



Staff Report

PLANNING DIVISION

DEPARTMENT of COMMUNITY and NEIGHBORHOODS

To: Salt Lake City Planning Commission
From: Katilynn Harris, Principal Planner, katilynn.harris@slcgov.com, 801-535-6179
Date: February 8, 2023
Re: PLNPCM2022-00587 – Zoning Map Amendment

Zoning Map Amendment

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 792 W 900 S & 875 S 800 W
PARCEL ID: 5-11-277-009 & 15-11-277-008
PARCEL SIZE: Total of 0.10 acres (approximately 4,561 square feet)
MASTER PLAN: [Westside Master Plan](#)
ZONING DISTRICT: [M-1 – Light Manufacturing](#)
PROPOSED ZONING DISTRICT: [R-MU – Residential/Mixed Use](#)

REQUEST:

Cameron Broadbent, the property owner, has submitted an application to amend the Zoning Map for two separate vacant parcels located at 792 W 900 S and 875 S 800 W. The requested Zoning Map amendment would rezone the property from M-1 (Light Manufacturing) to R-MU (Residential/Mixed Use). The purpose of the requested rezone is to allow for the development residential uses not permitted under the existing zoning district. Future development plans were not submitted with this application.

RECOMMENDATION:

Based on the information and findings listed in the staff report, it is the Planning Staff's opinion that the request does not meet the applicable standards of approval and therefore recommends that the Planning Commission forward a negative recommendation on to the City Council for consideration.

ATTACHMENTS:

- A. [ATTACHMENT A: Zoning & Vicinity Map](#)
- B. [ATTACHMENT B: Applicant Narrative](#)
- C. [ATTACHMENT C: M-1 & R-MU Zoning Comparison](#)
- D. [ATTACHMENT D: City Plan Considerations](#)
- E. [ATTACHMENT E: Zoning Amendment Standards](#)
- F. [ATTACHMENT F: Property Photos](#)
- G. [ATTACHMENT G: Public Process & Comments](#)
- H. [ATTACHMENT H: Department Review Comments](#)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION



The proposal to rezone the property from M-1, Light Manufacturing to R-MU, Residential/Mixed Use is intended to increase the development potential of the property in an area of the City transitioning from industrial land uses to residential and mixed uses. The subject parcel is undeveloped, vacant land located on the corner of 900 S and 800 W. The developer has not proposed a specific development plan as part of the rezone and does not have any pending building permits or other development applications for the property. Please refer to [Attachment B](#) for a detailed narrative submitted by the applicant for the proposed rezone.

Quick Facts

Size: 0.10 acres (approx. 4,561 SF)

Existing Zoning District: M-1, Light Manufacturing

Proposed Zoning District: R-MU, Residential/Mixed Use

Adjacent Zoning Districts:
– M-1

The primary purpose for the rezone request is so the applicant will have the ability to develop the properties for residential uses which are not currently permitted under the existing M-1 zoning designation. As stated in the narrative submitted by the applicant, “The property is intended to be used for small multi-family housing, duplex, triplex or fourplex, often referred to as the “missing middle” in Salt Lake City planning documents.”

Immediate Neighborhood Context

The subject property is located approximately 910 feet west of Interstate-15 along 900 S, one of the gateways to the Westside neighborhoods. The subject site is surrounded by a variety of zoning districts and land uses. See the Neighborhood Zoning Districts image on the following page for more details.



The surrounding properties on the block are zoned M-1. Despite this, the primary land use on the west side of the block is single family residential except for two small commercial/light industrial buildings; one off Genesee Avenue with the other directly east of the subject properties off 900 S. Except for two parcels at the northeast corner of the block, which contain a religious facility (Sumnum) the eastern portion of the block, which is separated by a 24 FT wide public alley, was rezoned from M-1 to R-MU in 2020. Two existing one-story warehouse buildings just east of the public alley in the R-MU zone have recently undergone an adaptive reuse process and are actively seeking commercial tenants.

The block to the north of the subject site also contains a mix of zones and uses. Most of the properties are zoned M-1 with the primary uses predominantly light commercial and light industrial except for four single family dwellings located at the southwest corner of the block. A vacant parcel on northwest corner of the block was recently rezoned to from M-1 to R-MU-35 (Residential/Mixed Use) to accommodate the development of residential land uses.

Blocks west of the proposed rezone are zoned R-1/5,000 (Single Family Residential) and R-MU-35 and predominantly consist of single-family homes; blocks to the east on the other side of Interstate-15 are zoned CG (General Commercial).

Project Background

Planning staff had multiple initial discussions with the applicant both at pre-submittal meetings and following submittal of the application and encouraged the applicant to explore other zoning districts with more compatible development regulations in relation to the surrounding development and consistent with the policies in the Westside Master Plan, however, ultimately the applicant decided to move forward with their request for R-MU.

Zoning Map Amendment Considerations

Planning staff is required by ordinance to analyze proposed zoning map amendments against existing adopted City policies and other related adopted City regulations. Planning staff is also directed to consider whether zoning map amendments implement best planning practices. Ultimately, however, a decision to amend the zoning map is fully up to the discretion of the City Council and is not subject to any particular standard of review or consideration. The full list of factors for the City Council to consider for a zoning map amendment are found in [Attachment E](#).

APPROVAL PROCESS AND COMMISSION AUTHORITY

The applicant has submitted a Zoning Map Amendment for the two properties subject to the standards found in 21A.50 of the Zoning Code. The City Council has decision making authority on the submitted Amendment. The Planning Commission provides a positive or negative recommendation to the City Council and, as part of that recommendation, can add conditions or request that changes be made to the proposal.

KEY CONSIDERATIONS

The key considerations and concerns below have been identified through the analysis of the project, neighbor and community input, and department reviews.

1. Westside Master Plan Guidance
2. Compatibility with Adjacent Properties

Consideration 1: Westside Master Plan Guidance

For zoning map amendments, Planning Staff is directed by ordinance to consider the associated City master plans and adopted policies that apply to a proposal. Staff reviews general City policies, including adopted policies in Citywide master plans such as Plan Salt Lake, and considers plans that are specific to an area. In this case the property is within the boundaries of the Westside Master Plan that was developed specifically for this area. The full plan can be accessed here: [West Side Master Plan](#).

See [Attachment D](#) for policy statements and goals from various city plans that staff considered as part of the review of this rezone request.


Opportunities that were identified that are proposed in the West Side Master Plan as the primary locations for growth and redevelopment can be categorized in seven distinct geographic areas or types:

- Within single family neighborhoods
- At significant intersections or nodes
- Along the Jordan River
- Along the surplus canal
- In the community's industrial districts
- Public spaces and parks

From the geographic areas/types noted above, the two that are most applicable to this project are nodes and industrial districts. The subject property is located along the 900 S Gateway between the 700 W Industrial Corridor and the 900 S/900 W neighborhood node. The development pattern along the 900 S gateway is principally composed of industrial uses on the south side of the street and single family uses on the north side. During the public input process for the Westside Master Plan, residents focused on how the inconsistent development pattern of industrial and residential uses impacts the perception

of their community, particularly on 900 S. The 700 W Industrial Corridor runs along 700 W from 800 S to 1700 S and was specifically identified in the master plan as an area that provides opportunities to diversify uses in the corridor as it makes up the eastern gateway to the Glendale and Poplar Grove neighborhoods.

As shown in the image to the right, the subject property is nearby, but not within, several nodes identified in the Westside Master Plan. Nodes are integrated centers of activities where travel corridors intersect. In the Westside, there are four basic types of nodes: neighborhood, community, regional, and recreation/open space. Within this area, the most significant for this project is the Neighborhood Node at 900 S/900 W which is a block west of the subject property.



Per the Westside Master Plan, a Neighborhood Node is defined as:

small-scale intersections that incorporate small commercial establishments and residential options. These nodes are easily accessible from the surrounding neighborhoods by foot or bicycle but provide very little parking, as they are not normally major attractions for residents outside of the neighborhood. They are also ideal locations for uses that cater to everyday needs and walking trips such as corner markets, cafes/restaurants, and salons or barbershops.

In addition to the definition, the master plan clarifies that these nodes are generally surrounded by single-family homes, therefore, building heights at neighborhood nodes should be limited to 35 feet or three stories.

The Westside Master Plan was adopted in 2014. Between 2015 and 2018, Salt Lake City initiated rezones for properties within the Community Node at 800 S/900 W and the Neighborhood Node at 900 S/900 W. The properties were rezoned from R-1/5,000 and CB (Community Business) to R-MU-35, a medium density mixed use district intended to better implement the vision of the master plan for this area.

The spaces in between the various nodes and corridors will reflect some of the changes seen in adjacent nodes in order to provide appropriate buffering and transitions. The master plan calls for new development that is compatible without impacting the stability of the community's interior.

As stated in 21A.24.170:

The purpose of the R-MU Residential/Mixed Use District is to reinforce the mixed-use character of the area and encourage the development of areas as high density residential urban neighborhoods containing retail, service commercial, and small-scale office uses. This district is appropriate in areas of the City where the applicable master plans support high density, mixed use development.

The proposed R-MU zone would allow for high density development with permitted residential development heights up to 75 FT and non-residential development heights up to 45 FT. High density residential and multi-use development is supported by the Master Plan on vacant parcels along the 700 West industrial corridor and at identified regional nodes, such as Redwood Road at 1700 S/2100 S.

This project is not within the 700 W industrial corridor – it’s just west of it along 800 W in an area that is intended to act as a buffer between lower density neighborhoods to the west and higher density to the east adjacent to Interstate 15. This project is not near any regional nodes identified in the Master Plan.

While the Westside Master Plan supports unique and compatible ways to add incremental density through infill development, it states that infill development should adhere to the prevailing development pattern in the immediate area – which in this particular area is predominantly single family residential. New development should not change the character of the neighborhood, rather, it should be a complement to the areas of opportunity identified in the West Side Master Plan.

