

Topic	Name	Comment	District
AHU's	Kerry Lehtinen	I have an AHUnit in my home, built in 1929. It was used 25 years ago as a rental but not with a lease. (Before I owned it.) It has 3 exits and complies to almost all the codes. I can't get it registered because I can't show proof and a copy of a lease showing it has been rented in the past. I am sure there are many units like mine that have just gone ahead and rented out their units. Which means the city has no oversight. If you eliminate the œproof of previous rental requirement, I am sure more units would be registered. I don't plan to rent my unit, but I would like to register it in case I ever decide to sell the home. I think it would be positive to say the unit is registered with the City. Thank you for your consideration. Kerry Lehtinen	n/a

Topic	Name	Comment	District
Construction	Garrett Albercio	<p>Dear Council Members: My name is Garrett Alberico and I live downtown at [REDACTED] South in a house divided into apartments. There is a large construction site across the street at approximately 325 East 300 South. About every 2-3 weeks, there are Kilgore concrete trucks that begin lining up for a concrete pour at 4 a.m, a steady stream of trucks lining 300 South from the job site all the way to 400 East. Their lights are flashing, horns honking, air brakes and hydraulics decompressing and loud banging--a surprising and extreme amount of noise lasting nearly 2 1/2 hours in the pre-dawn hours. This has been going for months. There are many existing residential apartment complexes in the area--the YWCA is literally, right across the street and I want to lodge a formal noise complaint. When other large complexes have gone up close-by, the construction companies have posted courtesy flyers on all our doors detailing when an early-morning pour is happening. Kilgore has not done this for this project and here are my questions: 1. does this project have the proper permits for 4 a.m concrete pours? I am writing this at home at 9 a.m and the construction site is perfectly quiet. Not a cement truck in sight! The photos I have included were taken at 4:30 a.m this morning and all the tenants in my building were awakened this morning by the excessive noise. 2. are construction companies obligated by guidelines or ordinances that require them to post and notify residents nearby when they're performing such sleep disrupting activities? After talking to David Jones in the SLC Engineering Dept. this morning, I understand the City Council is looking at passing ordinances pertaining to this exact issue. Please keep me posted on what more I can do to protect myself and all my neighbors from this ongoing intrusion. With downtown changing so drastically, it is important that the rights and freedoms of people who have lived downtown for years not get trampled by developers and construction companies in the process. Thank you. Garrett Alberico</p> <p>*See Corresponding Attachments*</p>	4

Topic	Name	Comment	District
Crime	Cristee Campbell	It has been brought to my attention that several if not many people in neighborhoods have to deal with constant drug dealer activity outside their doors and nothing ever is done about it. I/we are in that very situation and have been for 10 years and it seems to be getting worse. We contact police, we send licenses plate numbers, photos of activity and photos of them burning something noxious outside all year round. I recently called the DEA and every single time nothing is done about it. The house is right across the street from an elementary school which I always thought made the drug situation more of a concern to lawmakers, but I'm thinking it doesn't matter. I was telling a colleague about it and they said we'll have to move, because nothing is ever done about it if you don't have proof. They stated that they know of neighborhoods who have done the very same thing and nothing. Some ended up moving away from it. That is so backwards and makes no sense that law abiding people have to put up with this. The proof should be coming from police or narcotic investigations??? Shouldn't it?! Shouldn't your reform include something to help citizens live healthy lives in their own homes and backyards?! What do you suggest?? Cristee	n/a
District Attorney	Albert Cramer	This is to follow up on my previous email to you about my experience with the Salt Lake County DA Conviction Integrity Unit. I would like you to email Anna Rossi Anderson to get her view of our phone visit, then forward a copy to me so I do not misrepresent her opinion as I share my experience with others. In my opinion there needs to be far more accountability of State Attorneys. Susan Hunt, an assistant DA in my case, withheld an interview where the alleged victim said the crime did not occur. Ms. Rossi did not feel this was withholding evidence. I was not allowed witnesses on my behalf and Susan Hunt knew this. My petition to the Conviction Review Panel has a number of issues that Ms. Rossi felt did not meet the Panels level to address. I am still waiting for a Record of the petitions presented to the Panel and their response to those petitions, at least how many and the # of the petitions actually reviewed would be helpful Yes, many years have passed but the harm that was done to me and my family will happen to others, over and over again, if nothing is done to see that all Attorneys in Utah do what they promise and uphold the Constitution. At this writing I have seen no records to show the Conviction Review panel has done any good nor that States Attorneys are held accountable for their actions. If you have records to show me different, please send them to me so I can have data to show others. Thank you for your time and service.	n/a

