

Topic	Name	Comment	District
1172 Chandler Avenue Rezone	Ben Dahl	Live Public Comment	
1172 Chandler Avenue Rezone	Bruce Baird	Live Public Comment	
2960 South Richmond Street	Judi Short	I urge you to approve an adjustment to the property acquisition loan for the Community Development Corporation of Utah, so they would be able to purchase the property at 2960 Richmond Avenue, to be known as Richmond Flats, before the rezone, rather than after, per the original terms. Of the 1000 new housing units built in Sugar House in the last decade, less than 100 are affordable. We continue to make the housing problem more difficult, by approving project after project of market rate housing. We are doing nothing for those who work in our community at wages that will never allow them to afford to buy a house. We together continue to make the housing problems worse, which most certainly is against any goal in the recent Growing Salt Lake housing plan. This parcel is in a high opportunity area. Generally we oppose rezoning parcels from low density residential to multifamily housing because that seems in opposition to the Sugar House Master Plan. At the same time, this forwards part of the implementation of the Sugar House Master Plan which calls for building affordable housing. This area has many things going for it. This is on the edge of Sugar House, but still walkable or bikeable to the SHBD, or at the same time to the soon to come Millcreek City Center. We have asked the transportation staff to consider this particular area when it looks at transportation issues along Highland Drive from SHBD to Millcreek. People who work in Sugar House who make lower salaries ought to be able to live in our community, as we do. If we don't ever provide affordable housing, that will not hapoen. Please approve the changes to the conditions of this loan. -- Judi Short, Vice Chair and Land Use Chair Sugar House Community Council	7
2960 South Richmond Street	Lynn Schwarz	I am in favor of the adjustment to the property acquisition loan for the Community Development Corporation of Utah so that they can purchase the property at 2960 Richmond Avenue. This project will be known as Richmond Flats, and this adjustment will enable them to purchase the property before the re-zone instead of after, as per the original terms. Sugar House is in dire need of affordable housing. Project after project is proudly lauded as luxury developments. There is no way anyone who works in retail in Sugar House can afford to live in any of these projects, or indeed, anywhere in Sugar House. While usually loathe to increase density so close to a single family zone, the absolute dirth of affordable housing overrides the usual concerns. Also, this area will continue to have projects with increased density as Millcreek redevelops their City Center. Once again, please approve the changes to the conditions of this loan. Lynn Schwarz	n/a
480 East 6th Avenue Zoning Map Amendment	Byron Cannon	I have observed over several years the increasing, and now almost total deterioration of this historic property. I was in attendance at the Historic Landmark Commission's meeting before the Covid pandemic and was very favorably impressed with the proposal set forward by the owners; They are obviously conscientious members of the neighborhood and have put a great amount of time and effort into the plan they propose. We hope that the Council will give a green light so that work on the restoration, conversion can proceed without further delay. Thank You, B. Cannon	3
480 East 6th Avenue Zoning Map Amendment	Conor Burgon	Greetings  As a homeowner of a triplex on [REDACTED] we have only off street parking. My only worry is parking issues. Since I already have people parking infront of our home who go to the hair salon. With the extra people coming I imagine it could get worse. A lady who had needed handicap parking spot at 478 E 6th Avenue has since moved. I have attached a photo. I imagine it would be better to remove the handicap spot since no one uses it. The area is in need of parking availability and I think it should be included in any plans to change the zoning. We would love to have small local businesses near by. If the this corner becomes commercial property we believe their should be an effort to include more parking spots. <b>(See corresponding photo)</b>  Thanks for your time  Conor Burgon [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	
480 East 6th Avenue Zoning Map Amendment	Max Angle	I would like to register to make a public comment in support of the proposed re zoning of the property at 480 East Sixth Avenue for tonight’s meeting.  Thank you.	n/a
480 East 6th Avenue Zoning Map Amendment	Max Angle	Live Public Comment	

Topic	Name	Comment	District
Budget 2020-2021	Shan Ramasamy	<p>Increase Sales Tax on all luxury, tobacco, alcohol and no essential items by 2 % to pay for Covid 19 Pandemic funding.</p> <p>Increase the fines and penalty for noncompliance to any laws.</p> <p>All services department to be budget neutral ie pay themselves from their service fees collected.( Police, Courts = noncompliance enforcers)</p> <p>Pay cut for all Senators and Congressmen and women for a year.</p> <p>Cut operating expenses by 10% for non essential services.</p> <p>Get Motor vehicles Insurance companies to pay/subsidize the city for road maintence.</p> <p>These are some thoughts.</p> <p>Regards Shan</p>	n/a
Budget 2020-2021	Tonya Allred	<p>THANK YOU! For doing what you could to find some funding for The Inn Between! The homeless population this organization cares for, deserve to live and die with dignity! Well done!</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Tonya Allred</p>	n/a
Cleveland Court Rezone & Master Plan Amendment	Amanda Rupke	<p>Dear City Council Members-</p> <p>My husband and I sent in comments already (and my two sons), but I have a follow-up question. I am recalling a comment from Matt Lyon at the Planning Commission meeting back in January or February. He said, and I agree, that a bigger underlying question surrounding the Cleveland Court project is the current zoning itself. Our block (and a larger surrounding area) is zoned at RMF-35, while everything around it is residential. We are a zoned bubble that has the potential, over time, to morph into an island of condos and 3-story buildings.</p> <p>Why did the master plan include this over 20 years ago? I'm not sure anyone knows the answer or if it is worth digging up. My second question, and the one I really want to know, is how can it be changed? Is there a process for a group of residents to change the zoning that they are living in? It is unfair to think that one of us could move and leave behind a giant building for the rest of the neighbors. We care about each other and would pull together in this way.</p> <p>I have also wondered if the city can step in and buy this space and change it to a park instead, similar to the Allen Park situation. The residents here care about each other and would love a common green space to enjoy. There are lots of kids around and minimal parking. While there is some space now on 400 E., this would be chopped up by multiple driveways.</p> <p>Thank you for your time in reading this,</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Amanda Rupke</p>	5
Cleveland Court Rezone & Master Plan Amendment	Benjamin Petersen	Live Public Comment	
Cleveland Court Rezone & Master Plan Amendment	Caleb Rupke	<p>Hello, I'm Caleb, and I want you to make the empty lot into a bike park because I love to bike in there and if you make condos it is blocking my view of the sun and I won't be able to bike there and then I don't have anywhere to bike where I can go off of a ramp. If you make it a bike park it won't block the sun and a lot of people will have fun in there. It might even waste less materials. From, Caleb Rupke</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	5