It is clear that the existing M-1 zone allows for heights and uses that are not compatible with surrounding development nor the Master Plan goals to promote reinvestment and redevelopment in the Westside community. Staff is of the opinion the location of the proposal may be appropriate for appropriately scaled multi-family infill or low intensity mixed use development, however the proposed R-MU zone would accommodate development which is incompatible with the stated goals for this specific area as discussed above and in the Westside Master Plan.

Consideration 2: Compatibility with Adjacent Properties

The while the proposed R-MU Zoning District would provide the mix of uses described in the Westside Master Plan, the scale of development possible in the R-MU is not compatible infill for the existing and desired context of the neighborhood. Several considerations have been identified to determine if the proposed rezone is compatible with adjacent properties.

Development Characteristics Along 900 S

The development pattern along this portion 900 S is not entirely reflective of the current M-1 zoning development standards. The eastern portion of the block is in the process of redeveloping into the high-density mixed use called for by the recent rezone in that area and supported by the Master Plan along the 700 West industrial corridor. The remaining uses of the block are primarily single-family dwellings. In addition, the block directly west of the subject property is zoned R-1/5,000 and is reflective of that zoning district. As 900 S approaches the Neighborhood Node, the zoning changes from R-1/5,000 to R-MU-35 which provides a gradual transition into the node and smaller scale retail and locations for appropriately scaled neighborhood services..

The south side of 900 S is occupied by industrial uses. However, the 9-Line Trail acts as a buffer to those uses while providing active transportation options for the surrounding single-family neighborhood.

Development Characteristics Along 800 W

The development pattern along 800 W is residential in nature. Four smaller nonconforming single-family parcels are located north of the subject site along the east side of 800 W. These parcels are also located in the M-1 zoning of the block. A similar residential development pattern is found directly west and northwest of the subject site along the west side of 800 W. However, the properties to the west of 800 W are located within the R-MU-35 and R-1/5,000 zoning districts. The residential zoning districts to the west are separated by the 800 W right of way and a large center planting median (approximately 45 feet in width) along the frontage of the subject property and the block.

Development Characteristics Along Genesee Ave.

As mentioned, the block to the north of the subject site also contains a mix of zones and uses. The development patterns within this block are similar to those surrounding the subject site; small scale industrial uses mixed with single-family homes.

Concerning the block on which this project resides, the western half is zoned M-1, and primarily consists of smaller parcels and one story single-family residential dwellings. The eastern portion of the block was rezoned from M-1 to R-MU (Residential Mixed Use) in 2020 with the exception of two parcels located at the northeast corner, which contain a religious facility (Summum).

Building Height Compatibility

In considering the building height in the surrounding area, the R-1/5,000 zone immediately west and northwest allows a maximum building height of 28 feet. The existing zoning of the block allows a building height of 65 feet by right. The R-MU zone allows a building height of 75 feet by right for residential uses. The tallest building in the neighborhood is approximately 30 feet in height and is located within the M-1 zone directly south of the subject site across 900 S.

| | Existing M-1 Zone | Proposed R-MU Zone |
|-------------------|---|--|
| Setbacks | Front and corner side yard setback – 15' Interior and rear yard setback – None | Front and corner side yard setback – None Interior yard setback – None Rear yard setback – 25% of lot depth up to 30' |
| Height | 65' | 75' for residential uses 45' for nonresidential uses |
| Open Space | None required | 20% of lot for residential uses |

Staff Discussion

While Staff acknowledges the existing M-1 zoning district/development regulations are not compatible with the surrounding properties, staff is of the opinion the development standards of the R-MU zoning district are also not compatible with the surrounding properties and the development potential of the area. As mentioned, the parcels included in the proposed rezone are currently underutilized vacant land that is identified in the Master Plan as an appropriate area for medium density housing rather than high density housing. While staff is of the opinion that amending the existing M-1 zoning is appropriate, the new zoning district must provide for attractive, compatible, and moderate density, mixed-use development with an emphasis on pedestrian scale activity while maintaining compatibility with the existing development pattern of the area. For a more detailed comparison of the development regulations for the existing and proposed zoning districts, see [Attachment C](#).

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward a negative recommendation to the City Council regarding the proposed map amendment request as the R-MU zone is not compatible with the surrounding prevailing development pattern of single-family detached residential and is not consistent with key policies outlined in the Westside Master Plan.

NEXT STEPS


The Planning Commission can provide a positive or negative recommendation for the proposal and as part of a recommendation, can add conditions or request that changes be made to the proposal. The recommendation and any requested conditions/changes will be sent to the City Council, who will hold

a briefing and additional public hearing on the proposed zoning changes. The City Council may make modifications to the proposal and approve or decline to approve the proposed zoning map amendment.

If the proposed zoning amendment is not approved by the City Council, the property could still be developed under its current M-1 zoning designation, however, the property would not be able to be developed for multi-family residential uses as they are not permitted in the light manufacturing zoning district.

If ultimately approved by the City Council, the changes would be incorporated into the official City Zoning map and any new development on the rezoned parcels would be required to follow the regulations of the R-MU zoning district along with any development agreement requirements adopted by the City Council.

ATTACHMENT A: Zoning & Vicinity Map



- Subject Properties
- M-1, Light Manufacturing District
- R-MU, Residential/Mixed Use District
- R-1/5000, Single-Family Residential District
- OS, Open Space District

ATTACHMENT B: Applicant Narrative

Zoning Map Amendment

Salt Lake City Parcels Involved

15112770080000 – 875 South 800 West

COM 29 FT N OF SW COR LOT 26 CUMMINGS SUB OF BLK 2 PLAT C N 28 FT E 80 FT S 28 FT W 80 FT TO BEG 6665-2026 10243-2811

15112770090000 - 792 West 900 South

S 29 FT OF LOTS 24 25 & 26 CUMMINGS SUB OF BLK 2 PLAT C 5191-0980 6038-0771 6050-1172 6665-2032 10243-2813

1. Project Description

This proposal to amend the zoning map is initiated by the property owner and involves two vacant parcels on the corner of 900 South and 800 West which total 0.10 acres. The property is intended to be used for small multi-family housing, duplex, triplex or fourplex, often referred to as the “missing middle” in Salt Lake City planning documents. Several Salt Lake City planning documents have outlined a change in Salt Lake City public policy for this area due to various reasons. These include the ever increasing housing crisis in the city and the associated need for diverse housing options, beatification and utilization of the 9 Line corridor, the need for safe and efficient housing, flexible zoning tools and regulations to meet today’s conditions, and the need for effective, high quality, in-fill development. The majority, approximately 80%, of the 700-800 West block face for 900 South is unoccupied land. With over 50% of the block face’s zoning being changed in 2020 from M-1 to R-MU, the change in public policy for the block face is clear. This zoning map amendment completes the zoning change for the block face’s ONLY remaining vacant parcel.

This zoning amendment is supported by the following Salt Lake City planning documents:

Growing SLC: A Five Year Housing Plan 2018-2022

9 Line Corridor Master Plan, Adopted March 3, 2015

The Westside Master Plan, Adopted December 3, 2014

Salt Lake City Transit Master Plan | 2017 Executive Summary

Salt Lake City Pedestrian & Bicycle Master Plan, December 2015

Salt Lake City Westside Transportation Equity Study, 2021

Plan Salt Lake – Salt Lake City | Citywide Vision, Adopted December 1, 2015

1.a Purpose Of The Amendment

The purpose of this Zoning Amendment is to continue the work by the owner to beautify 800 West over a three block stretch, 800 South to Fayette Avenue, where the owner has built two new homes in the last three years. The owner desires to provide a custom-designed, custom-built residence appropriately-sized and beautifully landscaped which will offer direct access to recreation, public transit and non-car transportation on an east-west corridor in which the Westside Master Plan considers “in need of the most attention” (p.71 of the Westside Master Plan). The owner has a track record of developing custom, energy-efficient homes built to match the size and period of the surrounding neighborhood which fit in with the community (804 West Genesee and 802 West Fayette). Salt Lake City inspectors and neighbors who’ve viewed the owner’s previous work in its entirety can both attest to the owner’s commitment to personally building to the highest standard possible and being onsite during the build process to ensure quality building which enhances the community. Additionally, over the last three years, the owner has planted over 150 trees, shrubs, bushes, grasses and flowers along 800 West via approved landscape plans submitted to the city.

1.b Description Of The Proposed Use Of The Property Being Rezoned

“The purpose of the R-MU Residential/Mixed Use District is to reinforce the mixed use character of the area and encourage the development of areas as high density residential urban neighborhoods containing retail, service commercial, and small scale office uses. This district is appropriate in areas of the City where the applicable master plans support high density, mixed use development. The standards for the district are intended to facilitate the creation of a walkable urban neighborhood with an emphasis on pedestrian scale activity while acknowledging the need for transit and automobile access” (SLC Zoning Code).

With the 9 Line corridor helping to create a “walkable urban neighborhood,” developing these lots with the intent of restoring the “missing middle” living option adds to the mixed use character of the area. While a “hotel” is a permitted

use in the M-1 zone for legal lots like this one, the owner believes building a small, multi-family unit brings longer-term residents that better weave into the fabric of the existing community. The owner agrees with the SLC Planning Commission's 2020 allowance for one owner to change most of the block face and all the other vacant parcels to R-MU zoning. The owner believes this zoning is more in harmony with SLC's guiding master plans previously mentioned and shown in "City Goals" section 1.c below.

1.c Reasons Why The Present Zoning May Not Be Appropriate For The Area

Reasons are included in the headings: City Goals, Transportation and Equality

City Goals

With 160 people per day moving to Utah, their presence has become noticeable on our public roads (KSLTV.com, 12/28/2021). If we can create homes for people in places where walkable neighborhood infrastructure and public transit is already in place, we're helping achieve the goals of several SLC master plans. These goals help our community ease car traffic, improve air quality and encourage healthy living. It's interesting to note that the 9 Line corridor plan, which creates a walkable neighborhood connecting the east and west side of downtown SLC, is so important that it's one of the very few streets to ever have its own SLC master plan.

