blue planet is one of the last unique businesses that catered to a niche demographic, and provided a busy, reputable service to this area. And having walkable restaurants and gyms etc. is literally what every person desires in their neighborhood! To think that we'll be potentially losing these businesses to be walled in by more god awful stucco, pseudo modern, and unnecessary apartments makes me furious. So, we can look forward to apartments from 6th to 5th, with the exception of the gas stations that will be spared at both corners?! Why not get rid of Saffron Valley too? Throw in another gas station there, or better yet, a new apartment/condo structure to meet up with the new one on 4th!

If you can't read through to this sarcasm, I'll let you know...that was sarcasm! This community is selling off everything, and making terrible choices in very concentrated areas to try to meet housing needs. Sugar house is gonna be the new Daybreak if someone doesn't start paying attention to what we're losing.



From: malissa rae hazel <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

Please stop allowing all these multi units! Sugar house, especially off 2100 is already way over capacity. Traffic is ridiculous. 10 years ago when I bought off 500 E this was still a quaint part of lower sugghouse. Now it's something else all together. Why do we insist on turning this neighborhood into a city?!

From: Jamin Heath <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

It will be a slight burden on traffic getting in and out on busy 21st. Will these be affordable? Because 1200 a month for a one studio apartment is not affordable for 75 percent of the people living here. 800 for a studio, 900 for a one bedroom, 1000 for two bedroom is what these should cost. They will always be rented for that price. And people can actually afford it. Thanks

From: Alex Nygaard <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

There is not enough room for parking/commuting around 2100 s as it is - packing more people into this small space is the last thing we need to do right now. Also those buildings look hideous.

From: Julie Fife Mclaughlin <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

I absolutely do not want another monster apartment complex going up in my neighborhood. Traffic is already a nightmare on 2100 south. I live on Redondo and 6th East, I pay taxes, and I demand some input on this. Sugarhouse itself is as inviting as a prison complex. All views of the mountains are forever gone and the dozens of chain burger places, yogurt places and others are boring and repetitive. PLEASE do not ruin this neighborhood more than it already has been.

Sincerely,  
Julie Fife

From: Shannon Legge <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

I am very concerned there is not enough parking stalls for the people who will reside in this building. The average household in Utah has 2 cars (the Census Bureau ACS 1-year Estimate 2018). There are 71 units planned, indicating there is likely to be 142 parking stalls needed, and additional when considering visitors and new tenants. The building only plans 58 parking stalls, creating a deficit of at least 114 parking spots. There is no parking available along 2100. This will force residents to park along the residential streets. With this planned building and more buildings in the area, parking will create unattractive congestion along these residential street. I strongly urge the city planning committee to consider the parking implications of these higher density buildings. Please keep parking congestion down and available for homeowners in the area.

From: Martin <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

Looks like it's going to be a real shit show. What's up with the overdevelopment in the sugarhouse area



From: Michael Lobb <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:  
Enough development in Sugar House!!!

From: Marlene Fairchild <[REDACTED]> <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

NO! MORE! APARTMENTS/CONDOS!

There are already TOO MANY in the area. We are in a DESERT, which means we are a dry state. WHERE IS ALL THE WATER GOING TO COME FROM? We also live in a bowl which traps pollution, which INCREASES with each building put in--electric or not!

STOP building, for crying out loud!

From: Danielle Hamon <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

I am a very concerned homeowner impacted by these monstrous developments. This parking is inadequate. We bought our home to live in an established residential neighborhood. It is being converted to all high density housing now. We are already seeing the gangs move in in the S-line properties, with shooting and drug deals on the streets. Let's hope these transient apartments go away!

From: Ben Hagenhofer-Daniell <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

I support the construction of the project as submitted in the design review packet. Much needed dense housing in an appropriate site.

I wish that the first floor facing 2100 was commercial/retail.  
I wish that a large portion of the apartments were required to be affordable/rent controlled  
I wish we didn't squander the opportunity the site provides and only build 3 instead of 4 or 5 or 7 stories (would need different parking mins for that density)

I also don't think we'll get affordable or rent controlled units in any of these developments without a citywide ordinance requiring it. Developers won't do this altruistically, nor would I expect them to. Something to pass on to true city council.

since all of those things require a different zoning regime and the force of new municipal ordinance, that I don't see changing much, I support the plans as submitted

From: Lori D Salazar <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:  
My concern in parking. How many parking spaces are going to be provided? I live through the block on Commonwealth and parking is already limited. In the past, the city council has made it difficult to add driveways or make improvements on our properties. I would hope that these developers are being held to the same scrutiny the city council has held us to through the years. Granted, there is a need for affordable housing in SLC, in addition to mindful urban planning. I hope greed doesn't get in the way of this.



From: Wanda Brown <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

I heard you took the issues of this place off the concerns of the council. PLEASE LISTEN to the people who live behind this building and in the community. If I need to get 10 people to comment besides myself I will. Don't let this issue be dropped.

From: Kerri Wagner <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

The parking spaces seems very inadequate. With all the new developments in this area, we have already seen overcrowding on the streets. This is a problem! Not enough street lights and speed bumps in the are!  
to me

From: Melanie Williamskn <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

I am against more high density housing in this area! There is already so much - many units have yet to completed or occupied and the impact of such high density population is still unknown. The existing infrastructure (roads, parking etc) cannot continue to support such rapid growth without having a very negative impact on the neighborhood. While this area of SLC is very desirable I believe the rapid growth and explosion of high density housing is wrecking the neighborhood. It will soon be so difficult to get through traffic no one will want to visit or live here.

From: Tara McCutcheon <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

The best thing about Liberty Wells is the proximity to the city without the hassles of traffic and overcrowding- a rarity in our ever-expanding city.. As a resident of this neighborhood I am very concerned about parking availability on the streets for people living adjacent/near to these big housing developments as well as increased traffic congestion on a street with little room for expansion (2100 S). There's currently a multi-unit housing development in process on 2100 S and 400 E that will add stress to an area that's already becoming busier by the month. Please keep those of us in mind who love our quiet, residential neighborhood.

From: Danielle Hogle <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

STOP! FOR THE LOVE OF GOD! Congestion has not been dealt with. Parking has not been dealt with. I cannot tell you how many times I've almost been hit by a car in my residential neighborhood because people are looking for parking I need complexes. Have no regard for the residential neighborhoods around them. These multi-level apartment buildings in complexes are ruining everything that is great about Sugarhouse. Stop. Please for the millionth time from Sugarhouse people. Bring back the small, local businesses and not these huge chains. That will improve the economy more than overpriced apartment buildings.

From: MacKenzie Gilson <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:  
Hello-



Can we please just stop with all of the tightly packed, economy apartments? We have already begun to have issues with parking due to lack of adequate accommodation for the renters in the apartments, not to mention increases traffic and noise pollution. This is destroying the peace and comfort that we are all paying top dollar to enjoy. Please have more respect for us.

From: Candyce Taylor <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

I do not support this land being used in this way. We have way too many complex's without enough parking or resources and this area is overly congested as it is. These old private homes rarely have enough parking and we rely on parking on side streets to accommodate our families. Our city has completely lost its charm and with this large of a population, crime becomes the surrounding homeowners problem and not the city. We have incredibly high theft rates and this will only perpetuate the ever growing problem.  
Thank you, Candyce

From: Helen E Buzianis <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

No more apartments! Traffic is so congested now it is ridiculous! All these apartments are destroying what was once a quaint area (Liberty Wells to Sugarhouse), it's becoming unrecognizable. I don't care that they are so energy efficient. Put them somewhere else.

From: Anne <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

There are enough housing units going up in this area as is. There is a new complex basically across the street. Stop turning our city to cement. Create something that will beautify!

From: Melissa Seipp <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

My concern with all the apartment projects, is there is always a lack of parking. There needs to be two parking spots per apartment in the underground garage. Clearly there is no plan to deal with ALL tenant and guest parking, which will overflow into home parking and it is hard enough to park in this neighborhood without these projects. Unless they can ensure that they are providing parking for ALL tenants (all cars of people living there) as well as their guests, I don't want it in the neighborhood.

From: Staci Duke <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

Please stop building apartments that don't have adequate on-site parking. This development doesn't even have one parking space per unit, and common sense dictates that many of those apartments will be leased by couples with two cars. And what about their visitors? We keep seeing this again and again despite telling our leaders that we already don't have enough street parking to accommodate ourselves and our visitors.

It isn't fair to keep overcrowding our neighborhoods so a few developers make more money. It's greed to build a project that has more apartments than parking spaces. It's greed to constantly ask for variances so you can



squeeze your property for every dime. It's greed to pretend your project won't impact local congestion and noise.

Most of these developers do not live in this area, but you do. Please protect us! Taxes are important, of course, but so is the livability of our homes and neighborhoods. We want growth, but we want growth that is thoughtful and measured and helps preserve and enhance our neighborhoods.

From: Meg bond <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

I support this project. I like that it is utilizing energy efficient techniques, along with the all-electric approach. We need more housing in SLC and the lot is currently wasted space. The fact that the units are low rise is also a welcome surprise.

From: Diego Lurati <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

Our streets are already congested in this part of town as it is, we don't need more high density housing that is 1) not affordable for working class families and 2) does not have the necessary parking available for all units. Families do not have .8 cars, especially considering the atrocious public transportation this state has that working class families need to get to and from work, to the grocery stores and beyond.

From: Carrie Moore <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

The parking, noise and congestion is a concern

From: Emily dixon <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

We need affordable housing. If this is not geared towards the people in this community, who are working class, first time home owners and new family's Then I adamantly oppose a new fancy apartment building with huge price tags.

From: Sierra <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body: From: Joe Mason <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

I have looked at the codes and have come to the conclusion that the developers were misleading the conversations.

The codes show that one parking space per unit is the current code. R-MU-35 Residential - 1 Space per dwelling Unit

For them to say otherwise is untrue, without an exception being granted.

This is misleading at best, or dishonest as represented.

Please make sure they are responsible and ethical in dealings.

