

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
3/4/2021 10:35	Jim Wells	This is the 3rd time this proposal has taken up the city council's time. So let me add, Thirdly, that the subject property on Lincoln street was formerly owned by the same person who sold [REDACTED] street to my wife and I in 1990. They were asking approx. \$15,000 for it, but because we'd sunk all our savings into the house we bought and were expecting a baby we could not swing it. The owner of the four 200 S. properties was able to swing it. What is that property worth today? I'd say \$300,000 is not unreasonable. That is 20 times what he paid for it. The 200 S. properties were purchased prior to 1990 and have probably seen comparable appreciation. All these properties have also been generating rental income. The owner has done well by these properties already, and has done the absolute minimum in maintenance. If Salt Lake City wants to vastly increase the value of an existing property, there has to be a more deserving recipient. Maybe a neighborhood beautification reward could be established. Just a thought, Jim Wells	General/Other
3/4/2021 10:40	Drew Papadakis	I don't come to Salt Lake City very often, but I went to get a covid vaccine. I was a little taken back by how much disrespect is shown to the statue of Brigham Young that is on Main Street and South Temple. He was essentially the founder of Salt Lake City, and well respected in his generation. The way the statue is depicted you might as well put it in a closet. It should be moved to a more prominent place, with the help of the Mormon Church because for Salt Lake and Utah in general, he is kind of a big deal. Even Mark Twain thought he was OK. If this is the best we can do might as well burn the MF'er down and start over. I'm good with that, let get going. Drew Papadakis	General/Other

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
3/4/2021 10:43	Roxy Julian	<p>Hi SLC Council Members, There are several reasons that I oppose changing the zoning of the 200 South, Lincoln Street properties for increased density, such that 5 historic properties are demolished and those reasons center around the following areas: past and future cultural significance, sustainability, accessibility, and city obligation. I strongly support a vote of NO from the council member, for reasons above and as detailed below.</p> <p>1. The uniqueness, continuity, and unity in our past and future cultural communities is destroyed through the destruction of historically notable buildings and their replacement with inaccessible, cookie-cutter apartment complexes. There are plenty of areas in Salt Lake that are not being utilized and do not have the same cultural significance and are better candidates for the type of development that is desired through the rezoning of this area. Whatever benefits are gained by this type of development are NOT unique to this area, but the loss is unique. Their Historical significance has been otherwise noted by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Contributions to the Central City Bryant National Homes Historic District o The connection to SLC's Greek neighborhood of the home at 963 E 200 S o Their inclusion of the Salt Lake City East Side Historic District on the National Register of Historic Places <p>2. It is more sustainable to keep current homes instead of relegating them to landfills and be replaced by any material, but particularly by materials which are likely to include several non-renewable materials. This point is especially salient when the structures have demonstrated quality through withstanding several natural disasters, such as the earthquake and the windstorm last year. Moreover, it has been pointed out that the homes qualify for tax credits for appropriate rehab. Why unnecessarily contribute to the landfill?</p> <p>3. The current homes serve a housing need for a population that is already disadvantaged in the current SLC housing crisis</p> <p>*Continued 1/2*</p>	General/Other

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
	Roxy Julian	<p>*Continued 2/2* It's no secret that housing availability is of high priority to the citizens of Salt Lake. Replacing these housing units eliminates scarce housing options with luxury apartment units that are not accessible to the same populations, therefore pushing out people who work, live, and contribute to the area, while adding to the abundance of inaccessible housing in the city. Even, relegating one or two units in a complex to income-limited individuals does not serve the need currently served by these houses, and makes navigating getting housing incredibly complicated (aka less accessible). Gentrification mitigation should be prioritized by the City Council. 4. City Standards, expectation, and obligation all yield themselves to a no vote. o A unanimous no vote by the Planning Commission, in addition to the East Central Community Council, the local community, and SLC planning staff have all recommended to not change the zoning. o No obligation or responsibility of the city is met by a zoning change that only serves a small number of property owners who are only looking to acquire wealth. o The Oath of Office for City councilors includes a pledge to serve the residents of the city. This expectation is not met by this rezoning, which, again, serves only the property owner wealth acquisition and "open floor plans" To summarize, I have not found nor can comprehend any service to the city that is achieved in this rezoning. There is nothing uniquely achieved by this action that cannot be accomplished elsewhere, and there is detriment to the history and the character of this area and indicates a similar negative trend for the city as a whole. The buildings of a city are the connective tissues that unites the past and the future and help form its identity. The people in the city are its lifeblood, and driving them out deadens the city. Please vote no. Thank you, Roxy Julian</p>	