Topic	Name	Comment	District
Cleveland Court Rezone & Master Plan Amendment	Danielle Ruvolo	To whom it may concern, I own a home on Blair Street, a small street that would be seriously impacted by the zoning changes that are being proposed (petitions PLNPCM2019-00189 & PLNPCM2019-00190.) We can only access our home from Harrison Ave and Cleveland Ave. Cleveland is already a very small side street that does not have room for two-way traffic. Even if there is a car parked on one side of the street, we have to stop traffic for two cars to pass. To add 7 units to this very small corner would be absurd for traffic. I also highly protest changing the setbacks of the street. It would make the small street feel even smaller. Also our neighborhood children use these sidewalks for recreation. Please do not encroach on our space. 5 units is bad enough, 7 is unnecessary and highly unwanted by the neighborhood. Please listen to the concerns of the neighborhood homeowners and do not allow the developer to squeeze as much profit out of our cherished neighborhood as they can. Warm regards, Danielle Ruvolo [REDACTED]	5
Cleveland Court Rezone & Master Plan Amendment	Dave Houser	To whom it may concern: My name is David Houser, I live at [REDACTED] from the proposed complex. From my house and the property in question, you can't see any other multi-unit buildings except one duplex built in 1928. In my opinion, this project is solely for profit. The people building it do not live in the area so they have no reason to be concerned with the future impact of their project. They want to come in, build a complex with as many units as they can, sell them, take the profit and move on to the next project. We that live in the neighborhood have a very different vision for that property. We would like development like what is in the area. There are many children, a lot of traffic already and the safety of the area will suffer with a large, multi-unit complex. In addition, there is no direct access to businesses or public transportation. It takes 2 buses and 45 minutes to reach a TRAX station. I had a roommate that used public transportation and he would have to leave for work an hour to an hour and a half before his shift, depending on the day of the week. The investors want to bypass setbacks, easements, the number of allowed units and more to maximize their profit, regardless of the impact on the community. I know Many more people in the area feel this way because we are talking about it all of the time. There is one neighbor that doesn't oppose the project that I know of. He says that we can't stop progress, so there is no reason to fight it. I think we need to try and make the community the best it can be. Have it look appropriate for the area, have the considerations of existing properties and regulations in the area and with safety a priority. Thank You for your consideration, Dave Houser [REDACTED]	5
Cleveland Court Rezone & Master Plan Amendment	David Houser	Live Public Comment	
Cleveland Court Rezone & Master Plan Amendment	Debra Leafy	Please considering no changes to the said property zoning no parking small street on Cleveland ave also no available on 400 east where do Family and friends park low density no rezoning thanks for listening LELAND Leafy [REDACTED]	5
Cleveland Court Rezone & Master Plan Amendment	Eric	<p>Esteemed Council Members,</p> <p>I would like to respond to several of the comments made by the developer and make several of my own.</p> <p>The developer has stated that they are attempting to address affordability and scarcity issues with this development. I don't think allowing 2 additional units is going to make much of an impact on overall availability in the area, but 2 extra units will definitely have a large and lasting impact on every person living in the immediate vicinity of the development. It was also stated that there would be more bedrooms in the 7 unit proposal, there are 15. I didn't find the number in the original larger 5 unit proposal, but if they are 3 bedroom units there would be the same number of bedrooms.</p> <p>As far as affordability is concerned, I don't see how \$1000 a month for a 673 sq. ft. single bedroom unit is close to affordable! I pay about half that amount on my mortgage plus taxes for a 2 bedroom house, 2 car plus shop garage, on a third of an acre. I have a neighbor who pays about that for a 3 bedroom house rental and several that pay somewhat less \$550-750 for half a house 1 to 3 bedrooms. They can't afford more than they are paying, and don't want to leave the neighborhood. \$2200 a month and up for the larger 2-3 bedroom units doesn't seem affordable either.</p> <p>The developer made the comment that this development would be "Condominiums" so they would be "higher end" it doesn't sound like affordability is the goal. This also brings up a serious concern! If they are condominiums and not apartments, then they will be sold, not rented. Which is it. If they are to be sold that kind of makes the affordability issue moot. And the developer himself said they would be "higher end".</p> <p>This also brings up a Major issue with this development, Parking! People who buy a condo are likely to be more permanent than renters. This means they will have more cars and stuff, trailers motorcycles, etc. Where will they put it? There are only 8 off street parking spots in the current plan with 7 units, there should be at least 2 off street parking spots per unit at a minimum! This should be the case whether they are condos or not. There is a serious lack of parking the area. This is one of the most important reasons to limit this development to 5 units. Parking is a Major Concern!</p> <p>The developer stated that there are 44 apartments with in 3 blocks of the location that have 4 or more units. This is true, but of those listed 24 of them are 4 units each and there are only 17 with 7 or more units. Many of the apartments in the area are older single story 4 or 8 plexes on one or two lots and there are some complexes that are larger between 3rd east and State street. There is also a cluster of 8-10 complexes south of me on Emerson Ave. but it is scary and you don't go in there unless you live there. I doubt there is a development in the area besides Cleveland Court that is as high density and with so little parking on such a narrow street! <b>1 of 2 *Continued Below*</b></p>	n/a

Topic	Name	Comment	District
Cleveland Court Rezone & Master Plan Amendment	Eric	<p><b>2 of 2 *Continued Above*</b> The developer said they would be installing solar panels to help with "sustainability", this is commendable, but it is more about sale ability and profitability than any thing else. Sustainable would be 1 or 2 small units with rain water collection, gray water recycling, composting toilets, etc. and open space for food and small animal production, not 7 units jammed on a small lot with everything being brought in and popped out, times 7. It's a nice thought, but more hype than substance.</p> <p>I have lived in my home for about 30 years now and I hope to be here till I die. I can't afford to upgrade or even move elsewhere, I'm here. If someone came in and built a development blocking my sunlight and views installed 7 AC compressors on the other side of my fence, caused parking and access issues and other problems, I can't go anywhere! I would be devastated! I doubt Mr. Corroon would have these types of concerns at his home(s), and if he did, I don't think he would have any difficulty moving to a place more to his liking. I don't have that luxury and many of my neighbors are likely in a similar situation!</p> <p>I hope that the outcome is the correct one, for the community! Not the developer! Keeping the development at 5 units, or less! The front set back should be at least 10 ft. and the rear set back should be 15ft. ,to help Andrew and Aidrian, and the height should be kept to a maximum of 2 stories above grade. I am opposed to the zoning changes for Cleveland Court.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and service,</p> <p>Sincerely, Eric</p>	n/a
Cleveland Court Rezone & Master Plan Amendment	Eric Miller	Live Public Comment	
Cleveland Court Rezone & Master Plan Amendment	George Chapman	I like Peter Corroon more than I like this project. This rezone to the FB-UN1 zone should not be granted since it encourages patchwork quilt zoning throughout the City. One of the most important reasons for zoning in a City is to decrease fighting between neighbors and to assure property owners that their rights will be protected. If they move into a single family home neighborhood, they assume (and are assured) that the area will remain a single family home neighborhood. The FB-UN1 zone was for transit stations, not next to single family homes (even if there are some multifamily homes in the block). Please keep SLC zoning respectful and reasonable. Do not rezone to FB-UN1.	5
Cleveland Court Rezone & Master Plan Amendment	Heidi Poole	<p>Chair Warton, Vice Chair Johnston, and all other distinguished Council Members, I am writing to ask you to vote against the petition to change the zoning for the Cleveland Court master plan. In fact, it would be my sincere hope that the city step in and buy this property, as they did for Allen Park not too long ago. Just like the residents of that area, what we need most in our neighborhood is an open space for residents to enjoy. We have many young children in this neighborhood and they are currently loving the fact that they have an open space where they can play and bike. Whether you have young children or grand-children yourself or you just remember the joy it brought you to play outside in an open space when you were young, I sincerely hope you will consider this option and act upon it. Too often, we (the residents of this area) feel that the city's efforts to restore neighborhoods go to the wealthier east side. I lived in Glendale for many years and even though I now live a bit more east, the story has not changed much. What we and our future generations need is open space, not another apartment complex. I fully understand the need for more or affordable housing, but this already full neighborhood does not need another complex that will add cars (thereby decreasing the safety of the neighborhood for our kids), take away open space, and block views. Mayor Mendenhall recently blocked off streets so they could be used for pedestrian traffic and kids. That is what we, and our kids, need. We need a park, a playground, a bike park, a neighborhood garden. Not another set of condos. The project that is currently proposed (whether it be 5 or 7 units) does not fit into our neighborhood and will be very detrimental to our community. Blair street and the surrounding streets are filled with single-family homes, many over 100 years old, and a new multi-unit condo-complex does not fit into this architecture or model. And even if it did fit aesthetically, it still does not actually fit. The street adjacent to this lot (Cleveland) is already very narrow and struggles with parking and traffic in general. Adding even more traffic to this area is a true recipe for disaster. Please come take a look on garbage pick-up day (Thursdays) or really any day for that matter and you will see why adding even more traffic is absolutely ludicrous. On top of that, it will be dangerous, too. Countless are the times that I have almost had a run in with a bike or car that came through because the streets are already very narrow and visibility is very marred. This proposed project is therefore a hazard to our community, our safety, and our kids. In addition, this proposed construction will severely encroach upon the space of the current neighbors. The neighbors to the north will have all of their south-facing windows now facing condos that take away almost all of their daylight. In addition, all AC units will be right up against their house, creating a non-stop noise nuisance. The neighbor to the west, who currently already has a hard time pulling his truck out of his driveway, would now have even less space. And changing zoning now only sets a precedent for more petitions in the future. We already struggle to understand why our block is zoned the way it currently is. Please come look at our neighborhood! For the sake of our city and our future voters, I plead with you to not only vote against the current petitions but to also step up and claim this land for our children, as you have done for Allen Park. Please step up. For our city, for our community, for my kids, and for all the neighborhood children. You have an opportunity to make a mark, to make a change, to make a real difference. The ball is fully in your court. Thank you for your consideration. I am counting on you to do what is right.</p> <p>Sincerely, Heidi Poole</p>	5

