



# Staff Report

PLANNING DIVISION  
COMMUNITY & NEIGHORHOOD DEVELOPMENT

**To:** Salt Lake City Planning Commission

**From:** Krissy Gilmore, Principal Planner, 801-535-7780, [kristina.gilmore@slcgov.com](mailto:kristina.gilmore@slcgov.com)

**Date:** August 11, 2021

**Re:** PLNPCM2020-00174 West Temple Duplex Planned Development

## Planned Development

**PROPERTY ADDRESS:** 1048 S West Temple

**PARCEL ID:** 15-12-427-036-0000

**MASTER PLAN:** Central Community

**ZONING DISTRICT:** RMF-35 (Moderate Density Multi-family Residential)

**REQUEST:** A request by Adam Sapers, agent for the owners, for Planned Development approval to accommodate the subdivision of a lot resulting in one new lot. The applicant is proposing to retain the existing home at 1048 S West Temple and to construct a new duplex on the newly created lot. Planned Development approval is required due to the requested relief from lot area (8,000 SF to 6,000 SF) and lot width (50 FT to 37 FT) requirements for the new duplex. The property is zoned RMF-35 (Moderate Density Multi-family Residential).

**RECOMMENDATION:** Based on the findings listed in the staff report, it is Planning Staff's opinion that overall the project meets the applicable standards and therefore recommends the Planning Commission approve the requests with the following conditions:

1. Final landscape plan details shall be delegated to Planning Staff.
2. Applicant shall comply with all required department comments and conditions.

### ATTACHMENTS:

- A. [Vicinity and Zoning Maps](#)
- B. [Plan Set](#)
- C. [Additional Applicant Provided Information & Narrative](#)
- D. [Property & Vicinity Photographs](#)
- E. [Existing Conditions – Master Plan and Zoning Standards](#)
- F. [Analysis of Standards – Planned Development](#)
- G. [Public Process and Comments](#)
- H. [Department Review Comments](#)

## Project Description

The applicant is requesting Planned Development approval in order to accommodate the subdivision of a lot which would retain the existing home and create a new duplex on a new building lot. Parcels in the RMF-35 zoning district establish the lot area and lot width. The applicant is requesting a modification to the zoning rules to allow for a new lot that does not meet the lot area or width requirements. The requested relief is for lot area (8,000 SF to 6,000 SF) and lot width (50 FT to 37 FT 6 ½ IN) for the new duplex lot. The Planned Development process includes standards related to whether any modifications will result in a better final product, whether the proposal aligns with City policies and goals, and whether the development is compatible with the area or the City's master plan development goals for the area. The full list of standards is located in [Attachment F](#).


The applicant is proposing to build a one up/down duplex. The primary entrances face West Temple with an internal hallway leading to each unit. Vehicle parking is in the rear and can only be accessed from the rear alleyway. There will be no curb cuts onto West Temple Street.

The applicant has provided a narrative about their proposal and design considerations in [Attachment C](#).

## Project History

The applicant brought the proposal to the Planning Commission in June 2020 with a different design. The Planning Commission had concerns with the design and whether it fit the neighborhood context and if the front façade adequately engaged the street. The Planning Commission tabled the item to give the applicant a chance to address the concerns. The applicant hired a new architect and is proposing a fully redesigned product that includes elements that better reflect the existing residential development in the neighborhood, such as a pitched roof, window, and porch details.

## Original Design



## New Proposed Design



## Quick Facts

**Height:** ~28'; 2 stories

**Number of Dwellings:** new duplex, existing single family home to remain

**Front Setback:** ~30'

**Side (Project Perimeter) Setback:** ~10'/5'

**Exterior Materials:** wood siding, fiber cement siding, glass

**Parking:** 4 spaces in the rear (two per unit), accessed from the adjacent alley

### KEY CONSIDERATIONS:

The below considerations were identified through the analysis of the project and department review comments.

#### Consideration 1: Lots Area and Width Relief


The Planned Development is primarily being sought in order to create a new lot to build a duplex. The requested relief from lot area is approximately 8,000 SF to 6,000 SF, and lot width is 50 FT to 37 FT 6 ½ IN. The requested relief is only for the lot which will contain the new duplex. The structure and property meet all other zoning requirements. It exceeds front and rear setback requirements and is well below lot coverage requirements due to the small footprint of the duplex (approximately 550 SF). The existing single-family home will continue to meet the requirements for a single-family dwelling in the RMF-35 zone, with a new lot width of 50 FT and an area of approximately 8,000 SF.

The existing lot, at over 14,000 SF, would allow for the construction of a 5-unit multi-family development under the RMF-35 zone. By subdividing the lot, it is more likely that the existing home will be preserved rather than demolished and replaced with potentially denser development. Additionally, though not within a historic district, the existing home contributes to the overall character of the neighborhood. In general, the smaller single-family home and new duplex would be more compatible with the size and scale of the other homes on the block face. The existing lot in its current form is among the largest in the neighborhood, and nearly double the size of other single family lots. Subdividing the lot into two increases the compatibility with the neighborhood, which is generally one of long, narrow lots. As shown in the image to the right, many of the adjacent lots are of a similar size. A dashboard review shows similar lots with widths of approximately 37 FT and areas of 6,000 SF. It also provides an opportunity for infill on an underutilized piece of land.



*General map showing parcels in subject neighborhood.*

The proposed duplex has a relatively small footprint of 1,155 SF and covers approximately 20% of the new lot. The site configuration and design lend itself to compatible infill development that is sensitive to the West Temple frontage. Additionally, the placement of the structure will direct the vehicular



Site Plan

traffic to the rear alleyway and minimize vehicular traffic on West Temple. Because the modification will broaden the available housing type and stock, staff believes the requested modifications will result in a better product as it better meets City housing availability and affordability policy goals and recommends approval of the modification.

## Consideration 2: Neighborhood Compatibility and Design

The purpose of the RMF-35 (Moderate/High Density Multi-Family Residential District) is to:

*To provide an environment suitable for a variety of moderate density housing types, including single-family, two-family, and multi-family dwellings with a maximum height of thirty five feet (35'). This district is appropriate in areas where the applicable Master Plan policies recommend a density of less than thirty (30) dwelling units per acre. This district includes other uses that are typically found in a multi-family residential neighborhood of this density for the purpose of serving the neighborhood. Uses are intended to be compatible with the existing scale and intensity of the neighborhood. The standards for the district are intended to provide for safe and comfortable places to live and play, promote sustainable and compatible development patterns and to preserve the existing character of the neighborhood.*

The RMF-35 zone permits a variety of residential uses. While moderately scaled residential structures are located to the north, and the east of the subject property, the immediate neighborhood context primarily includes low scale single-family or duplex structures. These structures range from 1 to 3 stories in height, with a variety of roof types. The context includes a variety of materials, which range from synthetic stucco, wood, traditional masonry, and masonry veneers. As described above, duplexes are not uncommon in the area and are an expected, compatible housing type.

In regard to design, there are very limited design criteria required in the RMF-35 zoning district. The only design requirements, which are imposed on all residential districts, are front façade controls:

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

The newly submitted proposal includes a small front porch, large amounts of ground floor glass, and a pitched roof to better mimic the neighborhood context. Additionally, while it is a duplex, from the street it appears to be a typical single-family home. Staff believes the revised proposal better addresses the pedestrian-oriented and visual interest through its orientation to the street and high levels of transparency.