Salt Lake City has historically built effective public/private partnerships which began with the city making large infrastructure changes followed by zoning changes to accomplish additional reinvestment in the community. TRAX may be a good example of this. The TRAX installation was followed by zoning changes which introduced development along its corridor thru the city. The city's massive undertaking along the 900 South corridor seems similar to TRAX and offers pedestrian-friendly transportation. With the block face of 900 South between 700-800 West being 80% unoccupied space, it offers the perfect place to make zoning changes which bring additional investment to our community. This change is already underway. Many vacant land owners over several blocks to the east have already changed zoning along the 9 Line corridor.

Many city planning documents support this change. Some excerpts below (shown in different fonts, text, etc.) are directly from these documents and are shared in this section "City Goals" for the benefit of those wishing to be more familiar with relevant SLC planning documents.

Plan Salt Lake – Salt Lake City | Citywide Vision, Adopted December 1, 2015. Sections below are from pages 9-10:

DIVERSE MIX OF USES

By creating places with a diverse mix of uses, building types, connections, and transportation options, people have the choice of where they live, how they live, and how they get around. As our City grows and evolves overtime, having a diverse mix of uses in our neighborhoods citywide will become increasingly important to accommodate responsible growth and provide people with real choices.

CONNECTIVITY & CIRCULATION

Connectivity and circulation are critical to responsible, sustainable growth. We must ensure that our neighborhoods and districts are well connected by both providing a wide-range of transportation and mobility options and increasing the number of connections in our community. Smaller blocks and a diversity of connections are necessary to achieve this.

DENSITY

Density and compact development are important principles of sustainable growth, allowing for more affordable transportation options and creating vibrant and diverse places. Density in the appropriate locations, including near existing infrastructure, compatible development, and major transportation corridors, can help to accommodate future growth more efficiently. This type of compact development allows people to live closer to where they work, recreate, shop, and carry out their daily lives, resulting in less automobile dependency and greater mobility.

COMPATIBILITY

Compatibility of development generally refers to how a development integrates into the existing scale and character of a neighborhood. New development should be context sensitive to the surrounding development, taking into account the existing character of the neighborhood while providing opportunities for new growth and to enhance the sense of place.

MAXIMIZE PUBLIC INVESTMENTS

The cost of public infrastructure investments, such as transit, can be recaptured through new development and increases in density. Transit-oriented development maximizes transit infrastructure benefits through increased ridership and density. This type of development results in more walkable, vibrant, and accessible neighborhoods, as well as increases in property values and sales tax revenues for the community.

RESPONSIVE & RESILIENT

Designing infrastructure and development to be adaptable and responsive to a changing climate and demographic shifts will ensure our community is resilient and meets the changing needs of future generations. This means creating places that are durable and long lasting while being flexible, allowing for a diversity of users and uses.

GREEN BUILDING

Green infrastructure and development should incorporate sustainable building best practices including high performance energy and resource efficiency, renewable energy generation, transit and pedestrian orientation, storm water and water management, and the use of high quality, durable building materials.

“Guiding Principles” from Plan Salt Lake comes from p. 14:

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1/ Neighborhoods that provide a safe environment, opportunity for social interaction, and services needed for the wellbeing of the community therein.

2/ Growing responsibly while providing people with choices about where they live, how they live, and how they get around.

3/ 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.

4/ A transportation and mobility network that is safe, accessible, reliable, affordable, and sustainable, providing real choices and connecting people with places.

5/ Air that is healthy and clean.

6/ Minimize our impact on the natural environment.

7/ Protecting the natural environment while providing access and opportunities to recreate and enjoy nature.

8/ A beautiful city that is people focused.

9/ Maintaining places that provide a foundation for the City to affirm our past.

10/ Vibrant, diverse, and accessible artistic and cultural resources that showcase the community’s long standing commitment to a strong creative culture.

11/ Ensure access to all City amenities for all citizens while treating everyone equitably with fairness, justice, and respect.

12/ A balanced economy that produces quality jobs and fosters an environment for commerce, local business, and industry to thrive.

13/ A local government that is collaborative, responsive, and transparent.

Plan Salt Lake “Housing Initiatives” below are taken from p.39.

PLAN SALT LAKE

HOUSING INITIATIVES:

1. Ensure access to affordable housing citywide (including rental and very low income).

2. Increase the number of medium density housing types and options.

3. Encourage housing options that accommodate aging in place.

4. Direct new growth toward areas with existing infrastructure and services that have the potential to be people-oriented.

5. Enable moderate density increases within existing neighborhoods where appropriate.

6. Promote energy efficient housing and rehabilitation of existing housing stock.

7. Promote high density residential in areas served by transit.

8. Support homeless services.

2. The “missing middle” option, duplex, triplex and fourplex, offers us a way to increase the number of medium density housing options without adversely affecting the residential community.

3. The “missing middle” proposed for the corner of 900 South 800 West would naturally offer ground level living in an approachable living arrangement.

4. Building on the 9 Line corridor offers residents a recreational hub in “people-oriented” housing.

5. This rezone offers a moderate density increase appropriate for the existing neighborhood.

7. Public transit and pedestrian-friendly transit are both available to this lot. “Plans Salt Lake” suggests this is the type of residential area appropriate for high density.

Growing SLC: A Five Year Housing Plan 2018-2022 p.11 & 50.

The housing crisis also impacts middle-income households. The historically low vacancy rate of 2 percent in Salt Lake City in 2017 has driven prices up in every neighborhood. In many cases, middle-income households are forced to make the decision to locate in neighborhoods that they would not otherwise choose, take on greater amounts of debt, or move to another community. In August 2016, Salt Lake City conducted the Salt Lake Live Work Survey, which included people that commuted into the city for work. Among these commuters, 52 percent indicated that they would consider living in Salt Lake City if housing were more affordable. Salt Lake City’s population grows by 60 percent every day from in-commuters, which creates significant stress on our transportation network and the environment. Providing more affordable options could greatly reduce these impacts, which are shared by all residents.

Salt Lake City Workforce




Source: BBC Housing Market Study, 2016

Interesting to point out that Growing SLC’s findings suggested 52% of commuters would consider living in Salt Lake City if housing were more affordable.

SNAPSHOT SALT LAKE: SUMMARY

Salt Lake City Residents by Age, 2014



Source: BBC Housing Market Study, 2016

Wage Increase vs. Home Sale Price Increase 2011-2014




Nearly 4 of every 10 Salt Lake City residents is an adult millennial (between 18 and 34 years old). **Demand for housing in walkable neighborhoods and non-single family housing types by this demographic will drive the housing market for the next decade.**

In addition, similar housing choice preferences among the Baby Boomer cohort as they retire will put added pressure on urban types of housing development.

Nearly **one-half of all renters in Salt Lake City are cost-burdened**, and nearly one-quarter are extremely cost-burdened (spend more than 50% of income on rent).

Salt Lake City Household Composition, 2014



Nearly two-thirds of all households in Salt Lake City are composed of one or two people.

Source: BBC Housing Market Study, 2016

Growing SLC: A Five Year Housing Plan 2018-2022 p. 16 below offers additional “Guiding Principles” appropriating funds.

The Salt Lake City Council will support and fund projects that:

1. Adhere to federal-level efforts to encourage a mix of income in individual projects and neighborhoods.
2. Uphold an equitable ratio of affordable to market rate new units throughout the city. Ideally, projects outside areas of high opportunity should have lower ratios of affordable units.
3. Incentivize affordable housing within areas of high opportunity.
4. Award funding through a competitive, accountable, fair and transparent process to give all interested developers, agencies and organizations equal opportunity to submit proposals for consideration.
5. Incentivize the preservation and improvement of existing affordable housing.
6. Create a net increase in affordable housing units while:
 - i. Avoiding displacement of existing affordable housing to the extent possible, and
 - ii. Retaining and expanding the diversity of AMI and innovative housing types.
7. Keep publicly-funded housing projects affordable as long as possible.
8. Create a spectrum of housing options for people of all backgrounds and incomes.
9. Collaborate with the private sector to include affordable units in developments that are planned or in progress, which otherwise might not have affordable units.
10. Include collaboration with community and private sector partners to enable opportunities for in kind contributions, creative financing and service delivery models.
11. Utilize City-owned land whenever possible.
12. Enable residents' success to maintain housing through partnerships with providers of supportive services.
13. Support tax increment and neighborhood development goals when utilizing RDA money for housing development.
14. Identify opportunities to expedite City funded projects that are already in the process.
15. Clearly articulate to the community, developers and all interested parties options for funding and collaborating with the City on establishing affordable housing in all neighborhoods.
16. Identify tools to increase and diversify the total housing supply including housing types that the private market does not sufficiently provide such as family housing in the downtown area, innovative housing types, missing middle housing and middle- to low-income apartments.
17. Include affordable housing in transit-oriented developments because access to public transit increases access to opportunities. Moderate increases in density should be encouraged along transit corridors.
18. Include innovative parking solutions especially for projects near public transit to bring down construction costs so more affordable housing units can be built.
19. Include quality construction materials, design, and incorporate public or private amenities.
20. Allow and encourage opportunities for projects to remain at least to some extent on the City's tax rolls.

While no public funds are being sought for this development, it seems relevant to call out:

Point#8 encourages us to call for a spectrum of housing options for people of all backgrounds and incomes.

Point#16 calls out what some city documents refer to as the “missing middle.” It also encourages diversifying housing stock to include this option which is often not developed. This is due to rising development costs bringing about developer’s focus on multi-story apartment buildings.

Point#17 encourages us to include affordable housing options where possible near transit-oriented development areas. It also encourages moderate increases in density along transit corridors.