Topic	Name	Comment	District
Cleveland Court Rezone & Master Plan Amendment	Jason Robichaud	Dear City Council, As a resident of Blair Street who accesses my home via Cleveland Ave and my Garage via the Alley to the east of Blair, I am opposed to the Zoning Change from RMF-35 to FB-UN1 for the proposed Planned Development on 375 East Cleveland Avenue. My main concern is the allowed 7 unit density and reduction in size of required Setbacks. A few items to note: The Alley Width is 14' not the noted 20' Cleveland Ave is 27' wide The reasons for my objection to the zoning change are based on it allowing the planned development of 7 Units which varies from the intended FB-UN1 [4] unit preference. Cleveland Ave and the Alley can not house that vehicular traffic density. Also the intent of the FB-UN1 is if the Row House model is to be followed that all parking be accessed by the rear or Alley. This is not achieved in the current design, which is a trickle down of the requested density. The unit counts of [2] 3 Bedroom, [4] 2 Bedroom and [1] 1 Bedroom with only 6 on-site parking areas would put an already insufficient Cleveland Ave street width in gridlock. If street parking is allowed on Cleveland a number of issues arise: A parking spot is typically 8' wide, that puts the width of Cleveland down to 19' if one side has vehicles parked on it. At 19' 2 cars would struggle to pass each other in a head on situation. If both sides of Cleveland are allowed to have street parking, that puts the allowable road way down to 11' wide. That does not allow for Traffic to flow down Cleveland in two directions. With no Parking Strip, Snow removal will become a major issue if cars are then moved further into the road. We will loose a safe turning visual triangle from the alley onto the Cleveland Ave. (This study must be completed) With the requested density of 7 units a recycling program is required. This has not been addressed in any of the Proposals. If the recycling bin is to be located along the Alley, a garbage truck will not be able to turn onto Cleveland with vehicles stacked along the curb. This is already an issue with the current 4 flex just north of this proposal. If any vehicles are parked along Cleveland the truck but back up and turn onto Harrison. There are countless other reasons for this proposal to be redesign to stay with in the RMF-35 zoning and only allow for 4 units with parking accessed off the alley. See highlighted items from FB-UN1 zoning that are in violation with current design: Attached Garages and Carports - Attached garages and carports are required to be in the rear yard where the rear yard is accessible by an alley with access rights to the subject property. If there is no access to the rear yard, an attached garage may be accessed from the front or corner side yard provided that the garage door (or doors) is no wider than 50% of the front facade of the structure. Side loaded garages are permitted. Vehicle Access - Alley access required if property is served by a public alley or private alley with access rights. From a street if no alley access exists. Please consider denying this Zoning Change. -- Jason Robichaud [REDACTED]	5
Cleveland Court Rezone & Master Plan Amendment	Jon Strickland	To whom it may concern, I would like to voice my protest for the proposed zoning changes happening on Cleveland court- Petitions PLNPCM2019-00189 and PLNPCM2019-00190. 5 units is bad enough, but 7 will bring unwanted problems to our beloved neighborhood. The traffic on the small street (Cleveland) will be impossible if there is any parking on the street. I am in construction so I need the street access for my truck and trailers. It is already a tight squeeze and if there is just one car parked, it is nearly impossible to get through. Sometimes we use the alley to pull trailers behind our neighbors' homes, and the proposed setbacks would cause a big problem trying to get in and out. Please listen to the homeowners and do not allow this zoning change to happen. Thank you Jon Strickland [REDACTED]	5
Cleveland Court Rezone & Master Plan Amendment	Josh Newton	Council, I'm opposed to the projects requests for all 3 changes. The first is the zoning changes. This area is mainly single family homes that have been slowly torn down for more multi units. I believe there is a place for these higher density and mixed use units - closer to mass transit and State Street not 4 blocks away. Coming in and destroying a beautiful single family home that could have easily been remodeled - changing property lines to increase units(from 3 to 5) and now asking for additional changes to get even more units seems ridiculous for this area. If you drive around Liberty Wells you can find these multi-family units pretty easily. They are aging and run down profit centers that need to be updated and maintained. The new design requires a zoning change from RMF-35 to FB-UN1, then a modification to the new zoning for setback changes. This seems a bit ludicrous that something can't be built within the current zoning of RMF-35. I understand the need for more affordable housing in the city, but adding 2 more units only adds to the developers profit. The real push from the developer is to get as many units as possible to maximize profits. It's hard enough to get 1 zoning change, let alone 3. This type of change requires some real political muscle. The setbacks changes are absurd and should not be changed. Having a front yard of 5'5" on Cleveland is not normal for this street or area (per Peter's comments last meeting). All houses on Cleveland facing north have over 10' of front yard, plus side yards setbacks on both houses on Cleveland are over 8'-0". Reducing this by half and having no park strip reduces the safety of everyone walking past this development. If a dog barks in a window or someone is coming the other way, this could cause you to walk in narrow road. I have warned countless cars driving from 4th to 3rd at very high speeds. So reducing the setback on Cleveland is a very big NO. Allowing a 10'6" driveway is also a safety concern, since anyone using that driveway can't park on it without blocking the sidewalk. The average car is over 14' long, this doesn't create any additional parking but a very dangerous situation. This again puts the public safety at risk by walking in the road. Even with the setback on the north property being reduced from 16' to 15, the single family house to the north is now sandwiched between two multifamily units. The alley is not 20' but more like 15' on a good day. The proposal states that the courtyard design allows for more interaction within the community but that is not true, this type of develop excludes anyone that doesn't live within the development. Neighbors aren't going to enter a dead-end courtyard while walking their dog, this idea of inclusion is preposterous. Most of these courtyard style have perimeter fences that don't allow access due to security reasons. I could see this courtyard being fence shortly after being built due to high levels of foot traffic from State Street to Liberty Park late at night. I think if the developer wants to use the term "very environmentally friendly" then the City council should require them to make this a LEED certified project. By simply adding solar with no added explanation is simply a "green washing term" and doesn't mean anything. By requiring higher R values walls, Seer rate AC units above 20, high efficient windows and appliances then they could start to use the term "very environmentally friendly." <b>1 of 2 *Continued Below*</b>	5