We continue to have problems with parking in our neighborhoods between 700 East and 500 East between



2100 South and as far south as Stringham and Driggs.

Brixton has already created drama and trauma among neighbors, due to insufficient parking and charging additional for tenants. This overflow has impacted the neighborhood and has made it less safe. There are often people who barely avoid accidents because we can't see around corners, due to too many cars on the streets.

This is a blatant disregard for current residents and for those who should be welcome into a nice and safe place.

Please DO NOT CONTINUE this blatant and negative pattern toward the citizens of Sugarhouse.

From: LARRY DEAN <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

Salt Lake City continues to become more hostile to cars and their owners. The current project on 500 East between 1700 and 2100 will only have parking on the west side of the street eliminating a lot of parking. It's not right that developers can build these boxes and not have to provide parking. As mentioned the parking shortage will fall on the residences near by. From what I've heard and read, more people are driving not less. Until UTA can come up with a way to make their buses and trains safer from the virus fewer people will want to ride them. I don't expect much from the planning commission, The city is incredibly pro developer.

From: Kayla Chandler <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

The lack of parking for these new buildings is alarming! There needs to be 1 parking spot per unit at a minimum.

From: Lynn Lonardo <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

Please, do not allow Izzy North and Izzy South to continue to be built UNLESS they have enough parking for ALL tenants! It would put too much into the surrounding neighborhoods! The owners MUST confirm to the rules! No variances allowed!! It's already going to be crazy on 2100 with all the horrible traffic from all the other apts going up!!!!

Thanks, Lynn Lonardo

From: Brad Bishop <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

50 parking spots for 71 rentals? An average of 2 cars per rental. Where are the other 92 cars going to park? The overflow seems to be heading to my street where my kids play and cars speed by. I am very much against more parked cars on my road creating blind spots for cars driving through.

From: Shannon Legge <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

There is not enough parking planned for this structure. There have been issues with other higher density complexes such as the Braxton forcing residents of both this complex and surrounding single family housing to engage in parking wars. This creates an unsafe environment which attracts accidents due to not being able to see around vehicles while pulling out of drive ways, petty theft, and an unattractive street view that is clogged with cars instead of the beautiful mature trees that line this area. The US Census for Utah in 2018 states the average number of cars per household is 2, the building currently plans only one spot per unit. This is simply



not enough as there are multi bedroom units in this complex along with a need for space for visitors and new tenants. If this area seeks to grow as a multi use space, considerations need to be made regarding parking. If there are shopping areas developed, where will customers park? There will be no curb space available. If more high density units are built, where will those cars go when there is not enough space in those buildings to handle the parking? We don't want cars densely packed on our streets! This is not the Avenues! As additional parking is more costly, the developers might consider renting out any overflow parking. We have an opportunity here to demand the elimination of future years of headaches over parking issues.

I urge you, please, demand the developers provide enough parking on the premises for the residents who live there, their guests, and day visitors. Street parking is not a responsible option.

From: Joe Mason <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

Where are the Off Street Parking or loading facilities on this proposal?

#### 6. Circulation Plan Required<sup>65</sup>

Any application for a building permit shall include a site plan, drawn to scale, and fully dimensioned, showing any off street parking or loading facilities to be provided in compliance with this title. A tabulation of the number of off street vehicle and bicycle parking, loading, and stacking spaces required by this chapter shall appear in a conspicuous place on the plan.

It appears the shown parking spaces are not full sized, so it seems the total on the design may be in question.

Please have the planning commission pay attention to the existing problems created by the Brixton in this same neighborhood.

This is already having major negative consequences, and they actually have 'on street parking' options available on two sides of the building, which the Izzy North and South will not have.

From: Joe Mason <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

Please revisit this statement:

Implemented Environmental Best-Practices

- Lowered required parking to reduce surface area heat gain, water contamination, and emissions

This is true for building new parking lots and structures.

It fails to be true, when you don't require adequate parking within structures being built.

You compound the very thing you state you as environmental best practice.

Making more people fill the streets by parking over and in gutters, which collect dripping oil becomes detrimental to the environment, where when you require the adequate parking inside parking facilities and within the buildings, the owners are more likely to take pride in keeping the facilities clean. This encourages good behaviors and adds responsible building practices to sustain long-term enjoyment.

From: Taylor W Anderson <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:



2100 South is not in step with what residents want in this city. I support this becoming an urban corridor, but we can't realize the full potential of Sugar House if 2100 South is cars-first, cars-only. I support this development, but we need improvements for people outside of cars on 2100 South.

From: Jackie Assaad <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

I think it's incredibly important to make sure there is a realistic amount of parking stall for this project. There should be at least a 1.5-2:1 parking ratio. Having fewer will lead to a lot of people who already live in the neighborhood not being able to park on the street in their neighborhood. There are already a number of houses that do not have any off street parking and have to park on the street. Please please please this is very important to making sure the neighborhood doesn't become an awful parking mess. I am all for development but you need to provide residents parking, as well.

From: Mary Hubbert <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

I (and many of my neighbors) have concerns about parking & traffic related to this building. My residential street (E Elm Ave) is already being used as a bypass for 21st South and have seen increased traffic & more speeders since the apartments built off of 6th South opened. We do not need more. Commonwealth, Elm & Wilmington Aves all have small children in residence. Traffic is especially heavy on Commonwealth & Elm Aves as the streets are wider. Little children do not always look both ways and many cars have no regard for this. They are treated like main thoroughfares.

Parking is another problem. It seems as if there are not enough on-site stalls for each resident, making it necessary to park in residential areas. This is another burden for our neighborhood since there is no street parking on 21st by the proposed apartments. Please take these issues into consideration when making your decisions.

From: George Mcdonald <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

You can NOT allow these buildings (any in this area) to be built without adequate parking. No one is using mass transit, and I'm sure with Covid 19, people will use it less for years to come. Everyone drives, most couples have TWO cars, I experience this on my street constantly. Ask parking enforcement about my address.. I have people blocking my driveway constantly. Please make this a policy. Apartments must have parking (makes sense)!

From: Lauren Fisher <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:  
Hello,

I just learned of this project and the lack of parking proposed for the North Side - Izzy building that goes against code R-MU-35 Residential requiring 1 Space per dwelling unit. We own a home immediately behind the proposed area for the North building where many residents already need to park on the street due to lack of or shared driving way spaces in older homes. With the lack of proposed parking, I'm worried that our street will become even more so congested as residents of this new building have to search for parking off of 2100S. What we love about the area now is that it is open enough for us to see oncoming traffic, bike on, and otherwise enjoy. We want to avoid future parking issues, especially ones that lead to creating a parking permit system like they have in the Avenues, and to do so, new builds need to meet the minimum requirements for



parking--this project included.

Thank you,  
Lauren

From: stephen letendre <[REDACTED]> SLC 84105>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

this area is already congested enough, parking is likely to become a nightmare, more importantly, much more importantly is the expected increase in crime from transient housing. Our geographic area already has one of the highest rates of car burglary and home prowls in the city. Single family homes deserve the privacy they expected upon purchase. These apartments will be looming over the yards of family homes, depriving them of their expected and purchased privacy. Enough with these ugly buildings placing more people on small spaces of land than can realistically house them among those already living on virtually the same space.

From: Stephanie Anderson <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

More massive housing in the sugar house area is not sustainable without designated parking. Our streets are filled with cars already.

We know that many people moving to Utah are for tech jobs these are not located within public transportation areas. We are a commuter state. Until we have a decent public transport system we can not continue to develop like this.

Until we have transportation trends that support a massive shift from individual automotive ownership towards public transit, I feel building for the future without regard to current trends is very ill advised. I feel it would be better to build for the present constraints with adaptability for the future. If the expanded garage is not filled by residents, they can choose to offer parking permits for nearby offices and other high density housing that is in the works or already congesting our streets. If parking becomes so obsolete that 71 units do not need a measly 58 currently planned stalls (which is an issue in itself), or the minimum 150 stalls actually needed in the next 20 years, empty parking garages can be converted into storage, an office space/business hub (Peckham Levels in London), affordable housing/apartments (Broadway Autopark in Wichita), or even a hotel (The Summit in Cincinnati).

From: Kristin hessick <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

please build all new apartments and condos with a minimum of one parking space per unitFrom:

Malaika Homo <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

I'm concerned about this proposed development because of parking issues. I live on 6th E (which is a heavily used bike route) and already with the recent development in the neighborhood there are more vehicles parked in the street. It makes it very difficult to see cyclists (not to mention other cars) coming down the road when I'm trying to get out of my driveway. I worry that additional high-density housing with minimal parking will add to the existing traffic and parking issues .

From: Britney <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback



Message Body:

We built a permitted ADU in the neighborhood and were required to meet all zoning and permitting, which included a designated off street parking for the ADU. To provide developers with exemptions to these requirements is unfair and does not uphold the best interest of our neighborhood. Please take this into consideration.

From: Kaitlin Abare <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: TWENTYONES TAKE TWO Website Feedback

Message Body:

Hello-

I'm very excited that the trash heap that that corner has become will be better utilized! It is an eyesore on our neighborhood and I am at a point of avoiding the block all together due to the filth and dead birds that litter the area. I do however have a few concerns:

- I am all for less driving but given how car centric this city is, the parking spots are insufficient. What will be happening to encourage public transit usage and bike travel to this location?
- What type of traffic changes will happen on 2100 S and 2100 E both during construction and after? I live about a block away on 2100 S and I would like to make sure I am still able to get in and out of my driveway without concern.
- I have seen several rear end crash situations on 2100 S street due to cars slowing down to turn and others speeding and not paying attention, What will be done to ensure pedestrian and vehicle safety when more cars are added to this dangerous mix? UTA buses are some of the worst speeding offenders on this street.
- I am also concerned about local businesses in that area that I frequent and value greatly. The Bean Whole and Blue Plate are businesses that make our neighborhood special and I would hate to see them leave the area. Will they have priority for retail space in the new development?
- Will businesses in this development be able to sell alcohol since there is a school nearby? We really need a bar or pub in this neighborhood and I'm sure I speak for a lot of people in this changing area when I say that it will be easier to put up with construction and increased traffic if I know I can have a have a pint or cocktail with dinner when I patronize the new restaurants in the development.
- What type of signage will it have? The newly rebuilt bank nearby on 2100 S has an incredibly tacky light up sign that glows into the houses across the street and we were never warned about that monstrosity entering our neighborhood.