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
3/4/2021 10:46	Rae McKenzie	<p>Hello Salt Lake City Council members, I am emailing to voice my opinion about the proposed residential zoning of the historic houses located on 200 South / Lincoln Street. I am strongly opposed to this change. Vote NO TO THE ZONE! I'm urging you to vote "NO", because: The historic properties of Salt Lake City should be preserved, not only because it's the most sustainable and green choice, but it also keeps the history of the city alive. I do not like how the history and design of Salt Lake City is being erased; with all the new buildings going up and the old ones falling to their fate because they don't meet the demands of the current day and age. In example to the matter at hand, I think it is a better option to remodel and repurpose the current houses in this zone rather than demolish a piece of the city's history. Specifically, the house located at 963 E 200 S has significant connection to the city's Greek neighborhood, which most of has already been previously demolished. I used to live on [REDACTED] South, right across from Cafe Noir. I loved driving down that street and seeing all the historic houses and their individualities. I miss living down on that street, because of the convenience and the scenery. It was quiet. The whole neighborhood has character. I'd trade living in that neighborhood for where I am now any day. I specifically remember these groups of houses that are at stake with the zoning. The China Blue house, which I recently learned has been painted white, was always a favorite of mine. *Continued 1/2*</p>	General/Other

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
	Rae McKenzie	<p>*Continued 2/2* The blue paint and the swirly designs within the paint on the door were so creative and eye catching. I remember they had wooden stand-ups of trees in the front yard sometimes, I'm personally fond of trees and blue is my favorite color. That house always stood out to me. The neighborhood as a whole did. A modern multi-family housing development would ruin the charm of that neighborhood. As well as increase the rent for the properties nearby to even higher rates than what they're already at. They are barely affordable now, the addition of a townhouse building would inflate them drastically. I urge you to not taint a historic neighborhood with an eyesore of a townhome complex building and cause the rent rate increase for the people who live in the area. I travel a lot, and when I'm somewhere new, I'm definitely not impressed with the out of place to-date housing that's built amongst the historic properties that were in the location long before. That's what I like to see when I'm out in a new place, the history and the character it has to offer. Not the modern, copy and pasted nonsense you can see in way too many places these days. Keep Salt Lake City historic, charming, beautiful, and memorable. Not cookie-cutter, plain, and boring. Thank you, Rae McKenzie</p>	

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
3/4/2021 10:52	Ron Temu	<p>To: Salt Lake City Council From: Summum Re: Proposed West End zoning change Members of the Council, Summum, a small religious community in west Salt Lake City, wishes to express our objection to the proposed zoning change on the grounds of religious infringement. To provide some history, Summum was founded in 1975, and at that time, we informed government agencies of our intent to create a sacramental drink known as nectar publications as part of our religious practice. The nectars are created in a religious setting, and are used in a religious manner, in a practice of meditation. The sacramental nectars contain a small amount of alcohol, and federal and state authorities responded by stating they consider the sacramental nectars to be wine, and that we had to obtain a winery license in order to create them. We strongly objected to this classification of our sacramental nectars because of their religious nature, but in the end, we had no recourse, and we were forced to obtain a winery license which was a very significant expense to us. We established Utah's first federally bonded winery, and have maintained our federal and state licenses since then. At that time, we had planned to set up our church in a residential area similar to areas where you find other churches, but Salt Lake City would not allow a winery in a residential area. A winery could only be set up in a manufacturing zone. So we set out looking for a location, and found property at [REDACTED] Genesee Avenue where we've been for over 40 years. This property was what was available, and what we could afford given the expenses imposed upon us in order to practice our religion. Being next to the freeway in a manufacturing zone was not our preferred location, but this is what the city forced upon us, and we did our best to establish a peaceful sanctuary and temple. Around 2019, we knew things were changing with the property involved in this zoning change.</p> <p>*Continued 1/3*</p>	General/Other

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
	Ron Temu	<p>We were expecting at some point to receive notification about its development plans. Around January 2020, we received such a notice from Salt Lake City about an open house regarding the development to be held at the Salt Lake Public library. We attended the open house, but no representative for the developer attended. We waited for 30 minutes, but no one showed up. A city representative informed us not to worry and that we would be included in any discussions concerning the project and that we would be contacted. Later that year, we received notice about two Salt Lake Planning Commission meetings regarding the development. We attended the meetings and made our concerns known, but it was to no avail. There were two things that really struck us: 1. The planning commission thanked the developer for working with the community, yet our church, which has been a part of the community for over 40 years, and stands to be the most impacted by this development, was not contacted at all. 2. After having a secret meeting with the developer, the Poplar Grove Community Council gave their approval for the development. At no time did anyone from the council approach us for our feedback and concerns. For a state that prides itself as an inclusive religious community, this obviously depends on the religion. During the recent February 16 meeting held by the Salt Lake City Council, again the developer was thanked for working with the community, yet we were not involved in any such thing. For the developer and Poplar Grove to ignore us in this way is a blatant disregard for us as a religious organization and a viable member of the community. We contacted Councilman Andrew Johnston to raise our concerns and he facilitated a meeting with the developer, but there was no concern for the vital importance that the sun plays in our religious practice. It is ironic that we could not set up our church in a residential area, since we are now faced with a residential area being established right at our doorstep. If the proposed zoning change to R-MU is granted, the developer intends to construct a structure seven stories high towering over our sanctuary along our south and west property lines and this is in a neighborhood of small homes. *Continued 2/3*</p>	