Topic	Name	Comment	District
Ivory Homes' Proposed Development	Creed Collins	Good afternoon- I would like to unequivocally state my opposition to Ivory Homes' proposal to re-zone the property located at 675 North F Street. 1. Both proposals to date do nothing to address parking issues from so many dwellings on such a small property. 2. Both proposals to date do nothing to alleviate the traffic issues that would arise around the development, and on the feeder streets to that area of the Avenues (particularly E Street). 3. Ivory Homes purchased this land knowing full well how it was zoned. The area in question was zoned FB-UN1 for legitimate reasons, none of which have changed now that this particular developer owns the property. 4. Lastly, Ivory Homes' unwillingness to materially address the community's concerns in their recent re-proposal shows that they are not acting in good faith with the community. As such, the City should side with the actual residents, and not with a developer who clearly has no regard for the community. Thank you Creed Collins	3
Ivory Homes' Proposed Development	Cynthia Buckingham	Mr. Echeverria, I am writing in opposition to the new Ivory Homes proposal to develop the property at 675 N F Street. If I remember correctly, the original proposal included 40 homes (20 units, each with an ADU), plus 5 "custom homes". The revision includes 30 homes (15 "units," each with an ADU), plus the 5 custom homes, which could also end up with multiple units since there does not appear to be any restriction. So Ivory has reduced its request to rezone from 45 homes to 35-40, in an area zoned for 11 homes. This is not a sufficient response to the neighborhood concerns, nor does the proposal meet the city's standards for planned developments. In addition, my original objections to a zoning change remain applicable: This will not be an "affordable" housing project; they are to be high-end. Increased traffic will burden existing residential streets. There is still insufficient parking in the proposed development even for residents and any visitors will end up on surrounding streets, further complicating traffic patterns. There is a nearby bus line, but it does not provide access to neighborhood groceries or services, just to downtown and the U of U. Roads inside the development are narrow, making fire and other services difficult. Units are packed tightly together, leaving little green space and removing several mature trees, which will harm the existing bird and wildlife habitat. (Their proposal to plant 2 small trees in other places for every 1 removed is disingenuous, at the least.) I do not oppose ADUs in the neighborhood. Nor do I oppose sensitive development of that parcel. But the Ivory Homes proposal to pack 35-40 units into an area zoned for 11 is unacceptable. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments. Cynthia Buckingham	3

Topic	Name	Comment	District
Ivory Homes' Proposed Development	David Maher	We are writing in opposition to the Ivory Home application to rezone 675 F street to FB-UNI. The present zoning allows 11 home sites to be built while maintaining the continuity of the existing neighborhood. Ivory Home proposal provides a high density setting and the many problems associated with that. Traffic increases would be substantial. Demands on all services, fire, police protection and utilities will be challenged to meet the required needs. Additionally potential environmental concerns must be raised, as obviously with the proposed density level there will be a negative impact. Clearly the site as presently zoned would provide an excellent fit to the surrounding community. We need to challenge ourselves to preserve and maintain neighborhood character and continuity where ever we have the opportunity to do so . sincerely, David & Marilyn Maher	3
Ivory Homes' Proposed Development	Jan McKinnon	I have been reading the 1987 Greater Avenues Development plan again. It is a beautiful document which took into consideration not just what was good for the neighbors but what was good for the whole city. There's a visual image that needs to be preserved of housing, open space, parks, walking paths and bike trails along the shoreline trail. After studying the plan, I can understand where it might need to be tweaked occasionally, but it's a slippery slope when zoning changes are made by little steps. What you end up with is not what the plan intended. Ivory has a beautiful lot that can be developed according to the FR-3 zoning that exists for the lot. Keeping the zoning respects the greater good of the neighborhood and the city. Thanks for your work and I stand opposed to the rezone for Ivory Homes. Jan McKinnon	3