In summary, while modern in design, the new duplex generally fits within the context of new multi-family development in the general area. Additionally, the proposed size of the duplex is compatible with the existing development pattern of the neighborhood because of the mix of housing types and styles found.

#### **DISCUSSION:**

The development has been reviewed against the Planned Development standards in [Attachment E](#) and the proposal generally meets those standards, complying with the development expectations articulated in the *Central Community Master Plan* for the area and maintaining compatibility with the lower scale neighborhood.

As the applicant is generally meeting applicable standards and guidelines for the associated review, staff is recommending approval of the proposed development with the suggested conditions noted on the first page of this staff report.

#### **NEXT STEPS:**

##### **Planned Development**


If the proposal is approved, the applicant will need to need to comply with the conditions of approval, including any of the conditions required by City departments and the Planning Commission. The applicant will be able to submit plans for building permits for the development and the plans will need to meet any conditions of approval in those plans. Final certificates of occupancy for the buildings will only be issued once all conditions of approval are met. The applicant will also need to submit a preliminary plat to finalize the property lines.

##### **Planned Development, Design Review, and Subdivision Denial**

If the Planned Development request is denied, the applicant would not be able to develop the vacant portion of the property as it would not meet lot width or area requirements for any other development type allowed in the RMF-35 zoning district.





# ATTACHMENT A: Vicinity Zoning Map




## ATTACHMENT B: **Plan Set**

---







**JAD**  
JEFF ADAMS DESIGN  
*Signature Collection*

JEFF ADAMS DESIGN, LLC  
11629 S 700 E #150  
DRAPER, UT 84020  
801-878-6244

THESE PLANS ARE ONLY PERMITTED FOR USE UNDER THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS:

1. THE GENERAL CONTRACTOR AND/OR OWNER, AS PART OF THE DESIGN TEAM, ARE TO ENSURE THE DRAWING CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL PLAN CHANGES DURING THE COURSE OF CONSTRUCTION.
2. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE CITY OF SALT LAKE COUNTY, UTAH, AND THE APPROPRIATE PROFESSIONAL, SUCH AS CITY BUILDING OFFICIAL DESIGNER, STRUCTURAL ENGINEER, ETC.
3. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE CITY OF SALT LAKE COUNTY, UTAH, AND THE APPROPRIATE PROFESSIONAL, SUCH AS CITY BUILDING OFFICIAL DESIGNER, STRUCTURAL ENGINEER, ETC.
4. NO SHEET OR DETAIL SHALL BE USED INDEPENDENTLY FROM THE APPROVED DRAWING SET.
5. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE CITY OF SALT LAKE COUNTY, UTAH, AND THE APPROPRIATE PROFESSIONAL, SUCH AS CITY BUILDING OFFICIAL DESIGNER, STRUCTURAL ENGINEER, ETC.

THESE ITEMS ARE IN PLACE TO PROVIDE A CLEAR UNDERSTANDING OF CONTRACTOR AND OWNER RESPONSIBILITY AND TO HOLD THE DESIGNER AND/OR DRAFTER HARMLESS OF ANY FINANCIAL OR LEGAL LIABILITY RESULTING FROM ERRORS IN THESE DRAWINGS.

COPYRIGHT: JEFF ADAMS DESIGN ©2021 ALL RIGHTS RESERVED - NO REPRODUCTION IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT WRITTEN PERMISSION.

PLAN NAME:  
**SAPERS RESIDENCE**

ADDRESS:  
**1054 S WEST TEMPLE, SLC**

LOT#:  
**LOT #2**


DATE:  
**2021-07-22**

PROJECT NUMBER:  
**2016-000**

CONSTRUCTION DOCS.  
SHEET NAME:  
**SITE PLAN**



SHEET NUMBER:  
**SP01**





1 FRONT ELEVATION

1/8" = 1'-0" (ARCH B)  
1/4" = 1'-0" (ARCH D)



**JAD**  
JEFF ADAMS DESIGN  
*Signature Collection*

JEFF ADAMS DESIGN, LLC  
11629 S 700 E #150  
DRAPER, UT 84020  
801-878-6244

THESE PLANS ARE ONLY PERMITTED FOR USE UNDER THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS:  
1. THE GENERAL CONTRACTOR AND/OR OWNER, AS PART OF THE DESIGN TEAM, ARE TO ENSURE THE DRAWING CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL PLAN CHANGES DURING THE COURSE OF CONSTRUCTION AND WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE COST OF SUCH CHANGES.  
2. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE CITY BUILDING OFFICIAL DESIGNER, STRUCTURAL ENGINEER, ETC.  
3. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE CITY BUILDING OFFICIAL DESIGNER, STRUCTURAL ENGINEER, ETC.  
4. NO SHEET OR DETAIL SHALL BE USED INDEPENDENTLY FROM THE APPROVED DRAWING SET.  
5. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE CITY BUILDING OFFICIAL DESIGNER, STRUCTURAL ENGINEER, ETC.  
THESE ITEMS ARE IN PLACE TO PROVIDE A CLEAR UNDERSTANDING OF CONTRACTOR AND OWNER RESPONSIBILITY AND TO HOLD THE DESIGNER AND/OR DRAFTER HARMLESS OF ANY FINANCIAL OR LEGAL LIABILITY RESULTING FROM ERRORS IN THESE DRAWINGS.  
COPYRIGHT: JEFF ADAMS DESIGN ©2021 ALL RIGHTS RESERVED - NO REPRODUCTION IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT WRITTEN PERMISSION.

PLAN NAME:  
**SAPERS  
RESIDENCE**  
ADDRESS:

**1054 S WEST  
TEMPLE, SLC**

LOT#:  
**LOT #2**

DATE:  
**2021-07-23**


AND PROJECT NUMBER:  
**2016-000**

SET:  
**CONSTRUCTION DOCS.**

SHEET NAME:  
**FRONT & RIGHT  
ELEVATIONS**

SHEET NUMBER:


**A201**



2 LEFT ELEVATION  
1/8" = 1'-0" (ARCH B)  
1/4" = 1'-0" (ARCH D)



1 REAR ELEVATION  
1/8" = 1'-0" (ARCH B)  
1/4" = 1'-0" (ARCH D)



**JAD**  
JEFF ADAMS DESIGN  
*Signature Collection*

JEFF ADAMS DESIGN, LLC  
11629 S 700 E #150  
DRAPER, UT 84020  
801-878-6244

THESE PLANS ARE ONLY PERMITTED FOR USE UNDER THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS AND RESTRICTIONS:  
1. THE GENERAL CONTRACTOR AND/OR OWNER, AS PART OF THE DESIGN TEAM, ARE TO ENSURE THE DRAWING CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL PLAN CHANGES DURING THE COURSE OF CONSTRUCTION AND WILL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE APPROPRIATE PROFESSIONAL, SUCH AS CITY BUILDING OFFICIAL, DESIGNER, STRUCTURAL ENGINEER, ETC.  
2. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE APPROPRIATE PROFESSIONAL, SUCH AS CITY BUILDING OFFICIAL, DESIGNER, STRUCTURAL ENGINEER, ETC.  
3. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR OBTAINING ALL NECESSARY PERMITS AND APPROVALS FROM THE APPROPRIATE PROFESSIONAL, SUCH AS CITY BUILDING OFFICIAL, DESIGNER, STRUCTURAL ENGINEER, ETC.  
4. NO SHEET OR DETAIL SHALL BE USED INDEPENDENTLY FROM THE APPROVED DRAWING SET.  
5. THESE PLANS ARE IN PLACE TO PROVIDE A CLEAR UNDERSTANDING OF CONTRACTOR AND OWNER RESPONSIBILITY AND TO HOLD THE DESIGNER AND/OR DRAFTER HARMLESS OF ANY FINANCIAL OR LEGAL LIABILITY RESULTING FROM ERRORS IN THESE DRAWINGS.  
COPYRIGHT: JEFF ADAMS DESIGN ©2021 ALL RIGHTS RESERVED - NO REPRODUCTION IN WHOLE OR IN PART WITHOUT WRITTEN PERMISSION.