Since this development will be anchoring this section of Sugar House, it's important to consider the transit paths between here and the larger core section. 2100 S would greatly benefit from bikes lanes, at least from 2100 E to the park. This bike lane would connect to the 2100 E bike lane, making bike commuting more feasible and making the new apartments more desirable. This would also help control speed on 2100 S and make it safer for pedestrians.

With the appropriate traffic mitigation, I am excited to have this new development in the neighborhood and look forward to more dialogue.

Kaitlin

From: Kara Agresta <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: TWENTYONES TAKE TWO Website Feedback

Message Body:

To whom it may concern,

I am reaching out as I have looked at the plans since the blue plate diner has decided to sell to the developer. With the new plans in place they have forgotten to plant trees, where is the outdoor dining and why are they trying to go higher. This will ruin our upper East side community if we have tall buildings in the area for which the developer has plans to do. This is outrageous, maybe for downtown sugarhouse, but at 21st and 21st which is already incredibly busy with small streets. This project will put more kids at risk walking to school due to the amount of traffic that will be added to what is already there. How does the Sugarhouse community council plan on keeping our kids safe walking to school as it's already a busy intersection that is absolute crazy



and only one working crossing guard. as The old plans also had ideas about bike racks to promote biking and less use of vehicles. These new plans look nice on paper, but as a community trying to preserve the area, these plans are way too big for the area, I would really like to see the developer make some plans for trees and to assure that this will be an area that the community can enjoy local businesses, dining outside is a must for restaurants and must be a location that people can safely walk or ride their bike to. Is that in any of the plans? Be an advocate for your neighbors, your friends and family and for our community!

From: Stephanie Oblad <[REDACTED]>

Subject: TWENTYONES TAKE TWO Website Feedback

Message Body:

I am worried about extra height. They didn't need it before, I don't understand why they need it now. More trees! We walk all over this neighborhood to Dilworth and Fresh Market. We need more trees on the side walk. Please use brick or something that makes it look like it fits into the neighborhood. We don't need something that stick outs and looks like a modern eyesore. So many townhomes and new buildings are stark white or use metals on their exterior and they don't fit in. Sugarhouse is losing its charm. There doesn't seem to be a lot of space for outdoor/patio dining. Since it seems like we will have Covid restrictions for the next few years, you need to be able to have outdoor seating for restaurants.

From: Cinda Salazar Eresuma <[REDACTED]>

Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

There is very little to compliment in this design. It doesn't fit the look and feel of the neighborhood, it lacks adequate parking for the residents & their visitors., and it's current design would push parking into the neighborhoods and traffic onto 2100 south. The committee should require modifications. The impact to traffic should also be studied and mitigated. I would ask the builder this question:: How many vehicles do YOU park at your place of residence ? I doubt it's one,

From: Jackie Assaad <[REDACTED]>

Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

I think housing in the area is definitely needed and have no issue with the building of apartments/condos there. My only comment/concern is that these units are not affordable for the people in the neighborhood. There should at least be a few units on the lower end of the pricing spectrum. If I recall correctly, when I walked by there, the units were starting at 4-500's. I think we need more affordable housing before we put in more higher end housing which is all that seems to be getting built in the area. It would also be nice to have some retail or restaurant spaces on the bottom level, as well. Also, to be honest, they're quite ugly looking from the outside.

From: Steve Bunker <[REDACTED]> Salt Lake City, UT 84105>

Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

I'm writing to tell you to stop destroying our historic neighborhoods with these obscenely ugly and overbuilt structures!!! No place is safe anymore from the urban blight of these god-awful, poorly designed buildings that are like a cancer popping up all over our neighborhoods. Every single one of them is clearly built for PROFIT ONLY for the developers, with absolutely no care or consideration on how it will affect the surrounding properties and neighborhoods around it (blocking views, leaving 100-year-old houses with ZERO privacy, and absolutely piss-poor parking and green spaces).

As a homeowner in this neighborhood for 22 years, I am passionate about what happens to my community and I have had enough!!! I am not allowed to build structures on my property that take up more than 25% of the space (I found that out when I couldn't build a new garage the full size I wanted in my small backyard). Who

allowed zoning for this!?! Why is there NEVER any off-street visitor parking or even enough parking for one car per unit (in this current plan)!?! I'm all for building new housing and apartments in our neighborhood but they need to be scaled back to at least half of what is being proposed and designed to fit into the character and nature of the neighborhood. And they need to fully accommodate the needs of the tenants and their guests in their designs and planning without straining and overwhelming the neighborhoods around them.

71 units on this property is appalling!!! It should be cut in half (at least, if not more) and there should be buffer space on the south property line to not encroach and dominate over the houses there. If I'm required to have 75% of my yard (in front and back) be green space and plantings, then EVERY developer should also be required to have at least 25% of the allotted property be green space (not ZERO percent like in these plans). And guest and off-street parking on every one of these developments has been a joke. Every 3-story box townhouse property that has been built around me has zero parking for guests. That means myself and every homeowner in this neighborhood is SUBSIDIZING the developers with our tax dollars to maintain roads and curb/gutters because they are too stingy to provide ample and adequate parking in the development itself. It is obscene that these developers will walk off with MILLIONS of dollars in profit after destroying the aesthetic and livability of our neighborhood, leaving us to fight with tenants over parking spots on residential side streets that shouldn't have to subsidize the developers GREEDY plans and the city's poorly thought out zoning rules.

This particular development is EXTREMELY UGLY, and the thought that there would be a mirror development on the north side of 2100 will make this section of the neighborhood look hideous. WHY DOES NOTHING MATCH OR EVER BLEND IN WITH THE HISTORIC NEIGHBORHOOD AROUND IT!!! In the last 10 years, every single development built not just in the Liberty Wells neighborhood BUT EVERYWHERE are giant EYESORES on the community. We'll look back at this era of architectural building in this city with SHAME because it was all built for greed and profit, not to augment, add to, and beautify each community. We need to build a NEIGHBORHOOD that works for ALL OF US, not line the pockets of developers that have never lived here, have zero respect for the historic communities they're building in, don't understand what quality architecture design is, and don't care or listen to the residents that make this community what it is.

There needs to be a moratorium on any new buildings in this city until zoning is updated to actually take into account all the issues I've addressed above as well as the aesthetic of structures and how they fit in context to the historic ones around them. Liberty Wells and Sugar House are being destroyed before our eyes at the altar of the almighty dollar and it needs to stop now with this, and future developments!

From: Emily Pennock <[REDACTED]>  
Subject:Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

There is a rash of projects like this in Sugarhouse—projects that put modern-day stress on historic neighborhoods. This 1920's neighborhood was never designed or intended to support the kind of cars/traffic imposed by these large, very dense apartments with insufficient parking. Developers are cutting corners to pad their bottom line and forcing our unique and cherished neighborhoods to pick up the tab. The S-Line street car does not provide sufficient service to make this small amount of parking tenable. It's faster to walk than to ride on most stops and a bicycle is still faster from start to finish. The streetcar is another lie between the city and developers, a way to gentrify and exacerbate housing inequality in the city without actually investing in sustainable infrastructure or providing adequate public transit. These projects are part of the Master Plan, but these oversights will be the death of what Sugarhouse has been for generations; the kind of place I want to see survive and adequately adapt to the modern age

From: John Peterson <[REDACTED]>  
Subject:Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

This is a much better looking project than most. I love the style, included businesses and the all-electric approach



From: Charles Bench <[REDACTED]>, SLC UT 84105>

Subject:Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

Please allow these buildings to be built, they would be a welcome addition to our neighborhood.

From: Kerri Wagner <[REDACTED]>

Subject:Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

How many parking stalls in the garage? Our neighborhood has already experienced an increase of street parking, since the Brixton townhouses and apartments went in. Our streets are not equipped to handle more street parkers. We don't have enough street lights. We have too many speeders that kill the squirrels on our streets. And we do not have any speed bumps! Additionally, in the winter having street Parkers make it difficult to have our streets plowed. Please provide more information on the parking requirements for this new structure.

From: Peggy Clark <[REDACTED]>

Subject:Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

71 units and how many parking spaces? 140? Most people who live together have 2 cars.... not 1. There needs to be enough larking spaces or there will be cars parked all over the side streets. The side streets are narrow and 600 E is a bike route. Home owners don't want the overflow cars parking in front our houses. I hope the builder has provided ample parking. for these 71 units.  
PS Also, have them drive down 500 and 600 east so they can see how many cars already park on the street. Grrrrr.

From: Jeff Bair <[REDACTED]> SLC UT 84115>

Subject:Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

Though it's important to reduce the use of cars, we just aren't there yet. There isn't enough parking proposed for this development. With housing costs continuing to rise, most of these units will probably be filled with "roommates" that most likely will mean multiple vehicles per unit. This will mean all of these extra vehicles filling up the adjacent streets making it difficult for residents of those streets to have visitors as they won't be able to find parking.

Again - I encourage the reduction of vehicles and walkable communities, but we also need to be realistic in planning developments like these and the direct impact to the neighborhoods.

From: Mary <[REDACTED]> <Hollywood>

Subject:Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

These are horrible. They don't fit the neighborhood at all. Build something meaningful. Something that won't negatively impact the neighborhood.

No one who can afford these will go without a car. Were any impact studies completed? Guarantees for permitted parking for existing residence? The neighborhood already has speeding problems without any real plans to mitigate that. 70 units is another 100+ adults that need infrastructure that single family residence cant

accommodate in a single block. Seriously the back of the building looks 1000x better than the street facing side.