Growing SLC: A Five Year Housing Plan 2018-2022 p. 17 & 18 below emphasizes what it believes our #1 goal is together:

RESPONDING TO THE CRISIS: COMPREHENSIVE SOLUTIONS & POLICIES

Salt Lake City is witnessing tremendous growth as households are expanding and new housing is being developed. The vision of this plan, that Salt Lake City is a place for a growing diverse population to find housing opportunities that are safe, secure, and enrich lives and communities, recognizes the changing nature of the city, and provides the foundation for creating goals and strategies to manage the housing needs of tomorrow. The following pages outline the housing goals, objectives and strategies through which City departments and divisions, and public and private partners can achieve the outcomes identified in Plan Salt Lake and the Comprehensive Housing Policy adopted by the Council in February 2016.

In order to respond to Salt Lake City's changing demographics and the housing needs of its diverse communities, it is critical to begin to look within the City for real and responsive change that will encourage the market to develop the housing and infrastructure needed to accommodate our growing community. This goal focuses on the need to increase the diversity of housing types and opportunities in the city by seeking policy reforms that can enhance the flexibility of the land-use code and create an efficient and predictable development process for community growth. Strategic policy decisions that integrate the transportation system, development related infrastructure, financial institutions, and data, as well as innovative design and construction methods, can break down social and economic segregation, thus building a city for everyone.

GOAL 1: INCREASE HOUSING OPTIONS: REFORM CITY PRACTICES TO PROMOTE A RESPONSIVE, AFFORDABLE, HIGH-OPPORUNITY HOUSING MARKET

Objective 1: Review and modify land-use and zoning regulations to reflect the affordability needs of a growing, pioneering city

Plan Salt Lake's Existing Conditions report shows that the City has not had a significant update to its zoning code since the mid-1990s. Land use decisions of the 1990s came about as a reaction to the gradual population decline that occurred over the preceding three decades. Conversely, the city's population has grown by 20 percent in the last two decades, (the fastest rate of growth in nearly a century) presenting a need for a fundamentally different approach. Household type and makeup has also significantly changed to reflect smaller household sizes in the 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. A concentrated zoning and land use review is warranted to address these critical issues and to refine code so that it focuses on form and scale of development rather than intended use.

1.1.1 Develop flexible zoning tools and regulations, with a focus along significant transportation routes.

In order to respond to the demographic shift described above, modernizing zoning is key not only to catching up with the demand, but creating housing that responds to every stage of life whether just starting out or downsizing later in life. Immediate strategies that will be pursued for greatest impact include improving or expanding on zones that have supported recent housing development, including the Transit Station Area (TSA), Residential Mixed-Use (R-MU), Sugar House Business District (CSHBD), Gateway Mixed-Use (GMU), Central Business District (D-1), Downtown Warehouse/Residential District (D-3), and new form-based zones (FBUN). In addition, there is a need for in-fill ordinances that allow for greater density in existing neighborhoods, offering owners the option to subdivide large parcels to increase the utility and value of their land, removing impediments to innovative construction types, such as accessory dwelling units, and reducing parking requirements to bring down the cost of developing new housing units.

Growing SLC: A Five Year Housing Plan 2018-2022 p. 19 below mentions the “missing middle” and encourages us to all help with “finding a place for these types [of housing] throughout the city” as they help with “restoring choices for a wider variety of household sizes.”

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.

In-fill ordinances provide both property owners and developers with options to increase the number of units on particular parcels throughout the city. Such options would also help restore the “missing middle” housing types where new construction has principally been limited to single-family homes and multi-story apartment buildings for decades. Missing middle housing types are those that current zoning practices have either dramatically reduced or eliminated altogether: accessory dwelling units, duplexes, tri-plexes, small multi-plexes, courtyard cottages and bungalows, row houses, and small apartment buildings. Finding a place for these housing types throughout the city means more housing options in Salt Lake City, and restoring choices for a wider variety of household sizes, from seniors to young families.




Encouraging in-fill housing like this multi-unit building throughout the city means more people are able to find homes in Salt Lake City. (Image: Atlas Architects)



P.10 of the Westside Master Plan shows how the “missing middle” zoning (duplex zoning) represents just 2% of total zoning (2014).

The residential zoning districts form the core of the study area, between 900 West and Redwood Road and from I-80 south to 1700 South. Of the 1,020 acres of residential zoning in the Westside, **89 percent is zoned for single-family development** (including the community’s two mobile home developments). Another two percent for duplexes and the remaining nine percent for multi-family development. Well over one-half of the Westside’s 90 acres of multi-family zoning is contained in just six developments, all within two blocks of either Redwood Road or 1700 South. Not only does the Westside lack multi-family housing options, but the options that are there are not well integrated into the rest of the community.

The industrial zoning districts, and a majority of the commercial ones, surround the neighborhoods on the east, west and south sides. The open space zoning, which is almost entirely composed of the Jordan River Parkway and the community’s parks, is centrally located through the middle of the residential community.



P.10 of the Westside Master Plan suggests the Westside would benefit from better integrating multifamily into the rest of the community rather than repeating the past and concentrating it so heavily (50%+) in just six developments.



P. 33 of the Westside Master Plan mentions, “There are also several vacant or underutilized parcels that can be developed as infill parcels, and, depending on their size, can be seen as opportunities for multi-family projects.” “Multi-family residential infill will require some zoning ordinance modification” (p.33).

P. 34 of the Westside Master Plan also suggests that “infill development adhere to the prevailing development pattern in the immediate area.” More than 50% of the block face of 900 South was recently rezoned to a Residential Mixed Use (R-MU); this is clearly an undeniable pattern. The proposed zoning change is in line with that pattern of development on the existing block face. Furthermore, the Westside Master Plan encouraged the Salt Lake Planning Division to “Explore regulatory options for allowing two- or multi-family development” where appropriate. It also mentioned that it would be helpful to “add even a small amount of additional density without impacting the prevailing single-family character of the Westside and potentially introduce unique housing types and designs to the community or the city” (p.34). This rezone allowing for development of the “Missing Middle” helps achieve the recommendation to the Salt Lake Planning Division by adding just a small amount of additional density that’s in harmony with the character of the existing community.

P.69-71 of the Westside Master Plan speaks specifically of the 700 West corridor (Gateways & Industrial Districts):

The 700 West corridor is between I-15 and 800 West from 800 South to approximately 1700 South. Despite having only 20 percent of the industrial land in the community, the 700 West corridor is important because it forms the eastern edge of Glendale and Poplar Grove and is the gateway for three of the traditional neighborhood entrances: 800 South, 900 South and 1300 South. It abuts single-family neighborhoods and schools, creating an uneven and undesirable transition and an unattractive gateway.

In terms of redevelopment, the most important section of the corridor is between 800 South and 1400 South, a distance just under a mile. Both the pattern and quality of development vary in the corridor and the industrially-zoned areas sit directly across either 700 West or 800 West from residential properties. There are a couple of small, nonconforming industrial properties mixed in with homes but otherwise, there is a clear division between the districts.

Given the goal of increasing the community's residential density, there are opportunities for infill multi-family developments for residents who seek urban neighborhoods with an industrial appeal. The proximity to Downtown, the Jordan River and the 9 Line Trail all make the area attractive to many residents.

Between 800 South and 1700 South, there are approximately 75 acres of land on either side of this segment of the corridor that are vacant or underdeveloped. Assuming any individual site is not contaminated and with the appropriate building configurations and buffering from the railroad corridor, this land could be redeveloped as multi-family housing. A conservative multi-family density of 25 units per acre and a complete transformation of this land would yield over 2,000 new dwelling units. There is also opportunity for low-density infill projects on lots that are vacant but not big enough for multiple-unit residential development.

The landscaped medians and street trees on 800 West between 600 South and 900 South have helped create a buffer between the single-family residences and the industrial uses to the east. Such improvements are possible in this section of 800 West because the right-of-way is 90 feet wide. Elsewhere on 800 West and on all of 700 West, the right-of-way width is approximately 45 feet. One option for these smaller rights-of-way is to disallow on-street parking and install as narrow a median as possible for trees to grow. Additionally, large trees can be planted on the west side of 700 West where industrial uses are adjacent to residential ones. Regardless of the solution, the first step is to install sidewalks, curb and gutter on 800 West and 700 West where they are missing. A majority of the cross streets have all three.

GATEWAYS

Five of the six routes into the Westside from the east cut through the 700 West corridor. A first-time visitor to the community, using one of these five streets, regardless of their mode of transportation, is first greeted by a land use and development pattern that is not representative of the true character of the community. This is especially problematic when two of the community's major assets—the Jordan River and parks on 900 South and the Sorenson Multicultural and Unity Center—are both only a half-mile from their respective gateways. The topic of gateways and their current condition was a frequent point of discussion in public meetings, and some residents believed strongly that the gateways influenced how people felt about their community. The three gateways that were most commonly cited were 800 South, 900 South and 1300 South, but **900 South was generally considered the one in need of the most attention.**

The visual impact of the 900 South gateway is a result of three factors: the railroad corridor, the interstate and land uses. The latter can be addressed through regulatory and zoning changes in the short-term and redevelopment in the mid- to long-term. The first two factors, however, are barriers that must be mitigated through urban design treatments, infrastructure improvements and landscaping. While there are few realistic methods to mask the impact of the railroad corridor, viaducts provide opportunities to “recapture” these barriers and turn them into welcoming gateway features.

These gateway also provide opportunities for more community-driven projects. These projects, which may be temporary, simple and inexpensive, should be ongoing installations that the city facilitates and monitors for public safety purposes. Otherwise these projects would be the responsibility of residents and stakeholders. Activating public spaces near the gateways is another method of softening the impact of the viaducts. Increasing activity and attracting people to a more positive public space can become the focus of one’s attention upon entering the community. A newly-installed bicycle park on the south side of 900 South at 700 West is one such example. Further detail for the 900 South gateway is presented in the corridor plan for the 9 Line.



MOVING FORWARD

Explore ways to redevelop the 700 West industrial corridor.