Topic	Name	Comment	District
Ivory Homes' Proposed Development	Jan McKinnon	<p>Daniel. I am the recently elected HOA President of the Meridien. The development of the Meridien preserved the historic former VA Hospital which is an iconic building in the Avenues. This beautiful building sits just south of the proposed Ivory Homes development at 675 N F Street. Each of the residents in the Meridien opposes the rezone proposed by Ivory Homes. The project Ivory is proposing is too dense for our neighborhood. A modest estimate would put 70 new cars on our private road, Capitol Park Avenue. This is a road that the city would not adopt because it did not meet their safety requirements and therefore, the road is maintained by the two HOA's bordering the avenue. It would be dangerous to add this many cars to this narrow road. Ivory has given us many reasons to oppose their development. It is too dense. It does not fit in the neighborhood. This compact development with many small houses and extremely limited green space is not consistent with the surrounding neighborhood. The density threatens the sensitive foothills and wildlife that flourish in our neighborhood. Changing the zoning for one developer doesn't make any sense. In 1987 the Greater Avenues Development plan was carefully planned by professionals who understood the character and potential of the Avenues. They were concerned about the congestion in the lower Avenues if unchecked development occurred in the upper avenues. They even considered the appearance of the foothills from areas below. The planners purchased land for parks and designated areas that should be left undeveloped or used for future bike trails and walking paths. It's a good plan, and exceptions to it should not be made without redoing the whole plan. Making exceptions here and there would destroy the concept of the Greater Avenues development plan. The plan had a vision to direct future growth and development so that the quality of life and community scale would be maintained. 1 of 2 *Continued Below*</p>	3

Topic	Name	Comment	District
Ivory Homes' Proposed Development	Jan McKinnon	<p>2 of 2 *Continued Above* Ivory is asking for a change to the FB-UN1 zone which is generally reserved for urban areas where city services, employment opportunities, and schools are easily accessible by walking or with public transportation. This lot on F street provides none of those opportunities. One city bus arrives on the hour each during the week days. The closest grocery store is 7 blocks away down the hill and it would be challenging at best to walk back up the 7 blocks carrying a load of groceries. Few employment opportunities are available by walking. One elementary school is walkable but the other students are bussed to the middle school and high school. Preserving the zoning on this lot still allows Ivory to build 11 homes with ADU's. They stand to make a substantial profit with the current zoning. Ivory likes to say that their homes are affordable, but they are not. They like to say their homes are family friendly, but they are not. There is very little green space and no sidewalks. There is no compelling argument to change the zoning for Ivory but there are many compelling reasons to keep the FR-3 zoning designation. Thank you from all the residents at the Meridien. Jan McKinnon</p>	3

Topic	Name	Comment	District
Ivory Homes' Proposed Development	John Nisson	<p>Hi Mr. Echeverria, I am writing to you again, as resident of the avenues and adjacent neighbor to the property in question, to state my strong opposition to Ivory Homes proposed rezoning of 675 North F St. I live directly south at [REDACTED] and will be one of the neighbors most dramatically impacted by the proposed changes. I am a fairly new resident and only moved into my home this last year, however it has been a goal to move to the avenues for as far as I remember, and I have worked hard and saved diligently to make this a reality. Why the avenues, you may ask, well there are many reasons; to be a part of the most iconic neighborhood in the city, to live in a place that has charm and character and not a cookie cutter stucco community where the houses are built right on top of each other, but mostly to live in the same neighbor my great grandparents did almost a century ago. The ivory home proposal to rezone goes against every reason that I moved here and is an outright sham and abomination. The zoning parameters of the lot were set for a reason. The redesign has barely made modifications to their original proposal, and there was good reason their original proposal was soundly rejected. I hope you stay the course on this and hold true to the original zoning that was intended. As stated last time, I have grave concerns that my property value will be undermined by this proposed property along with Ivory Home's reputation for cheap construction. If necessary I will utilize whatever tools at my disposal to prevent this from occurring and preserving my investment. I purchased my home with the expectation that the street and surrounding properties would be of like kind and quality, this proposal is certainly not up to that standard. I welcome development on the lot in question, I just want it to be tasteful, fitting of the community, and not just be another overly dense eye sore and scab that would make my great grandparents turn over in their grave. Please do the right thing and say NO to REZONE. Best regards, John Nisson</p>	3