From: Michael Lobb <[REDACTED]>  
Subject:Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

To all involved,

It seems to me that the general area has and is being overbuilt for the infrastructure currently in place. Once again, the developer is asking for limited parking. The parking issues created at the development on 600 e and approximately 2200 s have already generated safety issues as well as several accidents. Adding a project of this magnitude would further stress the current issues already being pushed to their limits. The general infrastructure for these neighborhoods is old and already in need of repair. Adding the extra population will expedite the needs for repairs/replacement of the current systems and it ends up at the communities expense. We've seen the outcome of poor planning in addressing the developers needs without anticipating the impact on the community. Part of any approval process should include the future costs of dealing with these kinds of issues. We don't need another traffic fiasco like we have on the corner of 2100 s 1100 e. or any of the other nightmares we've experienced.

I've lived in Sugarhouse 60 years and think at this point we have enough high end developments. This project once again doesn't seem to be offering any kind of affordable housing or anything else the City touts about when speaking to the public.

I personally am not in support of this project!

Sincerely,  
Michael Lobb

From: wanda brown <[REDACTED]>  
Subject:Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

I Have the fact that neighbors who are behind this building will have to deal when loosing privacy and parking!

From: Charlotte W. Ovard <[REDACTED]>  
Subject:Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

I see from the article that 71 units will be built, but only 58 parking spaces will be provided. Save yourselves the mounting conflicts of limited parking and the growing anger of the mounting over-crowding issues that have existed for the last 3-5 years and provide either at least 13 more spaces or limit the units to 58. Most couples have more than one car so even providing 13 spaces is NOT enough. Your denial or lack of appropriate planning is making our city and community very congested and extremely unpleasant. Other cities need to take on the ever growing burdens of too much development and population growth.

From: Donna Bradshaw <[REDACTED]>  
Subject:Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

Wow that's a lot of people to add into the area! And how many parking spaces? That's not listed anywhere I could see. Parking is already getting crazy in that area- and everywhere in Liberty Wells, so that it seems like this many people will tax the already difficult parking situation. I don't agree with this and if I could vote against it I would



From: christopher tartaro <[REDACTED]>  
Subject:Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

Sugar House will never be the same. These greedy, big builders and land owners are being allowed to take over a once quaint neighborhood. It is disgusting. It doesn't seem to matter what the people say or do that have lived here for 25 plus years. Why on earth do we need more tacky apartments in the area? Please, someone listen to us. This development needs more off street parking and less units.

From: Tom Barraco <[REDACTED]>  
Subject:Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

I want one parking space for every bedroom to be built on the property itself. This, "they'll take the trolley" doesn't happen. We're heading to a real problem with on-street parking in this area, and it needs to stop. We really need to make these developers do more than make a bunch of money. While we're at it, I really think they need to be taxed more, not special tax considerations for land developers!

From: Emir Tursic <[REDACTED]>  
Subject:Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

The proposed number of parking stalls is inadequate. Recently competed multi family project on 600 E and Wilmington Avenue has flooded the surrounding streets with parked cars and this project will do the same. Residents in this area do not ride the public transportation and rely heavily on cars  
East and West Elevations should be more articulated to reduce the perceived scale of the building.

From: Dean Mellott <[REDACTED]>  
Subject:Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

One main reason for another review of the proposed zoning change is the 2100 South street doesn't have a turn lane for the amount of traffic entering and exiting the Izzy South which will impact commuting drivers on the heavily used 2100 South. It is illegal to cross the double yellow line when traveling westbound to enter the limited parking structure, as well as illegal to exit the Izzy South inadequate parking structure and turn westbound. There are already limited restrictions for automobiles on 600 E when making turns on 2100 S because of the biking route, and recent safety traffic light implemented for bikes and pedestrians.

The south side of Izzy South abutting the single family resident's backyards with the garage exposure, noise and exhaust pollution is unacceptable for an enjoyable relaxing backyard experience. The proposed plan "held the building back from the neighborhood a total of 20' (instead of the 10' required) to account for this increased height request." That 20' set back proposal is at the expense of property tax paying citizens who are having a zoning change for a giant complex placed right up against them and reducing their ascetically pleasing views of the sky and backyard. Is there going to be light pollution from the Izzy South at-grade parking shining in neighboring homes and yards sunset to sunrise year round?

A possible new coffee shop in Izzy South is not needed for there are already established businesses of numerous coffee shops, businesses selling coffee less than a block away. Most importantly, where will patrons park vehicles to enter the shop? Pedestrians will not allow the multi-level coffee shop/restaurant to be profitable. It sounds great on paper for a proposal though there is no parking lot.

The at-grade parking of 58 stalls, a .81 parking ratio isn't 100% of the 71 units and it is simple math.. 71 units with one automobile each and some units with two automobiles, visitors to the units needing a place to park and tenets (reserved parking stalls?) having their parking spaces being taken by visitors doesn't leave options other than parking in the single-family residential area on 600 East and especially Commonwealth & Elm. Just

the 71 units minus the 58 proposed parking stalls leaves a remainder of lucky 13 unavailable people, and if there is only one automobile per unit in Izzy South. Again, where is the parking lot for the west end possible retail? If this project of Izzy South parking issue isn't resolved there will be the same issue with Izzy North in the near future.

There are great examples of residential single-family homes affected by huge parking garages and monster apartment complexes with light pollution and ascetically pleasing, comfortable living they once had as well as the over crowded street parking by tenets on the south side of the S-line between 300 East and 500 East on E Haven Avenue. Though that is in South Salt Lake City it is what will occur in this Izzy South proposal.

If you have any questions please contact me.

From: Bob Farrell <[REDACTED]>  
Subject:Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

I am deeply concerned with the Izzy development. I understand there will only be one parking site per 2 rental units, and these will cost tenants an additional monthly fee. Also, I hear the retail units will not have dedicated parking. This will lead to even more strain on our neighborhood parking, as the tenants of Brixton congest our neighborhood.

In addition, the city chooses not to crack down on the vagrants that live on our streets in their vehicles that congest the area and bring crime such as shootings and nude crack heads menacing the area.

I am hoping our Council is respective of homeowners that care about our area, and limits developers that are not concerned with our way of life.

Respectfully  
Hi Caitlyn,

As a concerned resident living in a home on Redondo Avenue that will be directly behind the Izzy North property, I recently reviewed the mailer sent to my address. While I have many reservations regarding this new development and its effect directly on my household and the homes of my neighbors, one pressing issue stands out. The parking listed (60 stall for 75 units with no visible parking for the Izzy pub) is by no means sufficient to accommodate the number of dwellings planned, let alone a business that will need additional parking for patrons. What plans are in place for parking to accommodate not only residents of Izzy North and South, but customers of the future businesses? There are no parking options available on 2100 South, and my own home has no off-street parking. This leaves me in fear of our small residential streets overflowing with cars and my family with no place to park at our home of over 17 years. I have seen this happen in other neighborhoods in Salt Lake City when a new business or apartment moves in without providing adequate parking spaces. It would break my heart to feel forced out of my own home due to a lack of parking. This is of utmost importance to me, so please respond and address the concerns I have regarding the proposed Izzy project. I look forward to hearing from you.

Thank you for your time,

Adriana Pinto

From: Thea Brannon <[REDACTED]>  
Subject:Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

The bland and tacky facade is too monolithic. I think it would be OK to allow 2 or 3 feet of added height for intermittent, interesting facade extensions such as in Holladay project, which is infinitely more attractive. The proposed outdoor eating area next to a driveway and underneath the upper apartment is extremely uninviting. Burger in a cave with exhaust on the side, anyone? Ditto on the other two. Save the large trees for



clean air and a chunk of the green natural world as valuable amenity for the project and the proposed diners and shoppers. Enough asphalt and concrete!

From: Thea Brannon <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

Ugly, ugly, ugly design. I figure realistically you need about 100 parking spaces, and I can't see where plan says how many are provided, but I'm sure it won't be anywhere near enough. The houses on the street behind are very cute and have a relaxed feel. N-S street quiet--if this plan is approved as is, the neighborhood will be inundated with parked cars. And it's SO UGLY!

Hi Judi, a few comments regarding last night's LUZ meeting:

While I very much admire the design of the Izzy project on 21st So., the recurring issue for all of our Sugar House neighborhoods is that of on-street parking. Why is it that the City Council/ City Planning seem to favor developers rather than their constituents in the neighborhoods? This is a seemingly constant cry for fairness and consideration; it's time to address this issue. Can the SH Council request the City give this issue some serious

study and dialog with those affected most by the approval of apartment buildings in single family neighborhoods? It seems that the problem could be somewhat resolved if (as Lynn suggested) parking was automatically part of the rental agreement with a proviso that if the renter did not own an automobile, he/she would have the option of renting the space to another resident (who might have 2 autos) or allowing the space to have a storage unit....The parking standard of the City needs to be altered; it is disingenuous to burden neighborhoods to accommodate developers!

In the case of the Izzy project, there is a possibility that residents would attempt to utilize the Uinta Golf parking lot or that of St. Anns Church/School.!

On a positive note, the Izzy project design has some style--not the predominant "box/cargo container" style that has been approved throughout the City. I still have a problem with the "no setback" from the sidewalk.  
Patsy McNamara

From: Sharon Cotterill <[REDACTED]>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

I am opposed to the development because of inadequate parking for the number of units proposed. If this were 2050, maybe providing less than one Parking space for each unit is adequate but for today and the foreseeable future, there is insufficient parking allocated for these units. People can take mass transit for work, BUT they will more than likely own a car, or more than one per unit. YOU ARE PUTTING THE WEIGHT OF ADDITIONAL HOUSING ON ESTABLISHED NEIGHBORHOODS AND THAT IS NOT FAIR, TO THOSE WHO LIVE IN THESE ESTABLISHED NEIGHBORHOODS, we deserve to have our neighborhoods safe. Having to deal with unknown cars parking wherever they want for days on end because of a shortSighted council willing to approve a project they know will cause tension in the neighborhood is unconscionable. The cry of those who say NIMBY is not what I am saying, but to knowingly approve a project that will dramatically impact those streets where overflow parking will occur, is a dereliction of duty to the current taxpayers of the community. These are NOT affordable housing units. It is to squeeze as much as YOU allow into a small space. Five years from now, it will be a trash dump and an eyesore.