Permitted Uses. The Planning Division should comprehensively review the uses that are permitted in the current light manufacturing zoning district and determine if a new zone—an industrial park district, for example—may be more appropriate. A new district should more specifically regulate building and site design and should completely prohibit any uses that produce noxious odors, fumes or other discharge or other uses that rely heavily on outdoor storage.

Mixed Use Infill. The Planning Division should consider permitting residential and commercial infill on vacant parcels in the corridor. Any infill development with a residential component shall be contingent upon environmental review. Height and bulk regulations for infill development should be as flexible as they are for other uses in the zoning district in order to achieve high density development (50 or more dwelling units per acre).

Curb and Gutter. Salt Lake City should install curbs and gutter on all streets in the 700 West corridor where such improvements do not exist.

Streetscape Changes. The Transportation Division should consider modifications to the streets on 700 West and 800 West in order to buffer the existing industrial uses from the residential land uses to the west. Narrow landscaped medians or large trees on the west side of 700 West are other possibilities.

The “Moving Forward” section to the left comes from p.73 of the Westside Master Plan.

The Planning Division has made the 9 Line corridor a priority and work is now underway.

ALL infill vacant land (owned by one party) on the block face of 900 South 700-800 West has been changed to R-MU, and the owner of the last remaining vacant parcel on the block face has requested it now be change to R-MU.

800 West’s 90’ width makes it a natural buffer between mixed use and residential zoning. Master Plan recommendations include flexible zoning in this area allowing 50 or more dwelling units per acre.

Even on a national level, the Federal government sees this area and this lot’s entire north side block face (not the south) specifically as a “distressed area.”

The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has placed this block face in what it terms the “Opportunity Zone” where it invites owners to aid in developing this area for the benefit of the community (<https://opportunityzones.hud.gov/resources/map>).

Transportation

The current M-1 zoning does not allow for a small, multi-family home despite immediate access to public transit and recreation. With 160 new residents per day arriving, it's clear why the Utah State House Speaker mentioned transportation being the first issue when he commented on the influx of residents. He said, "State leaders are very aware of problems associated with a booming population...growth doesn't have to be the enemy but that Utah needs to be thoughtful with long-term planning for transportation, housing and recreation" (KSLTV.com, 12/28/2021).

The Salt Lake City Pedestrian & Bicycle Master Plan suggested that after gathering public input, one of the key themes regarding transportation was a need for better options and "support for conventional and low stress bikeways that are designed well, especially to minimize intersection conflicts" (P. ES-2).

The Salt Lake City Transit Master Plan 2017 Executive Summary suggested that "through public outreach efforts for the Transit Master Plan and past SLC planning efforts" transit officials learned that "forty-three percent (43%) of participants in the *Design Your Transit System Tool* identified improved access to transit on foot and by bike as a priority" (p.107). Additionally, some age groups that are likely to rent their home (18-36 year old Millennials) are more active, taking 23% fewer driving trips, 16% more walking trips and 24% more biking trips than other households (p.7). "Public transit is also the primary mode of travel for many of the approximately 1 in 10 Salt Lake City residents that have a disability" (p.7). A ground-level home is more accommodating to some disabilities and will naturally be a part of a small, multi-family home.

On a health note, obesity rates in Salt Lake County are at approximately 27%. Housing near transit and recreational opportunities increase physical activity and improve health (p.7). A home with direct access to the 9 Line corridor offers this opportunity.

The 9 Line Corridor Master Plan mentioned its intent is to function as "An urban thoroughfare and public open space, helping people make connections, reduce barriers, promote healthy lifestyles." Another part of its purpose is to help "a diverse assemblage of people and user groups, [provide]the opportunity for enhancing their connections to the surrounding businesses and neighborhoods that form a unique and attractive community" (p. 9). The rezoning of this underutilized land helps us achieve this vision of bringing a "Diverse assemblage of people" together to use the 9 Line space to connect people to recreation, public transit and the surrounding businesses.

Equality

Equality is a characteristic woven into Salt Lake City's guiding master plans.

The 9 Line Corridor Master Plan (2015) makes mention of reducing barriers and improving physical and cultural connections between the east and west sides of the City that in turn offer regional connections (p. 9). This zoning change helps people connect and reduces the barriers of east-west divide.

Growing SLC: A Five Year Housing Plan 2018-2022 mentions the growing disparity between wages and rental rates appears to be creating greater instability in the lives of low-income households (p.10). "The housing crisis also impacts middle-income households" (p.11). Higher income households appear to enjoy more housing stability. This zoning change helps provide lower rents and more stability to both low- and middle-income households with more diverse, quality housing stock in a middle price range. Exacerbating the housing crisis are local barriers to housing development (p.11)... The systemic affordable housing crisis has implications for every Salt Lake City resident and business." Allowing this zoning change will allow for a well-designed, small home for someone wishing to find a nice place to live that's more affordable than what average rents in SLC are currently (RentCafe.com, Zumper.com).

The Transportation Equity For Salt Lake City's Westside Study, 2021 shines a light on "Equitable Access" for west and east side Salt Lake City neighborhoods. One example of a benefit many eastside residents enjoy is the variety of several small, multi-family housing options around a major park such as Liberty Park. Additionally, you can bike or walk directly to the park from these small, multi-family options. The same opportunity around the west side's International Peace Gardens is limited. This zoning change brings "Equitable Access" to a housing option that is in limited supply around the park today and makes it accessible via the 9 Line corridor.

Impact

Why R-MU?

- Block face zoning is consistent. Consistency seems important since spot zoning is illegal. It seems the original intent when zoning half the block R-MU was to convert this block (along 900 South) to R-MU. Would it not otherwise be considered spot zoning since there is no other R-MU zoning near this location?
- 90' physical road break. With a 90' wide break between the east and west side of 800 West, including a 45' city owned park-like median, it doesn't seem we could find a better place to make a zoning break consistent with the change of the block face zoning started in 2020.
- 10' extra. R-MU appears to add just 10' to the current M-1 zoning maximum height of 65'.
- Practicality naturally limits height. Some may argue that the 75' height allowance in R-MU is too much for this lot. The reality is that these are two 0.05 acre lots and there is no physical way a 75' building could reasonably be constructed and allow any type of reasonable parking. Additionally, anything over 30' requires the power lines to be buried at a cost estimated to be \$2.5Mil per an email quote from Scott.Burton@pacificcorp.com (Mar/11, 3:45pm). Could some homes be torn down around the lot and developed into something larger? Yes. However, that misses the intent of building the "Missing Middle" on these lots, but it could be possible. If that large of an investment was made by an entity along a pedestrian-centric road with its own master plan dedicated to bringing people to use it, we'd be fortunate to welcome it as 900 South is one of the few entrances to the west side and its further development would be welcomed over the industrial neglect prevalent today.
- Missing Middle - This size of lot is ideal for developing the "Missing Middle."
- 12' on the south. The property line on the south of these lots is nearly 12' back from the sidewalk. SLC Fire requirements incentivizes owners to set a home back at least an additional 5+ feet creating almost a 17' setback; this is the planned setback from which the owner intends to begin designing.
- 9' on the west. The property line on the west is nearly 9' back from the sidewalk. While SLC is currently evaluating reducing parking requirements, such requirements have not yet been changed. Therefore, in order to accommodate adequate parking given current requirements of the proposed R-MU zone, the owner intends to pull the building forward to be set approximately 9' back from the sidewalk to meet the rear parking requirements. May we keep in mind that "Form" zoning approved just east a few blocks requires zero off-street parking (i.e., FB-UN2 zone for 278 West 900 South)?

Why is this different than the recent rezone of 805 South 800 West to R-MU-35?

- SLC made their intentions clear regarding the direction it wanted for 800 South years before the proposed zoning change for 805 S. 800 W. came along recently. Not all individual citizens/home owners sought to change the zoning of their homes to R-MU-35 along 800 South (800-900 West); that change was done by SLC or a small group getting it approved by SLC. It sent a clear message to myself as an existing owner of multiple properties along 800 West (including 804 W Genesee, separated from that zoning change by a 15' alley) and the rest of the community since the mandate was approved by SLC offices. The clear directive was that this would be more density, limited to 35' in height (via R-MU-35 zoning with its required parking of one car per unit).
- I was the only local citizen in the room when SLC Planning Commission was reviewing the zoning change request for 805 W. 800 S. The Planning Commission indirectly invited the owner to change his proposed zoning request from R-MU-45 to R-MU-35. Those actions were consistent and appropriate since SLC had already made its intentions clear for the area (the expanded block face of I-15 to 900 W) by initiating a zoning change to R-MU-35 years ago. That owner was simply being asked to adjust his request to meet the established pattern previously set. In that meeting, he graciously complied with the informal request before leaving the room.
- Similarly, SLC has approved a welcome change to R-MU zoning for 50% of the block face (700-800 W) along a future pedestrian, non-car corridor with its own master plan (the 9 Line Corridor Master Plan). Like the directional change on 800 South, the change on 900 South was set in motion years ago. The actions were clear. The message sent to local citizens was clear. The pattern of development along the respective roads was different, but made clear in the same fashion. As a resident, I read the actions and directions of SLC as a clear change to the area and purchased two lots along the same block face that was zoned R-MU. I've made a decision to invest and beautify this area years ago in a way that goes beyond what is "Required" (details below). I seek R-MU zoning, not R-MU-35 or 45 in its current form.

What's the impact to surrounding single-family homes and where has this been done in SLC already?