Topic	Name	Comment	District
Ivory Homes' Proposed Development	Kilaree Collins	Good Morning- I would kindly ask you to consider my request to oppose the Ivory Homes proposal to re-zone the property located at 675 North F Street. As a resident I have several concerns about this proposal. The second proposal posed by Ivory Homes does not address parking issues from so many dwellings on such a small property. Traffic would significantly increase in a community that does not have the infrastructure to support the burden of such heavy traffic. When Ivory Homes purchased this land, the zoning was already established. The property in question is zoned FN-UN1 and that zoning was a thoughtful zoning consideration with the Avenues Community in mind. To change the zoning would be detrimental. Last, but not least, Ivory Homes has not demonstrated that they would be a good partner in our community. They have not listened to our concerns or addressed them in this second proposal. I implore you to keep the zoning as is and reject the Ivory Homes proposal. Thank you for your consideration. Hilaree Collins	3
Ivory Homes' Proposed Development	Lynn M Keenan	Dear Mr. Wharton, I am absolutely opposed to Ivory Homes January 2021 proposal to change the zoning for the property on F Street and 13th Street in the Upper Avenues. I am flummoxed by the brazen and reckless proposal by Ivory Homes. I purchased my property in 2014. Prior to the purchase, I researched the zoning of the property on F Street and 13th Street. It is zoned for 11 houses. This zoning was acceptable. I moved from Seattle seeking a quiet safe neighborhood to jog and walk my dog. The current status with the current zoning maintains the integrity of the neighborhood. I adhered to zoning rules. I paid an additional \$60,000 regarding the maximal height of my home. If you notice, 678 F street violates the height restriction. I am adamantly opposed to changing the zoning to accommodate high density development. High density housing will add traffic to the streets, diminish the water pressure, bring noise to the quiet streets, and add air pollution. The added cars will significantly impact the air quality. The streets can barely accommodate the trash trucks that already turn around in my driveway. There is limited access for egress in case of a fire let alone room for fire and EMS vehicles. What is the plan regarding snow removal. There will be no place to put it. F Street is already precariously steep and is dangerous in the snow and ice. 1 of 2 *Continued Below*	3

Topic	Name	Comment	District
Ivory Homes' Proposed Development	Lynn M Keenan	2 of 2 *Continued Above* Ivory Homes proposal has very little grass and trees. This impacts the environment with pollution, noise and water drainage. There is not enough off-street parking for the additional cars. This proposal is not innovative in the least. This is a complete ruse. We already have The Meridian and North Point which are high density housing areas. Smiths' grocery can barely handle the current Upper Avenues population. What is the impact for the SLC Police Department and Fire Department. There is minimal public transportation. Ivory Homes is purely motivated by avarice. They are trying to hoodwink the residents and city planning commission. Ivory Homes has no altruistic intentions. They met with different parties in the neighborhood. Each group was told a different story. The ADU's will be unregulated multiple rentals with frequent turn over. Changing the zoning will negatively impact my neighborhood. I am absolutely adamantly opposed. I am asking you to do what is best for this neighborhood not what is best of the coffers of Ivory Homes. Please listen to the citizens who voted you into office and live in your district. Sincerely, Lynn M. Keenan MD FACP FCCP Assistant Professor of Medicine Division of Pulmonary / Critical Care Medicine University of Utah	3
Ivory Homes' Proposed Development	Maria Mastakas	Not sure if you guys saw - they have a sign up marketing the property. *See Corresponding Attachment*	3
Ivory Homes' Proposed Development	Merritt Stites	To Daniel Echeverria, Chris Wharton and Mayor Mendenhall: PLEASE carefully consider this proposal and DO NOT allow rezoning in the Avenues. This is not just about Ivory Homes this one time. This is about the possible loss of the beauty and uniqueness of The Avenues!!! I have been a resident of 10th Avenue for almost 50 years moving here from Boston. We chose the Avenues because of its diversity, its location and it's quiet Feel. Since living here we have experienced change with many more cars and many more parking problems. We have also experienced remodels and the beautification of many blocks That had previously been run down. People want to live here because it is beyond compare. If IvoryHomes is granted this change it is only a matter of months Before more housing developers request the same density wherever they can find a lot or individual homes to be pulled down and pack in more living spaces making traffic and the Integrity of the area diminish. Please don't allow this catastrophe to happen. Thank you, Merritt Stites	3