PLAN NAME:  
**SAPERS  
RESIDENCE**  
ADDRESS:

**1054 S WEST  
TEMPLE, SLC**

LOT#:  
**LOT #2**

DATE:  
**2021-07-23**

JAD PROJECT NUMBER:  
**2016-000**


SET:  
**CONSTRUCTION DOCS.**

SHEET NAME:  
**LEFT & REAR  
ELEVATIONS**

SHEET NUMBER:

**A202**





Qty	ID	Botanical - Common	Water Needs	Size	Notes
		Evergreen Shrubs			
3	JH	Juniperus horizontalis - Creeping Juniper	Xeric	- 10' Spread 6" Ht	Icee Blue' or another blue variety
1	MP	Pinus Mugo - Dwarf Mugo Pine	Xeric	3 - 5'	Slow Growth
		Perennials			
6	BS	Rudbeckia hirta - Black Eyed Susan	Xeric	12 - 14"	
3	RT	Kniphofia caulescens - Regal Torch Lily	Xeric	1.5 - 3'	
4	CM	Nepeta - Catmint	Xeric	12 - 14"	
3	PC	Echinacea purpurea - Purple Coneflower	Min	12 - 14"	Any variety of coneflower would suffice
		Cacti			
*		Hens & Chicks	Xeric	6"	

SITE PLANTING NOTES	
1	EDGING TO BE PLACED BETWEEN THE LAWN AND PLANTING BED.
2	PLANTING BED TO BE COVERED WITH 3" OF MULCH.
3	FINISHED GRADE OF PLANTING BED ADJACENT TO PAVED AREAS SHALL BE 1" BELOW PAVEMENT.


SITE GENERAL NOTES	
1	CONTRACTOR TO FIELD VERIFY LOCATION OF UTILITY LINES AS REQUIRED.
2	CONTRACTOR TO FIELD VERIFY MIN. 3'-0" SEPARATION BETWEEN GAS AND ELECTRICAL LINES.
3	REESTABLISH NATURAL GRADE AND NATURAL VEGETATION. PROVIDE TEMP. IRRIGATION TO ASSURE ESTABLISHED VEGETATION.
4	SURFACE WATER SHALL DRAIN AWAY FROM THE HOUSE AT ALL POINTS. DIRECT THE DRAINAGE WATER TO THE STREET OR TO AN APPROVED DRAINAGE COURSE, BUT NOT ONTO NEIGHBORING PROPERTIES. THE GRADE SHALL FALL A MINIMUM OF 6 INCHES WITHIN THE FIRST 10 FT. (IRC R401.3).
5	RETAINING WALLS (>4' OR SUPPORTING A SURCHARGE), SWIMMING POOLS, SOLAR AND/OR GEO-THERMAL HEATING SYSTEMS, AND PHOTO-VOLTAIC- AND/OR WIND-GENERATED ELECTRICAL SYSTEMS REQUIRE SEPARATE PERMITS. SEPARATE PLANS, SPECIFICATIONS AND APPLICATIONS ARE TO BE SUBMITTED AND REVIEWED PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF THESE PERMITS.

\* DUST, MUD AND EROSION SHALL BE CONTROLLED BY WHATEVER MEANS NECESSARY, AND THE ROADWAY SHALL BE KEPT FREE OF MUD AND DEBRIS, AT ALL TIMES.  
\* BUILDER/ OWNER SHALL SECURE AN EXCAVATION PERMIT PRIOR TO DOING ANY WORK IN THE PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY. TRAFFIC PLAN, BONDING AND INSURANCE WILL BE REQUIRED.  
\* PROVIDE FINISH GRADING AWAY FROM THE UNIT ON ALL SIDES AT A MINIMUM OF 6" IN. FIRST 10'-0" HORIZONTAL SLOPE IN LANDSCAPED AREAS. THEN MAINTAIN 2% MIN. HORIZONTAL SLOPE IN GRADE THEREAFTER TO APPROVED DRAINAGE AREAS.  
\* PROVIDE ON SITE RETENTION OF ALL STORM RUN OFF, BY WHATEVER MEANS NECESSARY DURING CONSTRUCTION.  
\* SHOULD GROUND WATER BE INCURRED DURING EXCAVATION, A QUALIFIED SOILS ENGINEER SHALL BE RETAINED TO DESIGN AND APPROVE A CONTINUOUS FRENCH DRAIN AT FOUNDATION, ON SITE.  
\* MAINTAIN NATURAL EXISTING GRADE AT REAR AND SIDES OF LOT WHERE POSSIBLE TO RETAIN STORM WATER. NO RUNOFF ONTO ADJACENT PROPERTIES.  
\* EXCAVATOR AND CONTRACTOR TO VERIFY ALL EXISTING UTILITIES- CALL BLUE STAKES!

SIDEWALK  
FRONT YARD EXTENSION  
CURB  
GUTTER




PROPERTY LINE  
PROPOSED PROPERTY LINE SPLIT  
METAL EDGING

PLANTING LEGEND



SQUARE FOOTAGE LEGEND

LOT SIZE:	14374.8 SQ. FT. (.33 ACRES)
PRIMARY DWELLING FOOTPRING SQ. FT.	1344 SQ. FT.
PROPOSED ADU SQ. FT.	567
EXISTING LOT COVERAGE:	9%
LOT COVERAGE + PROPOSED PROPERTY SPLIT FOR UNIT	11.6%
LOT COVERAGE + PROPOSED PROPERTY SPLIT FOR PRIMARY DWELLING:	14.6%



SITE  
PLANTING PLAN

6/12/2020  
REVISIONS

A NEW DESIGN FOR THE :  
SAPERS RESIDENCE  
1048 S WEST TEMPLE SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84101

L2  
SITE PLAN



(ALL OF LOTS 3, 4, AND 5, AND THE NORTH ONE-HALF OF LOT 6, BLOCK 2, THORN SUBDIVISION)

**BLOCK 1,  
WEST DRIVE SUBDIVISION**

**BLOCK 2,  
THORN SUBDIVISION**

**LOT 1**  
8,196 sq.ft.  
0.188 acres  
**1048 SOUTH**

**LOT 2**  
6,147 sq.ft.  
0.141 acres  
**1054 SOUTH**

**JASON YU**  
TAX ID: 15-12-427-026  
ENTRY NO.: 13092369

**DARIN MANO**  
TAX ID: 15-12-427-040  
ENTRY NO.: 12045637

**MEAD AVENUE  
(PUBLIC STREET)**

**GOLTZ AVENUE  
(PUBLIC STREET)**

**JEFFERSON STREET  
(PUBLIC STREET)**

**WEST TEMPLE  
(PUBLIC STREET)**

**20' ALLEY WAY  
(PUBLIC STREET)**

**FOUND RING AND LID STREET MONUMENT AT THE INTERSECTION OF MEAD AVENUE & WEST TEMPLE**

**FOUND RING AND LID STREET MONUMENT AT THE INTERSECTION OF MEAD AVENUE & JEFFERSON STREET**

**POINT OF BEGINNING**

**SOUTHEAST CORNER LOT 10, BLOCK 2, THORN SUBDIVISION**


**FOUND RING AND LID STREET MONUMENT AT THE INTERSECTION OF GOLTZ AVENUE & JEFFERSON STREET**

DOMINION ENERGY NOTE:


DOMINION ENERGY APPROVES THIS PLAT solely for the purpose of confirming that the plat contains public utility easements. Dominion may require other easements in order to serve this development. This approval does not constitute abrogation or waiver of any other existing rights, obligations or liabilities provided by law or equity. This approval does not constitute acceptance, approval or acknowledgment of any terms contained in the plat, including those set forth in the owners dedication and the notes and does not constitute a guarantee of particular terms of natural gas service. For further information please contact Dominion right of way department at 1-800-366-8532

ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER NOTES:

1. PURSUANT TO UTAH CODE ANN. § 54-2-37 THIS PLAT CONVEYS TO THE OWNER(S) OF THE OPERATORS OF UTILITIES THE PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT ALONG WITH ALL THE RIGHTS AND UTILITIES DESCRIBED THEREIN.
2. PURSUANT TO UTAH CODE ANN. § 17-27A-603(A)(C)(III) ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER ACCEPTS DELIVERY OF THE PUE AS DESCRIBED IN THIS PLAT AND APPROVES THIS PLAT FOR RECORDATION AND RECORDS IT. THIS PLAT CONTAINS THE PLAT CONVEYS THE UTILITY EASEMENTS AND APPROXIMATES THE LOCATION OF THE PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENTS, BUT DOES NOT WARRANT THEIR PRECISE LOCATION. ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER MAY REQUIRE OTHER EASEMENTS IN ORDER TO SERVE THIS UTILITY EASEMENT. THIS PLAT DOES NOT AFFECT ANY RIGHT THAT ROCKY MOUNTAIN POWER HAS OR DOES NOT HAVE.
3. A RECORDED EASEMENT OR RIGHT OF WAY.
4. THE LAW APPLICABLE TO PRESCRIPTIVE RIGHTS
5. TITLE 64, CHAPTER 60, REGARDING DAMAGE TO UNDERGROUND UTILITIES OR
6. ANY OTHER PROVISION OF LAW.



SALT LAKE CITY



I, SATTAR N. TABRIZ, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I AM A PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR LICENSED TO PRACTICE IN THE STATE OF UTAH, AND THAT I HAVE MADE A SURVEY OF THE PARCEL OF LAND SHOWN AND DESCRIBED ON THIS MAP. I ALSO CERTIFY THAT BY AUTHORITY OF THE OWNERS OF SAID PARCEL, I HAVE DIVIDED THE PROPERTY INTO LOTS TO BE HEREAFTER KNOWN AS:

DATE: SATTAR N. TABRIZ  
UTAH PROFESSIONAL LAND SURVEYOR  
LICENSE NO. 155100

ALL OF LOTS 3, 4, AND 5, AND THE NORTH ONE-HALF OF LOT 6, BLOCK 2, THORN SUBDIVISION,  
ON FILE AND OF RECORD IN THE OFFICE OF THE SALT LAKE COUNTY RECORDER, SALT LAKE  
CITY, UTAH.

ALSO DESCRIBED AS

A PARCEL OF LAND BEING LOCATED IN THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 12, TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 1 WEST, SALT BASE AND MERIDIAN, AND BEING MORE PARTICULARLY DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

BEGINNING AT A POINT THE NORTH WEST CORNER OF WAY LINE OF WEST TEMPLE STREET; SAID POINT BEING NORTH 0°14'11" WEST 127.28 FEET FROM THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF LOT 10, BLOCK 2, THORN SUBDIVISION, ACCORDING TO THE OFFICIAL PLAT THEREOF, FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE SALT LAKE COUNTY RECORDER, AND RUNNING THENCE SOUTH 89°57'18" WEST 163.75 FEET TO THE EAST LINE OF A 20.00' ALLEY WAY OF SAID THORN SUBDIVISION; THENCE NORTH 0°14'11" WEST 87.59 FEET ALONG SAID ALLEY WAY LINE; THENCE NORTH 89°57'18" EAST 163.75 FEET TO THE SAID WEST RIGHT OF WAY LINE FOR WEST TEMPLE STREET; THENCE ALONG SAID RIGHT OF WAY LINE SOUTH 0°14'11" EAST 87.59 FEET TO THE POINT OF BEGINNING.

1. THE BASIS OF BEARINGS IS NORTH 0°01'41" WEST A DISTANCE OF 674.58 FEET MEASURED BETWEEN THE FOUND RING AND LID STREET MONUMENT AT THE INTERSECTION OF MEAD AVENUE & JEFFERSON STREET AND THE FOUND RING AND LID STREET MONUMENT AT THE INTERSECTION OF GOLTZ AVENUE & JEFFERSON STREET (AS SHOWN HEREON).
2. COURSES AND DISTANCES SHOWN ON THIS MAP ARE MEASURED DIMENSIONS TAKEN FROM ACTUAL FIELD MEASUREMENTS, UNLESS CONTAINED WITHIN PARENTHESES INDICATING A RECORD COURSE OR DISTANCE. RECORD INFORMATION IS TAKEN FROM MAPS, PLATS, DEEDS OF RECORD, OR OTHER SOURCES OF RECORD INFORMATION.
3. PROPERTY CORNERS NOT FOUND WERE MARKED WITH A 5/8" x 24" REBAR AND YELLOW NYLON CAP STAMPED "WARD", TO BE SET AT ALL OTHER LOT AND BOUNDARY CORNERS UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.

KNOWN ALL BY THESE PRESENTS THAT WE THE UNDERSIGNED OWNERS OF THE DESCRIBED TRACT OF LAND ABOVE, HAVING CAUSED THE SAME TO BE SUBDIVIDED INTO LOTS, EASEMENTS TO HEREAFTER BE KNOWN AS:

THE UNDERSIGNED OWNERS HEREBY CONVEY TO ANY AND ALL PUBLIC UTILITY COMPANIES A PERPETUAL, NON-EXCLUSIVE EASEMENT OVER THE PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENTS SHOWN ON THIS PLAT, THE SAME TO BE USED FOR THE INSTALLATION, MAINTENANCE, AND OPERATION OF UTILITY LINES AND FACILITIES.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, WE HAVE HEREUNTO SET OUR HANDS THIS

DAY \_\_\_\_\_ OF \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_ A.D.

OWNER: \_\_\_\_\_ DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

STATE OF \_\_\_\_\_ }  
COUNTY OF \_\_\_\_\_ } S.S.

ON THIS \_\_\_\_\_ DAY OF \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_, PERSONALLY APPEARED BEFORE ME, THE UNDERSIGNED NOTARY PUBLIC, IN AND FOR SAID COUNTY OF SALT LAKE, IN SAID STATE OF UTAH, THE SIGNER OF THE OWNER'S DEDICATION WHO DULY ACKNOWLEDGED TO ME THAT \_\_\_\_\_ SIGNED IT FREELY AND VOLUNTARILY AS \_\_\_\_\_ THE FOR THE PURPOSES THEREIN MENTIONED.

NOTARY PUBLIC \_\_\_\_\_

PRINTED NAME OF NOTARY PUBLIC \_\_\_\_\_

MY COMMISSION EXPIRES: \_\_\_\_\_

COMMISSION NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

LOCATED WITHIN THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 12,  
TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 1 WEST, SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN,  
SALT LAKE CITY, SALT LAKE COUNTY, UTAH.