- Along non-car, transit lines (i.e., the pedestrian walkway of 900 South or TRAX line on 200 South), R-MU is a sound zoning choice because it requires at least some parking; this is in comparison to the zero parking requirement of selectively used Form zoning. R-MU is a natural choice over other zoning options when existing lot lines are set back a reasonable distance from the public sidewalk. That's the case with the corner of 900 South 800 West.
- There is an example worth noting that is nearby this proposed zoning amendment, namely 900 South 200 West. Form zoning (FB-UN2) turns to R-MU zoning as you move from 900 South 200 West further south and pass a major freeway exit (the 900 South I-15 exit), shown below. Immediately after a major I-15 road, R-MU zoning is the first zoning used (1015 South 200 West) on a corner lot with multi-family units. On the other end of the block face is the same R-MU zoning (1075 South 200 West). In-between the two R-MU lots are four one-story, single-family homes which have been zoned RMF-35. In principle & use, this is almost an exact match to what is being proposed with this zoning amendment for the corner of 900 South 800 West.
- It's worth noting that at 1075 South 200 West, only 45' separate a R-MU lot from additional one-story, single-family homes to the south. That's half the distance of the existing 90' between this proposed R-MU zoned corner lot of 900 South 800 West and the one-story, single-family homes to the west on 900 South. Additionally, this planned building on the corner of 900 South 800 West is a two-story building, making it fit in more seamlessly with the 900 South neighborhood.



- The proposed zoning amendment would create a version of the example above; however, the 900 South 800 West lot's building would be more appropriately sized to blend in with the existing single-family homes.
- The recommended zoning for 900 South 800 West would layout similarly to other nearby non-car, pedestrian corridors (example above).



Additional Impact

All vacant land on the 900 South (700-800 West) block face is owned by two parties. One party rezoned all their vacant land to R-MU in 2020. The other party wishes to now do the same. What wasn't changed to R-MU is still M-1 which was setup years ago before most manufacturing moved west.

While there are several uses for a vacant lot in the current M-1 zone that may be potentially profitable, these don't seem appropriate for the space. These include: a recycling collection station, a gas station, a cannabis production establishment, tire distribution center, sign painting & fabrication, 24-hour taxicab service or a dead animal cremation service center.

With 50%+ of the 900 South block face (700-800 West) being rezoned to R-MU, the city's intent to bring more mixed residential use along the 9 Line corridor is clear and consistent with the city's long-term planning documents. While the M-1 zone allows for a hotel/motel to be built, the zoning needs to be changed for a more appropriate small, multi-family home to be allowed.

It may be helpful for some to compare M-1 and R-MU zoning setbacks. As I understand them, they are as follows:

M-1 has no setback requirements for the interior side yard or the rear yard.

R-MU has no setback requirements for the interior side yard or the front/corner side yard.

M-1 has a 15' front & corner side yard setback

M-1 has no open space requirement for a lot nor does it require any rear yards.

R-MU requires 20%+ open space and a rear yard that is 25% of lot depth, but not exceeding 30'.


In the end, changing 900 South 800 West's vacant land zoning to match all other vacant land zoning on the block face is appropriate. Additionally, R-MU zoning incorporates a 20% open space requirement (currently zero open space is required in the M-1 zone) and is the best zoning for helping incorporate off-street parking into the future design. Such zoning seems appropriate since it also requires more parking than the Form zone approved a couple blocks east which requires zero off street parking.

R-MU zoning for the last vacant lot on the block face is an infill decision supported by seven SLC long-term planning documents and is in harmony with SLC's vision of sound planning.




900 South 800 West

Aerial view of lot lines



Looking east



Looking north

Sample 2-Story Structure

Proposed Site Plan:



Building (blue)



Parking (gray)

Open space inside the lot lines exceeds 20% min (light green)

Additional open space outside the lot lines (dark green)



 Proposed Building
 Proposed Parking

 Owner's Green Space
 SLC's Owner Maintained Green Space

The Owner's Proven Commitment To The Community

The owner of the property believes in the restoration and enhancement of this community along 800 West. Beginning in 2017 (SLC Case#PLNZAD2017-00393), the owner started with a vacant, neglected lot (830 South 800 West). The owner and his wife designed a custom home with a goal of building a home to add a pocket of sunshine to the area. The home's front door & much of the landscape is designed to be the color of sunshine with the goal of literally adding more sunshine to the neighborhood. Additionally, they sought to bring vintage features into a home that was designed to feel like a restored 1920's home. This included a wood-based exterior over 100% of the home, vintage exterior lighting as well as wood floors and tile that were consistent with buildings from the early 1900's. Lastly, it was landscaped to beautify the neighborhood and was referred to by one neighbor as the street's "Garden of Eden." Despite some individuals experiencing homelessness unplugging the water system to charge their cell phones, it still looks presentable and will be worked on again in 2022. Between this home and a second home (similarly built on a vacant, neglected lot at 802 West Fayette Avenue), nearly 150 trees, shrubs, bushes, grasses and flowers were installed by the hands of the owner.

Besides building homes complimenting the character of the neighborhood, the owner has helped and supported other owners along 800 West prepare to improve their land. He began years ago supporting one owner of a vacant parcel at 1050 South 800 West purchase the dilapidated home (808 W. Dalton) that had become a safety issue next door. He supported the owner who then completed a lot line adjustment and he helped sell the lots to individuals who completed the teardown and are beginning the development of 808 W. Dalton. The owner noticed the neglected lots of 800 South 800 West, but when he called to begin the process to clean up that lot (805 South 800 West), it was already in-process to be cleaned up and developed.

The lots on the corner of 900 South and 800 West were the last of the neglected lots on 800 West to be cleaned up. The owner and his family have begun cleaning them of trash and weeding them. Rezoning these lots is the first step towards designing a custom home that is suited to the lot, neighborhood and community.

The owner has previously worked as a Research Scientist designing product, packaging, and shelf space layouts prior to taking an interest in designing custom living spaces and landscapes to enhance the quality of life. For this corner, designs are being reviewed that originate in northern Europe, Hong Kong, New York and the Salt Lake Valley with the hope of bringing design elements that compliment the neighborhood and restore beauty to a vacant, neglected corner lot. The owner is studying the use of efficient building materials and practices that would enhance life for residents and the community. Upon rezoning, the owner will engage the professional services of additional designers, architects, engineers and builders.

The owner believes he can add to our community by providing a quality home in which to live. He's currently renting to or has rented to a diverse set of people living and working right in our community including retired veterans, a member of Ballet West, a volunteer of public radio, nurses, janitors, an airline analyst, self-employed service contractors, house cleaners, and partially-disabled individuals.

This zoning change allows for something to be built that will include ground-level units that may also afford some the rare chance to age in place near family. Additionally, this rezoning will offer a housing option that is disappearing since many multi-story apartment buildings are now including either parking on the first floor or commercial retail space.

Thank you for time and for the opportunity to work together to bring something good to our community.

Sincerely,
Cameron Broadbent

ATTACHMENT C: M-1 & R-MU Zoning Comparison

| REGULATION | EXISTING ZONING (M-1) | PROPOSED ZONING (R-MU) |
|------------------------|--|--|
| Lot Area/Width | <p>10,000 SF/ 80 FT</p> <p><i>*Existing Lots: Lots legally existing as of April 12, 1995, shall be considered legal conforming lots</i></p> | <p>Multi-Family Dwellings – <i>No minimum/50 FT</i></p> <p>Single Family Attached – <i>3,000 SF/22 FT for interior & 32 FT corner</i></p> <p>Single Family Detached – <i>5,000 SF/50 FT</i></p> <p>Twin Home Dwelling – <i>4,000 SF/25 FT</i></p> <p>Two Family Dwelling – <i>8,000 SF/50 FT</i></p> <p>Non-Residential Uses – <i>No minimum/No Minimum</i></p> <p>Other permitted or conditional uses in 21A.33.020 – <i>5,000 SF/50 FT</i></p> |
| Setbacks | <p>Front Yard – <i>15 FT</i></p> <p>Corner Side Yard – <i>15 FT</i></p> <p>Interior Side Yard - <i>No setback required</i></p> <p>Rear Yard – <i>No setback required</i></p> <p><i>*All required front and corner side yards shall be maintained as landscape yards in conformance with the requirements of chapter 21A.48 of this title</i></p> | <p>Front Yard – <i>No setback required; Maximum setback - at least 25% of the building facade must be located within 15 FT of the front lot line</i></p> <p>Corner Side Yard - <i>No setback required</i></p> <p>Interior Side Yard - <i>No setback required</i></p> <p>Rear Yard – <i>25% of the lot depth/need not exceed 30 FT</i></p> |
| Parking Setback | <p><i>No specific parking setback regulations</i></p> | <p>Surface Parking Lots Within an Interior Side Yard – <i>30 FT landscape setback from the front property line or be located behind the primary structure.</i></p> <p>Parking Structures – <i>45 FT minimum setback from a front or corner side yard property line or be located behind the primary structure.</i></p> |
| Building Height | <p>Building Height – <i>65 FT</i></p> | <p>Residential Building Height – <i>75 FT</i></p> <p>Non-Residential Buildings/Uses – <i>45 FT</i> (Maximum floor area coverage of nonresidential uses in mixed use buildings is limited to 3 floors)</p> |
| Open Space | <p><i>No specific open space regulations</i></p> | <p>Residential uses and mixed uses containing residential use - <i>20% of the lot area</i></p> |

The following uses are not currently allowed in the M-1 zoning district but are listed as permitted or conditional uses under the proposed R-MU zoning district designation:

| New Permitted | New Conditional |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| Art Gallery | Dwelling, group home (large) |
| Bed and breakfast, inn/manor | Dwelling, residential support (large) |
| Clinic (medical, dental) | Library |
| Daycare, nonregistered home daycare | Theatre, movie |
| Dwelling, accessory unit | |
| Dwelling, assisted living facility (large) | |
| Dwelling, assisted living facility (limited capacity) | |
| Dwelling, assisted living facility (small) | |
| Dwelling, group home (small) | |
| Dwelling, manufactured home | |
| Dwelling, multi-family | |
| Dwelling, residential support (small) | |
| Dwelling, rooming (boarding) house | |
| Dwelling, single-family (attached) | |
| Dwelling, single-family (detached) | |
| Dwelling, twin home and two family | |
| Eleemosynary facility | |
| Funeral home | |
| Mixed use development | |