Topic	Name	Comment	District
Ivory Homes' Proposed Development	Peter Wright	Please find attached a response to Thom Carter's Letter of Recommendation regarding the above application. Mr. Carter's letter of recommendation is also attached. Thank you for your consideration, Peter Wright *See Corresponding Attachments*	3
Ivory Homes' Proposed Development	Robin Kim	Hello I am a resident of Capitol Park and have written to you in the past. I have reviewed Ivory's revised proposal and remain opposed to the rezoning of 675 North F Street. Here are only some reasons that I oppose such rezoning: 1. The January 2021 proposed site plan under FB-UN1 packs 35 dwelling units into a compact space will cause many problems including: - More car traffic and car noise on the nearby Avenues feeder streets. - More ambient noise and lack of screening from the denser development for close neighbors. - Most of the cars will exit via a private road: Capitol Park Avenue is not a public street. - FB-UN1 is inappropriate. It is not appropriate for the setting in which this plot exists, which is a suburban residential neighborhood bordering on environmentally sensitive foothills. - Increases safety risk for students. F Street and 13th Avenue is currently a bus stop and at the crest of a very steep section of F where visibility is a real concern for cars coming uphill, especially in the dark. Kids walk to Ensign Elementary on 13th and 12th Avenues where there are only intermittent sidewalks and few crosswalks. 13th Ave from F to I Street will be heavily utilized by both kids and cars. - Harms neighborhood aesthetic. - Historic legacy will be lost of nearby buildings (the original VA Hospital and the second Primary Children's Hospital.) -. Loss of habitat. The neighborhoods in this area abound with wildlife. A denser development will leave less habitat for wildlife. Thank you for registering my concerns. Robin Kim	3
Ivory Homes' Proposed Development	Steven Stepanek	Erin, Daniel and Chris, I have reviewed the revised proposal made by Ivory Homes for my neighborhood. I FIRMLY believe that the existing zoning should remain in place to preserve the character of the neighborhood. Ivory purchased this plot of land with the existing zoning and should keep its plan consistent with that zoning. If they do not like that they are free to sell the land to other developers. Please do not approve any modifications to the current zoning. Downtown has added and is adding a huge increment of dense housing options and what Ivory is proposing is totally inconsistent with the nature and history of our neighborhood. Steven Stepanek	3

Topic	Name	Comment	District
Ivory Homes' Proposed Development	Teresa Stepanek	Erin, Daniel and Chris, I too have reviewed the revised proposal made by Ivory Homes for my neighborhood. I FIRMLY believe that the existing zoning should remain in place to preserve the character of the neighborhood. Ivory purchased this plot of land with the existing zoning and should keep its plan consistent with that zoning. If they do not like that they are free to sell the land to other developers. Please do not approve any modifications to the current zoning. Downtown has added and is adding a huge increment of dense housing options and what Ivory is proposing is totally inconsistent with the nature and history of our neighborhood. Teresa Stepanek	3
Ivory Homes' Proposed Development	Todd and Carmelle Jensen	Dear Mr. Echeverria: We have reviewed Ivory's revised proposal and remain in opposition of it for the following reasons. In my research of FB-UN1 it is designed for urban environments with public transportation thus reducing automobile use and encouraging walking and biking to needed services. We are located in a suburban neighborhood which lacks this. This development would add 70 or more automobiles to a school zone neighborhood where kids are already challenged walking to Ensign Elementary. The safety of our children is paramount. Capitol Park Ave is a private road that this development would need to enter and exit onto. If a change from FR-3 to FB-UN1 zoning is approved, this would allow future developments to occur in our environmentally sensitive foothills of our Avenues neighborhood. We do not object to this development as it stands within the existing FR-3 zone which is part of the master plan created some 20 years ago. This has served the neighborhood in keeping with aesthetic, environmental and safety concerns. Thank you for taking time to review our objections to the re-zoning. Sincerely Todd and Carmelle Jensen	3
Ivory Homes' Proposed Development	Tyler Jack	I have reviewed Ivory's revised proposal and remain opposed to the rezoning of 675 North F Street. My home is on the [REDACTED] of this property and their revision is even worse than the first. They plan to build homes almost right next to my backyard with zero greenspace and once again when we built our home we did not think zoning on our backyard would change as it has been a part of Salt Lake City's master plan for years. Nothing has changed in the avenues except Ivory wants to change the zoning to make more money. Please respect the people that already live here and do not change the zoning. *See Corresponding Attachment*	3