Topic	Name	Comment	District
Cleveland Court Rezone & Master Plan Amendment	Josh Newton	<p><b>2 of 2 *Continued Above*</b> There has been some confusion if this development is going to condos or apartments. Condos are sold as individual houses and apartments are rented and taken care of by a management company. It would be nice if this was cleared up since both pros and cons.</p> <p>The current proposal is asking the neighborhood to accommodate a lot for this development. They already plan to move the current utility pole into another yard so the new development can have a driveway and underground utilities. When asked at the first planning meeting about doing any upgrades to the surrounding areas, it was a strong NO from Peter Corroon and Sentry Financial. These changes are being pushed on the current residences and the developer has made no offer to do anything for the surrounding neighborhood. I think this comes from the arrogant attitude that Peter Corroon’s political willpower can push this project thru with minimal costs. More than half the neighbors I talked to, which isn't many due to the social distancing requirements from Corona-virus felt that the battle for Cleveland court was already lost due to the political power Peter Corroon has over a young City Council. Peter's many connections from his public duties has given him an ability to build anything he wants. I got many - "what's the point, Peter has more political pull and resources than all of Liberty Wells, plus this wouldn't be allowed in a “richer” area." I think that's a big concern for this area.</p> <p>I would have loved to see the torn down house restored but I understand the owner has the right to build within the codes. I think the city council should not allow ANY of the zoning changes.</p> <p>thanks, Josh Newton</p>	5
Cleveland Court Rezone & Master Plan Amendment	Josh Newton	Live Public Comment	
Cleveland Court Rezone & Master Plan Amendment	Judah Rupke	Hello! My name is Judah, I live in the [REDACTED] next to the lot. Instead of making condos could you make it a bike park because me my brother and my friend have bin biking a ton in the lot. If you make condos, I doubt people will rent it because of coved 19 but if you make a bike park more people will come. Thank you. Judah Rupke [REDACTED]	5
Cleveland Court Rezone & Master Plan Amendment	Ken Rozema	Live Public Comment	

Topic	Name	Comment	District
Cleveland Court Rezone & Master Plan Amendment	Lara McLellan Handwerker	<p>Hi all,</p> <p>I am writing as a resident of the neighborhood in which the Cleveland Court development is proposed. I live at [REDACTED] Apologies for the last-minute submission.</p> <p>I’m largely in favor of the development that is proposed. I generally favor form-based codes over density-based. Our area of town, while largely single family and duplex residences, is definitely a mixed-density neighborhood. There is nothing inherently bad about multi-family (or single-family attached) housing, and I disagree with the typical knee-jerk reaction against it. SLC is a quickly growing city desperately in need of missing middle housing, and providing 7 units in this neighborhood seems entirely reasonable to me. In terms of any impacts, I can’t see there being any difference between the 5 units the developer is permitted by right and the 7 units they would be permitted through the zoning change.</p> <p>Comments submitted by others in the neighborhood reflect concerns about additional traffic on Cleveland Court. I don’t believe that 7 units will negatively impact the traffic conditions – rather, I’d bet the people who tend to fly through on the street aren’t residents of the surrounding blocks. I think vehicles having to slow down &amp; be cautious because there are cars parked on the side, narrowing the street is actually a good thing – it makes your car trip take 10 more seconds, but being forced to slow down dramatically improves safety for the children who live in the neighborhood and the many pedestrians and bikes who use our street. There’s also not currently a lack of parking on 400 E, so I doubt there would be a lack of parking with a few additional cars.</p> <p>My main objection would be the additional exceptions requested to setback requirements in the FB-UN1 code. To maintain compatibility with surrounding existing buildings as the code dictates (21A.27.020), the setback requirements should remain at the FB-UN1 requirements. I would also like to see the developer required to have additional engagement with the streets on Cleveland &amp; 400 E. The courtyard of this particular development seems lovely for the residents of Cleveland Court, but I do think the lack of engagement with the street would negatively impact the neighborhood. Overall, I don’t think that it is wise to grant setback exceptions for the sake of the developer. The Planning Division created those setbacks within the FB-UN1 ordinance for a reason, so I think those should be abided by.</p> <p>Thank you so much to all of you for all of your hard work during these extraordinary times.</p> <p>Best,</p> <p>LARA MCLELLAN HANDWERKER Transportation Planner I</p>	5
Cleveland Court Rezone & Master Plan Amendment	Leonard Brause	<p>Dear Distinguished Council Members, I write this letter to strongly urge the City Council to vote against the proposed rezoning and the development of the Cleveland Court condominium project. The lot upon which the proposed project will be built is far too small for the multitude of proposed buildings, and the number of people, pets, and cars that inevitably occupy the numerous units. This will significantly damage the neighborhood, its character and its property values, as the area is mostly comprised of older, single-family residences. The lot originally contained a similar single-family residence. The people of this neighborhood live here precisely because of its character, and the fact that it is quiet, not overcrowded and quite beautiful. This proposed project will change all that in multiple, negative ways. Beyond the mere fact of the number of units, there will be far too many cars for the area's small alley and streets. Additionally, all of a sudden, the neighborhood is affected with a new lack of privacy, which again, is a unique characteristic of our location. A concurrent significant increase in noise and light pollution will also occur and these factors are very important to me as they are to other neighbors. The increase in children and animals running around will be combined with no adequate places to play, because you effectively took away the only open land around. Safety is also a very important as it is already difficult to get out of the alley with a vehicle. With an increase in children, cars, and pets, this will can present a dangerous combination of factors that should not be introduced into this neighbor area. There is already growing crime in this area, and I feel with these condos, if you allow them to be built, will be purchased in large amount to be turned into rentals, which will increase the number of transient parties who do not have a significant focus on the area and its characteristics that we treasure here. The single-family aura of the older housing is a defining characteristic of the area. You are unduly causing harm to our dream homes and our dream neighborhood. Our property values, and desirability, will certainly be lowered through this attempt to allow a square peg to be placed in a round hole “ a condo development is simply not appropriate for this neighborhood at this location. The proposed zoning change is obviously sought only by the condo owners and solely for financial gain. There are far more important elements of this area and this neighborhood than a financial windfall to one party. We do not want our neighborhood to be treated as a second-class neighborhood, and it appears that if we were further east, we would not be expected to put up with this proposed neighborhood trespass. The zoning of this area should be restricted to the construction of single-family residences only and this is precisely why zoning regulations are implemented to maintain the character and viability of neighborhoods not to destroy them. The city should purchase this land, as a park, garden, playground, etc. and leave a bit of open space for the community! I trust you will listen to the residents who have lived, played and worked in this lovely neighborhood for many decades and decide that their interests and their concerns are more pressing for attention by the Council Members, than short term financial interests of a few. Thank you very much, Sincerely, Leonard Braus [REDACTED] <i>(See corresponding document - same letter)</i></p>	5