The uses in the table below are currently listed as permitted or conditional uses in the land use table for the M-1 zoning district. These uses below would no longer be allowed under the proposed R-MU zoning district:

| Changing from Permitted to Not Allowed | Changing from Conditional to Not Allowed |
|--|---|
| Alcohol, Distillery | Animal, Raising of furbearing animals |
| Alcohol, Winery | Animal, Stockyard |
| Animal, Cremation service | Community correctional facility (large) |
| Animal, Kennel | Community correctional facility (small) |
| Animal, Pet Cemetery | Concrete and/or asphalt manufacturing |
| Animal, Pound | Grain Elevator |
| Bakery, commercial | Railroad freight terminal facility |
| Blacksmith shop | Railroad repair shop |
| Bottling plant | Recycling, processing center (outdoor) |
| Brewery | Rock, sand, and gravel storage and distribution |
| Building materials distribution | Utility, electric generation facility |
| Bus line station/terminal | Utility, sewage treatment plant |

| Changing from Permitted to Not Allowed | Changing from Conditional to Not Allowed |
|---|---|
| Bus line yard and repair facility | Utility, solid waste transfer station |
| Check cashing/payday loan business | Vehicle, automobile salvage and recycling (outdoor) |
| Contractor's yard/office | |
| Equipment, heavy (rental, sales, service) | |
| Equipment rental, (indoor and/or outdoor) | |
| Food processing | |
| Gas station | |
| Golf course | |
| Greenhouse | |
| Hotel/motel | |
| Impound lot | |
| Industrial assembly | |
| Large wind energy system | |
| Laundry, commercial | |
| Light manufacturing | |
| Package delivery facility | |
| Parking (commercial, off-site, park and ride lot, park and ride lot shared with existing use) | |
| Photo finishing lab | |
| Printing plant | |
| Radio, television station | |
| Recycling, collection station | |
| Recycling, processing center (indoor) | |
| Restaurant with a drive through | |
| Retail goods establishment with a drive through | |
| Sexually oriented business | |
| Sign painting/fabrication | |
| Small brewery | |
| Storage and display (outdoor) | |
| Storage, public (outdoor) | |
| Storage, self | |
| Store, convenience | |
| Studio, motion picture | |
| Taxicab facility | |
| Tire distribution retail/wholesale | |
| Truck freight terminal | |
| Vehicle, auction | |

| Changing from Permitted to Not Allowed | Changing from Conditional to Not Allowed |
|--|--|
| Vehicle, automobile truck and repair | |
| Vehicle, automobile truck and rental (including large truck) | |
| Vehicle, automobile, part sales | |
| Vehicle, automobile salvage and recycling (indoor) | |
| Vehicle, Recreational vehicle sales and service | |
| Vehicle, truck repair (large) | |
| Warehouse | |
| Welding shop | |
| Wholesale distribution | |
| Woodworking mill | |

ATTACHMENT D: City Plan Considerations

Adopted City Plan Policies and Guidance

Zoning map amendments are reviewed for compliance with City master plans and adopted policies. The below plans were adopted for the area:

Westside Master Plan (Current Community Plan)

- Generally speaking, most of the redevelopment in the Westside will be around those single-family neighborhoods. Redeveloping around them, though, presents challenges because it is easy to disrupt their character with tall buildings, dense residential complexes, or intense commercial activities.
- Identify underutilized or unmaintained areas within large residential blocks in the Westside. These mid-block areas should be targeted for development through flexible zoning and design standards.
- Infill development is guided primarily by compatibility with the existing neighborhood fabric, which includes elements like height, bulk, setbacks, architecture, landscaping and building materials.
- All new infill development, whether single-, two- or multi-family residential, should adhere to the prevailing development pattern in the immediate area.
- New residential and commercial development that is adjacent to established single-family neighborhoods should be buffered with landscaping and side or rear yard setbacks based upon the distance between the proposed building and the existing buildings.
- The Salt Lake City Planning Division shall analyze its existing zoning districts to determine what zoning changes will provide the most flexibility for low-intensity mixed-use development around identified neighborhood nodes. Building heights at residential nodes should be limited to 35 FT or three-stories without density limitations provided other development regulations are met. The goal should be between ten and 25 units per acre.
- High density residential and multi-use development should be put in place at regional nodes that have no density limitations and flexible height regulations to encourage high density residential development and compact, multi-use development.
- Review the uses that are permitted in the current light manufacturing zoning district and determine if a new zone may be more appropriate. A new district should more specifically regulate building and site design and should completely prohibit any uses that produce noxious odors, fumes or other discharge or other uses that rely heavily on outdoor storage.

9 Line Corridor Master Plan

- The project is located between two nodes identified in the master plan, the I-15 node which is a block east and the 9th and 9th node which is a block west. The plan identifies the intersection of 800 W as an access point for the residential uses along that street.
- The trail along 900 S between the I-15 node and the 9th and 9th node is identified as a Corridor Type C - The corridor is widest in this area connecting users to regional parks and

neighborhood commercial centers along the paved trailway. This area features a mixture of residential, commercial and light industrial uses.

Plan Salt Lake

- Growth – Promote infill and redevelopment of underutilized land.
- Housing – Direct new growth toward areas with existing infrastructure and services that have the potential to be people oriented.
- Beautiful City - Support and encourage architecture, development, and infrastructure that is people-focused, responds to its surrounding context and enhances the public realm, reflects our diverse cultural, ethnic, and religious heritage and is sustainable, using high quality materials and building standards.
- Create opportunities to connect with nature in urban areas.
- Reinforce and preserve neighborhood and district character and a strong sense of place.
- Preservation - Preserve and enhance neighborhood and district character.
- Encourage the incorporation of historic elements into buildings, landscapes, public spaces, streetscapes, neighborhoods, and districts where appropriate.
- Economy - Support the growth of small businesses, entrepreneurship and neighborhood business nodes.

Growing SLC

- Develop flexible zoning tools and regulations, with a focus along significant transportation routes
- Support diverse and vibrant neighborhoods by aligning land use policies that promote a housing market capable of accommodating residents throughout all stages of life

- **Salt Lake City Comprehensive Housing Policy**

The Salt Lake City Comprehensive Housing Policy was adopted on March 1, 2016. The Housing Policy represents the City Council’s efforts to establish a policy direction to address current conditions in Salt Lake City. The intent is that this direction will be followed whenever the City engages in housing funding assistance, zoning and land use planning, master planning neighborhoods, and creating economic incentives. Additionally, the Housing Policy is intended to achieve the following that relate to the requested rezone:

- Foster and celebrate the urban residential tradition
- Develop new housing opportunities throughout the City
- Promote a diverse and balanced community by ensuring that a wide range of housing types and choices exist for all income levels, age groups, and types of households

Transit Master Plan

- 900 S is identified as a high priority corridor as it provides opportunities for additional east/west cross- town connections as well as connections. 900 W is also discussed as improving connections to the neighboring Fairpark and Glendale communities.
- Building off existing plans and policies, the Salt Lake City Transit Master Plan recognizes the importance of land use, street connectivity, and placemaking to implement a well-used and attractive frequent transit network (FTN). The FTN must be supported by a concentration of land uses, connections to key destinations, a rich mix of uses, and interconnected streets. The Transit Master Plan embraces these concepts to help achieve the City’s goals to increase transit ridership in Salt Lake City.
- Provide a rich mix of uses that support street-level activity throughout the day and night. A diversity of land uses (including residential, commercial, industrial, institutional, and recreational uses) promotes walking and transit ridership, and reduces driving.
- A mix of land uses allows more daily needs to be met within shorter distances, encouraging people to walk and take transit for more trips. Land use diversity also creates a more interesting and active urban environment that makes walking and taking transit feel safer and more attractive at all times of the day and night.
- Salt Lake City also plays an important role in working with developers to set standards for new development. These standards can help ensure land uses support the FTN, including: Pedestrian-oriented design: Identify design standards that promote pedestrian-oriented urban design features, such as active frontages built right to the street with parking located at the rear of the building and landscaping that provides a buffer between the sidewalk and the street.
- Land use and placemaking recommendations –Continue to monitor zoning along the FTN to ensure transit is supported by a mix of uses, adequate densities, parking requirements, and other transit supportive elements.
- Provide a mix of housing options along the FTN to support housing affordability and diversity.

Staff Discussion

The Westside Master Plan supports commercial and residential infill development that is guided by compatibility with the existing neighborhood fabric. All new infill development should adhere to the prevailing development pattern in the immediate area which is predominately single family residential. The project’s proximity to downtown, the Jordan River, and the 9 Line Trail all make the property an attractive spot for redevelopment, particularly residential development. However, as discussed in the considerations section of the staff report, the proposed R-MU zone is not compatible with the stated goals of the master plan.