LOCATED WITHIN THE SOUTHEAST QUARTER OF SECTION 12,  
TOWNSHIP 1 SOUTH, RANGE 1 WEST, SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN,  
SALT LAKE CITY, SALT LAKE COUNTY, UTAH.



**Ward Engineering Group**  
Planning • Engineering • Surveying  
Since 1981

Salt Lake City Office  
231 WEST 800 SOUTH  
Suite A  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101

tel (801) 487-8040  
fax (801) 487-8668  
[www.wardeng.com](http://www.wardeng.com)

BUILDING OFFICIAL

APPROVED THIS \_\_\_\_\_ DAY OF \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_.

---

BUILDING OFFICIAL

**CITY ENGINEERING DIVISION**

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I HAVE HAD THIS PLAT EXAMINED BY THIS OFFICE  
AND IT IS CORRECT IN ACCORDANCE WITH INFORMATION ON FILE.

CITY ENGINEER	DATE
CITY SURVEYOR	DATE

CITY PLANNING DIRECTOR

APPROVED THIS \_\_\_\_\_ DAY OF \_\_\_\_\_, 20\_\_\_\_, BY THE  
SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION.

\_\_\_\_\_  
PLANNING DIRECTOR DATE

CITY ATTORNEY

APPROVED AS TO FORM THIS \_\_\_\_\_

DAY OF \_\_\_\_\_ 20\_\_\_\_.

\_\_\_\_\_

SALT LAKE CITY ATTORNEY

CITY APPROVAL

PRESENTED TO SALT LAKE CITY THIS \_\_\_\_\_  
DAY OF \_\_\_\_\_ 20\_\_\_\_  
AND IT IS HEREBY APPROVED.

\_\_\_\_\_  
SALT LAKE CITY MAYOR

\_\_\_\_\_  
SALT LAKE CITY RECORDER

<u>SALT LAKE COUNTY RECORDER</u>		RECORD NO. _____
STATE OF UTAH, COUNTY OF SALT LAKE, RECORDED AND FILED AT THE REQUEST OF: _____		NUMBER _____
DATE _____ TIME _____ BOOK _____ PAGE _____		ACCOUNT _____
FEES _____		SHEET _____
PRINTED NAME OF COUNTY RECORDER _____		OF _____ SHEETS



**ATTACHMENT C: Additional Applicant  
Provided Information &  
Narrative**

---

## 1. Project Description

At 1048 S West Temple in Salt Lake City, Doneta Gatherum owns a single-family residence that sits on .33 acres. The area on the south side of her property is currently vacant land. I approached Doneta last Fall about purchasing the vacant part of her parcel in order to build an owner-occupied duplex; she is excited about the idea and is open to selling the land. Attached is a notarized statement of consent authorizing me to act as an agent in the Planned Development application process. I plan on living in one of the units and renting out the other.

This proposed duplex is a great example of an urban infill housing development that promotes “smart growth” in Salt Lake City – a place that currently has a housing shortage and a number of homes that were built decades ago. Urban infill has many benefits - it helps improve the city’s image and living environment, provides homeownership opportunities within the city, and encourages investment into the surrounding neighborhood. Done wisely, infill development can take advantage of existing infrastructure; provide higher densities in locations where mass/public transportation is already in place; and integrate new housing into the fabric of the community.

Although the zoning of the parcel is RMF-35 (which would allow for a duplex from a zoning and density standpoint), there are a few code requirements that my proposed development does not meet due to the long and narrow nature of the proposed lot split. According to 21A.24.130: RMF-35 MODERATE DENSITY MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, a two-family dwelling must have a minimum lot width of 50 feet and a minimum lot area of 8000 square feet. In my proposed duplex, the lot width is approximately 34 feet and the lot area is approximately 6000 square feet. Furthermore, the code requires the interior side yard to be four feet (4') on one side and ten feet (10') on the other; my proposed duplex would be 4' 2" on one side and 7' on the other.

In the immediate neighborhood surrounding my proposed development, there are a number of existing homes that have narrow widths (<50') and small lot square footages. Within a three block area (including the house directly to the south of my proposed development) parcels #'s: 15124270400000, 15124280100000, 15124270230000, 15124270210000, 15124270330000, 15124080180000, 15124270030000, 15124280090000, 15124080100000, and others do not meet the 50 foot lot width requirement. I state this to show that my proposed home is very compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and would fit in well.

In December, I had a DRT meeting and after presenting my proposed development, got the green light from the Building Services, Public Utilities, Transportation and



Engineering divisions. I ask that the Planning Commission please consider the many advantages of this development and grant variances to these three code requirements.

## **2. Planned Development Information**

According to the Salt Lake City Masterplan, “Our vision is for downtown to be the nexus for sustainable urban living, commerce, and cultural life in the Intermountain West. The Downtown Community Plan is the road map for achieving this vision.” Specifically related to the Central Community Plan and its residential land use goals, “Future land use designations will assist the development and improvement of quality neighborhoods in response to typical city pressures. Designated land use development patterns of the master plan aid in the management of growth, particularly with respect to broader metropolitan sprawl issues”. The plan encourages “the creation and maintenance of a variety of housing opportunities that meet social needs and income levels of a diverse population” and “Encourage a variety of housing types for higher-density multi-family housing in appropriate areas to satisfy housing demand.”<sup>1</sup>

Both the current Mayor, Jackie Biskupski, and the newly elected Mayor, Erin Mendenhall, have been very vocal about the housing shortage and affordability problems that Salt Lake City faces. My planned infill development fits the criteria of the Master Plan goals/visions and the initiatives of our elected officials. Here are some descriptions of how my project meets planned development objectives:

- a) My proposed development uses design and architectural features that create a pleasing environment. As you can see in the attached renderings, the design of the duplex is aesthetically attractive and helps provide a fresh look to the People’s Freeway neighborhood – a community that currently has a number of old, unattractive, and poorly maintained homes that were built in the mid-1900s. Within a few blocks of my proposed development is a new apartment project, the “C9 Flats”. My proposed architectural design is similar to the look of the newest project in the area and promotes more developments in this style.
- b) My proposed development will utilize “green” building techniques – the goal is to have a net zero building. The building materials that I plan on using will be energy efficient and sustainable compared to traditional methods and reduce the overall energy loads (through insulation, efficient equipment and lighting, and careful detailing of the entire enclosure), limiting the amount of fossil fuels used.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.slcdocs.com/Planning/MasterPlansMaps/cent.pdf>

- c) My proposed development provides the elimination of incompatible uses (vacant land) through redevelopment. For the last 40+ years, the land has stayed vacant and the current owner has no plans going forward to develop it.
- d) My proposed development includes a rental unit which will help the housing shortage and affordability issues that Salt Lake City faces. I plan on renting the unit for \$1,100 a month, which is below market-rate housing in the area for a 2-bed unit.
- e) My proposed development is within a short walking distance of the Ballpark TRAX station, which fits within the TOD goals of the People's Freeway neighborhood.

Proper maintenance is essential to maximizing the environmental, social, and economic benefits. As owner of this property, I will make sure the front and back lawns are landscaped well and are maintained in a clean and pleasing manner and have a yearly budget of \$1,800 which includes items like grass cutting, snow removal, planting, etc to make sure this property . Since this is an infill development, capital improvements to the property are very limited but they include the addition of a paved path to the front door and the addition of 4 paved parking spaces on the property. If this project is approved, I will create a statement entitled "notice to purchasers" disclosing that the infrastructure is privately owned and that the maintenance, repair, replacement and operation of the infrastructure is the responsibility of the property owners.