Topic	Name	Comment	District
Cleveland Court Rezone & Master Plan Amendment	Luka Poole	<p>Hello,</p> <p>My name is Luka. I am [REDACTED] and I wanted to know if we could make the open lot into a bike park. Me and my friends love biking there and going off jumps and if you decide to make apartments they will block our view and we wont be able to bike around anymore.</p> <p>I think it is very important to have a safe place to play. There are a lot of kids in this neighborhood and the closest bike park is always busy and far away. I really hope you consider my request.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Luka Poole</p>	5
Cleveland Court Rezone & Master Plan Amendment	Matthew Bainsmith	<p>Hello -</p> <p>This is Matt &amp; Dani Bainsmith - residents @ [REDACTED]</p> <p>We ARE in support of development on this corner - but have concerns about the setback reductions, specifically on the south side of the property abutting Cleveland:</p> <p>The plan argues that the development matches the character of other RMF-35 developments in the neighborhood, but even the comp developments do not share the minimal setbacks that will be seen on Cleveland. Here are some of the issues that we see: The 5.4' setback makes sidewalk snow removal difficult on Cleveland. Also the current design faces doors inward and gives minimal regard to the neighborhood character of Cleveland. The current design approach is the equivalent of raising a wall on Cleveland, and drastically changes the character of the street and ambiance for homes directly to the south. Cleveland is already a narrow street compared to most other neighborhood streets in the area. The additional parking on the street from the development will create traffic issues for the neighborhood and alley access.</p> <p>Given the current plans there is NOT enough space for the current overhead utilities - and the accommodation for trash removal is incomplete. During the city council meeting earlier this year - the developer stated that one dumpster would be adjacent to the shared alley. First, recycling and trash should be considered, and it should be ensured that there is adequate space to unload these dumpsters.</p> <p>Thank You, Matt &amp; Dani</p>	5
Cleveland Court Rezone & Master Plan Amendment	Nick Norton	<p>Hello,</p> <p>My wife and I own [REDACTED]. After learning more about the proposed changes to the Master Plan and map and modifications of the setbacks we became more and more against such actions. The impact to the neighborhood would be very significant. The traffic, parking, and general aesthetic of the area would be altered and as always this alteration for the worst is permanent. Once done, these mistakes lasts our lifetime. Please do not grant these changes. Please rule for the people, not the developers who could not care a whet about the neighborhood. Money drives this. Speaking of money, I am disappointed that the developers are being represented by former Mayor Carroon. The mayor’s salary was paid by 'we the people'. He was elected to do our work. To use his influence gained by our past votes to do the bidding of developers and not the people is filthy indeed. He should be ashamed and I imagine he is not. Using public office for future gain is popular over these last few years if you know what I mean. In these current times I see movement away from this kind of behavior of our politicians. The people will gain ground as a reaction to “the haves” behavior. Let’s start now. Do not allow the change ordinances for developers short term gain.</p> <p>Nick Norton</p>	5

Topic	Name	Comment	District
Cleveland Court Rezone & Master Plan Amendment	Nick Odair	<p>Hey Darin,</p> <p>My name is Nick Odair, I live on [REDACTED] . I am emailing you in regards to Cleveland Court and the 7 unit complex that is currently being discussed to be put up directly north of my house. I want to first voice that I am opposed to a 7 unit complex being put up in the vacant lot. I am against a 7 unit building for the reason that Cleveland Avenue between 3rd and 4th east is not wide or large enough to accommodate the parking and traffic this complex requires. "The average American household owns 2 cars while 35% of households own 3 or more." (Source; Experian). Anyone that lives on Cleveland between 3rd and 4th east or near it know that any car parked on this street turns this avenue into a one way road until the parked car has been passed. If there are multiple cars parked one in front of the other on the south side of the road (because there is no parking allowed on the North Side) the entire street is now a one way road as no one can pass, this will almost be unavoidable with 14-21 new permanent resident cars looking for parking. This is also troublesome for the people who have driveways on Cleveland - the road is already so narrow, backing in and out of your driveway is difficult, adding more vehicles will only make this harder to navigate. In the US there are over 18,000 backup related crashes in drive ways, parking lots and alleys each year. (Source: NHTSA and Insurance Institute for Highway Safety)</p> <p>Also the houses on the south side of Cleveland facing north will almost certainly have cars parked in front of their house because their is no parking allowed on the north side of the road - yet the north side stays clear for the complex. I understand the road is not owned by the house that resides in front of it, but I want to bring light that Cleveland in between 3rd and 4th was not build to accommodate the traffic a 7 unit complex brings.</p> <p>Thank you for listening to my stance. Please confirm this has been received and will be posted to tonight's city council meeting.</p> <p>Thanks,</p> <p>Nick Odair [REDACTED]</p>	5
Cleveland Court Rezone & Master Plan Amendment	Paul Corrigan	<p>Dear Council-</p> <p>I do not support the proposed zoning changes for Cleveland Court. I think the setbacks are the most problematic. Required setbacks are critical for the safety of non-motorized citizens of our streets and sidewalks, such as children walking to school.</p> <p>0.2 acres is a small footprint for multi-unit construction, I recommend the council not increase beyond what is currently allowed. I also propose that the council compel the developer to offer units at below-market prices.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Paul Corrigan [REDACTED]</p>	5
Cleveland Court Rezone & Master Plan Amendment	Paul Corrigan	Live Public Comment	
Cleveland Court Rezone & Master Plan Amendment	Peter Coroon	Live Public Comment	
Cleveland Court Rezone & Master Plan Amendment	Ryan McMullen	Live Public Comment	
Cleveland Court Rezone & Master Plan Amendment	Tracey M. Watson	To Whom It May Concern, Please accept the attached public comment against the Cleveland Court Master and Zoning Map Amendments with the Council Members. I understand this item is on the agenda for tomorrow night's meeting. Thank you. Tracey M Watson ( <b><i>See corresponding Letter</i></b> )	5

Topic	Name	Comment	District
Covid-19	Cynthia Mitchell	I am concerned about working conditions within SLC stores. My granddaughter works in a Papa Murphy's store where they stand shoulder to shoulder building pizzas with no one wearing masks. I don't know what laws or protocols Salt Lake City is following in Utah, but it does not seem to be safe working conditions for young people (or anyone). Could someone please look into this situation or have OSHA get involved? Social distancing is not being adhered to either. This lack of regard for health and safety is concerning not only for all of their workers but also for whomever the workers are in contact with outside of work hours. (Staff Note: The address of the Papa Murphy's is 4578 S. 4000 W.)  Thank you,  Cynthia Mitchell [REDACTED]	n/a
Covid-19	David Holland	David Holland left a voicemail today asking the Council to distribute crisis information flyers/pamphlets/books through the mail or with food boxes. Mr. Holland suggests this because not everyone has access to the internet or newspapers. He has spoken with Tina from the Mayor's office about this idea and says if anyone finds this idea helpful to please call him for more suggestions. He can be reached at [REDACTED]	n/a
Covid-19	Ron Lloyd	The rules the SLC health department has created are not necessary. Having reduced store hours makes the stores more crowded. They've put a lot of people out of jobs and out of business for a virus that is less dangerous than the flu (statistically). "The recent Stanford University antibody study now estimates that the fatality rate if infected is likely 0.1 to 0.2 percent, a risk far lower than previous World Health Organization estimates that were 20 to 30 times higher and that motivated isolation policies."	n/a
General Comment	Anonymous	There are some expenditures that, as a long term resident of Salt Lake City, should be eliminated. The primary expenditure that I feel has outlived its purpose is that Salt Lake City owns and operates six golf courses which do not pay their own way. As a tax payer, I want Salt Lake City to get totally out of the golf course business. Golfing is an activity which serves a small percentage of the population because fewer and fewer people golf. The golf courses should be closed; people working for them should be re-assigned or released or retired. The golf courses should then be sold. My preference would be that the money from the sale of the golf courses would go into a trust fund, the profits of which would be used to fix city sidewalks. City sidewalks from downtown to the Avenues - from Sugar House to West Valley are dangerous - with lips sticking up on which both my husband and I have fallen - with roots pushing up large blocks of cement. City sidewalks need to be replaced and repaired and interest from the money from the sale of the golf courses along with the current budgeted money for repairing sidewalks could start to make a dent in this problem without adding additional taxes. Secondly, the Leonardo became a reality with little or no resident input. And it has become a boondoggle....which was obvious from the start. The presentations have been mediocre at best; sometimes offensive. We found the staff rude when we went to one display- the only one we have gone to. The tickets are too spendy for the value received. The Leonardo needs to be permanently closed. The old library is another piece of property that could be sold/should be sold for development. Thirdly, and this probably doesn't come under the control of the city council; but perhaps some exploration could be initiated. The Utah State Fairgrounds should be transformed into a technological park. The area sets on the trax line - between the airport and the city center. It would be ideal. Salt Lake City is not an agricultural community. With money from the sale of the Utah State Fairgrounds, the Utah State Fair could be moved to a county where agriculture, and more particularly, family farms are important to the economy. That was the purpose of the original state fairs - to keep farmers informed about agricultural developments and new ideas - new equipment - new resources. The Utah State Fair would serve the family farm better if it were relocated to a county where family farms were still vital to the economy. Fourthly, the Tracy Aviary should be integrated into the Hogle Zoo. I believe there could be significant savings if the Tracy Aviary were ultimately moved and became a part of the Hogle Zoo. Until then, it should come under the direction and control of the zoo staff - eliminating some management positions hopefully. Fifthly, one of my favorite places to be is the Salt Lake City Library. It has become uncomfortable because the homeless population loiters about the main doors sometimes in groups and has also taken over much of the library - computers - etc. Is there anything that can be done for us to reclaim our library? Thank you (Please do not print my name if you post my input because I do not want to be threatened or attacked. These are just my ideas - If the bulk of people don't share them, then so be it. But I have heard over the years, many others complain about the city being in the golf business - both in print and in conversation.) Thank you.	n/a
General Comment	Ashlee Oblad	Public hearing on library funding is not about libraries? There talking about arts and water	n/a
General Comment	Chelsie Acosta	Live Public Comment	
General Comment	George Chapman	I urge the City to not convert 900 South to a local traffic only street due to the business development efforts and 45 degree parking (unsafe for bicyclists). Although one lane in each direction could be closed to car traffic (keeping parking), 800 South would be a better shared use street where one lane in each direction can be efficiently and respectfully closed to vehicle traffic while keeping parking. 800 South is less used as a through street but its large width is wasted. Portable planters were proposed years ago to separate traffic from pedestrians and bicyclists on 800 East, and although the Parleys Trail planters are looking pretty bad, maybe that might be a better plan to encourage bicycling and better use of super wide streets. It shouldn't be just during the COVID virus emergency.	n/a