## High Boy Izzy South project destroys 2100 S. traffic throughput

george chapman <gechapman2@gmail.com>

Mon, Jul 6, 2020 at 4:25 PM

To: caitlyn.miller@slcgov.com

Cc: "Larsen, Jonathan" <jon.larsen@slcgov.com>, nick norris <nick.norris@slcgov.com>, Judi Short <[REDACTED]>, Levi Thatcher <[REDACTED]>, Larry Migliaccio <[REDACTED]>, Landon Clark <[REDACTED]>

I call the Planning Department's (and Transportation's) attention to the fact that the proposed project (Case number PLNPCM2020-00222) adds driveways to 2100 South and decreases safety for pedestrians and bicyclists due to the encouragement of more traffic exiting and entering the project from 2100 South (4+ driveways).

It effectively destroys a major east west bicycle route and does not increase sidewalk width. Left hand turns are 3 times more likely to kill or severely injure pedestrians and bicyclists. Senior citizens are most at risk of being killed in a left hand turn. Median age of bicyclists and pedestrians killed by left hand turns is 67 years old. 36% of all accidents occur during a turn. And left hand turns are two times more fatal than right hand turns.

The buildings should have ground floor retail to encourage mixed use which was what the area's last major rezone planned (the Sugar House Streetcar Form Based Zoning). The design effectively creates a zombie building. That encourages unwalkable areas since the ground floor is closed to pedestrian engagement.

Adding entrances and exits onto major arterials like 2100 South will back up traffic and increase air pollution on a road that is maxed out at almost 18,000 ADT. The result will be like the Chick A Fil restaurant (1200 East) that backs up eastbound traffic on 2100 S during evening rush hour. Poor planning effectively increases pollution in that case and it is also part of this plan.

Due to the significant danger to pedestrians and bicyclists that this project creates, I urge Planning to find that it should not be approved. I would not be so against this project if all of the exits and entrances were on 600 East and 500 East which have much less traffic. This project, as planned, will kill.

George Chapman



HIGH BOY VENTURES | IZZY SOUTH



## 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South)



The **Sugar House Community Council** has a request to review the proposal to build an apartment building at this location, just west of Uintah Golf.

Please read the proposal on our website, and give us your feedback using the comment form. We will send comments along with our letter to the Planning Commission. This is for a 3-story building with 71 apartments. It will be an all-electric building, and potentially solar panels on the roof.

This proposal will be on the agenda of the Sugar House Community Council Land Use and Zoning Committee May 18 at 6 pm. This will be a virtual meeting. If you provide a comment, we will email the link to join the meeting using Zoom.

Go here to review the plans and provide a comment.

[Plans for 542 South 2100 East](#)



## 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South)



The **Sugar House Community Council** has a request to review the proposal to build an apartment building at this location, just west of Uintah Golf.

Please read the proposal on our website, and give us your feedback using the comment form. We will send comments along with our letter to the Planning Commission. This is for a 3-story building with 71 apartments. It will be an all-electric building, and potentially solar panels on the roof.

This proposal will be on the agenda of the Sugar House Community Council Land Use and Zoning Committee May 18 at 6 pm. This will be a virtual meeting. If you provide a comment, we will email the link to join the meeting using Zoom.

Go here to review the plans and provide a comment.

[Plans for 542 South 2100 East](#)



## 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South)



The **Sugar House Community Council** has a request to review the proposal to build an apartment building at this location, just west of Uintah Golf.

Please read the proposal on our website, and give us your feedback using the comment form. We will send comments along with our letter to the Planning Commission. This is for a 3-story building with 71 apartments. It will be an all-electric building, and potentially solar panels on the roof.

**This proposal will be on the agenda of the Sugar House Community Council Land Use and Zoning Committee May 18 at 6 pm. This will be a virtual meeting. If you provide a comment, we will email the link to join the meeting using Zoom.**

Go here to review the plans and provide a comment.

[Plans for 542 South 2100 East](#)



## 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South)



The **Sugar House Community Council** has a request to review the proposal to build an apartment building at this location, just west of Uintah Golf.

Please read the proposal on our website, and give us your feedback using the comment form. We will send comments along with our letter to the Planning Commission. This is for a 3-story building with 71 apartments. It will be an all-electric building, and potentially solar panels on the roof.


**This proposal will be on the agenda of the Sugar House Community Council Land Use and Zoning Committee May 18 at 6 pm. This will be a virtual meeting. If you provide a comment, we will email the link to join the meeting using Zoom.**

Go here to review the plans and provide a comment.

[Plans for 542 South 2100 East](#)









[www.facebook.com/libertywellscommunitycouncil](https://www.facebook.com/libertywellscommunitycouncil)  
[www.lwccslc.org](http://www.lwccslc.org)

## Letter of General Endorsement

**Project Name:** Izzy South, 540 East 2100 South, SLC

**Architect:** AJC Architects

**Developer:** High Boy Ventures

**Petition Number:** [PLNPCM2020-00222](#)

8/20/2020

Caitlyn Miller and the Salt Lake Planning Commission,

The Liberty Wells Community Council (501c3 non-profit) a recognized SLC Community Organization officially endorses the Izzy South Development, Petition PLNPCM2020-00222.

The developer has visited with us on three separate occasions, twice at monthly public meetings and once at our official board meeting. The general consensus on this project is positive. We appreciate the design elements the developer has planned which make the project more unique for our neighborhood. The concept of studio units designed to appeal to young professionals is acceptable. Furthermore, the developer creating a communal space for a coffee shop or something similar is appealing to the overall benefits of this development to the community. The proposed height of this project is also acceptable. The project's location along 21<sup>st</sup> South and near the S-Line is ideal for those that choose not to have a car but rather use public transit and other modes of transportation. This includes close access to the 6<sup>th</sup> East bike trail which furthers the mission to reduce the overall carbon footprint of developments in Salt Lake City. In summary we approve this project as it has been proposed.

Sincerely,

Liberty Wells Community Council



**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Miller, Caitlyn](#)  
**Subject:** (EXTERNAL) concerns and questions regarding the proposed Izzy north project  
**Date:** Sunday, July 26, 2020 10:32:32 AM

---

Good morning. My name is Maxwell Loll, I own and reside at [REDACTED] in Salt Lake City. I recently received a notice of the proposed future development project, Izzy North. My rear property line adjoins this project site. One of my major concerns is that currently the project site elevation is roughly 4 feet higher than my property elevation, with a cinder block retaining wall and chain link security fence separating the properties. Any means or measures towards this wall and fencing will compromise the safety and security of my property, also concerning is the drainage from any structure built near the property line. I DO NOT want my property to flood during a storm or melt cycle because of improper drainage or negligent construction practices. I also DO NOT want the dividing wall or fence removed, adjusted, changed or compromised in any way shape or form. This would allow easy and open access to my property by any and all unknown person(s). This is a major safety concern for not just me, but also all of my neighbors and the entire neighborhood. Any compromise of safety towards current and future neighborhood residents regarding this development will not be acceptable or tolerated. Previous zoning changes have been made towards any development which may be put on that site. I do hope and wish the newest zoning changes and mandates that we as a community had to fight for are followed and not simply changed or overlooked. Salt Lake City and county have have been know to "bend" zoning issues, all in the name of progress and development. This does have a major negative impact in existing residents.

If possible, please sent me any and all information you have on the Izzy North project.

Thank You for your time and consideration regarding this matter. I look forward to hearing from you and others.

Max Loll

**From:** [george.chapman](#)  
**To:** [Miller, Caitlyn](#)  
**Cc:** [Larsen, Jonathan](#); [Norris, Nick](#); [Judi Short](#); [Levi Thatcher](#); [Larry Migliaccio](#); [Sugar House](#)  
**Subject:** (EXTERNAL) High Boy Izzy South project destroys 2100 S. traffic throughput  
**Date:** Monday, July 6, 2020 4:25:31 PM

---

I call the Planning Department's (and Transportation's) attention to the fact that the proposed project (Case number PLNPCM2020-00222) adds driveways to 2100 South and decreases safety for pedestrians and bicyclists due to the encouragement of more traffic exiting and entering the project from 2100 South (4+ driveways).

It effectively destroys a major east west bicycle route and does not increase sidewalk width. Left hand turns are 3 times more likely to kill or severely injure pedestrians and bicyclists. Senior citizens are most at risk of being killed in a left hand turn. Median age of bicyclists and pedestrians killed by left hand turns is 67 years old. 36% of all accidents occur during a turn. And left hand turns are two times more fatal than right hand turns.

The buildings should have ground floor retail to encourage mixed use which was what the area's last major rezone planned (the Sugar House Streetcar Form Based Zoning). The design effectively creates a zombie building. That encourages unwalkable areas since the ground floor is closed to pedestrian engagement.

Adding entrances and exits onto major arterials like 2100 South will back up traffic and increase air pollution on a road that is maxed out at almost 18,000 ADT. The result will be like the Chick A Fil restaurant (1200 East) that backs up eastbound traffic on 2100 S during evening rush hour. Poor planning effectively increases pollution in that case and it is also part of this plan.

Due to the significant danger to pedestrians and bicyclists that this project creates, I urge Planning to find that it should not be approved. I would not be so against this project if all of the exits and entrances were on 600 East and 500 East which have much less traffic. This project, as planned, will kill.

George Chapman

[REDACTED]

Salt Lake City

[REDACTED]

·  
HIGH BOY VENTURES | IZZY SOUTH



**From:** [Adriana Pinto](#)  
**To:** [Miller, Caitlyn](#)  
**Subject:** (EXTERNAL) Izzy Project Concerns  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 30, 2020 8:34:40 AM

---

Hi Caitlyn,

As a concerned resident living in a home on Redondo Avenue that will be directly behind the Izzy North property, I recently reviewed the mailer sent to my address. While I have many reservations regarding this new development and its effect directly on my household and the homes of my neighbors, one pressing issue stands out. The parking listed (60 stall for 75 units with no visible parking for the Izzy pub) is by no means sufficient to accommodate the number of dwellings planned, let alone a business that will need additional parking for patrons. What plans are in place for parking to accommodate not only residents of Izzy North and South, but customers of the future businesses? There are no parking options available on 2100 South, and my own home has no off-street parking. This leaves me in fear of our small residential streets overflowing with cars and my family with no place to park at our home of over 17 years. I have seen this happen in other neighborhoods in Salt Lake City when a new business or apartment moves in without providing adequate parking spaces. It would break my heart to feel forced out of my own home due to a lack of parking. This is of utmost importance to me, so please respond and address the concerns I have regarding the proposed Izzy project. I look forward to hearing from you.