Thank you for your time in reviewing my planned development application.

Sincerely,

Adam Sapers

## ATTACHMENT D: Property & Vicinity Photographs



*View of the subject properties from West Temple. Property includes the single family structure to the right and the lot with trees in the middle.*



*Second image of subject properties.*



*View looking east and northeast on West Temple from in front of subject property, showing an apartment development.*





*View of rear alleyway. Subject properties are shown at the yellow line.*

# ATTACHMENT E: Existing Conditions – Master Plan and Zoning Standards

## City Master Plan Policies

### Central Community Master Plan

This development is located within the People's Freeway (Ballpark) neighborhood of the *Central Community Master Plan*. The intent of this Master Plan is to create a future for the Central Community based on four fundamental goals:

- *Livable communities and neighborhoods*
- *Vital and sustainable commerce*
- *Unique and active places*
- *Increased pedestrian mobility and accessibility*

The below are additional applicable policies and guidelines related to the proposal.

**Residential Land Use Policy #3:** Promote construction of a variety of housing options that are compatible with the character of the neighborhoods of the Central Community.

- *Strategy RLU-3.1 Encourage residential land developers to build housing that provides residential opportunities for a range of income levels, age groups, and family size.*
- *RLU-3.2 Encourage a mix of affordable and market-rate housing for owner occupancy throughout the Central Community. Encourage a mix of rental properties for those who cannot afford or do not choose home ownership.*
- *RLU-3.3 Use the planned development process to encourage design flexibility for residential housing while maintaining compatibility with the neighborhood.*
- *RLU-3.4 Encourage high performance, energy efficient residential development.*

The plan also notes the following about the neighborhood area itself:

- *Address ways of transitioning the northern portion of the neighborhood from the historic character of low-density residential development to one of transit-oriented development.*

The zoning adopted for the area is generally reflective of these general policies, particularly regarding providing additional lower scale housing types and increasing the residential density of the area, and duplex developments fit within the above plan guidance.

The master plan identifies a future land use of Low/Medium-Density Residential (10-20 Dwelling Units/Acre). Low/medium-density residential areas are mainly low-density neighborhoods containing a broad mix of dwelling units ranging from single family detached to single family attached dwelling units (three or more units per structure). This land use designation allows single-family detached and attached residences on small lots (i.e., 2,500-5,000 square feet per individual lots) and townhouses. The proposal is generally in-line with the development expectations expressed in the plan.

### Citywide Housing Master Plan



The City recently adopted a citywide housing master plan titled *Growing SLC: A Five Year Housing Plan 2018-2022* that focuses on ways the City can meet its housing needs in the next five years. The plan includes policies that relate to this development, including:

- Objective 1: Review and modify land-use and zoning regulations to reflect the affordability needs of a growing, pioneering city
  - *Increasing flexibility around dimensional requirements and code definitions will reduce barriers to housing construction that are unnecessary for achieving city goals, such as neighborhood preservation.*
- *1.1.1 Develop flexible zoning tools and regulations, with a focus along significant transportation routes.*
- *1.1.2 Develop in-fill ordinances that promote a diverse housing stock, increase housing options, create redevelopment opportunities, and allow additional units within existing structures, while minimizing neighborhood impacts.*
- Objective 6: Increase home ownership opportunities

The planned development process is a zoning tool that provides flexibility in the zoning standards and a way to provide in-fill development that would normally not be allowed through strict application of the zoning code. This process allows for an increase in housing stock and housing options and provides a way to minimize neighborhood impacts through its compatibility standards. The proposed development is utilizing this process to provide additional housing ownership options in the City to help meet overall housing needs.

### **Plan Salt Lake**

The City has an adopted citywide master plan that includes policies related to providing additional housing options. The plan includes policies related to growth and housing in Salt Lake City, as well as related policies regarding air quality:

#### ***Growth:***

- *Locate new development in areas with existing infrastructure and amenities, such as transit and transportation corridors.*
- *Promote infill and redevelopment of underutilized land.*
- *Accommodate and promote an increase in the City's population.*

#### ***Housing:***

- *Access to a wide variety of housing types for all income levels throughout the City, providing the basic human need for safety and responding to changing demographics.*
- *Increase diversity of housing types for all income levels throughout the city.*
- *Increase the number of medium density housing types and options.*
- *Enable moderate density increases within existing neighborhoods where appropriate.*

#### ***Air Quality:***

- *Increase mode-share for public transit, cycling, walking, and carpooling.*
- *Minimize impact of car emissions.*
- *Reduce individual and citywide energy consumption.*

**Staff Discussion:** The proposed development provides in-fill housing on underutilized land near transit that is intended to accommodate additional density. The limited modifications promote the redevelopment of this underutilized land to help meet City growth and housing



goals. The project also provides an increase in a low to medium density housing type (duplex). Recent planning best practices have discussed the lack of a “missing middle” housing types in urban areas. The “missing middle” housing type is generally viewed as multi-family or clustered housing which is compatible in scale with single-family homes that help meet the growing demand for walkable, lower scale urban living. This proposed development helps to meet the goals of the applicable City master plans as well as providing needed housing.

## Applicable Major Zoning/Design Standards

### RMF-35 Zoning Standards

Should the Planned Development request receive approval, the following standards will need to be met at the time of the request for a building permit for any developments on the newly created lots.

Requirement	Standard	Development Proposal	Compliance/Impact on Development
Front	20'	~30'	Complies
Side/ Rear Yard	Four feet (4') on one side and ten feet (10') on the other  Rear: 25% of the lot depth but not less than 20'	Development site setbacks overall:  Side (North): ~5' Side (South): ~10' Rear (West): ~83'	Complies
Lot Area	8,000 square feet	14,374 square feet (total development site)  6,145 square feet (new duplex lot)  8,229 square feet (single family lot)	Complies with Planned Development Approval
Lot Width	50'	~ 88' wide (total development site)  ~ 38' (new duplex lot)  ~ 50' (single family lot)	Complies with Planned Development Approval
Maximum Height	35'	~28'	Complies
Parking	2 parking space per dwelling unit	4	Complies
Lot Coverage	50%	~20%	Complies

# ATTACHMENT F: Analysis of Standards – Planned Development

**21A.55.050: Standards for Planned Developments:** The planning commission may approve, approve with conditions, or deny a planned development based upon written findings of fact according to each of the following standards. It is the responsibility of the applicant to provide written and graphic evidence demonstrating compliance with the following standards:

Standard	Findings	Rationale
A. Planned Development Objectives: The planned development shall meet the purpose statement for a planned development and will achieve at least one of the objectives stated in said section. To determine if a planned development objective has been achieved, the applicant shall demonstrate that at least one of the strategies associated with the objective are included in the proposed planned development. The applicant shall also demonstrate why modifications to the zoning regulations are necessary to meet the purpose statement for a planned development. The Planning Commission should consider the relationship between the proposed modifications to the zoning regulations and the purpose of a planned development, and determine if the project will result in a more enhanced product than would be achievable through strict application of the land use regulations.	Complies	<p>The purpose statement for a Planned Development states:            “A planned development is intended to encourage the efficient use of land and resources, promoting greater efficiency in public and utility services and encouraging innovation in the planning and building of all types of development. Further, a planned development implements the purpose statement of the zoning district in which the project is located, utilizing an alternative approach to the design of the property and related physical facilities. A planned development incorporates special development characteristics that help to achieve City goals identified in adopted Master Plans and that provide an overall benefit to the community as determined by the planned development objectives. A planned development will result in a more enhanced product than would be achievable through strict application of land use regulations, while enabling the development to be compatible with adjacent and nearby land developments. The City seeks to achieve at least one or any combination of the following objectives through the planned development process.”</p> <p>The applicant suggests that the development complies with Objectives F.1.</p> <p><b>F. Master Plan Implementation:</b>  <i>A project that helps implement portions of an adopted Master Plan in instances where the Master Plan provides specific guidance on the character of the immediate vicinity of the proposal:</i></p>