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
	Ron Temu	<p>*Continued 3/3* What this will do to us: 1. Such a high structure will reflect additional noise coming from the freeway on to our sanctuary. This will impact the peacefulness we've been able to establish, and affect the meditations we practice there. 2. The meditations we practice have components to them, and one of the components is sunlight. Everyone knows there are health and psychological benefits to sunlight, but sunlight for us also includes a spiritual benefit. We practice meditations inside our buildings, and outside around our Koi pond. The sun light that shines on our green house and buildings on our property plays a very important role in our religious practice. With such a high building right next to us, it will significantly block light from the sun. There will be some months that we don't receive any light at all. This will also affect our greenhouse that we use to grow spiritual herbs and plants that help promote spiritual growth and healing for our members. 3. The only parking for our church is on the streets, mainly Genesee Avenue. With high density housing next to us, our parking could be dramatically affected. Even though the residential building will have parking, what about two car families? What about families and friends and other people visiting the residents? Where will they all park? 4. Our plan of adding solar panels in order to be more environmentally friendly will also be ruined. We attempted to buy the 100-year-old single family residence right next to our rectory on the west side in the hope that we could establish some space between our rectory and the development. We asked what they wanted and we said that we would pay it. Now the developer has taken a small little residence in order to make a 75-foot tenement building, adding another 10 feet to the current zoning and packing in 244 units that are over a half mile from a tracks station. We understand the need for housing and the need to support the planned businesses. But this need does not supersede our Constitutional rights protected by the First Amendment. We feel there can be a better balance achieved with the developer's plans, the city's needs and our community needs. A housing structure limited to around 35 feet in height would be reasonable to us. We feel that R-MU-35 would be more appropriate for the situation and we are asking the Salt Lake City Council to rezone to R-MU-35 instead of R-MU. Ron Temu</p>	

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
3/4/2021 10:53	Ira Hinckley	Dear Council, Please do not allow the rezoning and destruction of the beautiful old homes on 2nd south. Destroying these would put a huge black eye on this historical district and ruin the character of the single family home neighborhood. Especially when replaced by another hideous townhome project. Although the houses have been neglected that is no excuse not to rehabilitate them. If the current owners are too lazy and greedy to fix them up then they should be forced to sell them to someone willing to comply with city zoning and not destroy the historical neighborhood. These homes contribute to the fabric of Salt Lake City and are part of the National Register of Historic Places. This terrible plan will destroy historic properties within a National Historic district, increase rental rates, create more waste and ruin the neighborhood. This ghastly proposal has also received a unanimous negative recommendation from the historic landmark commission. This proposal must be denied! Ira Hinckley Resident	General/Other
3/4/2021 13:08	Anonymous Constituent	This caller did not give her name but she is in opposition to the rezoning of the 900 E / 200 S area. She believes there are enough of the "filing cabinet" apartments in town and that they are starting to threaten the character of the community. She believes the lot is not a good candidate for rezoning and would like to see it remain as it is.	General/Other
3/4/2021 13:15	Anonymous Constituent	Peter called in to oppose the rezoning of the 900 E / 200 S area. He doesn't believe the zoning in the area should be changed. He wants it to remain residential and would like to see the historic homes preserved.	General/Other

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
3/4/2021 13:24	Debbie Woodbury	Hello, I oppose the rezoning of the 5 historic properties on Lincoln Street and on 200 S st. from single and 2 family R2 zoning to RMF35. This area was zoned in this way for good reasons. I lived on University street close to 200 S before moving a few blocks south and I used that street constantly to travel downtown and it is a small street not suited for a great influx of people living there. The University itself generates a lot of traffic not to mention the people who live in the area. My mother in law still lives on University st so I spend a lot of time driving around that area and feel strongly that it will not handle this kind of high density buildings well. I have friends who live in that area and they all oppose this development and have been working for the past 2 years through all the avenues that have been pursued by the owners of these historic buildings who are intent on making a profit at the expense of everything else. There are other areas in the city that are more suited to this kind of development and are already zoned to accommodate it and the city should stick to this good plan. Thank you for your time Debbie Woodbury	General/Other
3/4/2021 13:28	Jill Thomas	Please do NOT make zoning changes that will increase housing density in our neighborhoods! Please preserve the charm and integrity of homes with families, lawns, uncrowded streets. I know there is a housing shortage, but destroying the lovely look of our neighborhoods is not a solution. Allowing more apartments in our neighborhoods will destroy the look and charm of Sugar House. Sincerely, Jill and Nick Thomas	General/Other