Topic	Name	Comment	District
General Comment	John Katoab	Hello, My name is John Kotab. I am a resident in District 4, There is a matter happening regarding 5G technologies that is worth closer attention, because when a law or corporate motion is planned that is likely to excite the ire of the public, it is often done in a manner and with such timing as to avoid protest and hindrance. The COVID-19 epidemic is just such a time for the FCC and the Communications Industry they often protect. We need to be extra vigilant and not let FCC interests get "pushed through" to possible detriment to vulnerable individuals, insects, birds, and even weather forecasting accuracy. Please take a moment to review the letter copied below from the Children's Health Defense. This has been sent by hundreds of SLC residents to our representatives, with no response or action on their part. It is a legal request and is being upheld in numerous cities after review by their city attorneys. We request that this be sent right away to the city attorney and that our legal rights to be respected and upheld. We are not an aggressive nor uninformed group of people, and we are seeking only to have some time for safety reviews before these installations continue. This includes the exploration of city-owned and -operated smart meters/fuseboxes to ensure responsible power distribution, as well as more neighborhood notification and discretion in the permitting process. We are aware that local ordinance is often superseded by state and federal law, and we ask that Salt Lake City joins 60+ cities and counties in the lawsuit (19-70144) against the FCC. [Also, in an effort to expand local autonomy, please encourage our leaders to support S.2012, H.R 530, to oppose S.1699 and S.7243, and to repeal UT S.B 189] As you may be aware, there are zero studies on the safety of 5G for humans, animals, insects and the environment. According to a Harvard Ethics Review, the FCC is dominated by the same telecommunications industry it's meant to regulate. This conflict of interest means we're not being properly safeguarded; that our public safety is being exchanged for industries' bottom-line. While we do not believe that this service will be completed halted in our city, at the bare minimum, we hope to have safer processes and most specifically, protection of our children and the vulnerable - just like in the current emergency situation. Thank you for your attention to this very important matter, and please do reply directly to me at this address. Bless, John K <b>1 of 2 *Continued Below*</b>	4
General Comment	John Katoab	<b>2 of 2 *Continued Above*</b> DEAR MAYOR & CITY COUNCIL MEMBER, WE ASK THAT YOU IMPOSE A MORATORIUM ON SMALL CELLS AND OTHER WIRELESS INFRASTRUCTURE PERMITS PROCESS AND DEPLOYMENT UNTIL THE COVID-19 EMERGENCY IS OVER. THE WIRELESS PROVIDERS ARE USING THE COVID-19 EMERGENCY AS COVER TO EXPAND AND CEMENT THEIR RAPID AND VIRTUALLY UNSUPERVISED DEPLOYMENT OF HARMFUL WIRELESS INFRASTRUCTURE. OUR LOCAL LEADERS SHOULD NOT HAVE TO DEDICATE TIME AND RESOURCES TO POLICING WHETHER THE WIRELESS COMPANIES ARE FOLLOWING LOCAL AND STATE LAW, THEY HAVE FAR MORE IMPORTANT THINGS TO DO. THE FCC WIRELESS PERMIT RULES ALLOW EMERGENCY MORATORIA. HOMELAND SECURITY GUIDELINES EMPHASIZE THAT MAINTENANCE OF EXISTING COMMUNICATIONS CAPABILITY IS THE PRIORITY. NEW CONSTRUCTION IS NOT ESSENTIAL. THE COVID-19 EMERGENCY HAS LED TO A GOVERNMENT SHUT DOWN OF NON-ESSENTIAL ACTIVITY. HOSPITALS, EMERGENCY RESPONSE AND LOCAL OFFICIALS ARE OVERWHELMED AND THEY MUST BE ALLOWED TO FOCUS ON WHAT IS INDEED ESSENTIAL. NOW IS NOT THE TIME TO BE DEDICATING RESOURCES TO EXPANDING, RATHER THAN JUST MAINTAINING, OUR NETWORKS. THE FCC HAS DIRECTLY HELD A LOCAL JURISDICTION CAN IMPOSE A TEMPORARY HALT TO DEPLOYMENT AND PERMITS DURING EMERGENCIES. IN THE MATTER OF ACCELERATING WIRELINE BROADBAND DEPLOYMENT BY REMOVING BARRIERS, FCC 18-111, 33 FCC RCD 7705, 7784-7785, 157 (2018) (WE RECOGNIZE THAT THERE MAY BE LIMITED SITUATIONS IN THE CASE OF A NATURAL DISASTER OR OTHER COMPARABLE EMERGENCY WHERE AN EXPRESS OR DE FACTO MORATORIA THAT VIOLATES SECTION 253(A) MAY NONETHELESS BE NECESSARY TO PROTECT THE PUBLIC SAFETY AND WELFARE OR TO ENSURE THE CONTINUED QUALITY OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES.) HOMELAND SECURITY HAS DECLARED THAT LOCAL GOVERNMENT IS ON THE FOREFRONT AND CAN TAKE CONTROL OVER DETERMINING WHETHER TO TEMPORARILY HALT ALL NON-ESSENTIAL ACTIVITY. HOMELAND SECURITY GUIDANCE DOCUMENTS PRIORITIZE MAINTENANCE OF EXISTING COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS, AND DO NOT SUPPORT ESSENTIAL STATUS FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION. SEE HOMELAND SECURITY CYBERSECURITY & INFRASTRUCTURE SECURITY AGENCY, IDENTIFYING CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE DURING COVID-19, <a href="https://www.cisa.gov/identifying-critical-infrastructure-during-covid-19">HTTPS://WWW.CISA.GOV/IDENTIFYING-CRITICAL-INFRASTRUCTURE-DURING-COVID-19</a> (LOCAL CONTROL); E-CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE AND KEY RESOURCES SUPPORT ANNEX, <a href="http://www.fema.gov/pdf/emergency/nrf/nrf-support-cikr.pdf">HTTP://WWW.FEMA.GOV/PDF/EMERGENCY/NRF/NRF-SUPPORT-CIKR.PDF</a> (FOCUS ON PROTECTION, RESPONSE, RECOVERY, AND RESTORATION). HOMELAND SECURITY, LIKE THE FCC, UNDERSTANDS THAT IT IS ESSENTIAL IN AN EMERGENCY SITUATIONS JUSTIFY FOCUSING ON PROTECTING, RESPONDING, RECOVERING AND RESTORING OF EXISTING SYSTEMS, BUT NEW COMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION IS AND SHOULD BE DEEMED NONESSENTIAL, AND SUBJECT TO LOCKDOWN FOR SO LONG AS WE ARE UNDER EMERGENCY CONDITIONS. CITIES CAN AND SHOULD IMPOSE A MORATORIUM ON DEPLOYMENT IN THEIR LOCAL AREA AND FREEZE THE PERMIT PROCESS UNTIL THE COVID-19 EMERGENCY IS OVER.	4
General Comment	Margaret Holloway	Thanks for the trees. BUT WE NEED POLICE CAMERAS. Not for a few days at a time.  They shoot up the same areas. Again and again. The city needs more cameras.  But we get a 300,000 gravelpit of a dog park. And a few trees. Margaret Holloway	n/a
General Comment	Ruby Thomas	Kudos to the transportation office for closing the lanes on 900 so and turning them in bike and pedestrian lanes. I enjoyed my ride going down 300 E (which has bike lanes) and then traveling up 900 so and back. I cant wait for tomorrow when 600 E will also open for biking. Thank you Ruby Thomas	n/a