Topic	Name	Comment	District
Parking	Chuck Ray	<p>I wrote in a week ago about my experience visiting downtown SLC to have dinner with my family while taking my son to visit the U. The parking experience was so bad, and continues to follow me and steal my time and money, that I won't be back. Imagine this headline - Bad parking violation experience causes visitor from neighboring state not only to refuse to send his kid to university in SLC, but also never ski, river run, fish, bike and trail run in UT ever again. Not only could I not figure out how to pay for parking (correction, the app simply did not work), I had to trade family-time for poking at my phone inputting all my private information only to be denied paying the fee. I was threatened with a \$60 fine to become \$90. To park, so I can spend my money in your restaurants! Which I'm happy to do of course, but not at the cost of threats, fines, more lost time, and mental expense to boot. Turns out, per the email below, that your parking services are run out of WA and that there are apparently two different payment apps !! What gives? How would a driver ever know that? Call to Park and Pay by Phone. Where is the pay at point of sale?? Perhaps there is payment kisok, it's not where the two different signs are installed next to each other at the parking lot entrance that's for sure. (BTW how the hell could Call to Park, which I was apparently using, be an *app*? Which I signed up to??) Is it expected that to park car in SLC, to go shopping (! retail revenue and sales taxes !) requires a scavenger hunt to pay the stupid parking fee? Well I'm simply not going to trade my recreation time hunting down parking payment rather than laughing with fam. Time is an unfungible commodity, in short supply, and not tradable for predatory practices. I donate this time to you my nieghbor in the Mountain West. Signing off, never visiting as a tourist with money to spend to be clear about the impact of bad experience, respectfully, and godspeed, -Chuck Ray / Boulder CO</p>	n/a

Topic	Name	Comment	District
Rezone 1300 State	Tyson Carbaugh-Mason	Good Morning Councilman Wharton, I am writing to express my concern over an article I recently read from Feb. 2 on the website Building Salt Lake, titled "While Keeping His Plans A Pleasant Surprise, Coachman's Owner Wants the City to Rezone His State Street Properties." In this article, it is reported that the city is considering rezoning properties around 1300 S State Street for potential redevelopment without actually seeing what the developer has planned for the site. This, to me, seems as though the developer is holding the city hostage. Further, this is not the way that deliberative and open city government should operate. Private citizens should not be able to say, "I have something in this mystery box, and you can only see it if I get my way." As well, it appears that because these plans are not being made publicly available, the community is not being afforded the opportunity for any public comment about what may be coming down the pike. Again, an egregious breach of transparency and the democratic process. I urge you to carefully consider these points as the council moves forward on the possible rezone of Mr. Nikols properties.	5
Rezone 949-963 E 200 S	Ann & John O'Connell	Counsellor Valdemoros, I and my husband are concerned that the request for a rezone of the three houses on Second South and one on Lincoln Street is again under consideration. It should not be. The Salt Lake City Planning Commission voted NO on 2/12/2020 - unanimously. The city's policy should be to encourage restoration and repair rather than replacement with a multiple apartment complex of questionable architectural value. The three Victorian Era houses on 2nd South provide visual beauty and historic presence to a neighborhood of other architecturally noteworthy homes and a tree-lined median strip. The proposed apartment complex would add nothing but parking problems. Our neighborhood is already overcrowded because so many older homes have been divided into apartments " often as many as 4 or 5 of them in one former single family home. Regretfully there are already numerous ill-placed and badly designed apartment buildings. Streets are lined with cars every evening. We live on Tenth East which has not escaped much of the blight of poor zoning decisions " too many apartments with absentee landlords . We enjoy strolling down this portion of Second South has retained a more stately presence. Please allow it to remain that way. Or, better, encourage repair and restoration. Ann and John O'Connell	4