Thank you for your time,

Adriana Pinto

**From:** [Suzanne Stensaas](#)  
**To:** [Miller, Caitlyn](#)  
**Subject:** (EXTERNAL) Izzy South Design Review  
**Date:** Friday, August 14, 2020 12:13:05 PM

---

**3. Izzy South Design Review at approximately 534 East 2100 South** - Ryan McMullen, Applicant, is requesting Design Review approval for a proposed 71-unit mixed use building located at approximately 534 East 2100 South by the name of "Izzy South." The Applicant is requesting a modification of the maximum height requirement to accommodate architectural features on the front-facing façade of the proposed building. The property is zoned CB (Community Business) and is located within Council District 7, represented by Amy Fowler. (Staff Contact: Caitlyn Miller at (385) 202-4689 or [caitlyn.miller@slcgov.com](mailto:caitlyn.miller@slcgov.com)) **Case number PLNPCM2020-00222**

I don't know how to comment on this but this area is residential and this is too high. I also resent that there is not more setback and requirement for trees, green space, planning, wider sidewalk . This applies to all of Sugar House and 2100 South. I live in Sugar House area and travel up and down 2100 S and am appalled at the lack to green space and setback on properties.

Suzanne S. Stensaas

[REDACTED]

Salt Lake City, Utah 84109, USA

Telephone [REDACTED] Skype: [REDACTED]

email: [REDACTED]




**From:** [T Logan S](#)  
**To:** [Miller, Caitlyn](#); [Tegan Tingley](#)  
**Subject:** (EXTERNAL) Izzy South Public Comment  
**Date:** Friday, July 31, 2020 7:14:39 AM  
**Attachments:** [image.png](#)

---


Case number PLNPCM2020-00222

### Comments

Parking is going to be the crux with this project, especially with the proposed commercial use. Izzy South has 70 proposed units. With 1.25 stall/unit ratio the developer would need about 87.5 Stalls. Adding 1150 Sf of commercial parked at 5 stalls per 1000 sf equals 5.75 stalls. Total 93.25 stalls. Round up to 94 Stalls - 60 provided = 34 stall deficient. Where do these cars park? 500 E, Commonwealth, 600 E. At 22' per car this equals 748 linear feet. Where does the impact of these cars go? See attached take off. The red line is approx. 980 Linear feet. This does not account for curb cuts. So, my guess is that most of Commonwealth will be parked by this development (worst case scenario) upon full occupancy. However, I believe that MUR land use is better than the existing land use. I think the solution would be for the developer to give back to Commonwealth by paying for bulb-outs at the intersection of 500 E and 600 E and a mid-block speed bump. This would encourage traffic calming measures and reduce the number of cut-throughs. Another ask would is to plant trees at 1 per 30 lf. in the park strip where there are currently no trees along Commonwealth Ave. Maybe the SLC can help split the cost with the Developer for this? This "gift" will help the residences directly south of the development come at terms with a new 3 story development in their back yard come to accept the development.



Regards,  
Tyler Smithson



**From:** [TOM COTTERILL](#)  
**To:** [Zoning](#)  
**Subject:** (EXTERNAL) PLNPCM2020-00222  
**Date:** Tuesday, August 18, 2020 10:26:35 AM

---

**MS. MILLER:**

**RE: IZZY SOUTH**

MY NAME IS TOM COTTERILL. SHARON & I HAVE LIVED AT [REDACTED] FOR ABOUT 30 YEARS. DEVELOPMENT IN OUR NEIGHBORHOOD IS INEVITABLE. I'M CONCERNED ABOUT PARKING & TRAFFIC ON 2100 S. WITH THIS PARTICULAR DEVELOPMENT. THE DEVELOPMENT ON 600 E NEAR THE STREETCAR LINE IS ATROCIOUS. SIDE STREET PARKING SHOULD BE PROHIBITED AND ALL VIOLATIONS OUGHT TO GO DIRECTLY TO RYAN McMILLAN & HIS ASSOCIATES.

WOULD RYAN MCMILLAN OR ANY OF HIS GROUP CHOOSE TO LIVE IN THIS NEIGHBORHOOD WHEN IT IS DONE? WE WILL NOT BE PARTICIPATING IN THE WebEX SESSION BUT I WANTED TO GIVE YOU MY OPINIONS ON THIS MATTER.

TOM C.



Members of the Commission,

Attached to this letter are photos illustrating the current parking situation around the proposed Izzy South development. The first few pages of the letter show a map of the proposed Izzy South and the nearby Brixton development. Also included is a map of the nearby Zeller development in South Salt Lake, as well as photos of full street parking near the Zeller.

The attachments similarly show photos of full parking spaces along the residential streets near the Brixton development, which is situated at 600 East and Wilmington Avenue. The photos in the attachments were taken on various day and at various times over the stretch of about two weeks. We have also included photographs of parking violations that are common to this area. Finally, we have included a report that shows the current lack of available off-street parking and the dearth of ridership along the adjacent UTA S-Line.

These photos and reports illustrate why the Izzy South's current parking plan is inadequate. The Brixton and Zeller, which were built with more off-street parking than Izzy South has planned, have resulted in overcrowded streets and daily parking violations. The Izzy South will result in ever more overcrowding on streets that already suffer from a lack of off-street parking and, as the ridership data shows, this is unlikely to be resolved by the nearby S-Line.

The Sugar House Community Council urges the Commission to require the Izzy South to build more off-street parking to resolve these issues.

Respectfully,

The Sugar House Community Council





### Table of Contents


- Cover Letter
- Map of Proposed Izzy Development, Brixton Development, and Photos of Street Parking around the South Salt Lake Zeller Development
- Attachment 1 – Parking Photos (600 E between 2100 S and S-Line)
- Attachment 2 – Parking Photos (Wilmington Ave. between 600 E and 700 E)
- Attachment 3 – Parking Photos (Wilmington Ave. between 500 E and 600 E)
- Attachment 4 – Parking Photos (Green Street south of Simpson Ave.)
- Attachment 5 – Photos Showing Parking Violations
- Attachment 6 – Current Residential Parking Report
- Attachment 7 – UTA Ridership Data








## Vicinity Map





**Brixton  
Apartments**



4 lots on the north side of Commonwealth ave have no driveways for parking options.









Notice the parking too close to the corners and full frontal parking filled down Wilmington Ave east and west of 600 East.


Parking is extended North and south on 600 East, beyond the tracks line and past Simpson Ave and north of Elm Street.






Inside garage parking at the Zeller is designed for 1.3 per living unit with a \$50 per parking space fee. Visitors and tenants are still parking up to 3 blocks from facility, due to insufficient exterior parking options.











# Attachment 1



08.05 am 600 e 3



08.01 AM 5 (600 E)




08.01 AM 2 (600 E)



07.30 PM 6



07.29 PM 3



07.30 PM 4


**600 E (between 2100 S and S Line)**



# Attachment 2



Wilmington  
07.26 AM 2



08.09 am Wilmington  
(600 - 700 )1




08.05 am  
Wilminton 2



08.05 am  
Wilmington 1



07.30 PM 1



07.30 PM 3

**Wilmington (between 600 E and 700 E)**



# Attachment 3



Wilmington  
07.26 AM



08.09 am Wilmington  
(500-600) 2



08.09 am Wilmington  
(500-600) 1



08.01 AM 1  
( Wilmington 500 - 600)



07.30 PM 1



07.30 PM 2

**Wilmington (between 500 E and 600 E)**



# Attachment 4



08.19 PM 3



08.19 PM 2





08.19 PM 1

**Green Street (South of Simpson Avenue)**



# Attachment 5



## Parking Violations



# Attachment 6

Street	House #	Driveways	Vehicles	Street	House #	Driveways	Vehicles	Street	House #	Driveways	Vehicles	Street	House #	Driveways	Vehicles
500 E - East Side	7-11 Store			Wilmington - 600-700 East				Elm Ave - North	521	2	3	Elm Ave - South	524	1	3
	2125	2	1		603	1	3		533	1	4		528	2	6
	???	1	2		609	1	2		537	1	1		532	1	4
	2147	1	2		615	1	2		543	1	2		536	1	2
	???		2		619	0	1		551	1	2		542	1	1
	2155	1	2		621	0	1		557	1	2		546	1	3
	2168	1	3		625	1	2		563	1	2		550	1	3
	Dave & Ellen	2	5		633	1	2		573	1	2		556	1	2
	2193	1	2		635	1	4		579	2	2		560	1	2
	2197	2	2		641	1	3						564	1	1
	2209	2	1		653	1	2						568	1	1
	2213	1	1		657	1	1						574	1	2
					659	1	6	Total		11	20			13	30
					991	1	3								
					663	1	2	Wilmington - North	517	1	2	Wilmington - South	516	1	2
Total		14	23			12	34		523	1	2		520	1	3
600 East - East	Coffee Shop			600 East - West Side	Warehouse				527	1	2		5??	1	
	2119	2	2		2218	1	3		531	1	2		530	1	3
	2123	1	2		2214	1	3		535	2	3		536	1	2
	2129	1	2		2208	1	2		541	1	4		540	1	1
	???	1	2		2198	2	2		545	1	2		544	1	2
	2139	1	3		2194	1	1		549	1	4		550	1	2
	2145	1	2		2188	1	1		555	1	2		554	1	3
	2149	1	2		2184	1	1		559	2	2		550	1	3
	2153	1	3		2180	1	1		563	1	1		562	1	4
	2157	1	1		2176	1	1		567	1	1		5??		2
	2165	1	2		2160	1	2	Total	573	1	2		572	1	2
	2167	1			2158	1	2			15	29			12	29
	2169		2		2144	2	3	Combined Totals	Driveway	164	259	Cars	Total Properties	109	
	Alley				2124	3	3						Ave Cars per house	2.38	
Total		12	23			17	25								
Commonwealth - North	523	1	2	Commonwealth - South	520	2	2	<div>Total Properties109</div> <div>Total Driveways164</div> <div>Total Cars259</div> <div>Average Cars2.38 per house</div>							
	527	1	2		526	2	2								
	533	1	3		538	1	2								
	537	2	3		540	1	1								
	543	1	3		548	1	2								
	5??	1	2		554	1	1								
	551	1	2		562	2	2								
	557		3		568	1	2								
	Empty Lot				570	1	2								
	567	1	3		576	1	1								
	579	1	3		580	1	2								
					586		1								
Total		10	26			14	20								