Topic	Name	Comment	District
General Comment	Susan Barretta	I would like to complain about a long standing issue with unleashed dogs in public parks and on the Jordan River trail. With summer coming and many people with time on their hands the problem is worse. My husband and I walk our LEASHED dog twice a day. I have experienced two ugly incidents on the trail by Riverside park with unleashed dogs. Our LEASHED dog does not tolerate well being surrounded by unleashed ones. The city does not enforce leash laws. So we want the city to consider dedicating a portion of Riverside park to a FULLY FENCED, off leash area for dogs and their owners, along with installing clear signage stating that the gate to the off leash area must remain closed and that a leash is required in the rest of the park and along the trail. I don't know what the city is trying to accomplish obstructing through traffic on 500 North. Not only are cars ignoring the no thru traffic signage but at least one sign between Oakley and 1300 W has been knocked down and run over and is lying in the middle of the street. My understanding is that the city wanted to obstruct thru auto traffic so that people could "recreate" yet WE, who keep our dog leashed, are the ones forced off the trail and out of the parks due to the inconsideration of others or lack of understanding of the basic law of keeping a dog on a leash. Susan Barretta	4
RECM Zoning Map Amendment, 347, 353, and 359 North 700 West	Andrew Black	Live Public Comment	
RECM Zoning Map Amendment, 347, 353, and 359 North 700 West	Christian McMullin	Live Public Comment	

Topic	Name	Comment	District
Shared Mobility Devices	Jonathan Hopkins	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>I'm writing to provide feedback on proposed scooter legislation that is coming before council work session today. Particularly, there is the potential to irreparably harm micromobility in Salt Lake City at a time when it will be critical to economic recovery.</p> <p>The costs proposed by the City for this program are extraordinary. For example: The national average for city scooter fees is 2.7% of revenue. In comparison, the proposed up front fee would equal 95% of our 2020 SLC revenue to date for our 900 authorized scooters. The city proposes extracting almost every dollar of revenue we've collected this year during a global pandemic. The proposed fees for our 2019 fleet levels would extract up to one third of SLC revenue for our worst case annual revenue projections for the year. If we factor in the costs we saw in 2019 to provide the city's mandated equity zone operations, then regulatory costs (fees + equity zone costs) in SLC on a 900-vehicle fleet would equal 57%-104% of our best / worst case revenue projections for the year. Why are these numbers so high? In 2019, the city's equity requirements effectively required a contribution of over \$400,000 a year towards a valuable public benefit. This public benefit, given its largess, should be considered a credit towards the city's program costs. The benefit is for the good of the city and required of no other mobility industry. For comparison, Uber and Lyft each pay a \$5,000 annual fee to operate statewide and have no equity requirements in SLC.</p> <p>Other cost drivers will have high cost, destructive effects on the program and should be rejected. The city is proposing using scooter impound companies such as Sweep, at great expense (25% of all city admin costs) This adopts a failed approach from San Diego and Phoenix that has resulted in many companies leaving the markets. The program is responsible for denying virtually any company the opportunity to make a profit (aside from the impound company) due to a demonstrated history of predatory and unsavory operating practices within the impound industry.</p> <p>It has not been broadly adopted nationally. Companies can provide this service themselves or be charged a fee (\$25) if a police or public works official moves a scooter.</p> <p><b>1 of 2 *Continued Below*</b></p>	n/a

Topic	Name	Comment	District
Shared Mobility Devices	Jonathan Hopkins	<p><b>2 of 2 *Continued Above*</b> Instead of taking actions that put mobility companies at further risk, cities around the world are recognizing scooters as part of the solution to revive mobility and their economy:</p> <p>Cities globally are treating scooters like essential transportation services, from Portland to Austin to Brussels, and considering them a necessary alternative for those cautious about riding transit. They are part of the business recovery we all need: In Denver, 77% of riders say they visit local businesses more because of Lime scooters, and 97% of riders have used Lime to visit local businesses. Scooters reduce congestion (30.6% of SLC riders ride in place of a car)</p> <p>Scooters reduce pollution (saving 404g of pollutants for every mile traveled in place of a car).</p> <p>During the coming months as some people avoid transit, SLC can not fit every employee entering the city in a car. Scooters are inherently a socially distant travel mode that people will need and the city can integrate into recovery plans.</p> <p>Now is not the time to charge to a city fee structure that would be one of the highest in the country. The change will affect an industry that has been hit just like so many others during this global pandemic--an industry that will be essential to the city’s cleaner air, small-business focused recovery.</p> <p>If a fee does need to be charged, a fairer approach is to assign a 5 cent per trip fee in Salt Lake City. This approach avoids a massive up-front cost.</p> <p>It is variable so that the fee doesn’t exceed potential revenue in an unpredictable year.</p> <p>It is consistent with the rest of the state. Other Utah cities charge 10 cents per trip, but do not have the equity zones that are very expensive to operate.</p> <p>The minimal fee has limited negative effect on mode shift away from cars</p> <p>It is still more expensive on a per-mile basis than the gas tax (7.1 cents per mile for scooters compared to 1.5 cents per mile for a Utahan to drive the average car).</p> <p>Again, Uber and Lyft disrupt traffic and wear down pavement like all cars, and have no fee from the city and no special impound provisions, while increasing pollution and congestion.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and dedication to the people of Salt Lake City. We, too, are dedicated to working together to help with the economic recovery that is ahead of us.</p> <p>—Jonathan</p>	n/a