		<p><i>A project that is consistent with the guidance of the Master Plan related to building scale, building orientation, site layout, or other similar character defining features. (Ord. 8-18, 2018)</i></p> <p>The proposal meets objective F, as the Central Community Master Plan calls for creative infill techniques to increase the housing supply in the area, while keeping with the established community character. Additionally, the addition of lower scale multifamily development meets the City's goal's for increased housing. The development is within a short walking distance to the Ballpark and 900 South Trax Stations, which meets the TOD goals of the People's Freeway (Ballpark) Neighborhood.</p> <p>Staff has stated that the proposal is supported by the Central Community Master Plan. The future land use map indicates this area as Low/Medium Density Residential (10-20 dwelling units/acre). The added density and housing type is an anticipated use for this area, which is indicated in the Master Plan.</p>
B. Master Plan Compatibility: The proposed planned development is generally consistent with adopted policies set forth in the Citywide, community, and/or small area Master Plan that is applicable to the site where the planned development will be located.	Complies	<p>The Central City Master Plan Residential Land Use Policies and Strategies include discussion of promoting a variety of housing options with compatible infill development. It also discusses providing a range of rental housing types. The proposed development provides a compatible duplex which would provide a rental unit. As demonstrated in Attachment E, Staff finds that the proposal is consistent with adopted policies.</p>
C. Design and Compatibility: The proposed planned development is compatible with the area the planned development will be located and is designed to achieve a more enhanced	Complies with conditions.	<p>The proposed planned development would promote the development of underutilized space in the neighborhood with a duplex home similar in size and scale to the other</p>

<p>product than would be achievable through strict application of land use regulations. In determining design and compatibility, the Planning Commission should consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Whether the scale, mass, and intensity of the proposed planned development is compatible with the area the planned development will be located and/or policies stated in an applicable Master Plan related to building and site design;</li> <li>2. Whether the building orientation and building materials in the proposed planned development are compatible with the neighborhood where the planned development will be located and/or the policies stated in an applicable Master Plan related to building and site design;</li> <li>3. Whether building setbacks along the perimeter of the development: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Maintain the visual character of the neighborhood or the character described in the applicable Master Plan.</li> <li>b. Provide sufficient space for private amenities.</li> <li>c. Provide sufficient open space buffering between the proposed development and neighboring properties to minimize impacts related to privacy and noise.</li> <li>d. Provide adequate sight lines to street, driveways and sidewalks.</li> <li>e. Provide sufficient space for maintenance.</li> </ol> </li> <li>4. Whether building facades offer ground floor transparency, access, and architectural detailing to facilitate pedestrian interest and interaction;</li> <li>5. Whether lighting is designed for safety and visual interest while minimizing impacts on surrounding property;</li> <li>6. Whether dumpsters, loading docks and/or service areas are appropriately screened; and</li> </ol>	<p>residential structures on the block face. The reduced lot area and width would also be compatible with the size of other lots on the block face and general neighborhood area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The area has a mix of single-family and multi-family of similar density and intensity. The 1,155 square feet footprint, is an appropriate mass and scale for the neighborhood.</li> <li>2. The orientation of the development is toward West Temple with access to the individual units internal to the structure. The applicant incorporated a front porch feature and entrance door on the front façade to fit in with the direct context of the neighborhood and meet front façade requirements.</li> </ol> <p>The design of the new home is more modern than homes typically found in that immediate block, however; there are examples in the surrounding area of similar modern design. The smaller building scale helps make the design context appropriate.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. The proposed setbacks and buffers are adequate to minimize impacts to adjacent properties. The small footprint of the duplex allows a great deal of open space on each lot.</li> <li>4. The primary elevations have been designed to provide for ground floor transparency and architectural detailing. The first floor of the street facing facades, contain a window and a door. The integration of a variation of textures, glass, and architectural features helps in creating pedestrian interest at the street level.</li> <li>5. The lighting will be directed towards the interior of the development.</li> <li>6. As indicated on the site plan, trash/dumpster areas are located behind the parking area and will be adequately buffered.</li> <li>7. The development does include 4 surface parking stalls located toward the rear of the property adjacent, and</li> </ol>
--	--

7. Whether parking areas are appropriately buffered from adjacent uses.		accessed by, the alleyway. These parking stalls are setback from adjacent uses.
<p>D. Landscaping: The proposed planned development preserves, maintains or provides native landscaping where appropriate. In determining the landscaping for the proposed planned development, the Planning Commission should consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Whether mature native trees located long the periphery of the property and along the street are preserved and maintained;</li> <li>2. Whether existing landscaping that provides additional buffering to the abutting properties is maintained and preserved;</li> <li>3. Whether proposed landscaping is design to lessen potential impacts created by the proposed planned development; and</li> <li>4. Whether proposed landscaping is appropriate for the scale of the development.</li> </ol>	Complies	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Four mature trees within the periphery of the property will be maintained as part of this development.</li> <li>2. The landscaping that is proposed to be removed will be replaced with new landscaping. The trees to be removed appear to be in poor condition and their removal should not negatively impact the development. Tree species selection should be made in coordination with the City Forester.</li> <li>3. The applicant has incorporated trees along the perimeter of the development and the front yards. These elements will help to buffer and lessen the potential impacts from the development.</li> <li>4. The proposed landscaping is appropriate for the scale of the development.</li> </ol> <p>While Staff believes the proposed landscaping plan meets the standard, a suggested condition of approval is that final landscape plan details be delegated to Planning Staff.</p>
<p>E. Mobility: The proposed planned development supports City wide transportation goals and promotes safe and efficient circulation within the site and surrounding neighborhood. In determining mobility, the Planning Commission should consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Whether drive access to local streets will negatively impact the safety, purpose and character of the street;</li> <li>2. Whether the site design considers safe circulation for a range of transportation options including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Safe and accommodating pedestrian environment and pedestrian oriented design;</li> <li>b. Bicycle facilities and connections where</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Complies	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The design of the development, with parking accessed through the alleyway, minimizes the impact to West Temple Street.</li> <li>2. The development provides safe pedestrian access throughout the site. There are no anticipated or foreseen conflicts between different transportation modes.</li> <li>3. The development is self-contained within the site. There are no anticipated access issues with the adjacent uses or amenities.</li> <li>4. The proposal is required to meet all fire code requirements. Compliance through the Planned Development review does not guarantee compliance with the International Fire and Building Codes and it does not guarantee the issuance of any building</li> </ol>