# Attachment 7

ObjectId	NTD_Mode	Sub_Cat	Month	WKD2017	WKD2018	WKD2019	WKD2020	2017	2018	2019	2020
	Type of Tra	Sub_Cat		Total Rider	Total Rider	Total Rider	Total Rider	# per day	# per day	# per day	# per day
25	Light Rail	S Line	January	1312	1357	1181	1331	42.3	43.8	38.1	42.9
26	Light Rail	S Line	February	1364	1389	1180	1457	48.7	49.6	42.1	50.2
27	Light Rail	S Line	March	1437	1359	1183	1162	46.4	43.8	38.2	37.5
28	Light Rail	S Line	April	1415	1381	1253	653	47.2	46	41.8	21.8
29	Light Rail	S Line	May	1481	1386	1238	550	47.8	44.7	39.9	17.7
30	Light Rail	S Line	June	1500	1421	1300	580	50	47.4	43.3	19.3
31	Light Rail	S Line	July	1444	1334	1311		46.6	43	42.3	
32	Light Rail	S Line	August	1586	1385	1370		51.2	44.7	44.2	
33	Light Rail	S Line	September	1458	1414	1501		47.1	50		
34	Light Rail	S Line	October	1440	1329	1379		48.6	42.9	44.5	
35	Light Rail	S Line	November	1377	1265	1389		46.5	42.2	46.3	
36	Light Rail	S Line	December	1386	1199	1345		45.9	38.7	43.4	
								44.7			



## **ATTACHMENT G: Department Review Comments**

---

Sustainability: No comment

### **Building Services:**

There are four items of concern that I see in this design that will need to be addressed:

- The west stair, as Ted mentioned, cannot exit through the pub. Neither stair can exit through the parking garage. The exit from the building must be clear and discernable after exiting the fire-resistance rated stair enclosure. See IBC 1028.1.
- Elevators cannot open into a protected stair enclosure. See IBC 1023.4.
- The egress path on the east side of the building will need to comply with IBC 1024.8. This includes fire-resistance ratings for any structure to the east of the egress court within the required width.
- There is an opening in the parking garage on the west wall. No openings are allowed within 3' of a property line per IBC 705.8.

The stair to the left cannot exit through the pub. The building will require an AM&M increase for fire department access. automatic fire sprinkler system to a density plus 0.05 GPM/1 sq. ft. and maybe required to have wet standpipes.

### **Engineering:**

No objections.

Prior to performing work in the public way, a Permit to Work in the Public Way must be obtained from SLC Engineering by a licensed contractor who has a bond and insurance on file with SLC Engineering.

### **Transportation:**

Transportation has no issue with the extra height. The plans should include parking calculations. The location of bike racks should be shown on the drawings. The plans should show ten foot sight distance triangles at the egress of the parking area.

Public Utilities: No comments

Fire: No comments

Urban Forestry: Street trees have been approved (see attached letter)

## Ryan McMullen

---

**From:** James Zaugg <JZaugg@greatbasineng.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 31, 2020 3:28 PM  
**To:** Ryan McMullen  
**Subject:** FW: (EXTERNAL) The Izzy South Forestry review

Ryan,

Below is an email from Nate Orbock, SLC Forester, approving the tree species for the street trees for Izzy South.

-Jim Zaugg

---

**From:** Orbock, Nathaniel <Nathaniel.Orbock@slcgov.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, August 31, 2020 3:00 PM  
**To:** James Zaugg <JZaugg@greatbasineng.com>  
**Subject:** RE: (EXTERNAL) The Izzy South Forestry review

Jim,

Will this project be going through Project Dox?

I've reviewed the landscape plan and serviceberry is an acceptable choice for the parkstrip at the listed address, 542 E 2100 S. Serviceberry can come in clump form or tree form, so please note that we will require tree form to be planted in a 2" caliper. Urban Forestry will need to issue a planting permit to someone associated with this project as well.

Thanks,

Nate Orbock  
Forest Area Service Coordinator  
ISA Certified Arborist/Tree Risk Assessment Qualification

URBAN FORESTRY DIVISION  
SALT LAKE CITY CORPORATION

TEL 801-972-7840  
FAX 801-972-7847



---

**From:** Forestry, Urban <[Urban.Forestry@slcgov.com](mailto:Urban.Forestry@slcgov.com)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 27, 2020 7:39 AM



**To:** Orbock, Nathaniel <[Nathaniel.Orbock@slcgov.com](mailto:Nathaniel.Orbock@slcgov.com)>

**Subject:** FW: (EXTERNAL) The Izzy South Forestry review

Sr is in tk.

ELLIE HARDMAN

Office Tech II

URBAN FORESTRY PROGRAM  
SALT LAKE CITY CORPORATION

TEL 801-972-7818

FAX 801-972-7821



---

**From:** James Zaugg <[JZaugg@greatbasineng.com](mailto:JZaugg@greatbasineng.com)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 26, 2020 3:01 PM

**To:** Forestry, Urban <[Urban.Forestry@slcgov.com](mailto:Urban.Forestry@slcgov.com)>

**Subject:** (EXTERNAL) The Izzy South Forestry review

Dear Urban Forester,

I have been asked by the City Planner to get a confirmation from the Urban Forester on our tree selections along 2100 south prior to the planning commission meeting.

The planning application number is PLNPCM2020-00222 for design review.

We have a 3' park strip and are planning on planting Robin Hill Serviceberries in the park strip. See the attached plan.

The address of the property is:

542 East 2100 South

Salt Lake City, UT 84106

Sincerely,

Jim Zaugg



**Attachment C: Minutes from December 2, 2020**



**SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**This meeting was held electronically pursuant to the**  
**Salt Lake City Emergency Proclamation**  
**Wednesday, December 2, 2020**

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:30:15 PM](#). Audio recordings of the Planning Commission meetings are retained for a period of time.

Present for the Planning Commission meeting were: Chairperson, Brenda Scheer; Vice-Chairperson, Amy Barry; Commissioners Andres Paredes,Carolynn Hoskins, Maurine Bachman, Matt Lyon, Adrienne Bell, Jon Lee, and Sara Urquhart.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Nick Norris, Planning Director; Wayne Mills, Planning Manager; Paul Nielson, Attorney; Caitlyn Miller, Principal Planner; Aaron Barlow, Principal Planner; David Gellner, Principal Planner; Mayara Lima, Principal Planner; and Marlene Rankins, Administrative Secretary.

Chairperson Brenda Scheer read the Salt Lake City Emergency declaration.

**REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR** [5:31:53 PM](#)

Chairperson Scheer stated she had nothing to report.

Vice Chairperson Barry stated she had nothing to report.

**REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR** [5:32:04 PM](#)

Nick Norris, Planning Director, stated he had nothing to report.

[5:32:30 PM](#)

**Izzy South Design Review/Special Exception at approximately 534 East 2100 South** - A request by Ryan McMullen for Design Review and Special Exception approval to develop a 71-unit mixed use building located at approximately 534 East 2100 South in the Community Business CB zoning district. The applicant is requesting Design Review approval because the project is over 15,000 square feet in size and Special Exception approval to allow 3' of additional building height. The project is located within Council District 7, represented by Amy Fowler (Staff contact: Caitlyn Miller at (385) 315- 8115 or [caitlyn.miller@slcgov.com](mailto:caitlyn.miller@slcgov.com)) **Case numbers PLNPCM2020-00222 & PLNPCM2020-00655** (Tabled from 9/23 Planning Commission meeting)

Caitlyn Miller, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff recommended that the Planning Commission approve the request.

Justin Heppler, applicant, provided a presentation with further details.

**PUBLIC HEARING** [5:47:29 PM](#)

Chairperson Scheer opened the Public Hearing;

Caitlin Lutsch, Liberty Wells Community Council – Stated her support of the request and that the community was mostly supportive of the project except for the few concerns previously mentioned at the September 23, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting.

Joe Mason – Stated his support of the request. He also raised concern with the compatibility of the neighborhood.

Scott Doutre – Stated his concerns with the compatibility of the neighborhood.

Shane Stroud – Raised concerns with parking and stated his opposition of the request.

Liz Schwab – Raised concerns with parking.

Bob Farrell – Raised concerns with parking issues.

Soren Simonsen – Stated his support of the request.

Wanda Brown – Raised concerns parking, noise and light pollution.

Aikona Leafaitulagi – Stated her opposition of the request.

Judi Short, Sugar House Community Council - Provided an email comment raising concerns with parking and opposition of the request.

Seeing no one else wished to speak; Chairperson Scheer closed the Public Hearing.

The applicant addressed the public comments and concerns.

The Commission made the following comments:

- I'm generally supportive at this point in time based on the standards before us
- I believe the applicant addressed the concerns that were set forth

#### **MOTION [6:18:30 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Bell stated, based on the information in the staff report, the information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, I move that the Planning Commission approve petition numbers PLNPCM2020-00222 and PLNPCM2020-00655, a Design Review and Special Exception request, respectively, for Izzy South located at approximately 534 East 2100 South.**

**Commissioner Lee seconded the motion. Commissioners Bachman, Barry, Bell, Hoskins, Lee, Lyon, and Urquhart voted “Aye”. Commissioner Paredes voted “Nay”. The motion passed 7-1.**

#### **[6:21:24 PM](#)**

**Kozo House Design Review at approximately 157, 175 North 600 West, and 613, 621, 625, 633 West 200 North** - A request by David Clayton for Design Review approval to develop a 319-unit mixed use building on six parcels located at 157 North 600 West, 175 North 600 West, 613 West 200 North, 621 West 200 North, 625 West 200 North, and 633 West 200 North. These properties are located in the TSAUC-T Zoning District. The applicant is requesting Design Review approval to allow the proposed building to exceed the maximum street facing façade length and to modify the spacing of building entrances. The project is located within Council District 3, represented by Chris Wharton (Staff contact: Caitlyn Miller at (385) 315- 8115 or caitlyn.miller@slcgov.com) **Case number PLNPCM2020-00258** (Tabled from 10/14 Planning Commission meeting)

Commissioner Bell recused herself due to possible conflict of interest.