Topic	Name	Comment	District
Rezone 949-963 E 200 S	James Wells	<p>What has changed since the prior unanimous decision of the planning commission against the re-zone? I've noticed that repairs were made to one or more roofs (this action implies that the owner believes the structures are maintainable as is). The tenants have been evicted and a large amount of debris has accumulated in the trash bins. I see nothing in these actions to warrant the planning commission reversing its past, well thought out and community supported decision. In looking at earlier material supplied by the landowner I note two obvious misrepresentations: They state that the proposed apartment buildings would be no higher than the existing houses. This is untrue: The home at 159 Lincoln str. is a single floor structure. All of the proposed apartment buildings are multi floor structures. They also state: "The City believes the increase in units will not significantly affect traffic on either 200 S. or Lincoln Str." I am not aware of a representative of Salt Lake City ever stating this. Anyone who has ever tried to park or even maneuver a truck on Lincoln street knows how bad the parking and traffic already are. The owner proposes to add 36 parking spaces. This is not likely to be adequate for the high rollers who could afford the foreseeable future rents. In addition to this car load 48 garden, recycling and garbage bins will occupy the curb. Longtime residents of Lincoln street will likely find themselves parking on another block and walking through a maze of bins on garbage pickup days! Finally, as I stated during the 2019 meetings, changing the zoning amounts to nothing less than rewarding an, at best, absentee landlord (The owner was working in China, about as absent as a landlord can get!). Such action establishes a very negative precedent for Salt Lake City! I am a local resident and constituent of the city council. Thank you, James Wells</p>	4

Topic	Name	Comment	District
Rezone 949-963 E 200 S	Jeri Fowles	This is Jeri Fowles. I am a homeowner in council district 4. I strongly OPPOSE rezoning these properties. The rezoning application doesn't meet standards in the city code, it was opposed during the public process and by the East Central Community Council. It received a unanimous NO vote from the Planning Commission last year. I have personal experience in the damage of converting single family dwellings into multi-unit apartments. Last summer our neighbors tried to sell their home. Multiple buyers rejected their beautiful home because across the street are multi-unit apartments. The front yards and parkway are cluttered and poorly kept. The potential buyers were concerned about whether the home would keep its value. Our neighbors reduced the asking price of their home by 10%, roughly \$75,000. These rental properties bring noise, litter, congestion, and turnover. We need to preserve the beauty of these older homes and protect the value of this historic neighborhood. There are much better ways to address the housing shortage. I ask the Council to vote NO to rezoning. Respectfully, Jeri Fowles	4

Topic	Name	Comment	District
Utah Theater	Casey O'Brien McDonough	<p>Hello again, I wanted to provide follow up comments after speaking and then listening to the RDA update and follow up regarding the Utah (Pantages) Theater sale. Seeing the historic documentation of the Utah (Pantages) Theater, was on one hand simply amazing (it's a must see at https://pta.lib.utah.edu). But I don't know how anyone can see it all and not also feel very depressing that something so special is being given up on. I imagine if similar decisions were made in the past, with all of us sitting here today seeing all the same amazing documentation, but instead imagine it's a web site for the City & County Building. Imaging sitting in a 1980's office building right now, a building that stands where the City & County Building once stood. Isn't that what we are doing right now with the Utah (Pantages) Theater? It is surely clear to you all that I think it is and see nothing less than regret after the theater is gone moving into the future. I would add that in regard to the historic materials in the theater that were also discussed, maybe a better idea is to negotiate with the developer to build and maintain a museum space specific to the Utah (Pantages) Theater as part of their project. It could not only highlight what we are giving up for the new project, but the long-lived history of theater in Salt Lake City. Currently the sales agreement basically gives away all the physical artifacts to the developers, with little to no trade in value. I believe it reflects the hasty nature at the end of the deal and the change in administrations. I don't know how anyone can see this part of the deal as anything but a give away of something everyone seems to agree has immense value. Another option could be to negotiate with the developer to have the historic artifacts donated to the University of Utah or another public entity. I'm still hopeful for the 1 in 1,000 chance the theater can still be saved. But that's seems to be up to the Mayor, the City Council, and the Developers to find the way as it would require a renegotiation and larger vision and plan for the entire block. Thanks again for taking the time to read my comments, I appreciate as always. Casey O'Brien McDonough</p>	n/a











CAPITOL PARK COTTAGES



IVORYHOMES
Utah's Number One Homebuilder*

- 20 Single Family Homes
- Energy Efficient, Innovative Floorplans



bit.ly/3cGnjvT

— 973 North F. Street —



Ivory Concept Plans side-by-side Comparison



45 dwellings

25 lots

27 structures

35 dwellings

20 lots

26 structures

Current FR-3 zoning permits 11 lots

Revised Ivory design remains cluttered and overly dense

7 th February 2021

Dear Chris,

RE . Ivory Homes Petition to Rezone 675 North F Street

It was good to see you at the GACC meeting last Wednesday. I note that you will be meeting with Ivory shortly and doubted that you have yet had time to review the 202 page submission from them. We have reviewed this in detail and thought it might be useful to share a few thoughts with you ahead of your meeting.