Topic	Name	Comment	District
Shared Mobility Devices	Thom Carter	<p>Good afternoon,</p> <p>I'm writing to the council to point out how important micromobility (scooter) companies are to our city and to our successful collaboration for cleaner air.</p> <p>It's come to my attention that the city council is considering fees that would greatly increase up front costs on the industry in the middle of a global pandemic. Furthermore, my understanding is that these fees would be a very significant share of revenue.</p> <p>From my perspective, these micromobility companies provide a public good that far exceeds the costs borne by the city: The are committed to clean air. Lime, for example, supported the donation of nearly \$4,000 to our organization over the past year through their community program - LIME HERO, allowing riders to round up their ride for clean air Lime volunteered to participate in the Clear the Air Challenge with UCAIR and the Salt Lake Chamber. They donated reduced cost trips to all participants during the Challenge They have offered lower cost rides on free transit days and other key events Meanwhile, they have been providing free zero-emission rides to healthcare and law enforcement professionals in our community since their return to our City. They contribute substantially to equity at no cost to the city. My understanding is that they spend far more on equity than they make in profits in our city.</p> <p>I want these sorts of innovative partnerships to continue. I am worried that if we suddenly place high fees on these companies in the middle of an economically disruptive pandemic, it will endanger these partners and their work. That will hurt our ability to get people to work post-pandemic and drive clean economic development in our communities.</p> <p>Please recognize the important positive work they do in our communities, and how critical they are to our recovery as you consider whether to add costs to their operations in our city. We are going to need them in the future more than ever, and we will be thankful for their presence in our city.</p> <p>Please feel free to reach out to me with any additional questions.</p> <p>Best, Thom Carter</p>	n/a
Vegetation Reduction Permits for Wildfire Mitigation	George Chapman	<p>The Council is setting a public hearing date for Wildfire Mitigation. Permits for Wildfire Mitigation should include dumpsters for removing scrub oak cuttings that are difficult to fit in garbage cans. Call2Haul does not allow them. Please ensure that the final public hearing on June 2 includes Call2Haul flexibility. East Bench Community Council has expressed concern many times about this issue.</p>	n/a

Tracey M. Watson  
[REDACTED]  
Salt Lake City UT 84115

May 4, 2020

Salt Lake City Council  
Chair, Chris Wharton  
Vice Chair, Andrew Johnston  
Council Member Darin Mano,  
Council Member Dan Dugan  
Council Member Amy Fowler  
Council Member Ana Valdemoros  
Council Member James Rogers

Re: Public comment AGAINST adopting an ordinance regarding Petitions PLNPCM2019-00189 and PLNPCM201900190 Cleveland Court Master Plan and Zoning Map Amendments.

Chair Warton, Vice Chair Johnston and all other distinguished Council Members,

I write to ask you to vote against adopting the ordinance and petitions mentioned above. This proposed property use does not fit into our community and will significantly and negatively impact our Blair Street extended family. More importantly, since you began your review of this project, our world has changed, and we will not return to the normal we recently knew and we need this space for the healing and recreation of the neighborhood children – even if we can't keep this space forever; we need it for now.

First, Blair Street and the surrounding blocks are an extended family and this type of dwelling, especially at this epidemic time does not present a positive contribution to the neighborhood or the family. I have lived at [REDACTED] since 1997. For almost 23 years, I have witnessed and participated in this block and neighborhood transition into an extended family. When a homeowner has died or moved away, the family members in charge of selling the home have painstakingly worked with residents to carefully choose new homeowners who will contribute positively to this community. We look after each other; we loan yard equipment to each other; we bring each other's garbage cans inside; we watch for each other's package delivery; the children play in everyone's yard; we knock on each other's door if we have not seen a neighbor in more than a day or two; and this year we even had a progressive dinner party. We love Blair Street and our extended Blair Street family. This ordinance and pending petitions just don't fit into the neighborhood – at least not as proposed – and certainly not as proposed at this time or in the near future.

There simply is not enough room on the lot for the number of units proposed; the numbers of persons who will move in and the number of vehicles that will need street parking. Whether or not the law or zoning permits this, or whether there is a "plan" for off street parking, please come and walk the street. Getting in and out of the alley will be made more difficult and it is unlikely people will use the off street parking. Please come walk the street on a Thursday/garbage day. There is already no place to put the cans but our dedicated City employees often get in and out of their trucks to move cans to avoid damage to any of our cars. Whether zoning and law permits these petitions, this development will do nothing to positively contribute to this neighborhood.

Watson

Public Comment AGAINST PLNPCM2019-00189 & 201900190

May 4, 2020

Page 2

Second and most importantly, please vote against this ordinance and proposed positions during this pandemic time. COVID-19 sent our kids home; sent us home. Many of us are work from home and our kids need the safety of Blair Street now more than ever. Our kids need to heal and to recreate. They need to race down the block on their bikes, they need to run and shoot water and nerf guns and play tag and they need more open space and not less. We see examples of this recently as Mayor Mendhall has recently closed off certain streets to cars to give residents more space to be outside safely. Our Blair Street kids need this now and they certainly don't need any unnecessary traumas for the foreseeable future.

For these reasons, as well as the many others provided by my Blair Street neighbors, please vote against these petitions at this time.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,



Tracey M. Watson

[REDACTED]  
Salt Lake City UT 84115

**Dear Distinguished Council Members,**

I write this letter to strongly urge the City Council to vote against the proposed rezoning and the development of the Cleveland Court condominium project. The lot upon which the proposed project will be built is far too small for the multitude of proposed buildings, and the number of people, pets, and cars that inevitably occupy the numerous units. This will significantly damage the neighborhood, its character and its property values, as the area is mostly comprised of older, single-family residences. The lot originally contained a similar single-family residence.

The people of this neighborhood live here precisely because of its character, and the fact that it is quiet, not overcrowded and quite beautiful. This proposed project will change all that in multiple, negative ways. Beyond the mere fact of the number of units, there will be far too many cars for the area's small alley and streets. Additionally, all of a sudden, the neighborhood is affected with a new lack of privacy, which again, is a unique characteristic of our location. A concurrent significant increase in noise and light pollution will also occur and these factors are very important to me as they are to other neighbors. The increase in children and animals running around will be combined with no adequate places to play, because you effectively took away the only open land around. Safety is also a very important as it is already difficult to get out of the alley with a vehicle. With an increase in children, cars, and pets, this will can present a dangerous combination of factors that should not be introduced into this neighbor area.

There is already growing crime in this area, and I feel with these condos, if you allow them to be built, will be purchased in large amount to be turned into rentals, which will increase the number of transient parties who do not have a significant focus on the area and its characteristics that we treasure here.


The single-family aura of the older housing is a defining characteristic of the area. You are unduly causing harm to our dream homes and our dream neighborhood. Our property values, and desirability, will certainly be lowered through this attempt to allow a square peg to be placed in a round hole – a condo development is simply not appropriate for this neighborhood at this location.

The proposed zoning change is obviously sought only by the condo owners and solely for financial gain. There are far more important elements of this area and this neighborhood than a financial windfall to one party. We do not want our neighborhood to be treated as a second-class neighborhood, and it appears that if we were further east, we would not be expected to put up with this proposed neighborhood trespass. The zoning of this area should be restricted to the construction of single-family residences only and this is precisely why zoning regulations are implemented – to maintain the character and viability of neighborhoods not to destroy them.

The city should purchase this land, as a park, garden, playground, etc. and leave a bit of open space for the community! I trust you will listen to the residents who have lived, played and worked in this lovely neighborhood for many decades and decide that their interests and their concerns are more pressing for attention by the Council Members, than short term financial interests of a few.

Thank you very much,

Sincerely,  
Leonard Braus

  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84115