Caitlyn Miller, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file).

Dallin Jolley and David Clayton, applicants, provided a presentation with further design details.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- Clarification on whether there was a change in number of units
- Clarification on number of parking spaces

**PUBLIC HEARING [6:41:28 PM](#)**

Chairperson Scheer opened the Public Hearing;

Pamela Starley – Stated her opposition of the request.

Keiko Jones – Stated her opposition of the request.

Chelene Fortier – Raised concerns with the parking and stated her opposition of the request.

Antonio Fiero – Stated his opposition of the request.

Aikona Leafaitulagi – Stated her opposition of the request.

Call in user – Stated his opposition of the request and asked the Commission to consider the neighborhoods comments and concerns.

Jason Walker – Stated his opposition of the request.

Seeing no one else wished to speak; Chairperson Scheer closed the Public Hearing.

The applicant address the public comments and concerns.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- Clarification on whether the applicant owns all of the single-family home on the South side of 2<sup>nd</sup> North
- Clarification on how higher density makes property more affordable
- Clarification on how a zoning change takes place
- Clarification on zoning amendments and who is authorized to initiate an amendment
- Clarification on the term “affordable” and what it’s based on
- Height restriction of the core areas
- Clarification on what is included in a score
- Clarification on whether there was communication with the transportation department regarding the traffic flow
- Whether the applicant has had communication with the community council

The Commission made the following comments and discussion:

- I’m in favor of tabling this to hear a better response from transportation
- I’m weighing the project; I think it’s come a long way; I certainly understand where the community is coming from a tight knit community
- Clarification on adding condition to approval and whether it would address the increased load

**MOTION [7:39:23 PM](#)**

Commissioner Barry stated, based on the analysis and findings listed in the staff report, information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, I move that the Planning Commission approve the Design Review request including modifications to the maximum distance between building entrances, maximum length of a blank wall, and maximum length of a street-facing façade (PLNPCM2020-00258) for the Kozo House Apartments project located at approximately 175 North 600 West. This recommendation is based on the conditions of approval listed in the staff report. With the added condition:

**#9 – That a traffic study be conducted with Transportation; specifically looking at the circulation of the increased traffic load and the pedestrian safety regarding the intersection on 200 North and 600 West.**

Final details regarding these conditions of approval are delegated to planning staff.

Commissioner Lee seconded the motion. Commissioners Bachman, Barry, Hoskins, Lee, Lyon, and Urquhart voted “Aye”. Commissioner Paredes voted “Nay”. The motion passed 6-1.

**[7:44:28 PM](#)**

**Learned Ave Alley Vacation at approximately 1025 West North Temple** - A request from Jarod Hall of Di'velept Design, representing the owner of surrounding properties, Riley Rogers, to vacate the public alley adjacent to the rear property line of 1025 West North Temple that runs mid-block from east to west. The subject alley is surrounded by the TSA-SP-T (Special Purpose Transit Station, Transition Area) zoning district and is located within Council District #2, represented by Andrew Johnston (Staff contact: Aaron Barlow at (385) 386-2764 or aaron.barlow@slcgov.com) **Case number PLNPCM2020-00572**

Aaron Barlow, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff recommended that the Planning Commission forward a position recommendation to the City Council with the conditions listed in the staff report.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- Clarification if the surrounding properties have access to their required parking from the alley
- Clarification on whether the Commission can condition alley vacations for affordable housing

Jarod Hall, applicant, provided further information.

**PUBLIC HEARING [7:55:47 PM](#)**

Chairperson Scheer opened the Public Hearing;

Antonio Fiero – Asked whether there the nearby restaurants would be closed down and whether the apartments will be affordable.

Seeing no one else wished to speak; Chairperson Scheer closed the Public Hearing.

The applicant addressed the public's questions.

**MOTION [7:58:22 PM](#)**

Commissioner Bachman stated, based on the findings and analysis in the staff report, the policy considerations for alley vacation, and the input received, I move that the Planning Commission



forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for the alley vacation proposed in PLNPCM2020-00572 with the conditions listed in the staff report.

Commissioner Hoskins seconded the motion.

Commissioner Lyon asked to make a friendly amendment; to add a condition that the City Council also explore adding affordable housing. Commissioner Bachman accepted the amendment.

Commissioners Bachman, Barry, Bell, Hoskins, Lee, Lyon, and Paredes voted “Aye”. Commissioner Urquhart voted “Nay”. The motion passed 7-1.

The Commission took a 5-minute break.

[8:01:22 PM](#)

**Greenprint Gateway Apartments Planned Development and Design Review at approximately 592 West 200 South** - Mark Eddy of OZ7 Opportunity Fund, has requested Planned Development and Design Review approval for the Greenprint Gateway Apartments to be located on three (3) contiguous parcels located at 592 W 200 S, 568 W 200 S and 161 S 600 W respectively. The proposal is for a 150-unit apartment building on a 0.59 acre (26,000 square feet) consolidated parcel. The proposed building will be six stories in height and will be approximately 70-feet tall to the top of the building's parapet. The apartments will be a mix of micro and studio apartments. The properties are located in the G-MU Gateway-Mixed Use zoning district. The G-MU zoning district requires Planned Development approval for all new principal buildings and uses. In addition, Design Review approval has been requested to address some design aspects of the building including material choices and maximum length of a section of blank wall space on the west façade of the building. The proposal is located within Council District 4, represented by Ana Valdemoros. (Staff contact: David J. Gellner at (801) 535-6107 or david.gellner@slcgov.com) **Case number PLNPCM2020-00493 & PLNPCM2020-00749**

David Gellner, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff recommended that the Planning Commission approve the request with the conditions listed in the staff report.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- Clarification on the staff recommendations

Mark Eddy, applicant, provided further details and was available for questions.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- Clarification on the West elevation of the building and small size of windows
- Discussion of the interior floor plan design and type of units
- Design of the building and lack of cornices
- Landscaping plan, required buffers and fence/gate

**PUBLIC HEARING** [8:25:54 PM](#)

Chairperson Scheer opened the Public Hearing; seeing no one wished to speak; Chairperson Scheer closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- Clarification on whether the units are market rate
- Proposed materials

**MOTION [8:29:17 PM](#)**

Commissioner Bell stated, based on the findings and analysis in the staff report, testimony, and discussion at the public hearing, I move that the Planning Commission vote to **APPROVE** the proposed Planned Development and Design Review applications for the Greenprint Gateway Apartments located at approximately 592 West 200 South, files PLNPCM2020-00493 and PLNPCM2020-00749 with the conditions of approval listed in the staff report with one addition:

4. Elimination of the required 7-foot parking lot perimeter landscaping buffer on the North edge of the surface parking area.

Commissioner Bachman seconded the motion. Commissioners Bachman, Bell, Hoskins, Lee, Lyon, and Paredes voted “Aye”. Commissioner Barry voted “Nay”. The motion passed 6-1.

Commissioner Urquhart was unable to vote due to technical difficulties.

**[8:33:56 PM](#)**

**Rezone at approximately 860 & 868 East 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue** – Remarc Investments, representing the property owner, is requesting a Zoning Map Amendment from CN (Neighborhood Commercial) and SR-1A (Special Development Pattern Residential) to R-MU-35 (Residential/Mixed Use) at the above-listed addresses. The applicant would like to rezone the properties to allow a multi-family development on the lots, however the request is not tied to a development proposal. The properties are located within the Avenues Local Historic District and any future demolition or new construction must be approved by the Historic Landmark Commission. Although the applicant has requested that the property be rezoned to R-MU-35, consideration may be given to another zoning district with similar characteristics. The property is located within Council District 3, represented by Chris Wharton. (Staff contact: Mayara Lima at (385) 377-7570 or mayara.lima@slcgov.com) **Case number PLNPCM2020-00703**

Mayara Lima, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff recommended that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council with the conditions listed in the staff report.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- Height differences
- Commercial component and whether it's practical in the long term
- Clarification on why the house is being included in the rezone if it's going to remain as a house

Marcus Robinson and Kevin Blalock, provided a presentation with further details.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- Whether the applicant has shared their plans with the community council or the surrounding neighborhood

**PUBLIC HEARING [9:02:03 PM](#)**

Chairperson Scheer opened the Public Hearing;

Beckie Bradshaw – Provided an email comment raising concerns with parking and traffic issues.

Brandy Dominguez – Provided an email comment stating her opposition of the request.



Jack Galian – Provided an email comment that he was interested in attending the meeting, but staff did not see him listed in the attendee list.

Nick Gurr – Provided an email comment stating his opposition of the request.

Zack S – Provided an email comment stating his opposition of the request.

Seeing no one else wished to speak; Chairperson Scheer closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant further discussed the following:

- Clarification on what other zoning districts were considered and how it was settled on the current proposal

The Commission made the following comments:

- I'm in favor of recommending approval; I'm not in favor of the condition
- I agree, I don't think that a commercial requirement is appropriate

The Commission and Applicant further discussed the following:

- Whether there's any off-street parking for the existing home

**MOTION [9:17:28 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Bell stated, Based on the information listed in the staff report, the information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, I move that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council approve the proposed zoning map amendment, as presented in petition PLNPCM2020-00703.**

**Commissioner Bachman seconded the motion. Commissioners Bachman, Barry, Bell, Hoskins, Lee, and Paredes voted "Aye". Commissioners Lyon, and Urquhart voted "Nay". The motion passed 6-2.**

**The meeting adjourned at [9:19:16 PM](#)**