ATTACHMENT E: Zoning Amendment Standards

21A.50.050: A decision to amend the text of this title or the zoning map by general amendment is a matter committed to the legislative discretion of the city council and is not controlled by any one standard. In making a decision to amend the zoning map, the City Council should consider the following:

| FACTOR | FINDING | RATIONALE |
|---|-------------------------------|---|
| <p>1. Whether a proposed map amendment is consistent with the purposes, goals, objectives, and policies of the city as stated through its various adopted planning documents;</p> | <p>Does Not Comply</p> | <p>The property is located within the <i>Westside Master Plan</i> area. See Attachment D for discussion of relevant City policies and plans and the proposal’s noncompliance.</p> |
| <p>2. Whether a proposed map amendment furthers the specific purpose statements of the zoning ordinance.</p> | <p>Does Not Comply</p> | <p>The purpose of the R-MU Residential/Mixed Use District is <i>to reinforce the mixed-use character of the area and encourage the development of areas as high density residential urban neighborhoods containing retail, service commercial, and small-scale office uses. This district is appropriate in areas of the City where the applicable master plans support high density, mixed use development. The standards for the district are intended to facilitate the creation of a walkable urban neighborhood with an emphasis on pedestrian scale activity while acknowledging the need for transit and automobile access.</i></p> <p>The proposed location of the zoning district does not fit the location criteria of the zone. The zone would be located in an area supported by the master plan for a mix of uses including low to moderate density residential rather than high density. The standards of the R-MU zone, such as building height, are not compatible with the existing context of single-family dwellings that the master plan seeks to preserve.</p> |
| <p>3. The extent to which a proposed map amendment will affect adjacent properties;</p> | <p>Does Not Comply</p> | <p>While the proposed R-MU zoning district would allow a mix of land uses and residential uses that are not currently allowed by the M-1 zoning, the intensity of development permitted by this zone would overshadow the adjacent properties.</p> <p>The proposal would add residential uses as allowed uses to the properties; however, even though the surrounding properties are zoned M-1, many of the adjacent properties contain</p> |

| | | |
|--|------------------------------|--|
| | | <p>residential uses so the proposed zone would be more compatible with the existing uses than the M-1 zoning district from a land use aspect.</p> <p>Many of the more visually and environmentally impactful industrial uses that are currently allowed in the M-1 zone would no longer be allowed under the requested zoning designation. See Attachment C for a comparison of the permitted and conditional uses in the M-1 and R-MU zone.</p> <p>The proposed zoning district allows for heights up to 75' for residential development, which is an increase in 10' from the 65' that is currently allowed in the M-1 zone. While the size of the combined lots makes maximizing the full 75' height unlikely, the immediate proximity to the R-1/5,000 zone across 800 W makes any development taller than 35' incompatible with the surrounding properties.</p> |
| <p>4. Whether a proposed map amendment is consistent with the purposes and provisions of any applicable overlay zoning districts which may impose additional standards</p> | <p>Not Applicable</p> | <p>The proposed map amendment is not within any overlay zoning district. This standard is not applicable to the proposal.</p> |
| <p>5. The adequacy of public facilities and services intended to serve the subject property, including, but not limited to, roadways, parks and recreational facilities, police and fire protection, schools, stormwater drainage systems, water supplies, and wastewater and refuse collection.</p> | <p>Complies</p> | <p>The subject property is located within a built environment where public facilities and services already exist. The site is currently served by 900 S and 800 W. Future development on these properties, such as commercial or multifamily development may require upgrading utilities and drainage systems that serve the properties. Any required infrastructure upgrades will be evaluated with a specific site development plan.</p> |

ATTACHMENT F: Property Photos





Subject Property from 900 S



Property across 900 S



Block face along 800 W



Block face along 900 S



Residence directly north of subject property



Commercial building directly east of subject property



Subject Property from 9 Line Trail



Retrofitted warehouse buildings east of subject property

ATTACHMENT G: Public Process & 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 since the applications were submitted:

- September 21, 2022– The Poplar Grove and Glendale Community Councils were sent the 45-day required notice for recognized community organizations.
- September 21, 2022 - Property owners and residents within 300 feet of the development were provided early notification of the proposal.
- September 2022 – January 2023 – The project was posted to the Online Open House webpage.

Notice of the public hearing for the proposal included:

- January 27, 2023
 - o Public hearing notice sign posted on the property
- January 27, 2023
 - o Public hearing notice mailed
 - o Public notice posted on City and State websites and Planning Division list serve

Public Input:

Planning Staff received a letter of support from the Poplar Grove Community Council. Staff also received an email of support from a member of the community. No other formal public comments have been received as of the publication of this staff report.

Both letters were in favor of the project's ability to provide appropriate residential infill development, a land use that is currently prohibited under M-1.

All written public comments received to date are attached on the following pages of this attachment.



12/12/2022

RE: 900 S 800 W Corner Rezone To RMU affecting 875 S 800 W & 792 W 900 S

Dear Salt Lake City Planning Commission & City Council,

As the Poplar Grove Community Council Chair, I see a number of development projects. I welcome careful planning that brings commercial, multi-family housing that may begin to help our housing crisis. I also feel it's important to allow diversification of housing with small, residential multi-family units like those proposed with this zoning change on the corner lots of 900 S 800 W.

With commercial multi-family units going in on the east half of the block (currently zoned RMU), it seems fair to allow an individual owner on the same blockface to change the zoning of their lots to match the same RMU zoning

Salt Lake City has done a good job of supporting responsible commercial builders, but I think it can increase support of committed community members seeking to build on a small scale. Cameron Broadbent, is such a community member. He has helped the community by turning two abandoned lots (802 W Fayette Ave & 804 W Genesee) into homes that thoughtfully match the character, style and building materials of existing homes in the neighborhood.

These vacant lots at 900 S 800 W represent some of the last few available in downtown Salt Lake City. This offers the city a chance to be flexible with individual land owners thoughtfully seeking to do quality infill projects in neighborhoods they already help maintain. We have an opportunity here to support a committed community member to help build out the landscape on a major, non-auto transit line (the 9-line Corridor).

I support this zoning change as it is proposed from M-1 to RMU.

Thank You for Your Consideration,

PGCC Board Chair

From: [Kelly Harris](#)
To: [Harris, Katilynn](#)
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Zoning Change PLNPCM2022-00587
Date: Friday, September 30, 2022 3:36:07 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)

Ms. Harris

The request for zoning change and subsequent housing construction will help improve the neighborhood a great deal. Too bad more the this type of improvement is not happening. I approve of this request to change the zoning.

Kelly Harris

Mr. Kelly Harris, PE, PTOE

Sr. Project Engineer
Transportation

[Redacted]



This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are confidential and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you are NOT the intended recipient and receive this communication, please delete this message and any attachments. Thank you.

ATTACHMENT H: Department Review Comments

This proposal was reviewed by the following departments. Any requirement identified by a City Department is required to be complied with.

Building Code: Heather Gilcrease (heather.gilcrease@slcgov.com or 801-535-7163)

No building code issues during this phase of the development process. Any construction will require a building permit.

Economic Development: Lorena Riffo Jenson (Lorena.riffojenson@slcgov.com)

No comments received at this time.

Engineering: Scott Weiler (scott.weiler@slcgov.com or 801-535-6159)

No comments received at this time.

Fire: Doug Bateman (douglas.bateman@slcgov.com or 801-535-6619)

No fire code comments related to the zoning amendment. Any future development or building permit submittal will need to meet minimum requirements of current adopted fire codes

Housing Stability: Tony Milner (tony.milner@slcgov.com or 801-535-6168)

No comments received at this time.

Parks: Kristin Riker (kristin.riker@slcgov.com or 801-972-7804)

No comments received at this time.

Public Services: Jorge Chamorro (jorge.chamorro@slcgov.com or 801-535-7150)

No comments from Public Services Operations.

Public Utilities: Kristeen Beitel (kristeen.beitel@slcgov.com)

Public Utilities has no issues with the proposed zoning map amendment. Additional comments have been provided to assist the applicant in obtaining a building permit.

Additional comments have been provided to assist in the future development of the property. The following comments are provided for information only and do not provide official project review or approval. Comments are provided to assist in design and development by providing guidance for project requirements.

- Public Utility permit, connection, survey, and inspection fees will apply.
- All utility design and construction must comply with APWA Standards and SLCPU Standard Practices.
- All utilities must meet horizontal and vertical clearance requirements. Water and sewer lines require 10 ft minimum horizontal separation and 18” minimum vertical separation. Sewer must maintain 5 ft minimum horizontal separation and 12” vertical separation from any non-

water utilities. Water must maintain 3 ft minimum horizontal separation and 12” vertical separation from any non-sewer utilities.

- Utilities cannot cross property lines without appropriate easements and agreements between property owners.
- Parcels must be consolidated prior to permitting.
- Site utility and grading plans will be required for building permit review. Site utility plans should include all existing and proposed utilities, including water, irrigation, fire, sewer, stormwater, street lighting, power, gas, and communications. Grading plans should include arrows directing stormwater away from neighboring property. Please refer to APWA, SLCDPU Standard Practices, and the [SLC Design Process Guide](#) for utility design requirements. Other plans such as erosion control plans and plumbing plans may also be required, depending on the scope of work. Submit supporting documents and calculations along with the plans.
- Applicant must provide fire flow, culinary water, and sewer demand calculations to SLCDPU for review. The public sewer and water system will be modeled with these demands. If the water demand is not adequately delivered by the existing main, then a water main upsizing will be required at the property owner’s expense. The expected maximum daily flow (gpd) from the development will be modeled to determine the impacts on the public sewer system. If one or more sewer lines reaches of the sewer system reach capacity as a result of the development, sewer main upsizing will be required at the property owner’s expense. Required improvements on the public water and sewer system will be determined by the Development Review Engineer. A plan and profile of the new main(s) and engineer’s cost estimate must be submitted for review. Design drawings and cost estimate must be stamped and signed by a professional engineer. The property owner is required to bond for the amount of the approved cost estimate.
- One culinary water meter is permitted per parcel and fire services, as required, will be permitted for this property. Each service must have a separate tap to the main.
- Site stormwater must be collected on site and routed to the public storm drain system. Stormwater cannot discharge across property lines or public sidewalks.
- Stormwater treatment is required prior to discharge to the public storm drain. Utilize stormwater Best Management Practices (BMP's) to remove solids and oils. Green Infrastructure should be used whenever possible. Green Infrastructure and LID treatment of stormwater is a design requirement and required by the Salt Lake City UPDES permit for Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4). This permit was updated with this requirement in June 2021. If green infrastructure is not used, then applicant must provide documentation of what green infrastructure measures were considered and why these were not deemed feasible. Please verify that plans include appropriate treatment measures. Please visit the following websites for guidance with Low Impact Development: [Low Impact Development](#) and [Low Impact Development Guide](#).

Sustainability: Debbie Lyons (debbie.lyons@slcgov.com or 801-535-6540)

No comments received at this time.

Transportation: Jena Carver (jena.carver@slcgov.com)

No comments received at this time.