<p>appropriate, and orientation to transit where available; and</p> <p>c. Minimizing conflicts between different transportation modes;</p> <p>3. Whether the site design of the proposed development promotes or enables access to adjacent uses and amenities;</p> <p>4. Whether the proposed design provides adequate emergency vehicle access; and</p> <p>5. Whether loading access and service areas are adequate for the site and minimize impacts to the surrounding area and public rights-of-way.</p>		<p>permit. This will be reviewed during the building permit phase of this project.</p> <p>5. Mechanical areas and trash enclosures are interior to the development site.</p>
<p>F. Existing Site Features: The proposed planned development preserves natural and built features that significantly contribute to the character of the neighborhood and/or environment.</p>	Complies	<p>There are no natural or built features that significantly contribute to the character of the neighborhood or the environment on this site.</p>
<p>G. Utilities: Existing and/or planned utilities will adequately serve the development and not have a detrimental effect on the surrounding area.</p>	Complies	<p>Public utility connections will be fully evaluated during the building permits review phase of the development, and upgrades may be required by that department to serve the property.</p>

# ATTACHMENT G: Public Process and Comments

## Public Notice, Meetings, Comments

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

- Early notification regarding the project mailed out March 9, 2020
  - Notices were mailed to property owners/residents within ~300 feet of the proposal
- The Planning Division provided a 45-day comment period notice to the associated community council for the property, Ball Park Community Council. Due to COVID-19 the Community Council was not able to hold an in-person meeting in April and requested that the applicant present at their virtual May 2020 meeting. The applicant agreed and attended their May meeting via Zoom. The council had questions regarding the difference between a duplex and an ADU and some concern was expressed regarding the modern design. Overall, the conversation was positive. Staff has not received a formal letter indicating a position from the Community Council.
- Planning Division Open House –
  - A virtual open house was held throughout the month of May. Notices were mailed to property owners/residents within ~300 feet of the proposal and sent out on the City's Planning listserv and community council contacts.
  - Staff received two comments which are attached.

Notice of the public hearing for the proposal included:

- Public hearing notice mailed on June 11, 2020
- Public hearing notice posted on June 12, 2020
- Public notice posted on City and State websites and Planning Division list serve on June 11, 2020

Notice of second public hearing for the proposal included:

- Public hearing notice mailed on July 29, 2021
- Public hearing notice posted on July 29, 2021
- Public notice posted on City and State websites and Planning Division list serve on July 29, 2021.

## Public Input:

Regarding the original proposal, staff received three public comments regarding the proposal – two in favor and one against the proposal. Both comments mentioned concern with the south facing façade, which has been addressed through the currently proposed design.

No other public input was received.

**From:** [Anderson, John](#)  
**To:** [Jason Yu](#); [Planning Public Comments](#)  
**Cc:** [Gilmore, Kristina](#)  
**Subject:** RE: (EXTERNAL) PLNPCM2019-00174 West Temple Duplex Planned Development  
**Date:** Monday, September 28, 2020 11:17:22 AM

---

Jason,

I have copied Kristina Gilmore on this email. She is the planner assigned to the project. I believe that the applicant is redesigning the project in response to comments received from the Planning Commission. Kristina can give you a more detailed response.

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:** Jason Yu [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 24, 2020 10:47 PM  
**To:** Planning Public Comments <[planning.comments@slcgov.com](mailto:planning.comments@slcgov.com)>  
**Subject:** (EXTERNAL) PLNPCM2019-00174 West Temple Duplex Planned Development

i would like to add a comment for the record on this planned development. i currently own the property directly north of the subject property and fully support the planned development.

It troubles me that in the last planning commission meeting, the members' lack of imagination was the primary driver behind tabling the discussion and their own opinions of beauty were what drove the discussion with regard to approving whether or not to allow the minimum lot size to be undertaken.

the neighborhood craves density and giving too much consideration to dilapidated farm houses when thinking about design is not the correct approach in my opinion.



## Gilmore, Kristina

---

**From:** Doug Flagler [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 28, 2020 4:37 PM  
**To:** Gilmore, Kristina  
**Subject:** (EXTERNAL) 1048 s West Temple Project

I just wanted to leave a comment on the 1048 s West Temple Project. I am strongly in favor of having a duplex on this lot. We would love to see more density and infill on the large lots in this area. I would like to see this project do something to mitigate the harsh blank wall that will be on the south side of this project. I would like it to have window or art or something to make them more interesting and not an eye sore for their neighbors. Thanks you for your time and all your hard work.

- Doug Flagler [REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone

## Gilmore, Kristina

---

**From:** Michael Hughes [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, May 8, 2020 9:34 AM  
**To:** Gilmore, Kristina  
**Subject:** (EXTERNAL) <https://www.slc.gov/planning/2020/05/06/west-temple-duplex-1048-s-west-temple/>

Kristina,

This project just doesn't seem to fit in this area. I would be against the subdivision being granted to allow the proposed duplex to be built.

For a single family home similar to the surrounding homes, or for some other duplex design, I would be in favor. But not for the modern tall, rather stark duplex design.

The massing of height and width on the proposed subdivided lot, and the stark two story north wall of the design is not in keeping with the surrounding properties and would be an eyesore in my opinion. Some other design might work better.

I realize the look and feel of the proposed building and its effect on surrounding property owners may not be part of your review of the plans or recommendation to the Planning Commission.

Thank you,

Michael Hughes, SLC resident  
704 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Salt Lake City, UT 84103  
[REDACTED]

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

# ATTACHMENT H: Department Review Comments

---

## **Planning** (Krissy Gilmore at [Kristina.gilmore@slcgov.com](mailto:Kristina.gilmore@slcgov.com) or 801-535-7780)

A Preliminary Plat must be applied for an approved before building permits can be issued.

## **Public Utilities** (Jason Draper at [Jason.Draper@slcgov.com](mailto:Jason.Draper@slcgov.com))

No objection to the proposed Planned Development. Development comments – Required for building permit:

- A utility development permit will be required.
- The proposed lot will need its own water service
- The proposed lot will need its own sewer service

## **Engineering** (Scott Weiler at [scott.weiler@slcgov.com](mailto:scott.weiler@slcgov.com))

No objection.

## **Transportation** (Michael Barry at [michael.barry@slcgov.com](mailto:michael.barry@slcgov.com))

No comments.

## **Fire** (Edward Itchon at [Edward.Itchon@slcgov.com](mailto:Edward.Itchon@slcgov.com))

If the side yards are closer than 15 ft. then an alternative means and measures application can be used for IFC section 503.1.1.

## **Zoning** (Anika Stonick at [patriciaanika.stonick@slcgov.com](mailto:patriciaanika.stonick@slcgov.com))

Planned Development application for current address 1048 So. West Temple, to divide existing lot for new parcel to be developed with new structure housing proposed two-family use; in RMF-35 zone; together, the existing SFD on larger resulting lot and proposed two-family use on smaller resulting lot, do not exceed limit of 21A.55.020.D for densities of Planned Developments (by having total square footage needed, or more, for those two uses per required lot sized listed at 21A.24.21.24.130.C).

For the proposed two-family use, the site plan shows the applicant is not proposing minimum required parking per 21A.44.030.G. table- 2 vehicle parking stalls for each dwelling unit. On the site plan, two stalls are shown on-site and one stall is shown on the street. All four (4) required parking stalls must be provided on-site for the two-family use per 21A.44.040.B.6. To propose complying parking sizes, locations, on-site.

*Planning Response: The revised site plan shows four legal parking stalls on-site.*

Removal of existing trees is to be per 2A.48.135. Other landscaping requirements of 21A.48 to be met, including 21A.48.055 Water Efficient Landscaping (required per 21A.48.055.A.1.a(3)).

To obtain Address Certificate for new lot/proposed building.

To pay Impact Fees for new dwelling units.