Firstly, we find it deeply disappointing that Ivory has chosen to ignore the opinion of Avenues residents. With over 2100 Greater Avenues residents signing a petition opposing rezoning, 100+ writing letters objecting and a 688 to 4 vote against rezoning at the August GACC, there could not have been a more emphatic rejection of Ivory's rezoning proposal from the people most impacted by their plan.

In our opinion the latest concept plan is still overly dense - it has 35 residences, 20 lots and 26 structures on a plot that would under current zoning allow 11 lots. From an aesthetic and environmental perspective this proposal is cluttered, overly dense and does not fit with existing development. Attached is a slide showing the original and revised concept plans side by side. I think you will agree it's hard to tell the difference.

Ivory has blitzed their 202 page treatise to the Mayor, City Council, Planning Commission and Planning Division. Much of their new submission is factually incorrect and misleading but few will read it in its entirety and on the surface it looks impressive. For example, they highlight selected sections of the City's Five -Year Development Plan but totally ignore all the sections that clearly state the need for high density development to be in "walkable" areas of the City with easy access to a range of amenities and mass transit options. Those of us familiar with the vicinity, and I include you in that category, know this is not such a location but many city officials will not. Over the course of the next few weeks we will provide you with many other examples of shortcomings and inaccuracies in Ivory's proposal.

We are well aware of the severe housing shortage facing the City and are not opposed to a reasonable increase in density. Nor are we opposed to ADU's; you may recall that in earlier presentations we suggested that if Ivory wanted to build ADU's they could do so under FR-3 in combination with the 2018 ADU Ordinance without rezoning. All of the benefits in terms of expanded housing options they claim for the project can be accomplished by building ADU's under current zoning, not overburdening the lot or adjacent neighborhood.

Chris, when we last met in July 2020 you stressed that there is a process and that it would not be appropriate for you to express opinions ahead of the Planning Commission recommendation. We have respected that and not bugged you since then, however, we now see Ivory engaging in a very aggressive manner lobbying all the city officials and we can no longer remain passive.

We would like to request that you meet again with our organisation via a Zoom call. Would you be available some afternoon during the week of February 15th. Monday February 15th at 3-00 PM would be ideal for us but we will make every effort to be available whatever day and time that week works for you.

Thanks again for all you do for the City, I hope 2021 is not quite as challenging as 2020.

Best regards,

Peter Wright
Chair the Preserve Our Avenues Zoning Coalition

2-10-2021

To whom it may concern,

I have reviewed Ivory's revised proposal and remain opposed to the rezoning of 675 North F Street. My home is on the west side of this property and their revision is even worse than the first. They plan to build homes almost right next to my backyard with zero greenspace and once again when we built our home we did not think zoning on our backyard would change as it has been a part of Salt Lake City's master plan for years. Nothing has changed in the avenues except Ivory wants to change the zoning to make more money. Please respect the people that already live here and do not change the zoning.

Tyler and Ann Marie Jack

[REDACTED]

SLC, UT 84103

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment
2/10/2021 11:46	Calvin Dittmore	<p>As someone who lives in the glendale area I drive past the fleet block everyday. I would like to keep the public land zoning of the block and utilize it to honor the citizens killed by police officers. Building more unaffordable housing would disgrace the good work being done currently with the murals. I propose another free water station, a warming station for our unsheltered community (see examples from cities like Chicago) and potential public space opportunities for landscape art or things like a pickleball court. Housing prices will continue to rise as our population grows here in Utah. to create nature and public oriented spaces is the right move for our city as gentrification will naturally take effect on the westside. In conclusion: Adjust the block in a way to keep honoring people killed by police. Create a space for public recreation and outreach. Thank you</p>