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
3/4/2021 13:33	carol steffens	<p>Councilman Mano, Please stop the destruction of our R-1 neighborhoods by allowing Nightly rentals (air bnb, etc) to continue unregulated in our neighborhoods especially historically designated area. AirBnB.....I have renamed it “ THE SUITCASE PARADE “ I experienced living across the street from an AirBnB listing a couple years ago and it didn’t take me long to figure out that nightly companies destroys neighborhoods, ruins affordable housing for city residents, and has no regard for existing residential zoning regulations. After many complaints, Salt Lake City has done very little to regulate this illegal city ordinance. I own a duplex in SLC and every year SLC sends me a bill for my business license. My license is about \$800 a year but the city says if I watch a video on fair housing guidelines, fire codes, etc., that I can obtain the license for \$190. Fair enough. BUT...”hosts” running the nightly motel rentals pay no business license money to the city. Research articles also say that some hosts will not rent to people due to their race!! Racial discrimination!!! There was an Air Bnb a few blocks away from me that had pictures of beds up on a shelf basement that they were renting out. If a landlord tried to do that, the city would shut them down on fire codes in two seconds. I encourage all landlords out there to put statements in their leases that tenants can not air BNB, a bedroom, or the nightly “couches” in their apartment. Other good tenants see what is going on and they leave. Who wants to live next to the Suitcase Parade? Also, potential homeowners, before you buy, ask the seller to disclose if they live next to or near a residence being used as a nightly motel. I also live in a historic district where people have made tremendous efforts to the preserve historical aspects and architecture of the area. It is ironic that you have to get permits from SLC to make even the slightest building changes but an owner can open up a nightly motel in a historically designated area as one did last year. Terrible!!! Protect our historic districts from being ruined. Air BnB loves it when people open nightly motels in lovely neighborhoods. They are making big money off the backs of residents that have worked hard to make it that way. Until you have lived next to one watching it every day, you don’t really know the insidious destruction it does to neighborhoods. I know first hand. Start the regulation as other cities have done now please. Carol Steffens</p>	General/Other

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
3/4/2021 13:47	Jan Hemming	Councilman Dugan: I noticed that the City Council is going to discuss the controversial 5G wireless cell tower issue during its work session today. I wanted to express my opposition to these ugly towers. I was shocked to learn about the numerous 5G tower placements that residents in District 5 — just below us — are about to face (see map). And this is only ONE CARRIER. Imagine what the map will look like when 5-6 carriers all want towers? Whatever technology benefit these towers supposedly represent, is outweighed by the damage they will do to the aesthetic beauty of our neighborhoods. Is this progress? What has really angered residents, is the feeling of utter helplessness — that this was a “deal” cooked up by state officials and those most impacted by the “deal” have no say in the matter. They have no voice in where these towers will be placed. The whole process of permitting needs to be brought out of the shadows and into the light of oversight and transparency. Why is our city engineer being forced to sit on the sidelines with his hands tied while these techno giants indiscriminately make decisions without community input? Please exercise your power to raise these important questions and, at the very least, have a moratorium until citizens can be involved in the process. Janet Hemming	Small Cell Wireless Facilities
3/4/2021 14:08	Tim Funk	Hello Dan and Jim, “No” on Lincoln Street and 200 south and “Go Slow” on RMF-30 rezoning. Both of these questions are currently before the Council We appreciate how difficult it may be to make a decision on either one. In an effort to help we are forwarding to you a copy of an op-ed piece which should be in the Salt Lake Tribune in the next few days. Hopefully it will help in your consideration on what to do. As always, thanks for all you do for the city especially the lower income renters impacted by both these questions. Best regards, Tim Funk Crossroads Urban Center [REDACTED]	
3/8/2021 16:56	Sam Huntington	<mailto:Chris.Wharton@slcgov.com> > Subject: (EXTERNAL) From your constituent Councilmember Wharton, I recently moved back into the Citifront Apartments on North Temple into your district. I am calling on you to NOT pass the additional \$650,000 funding to the police to continue to criminalize my houseless neighbors. They are humans worthy of respect and this money, if it exists, could be much better spent on housing vouchers, food, and supporting outreach efforts and actually funding housing solutions. Do not spend my tax dollars on police raids. _____	
3/9/2021 8:54	Amon	Amon would like to see the homeless camp at 700 S & State St cleaned up.	Homelessness

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
3/9/2021 8:56	Amy Hawkins	Dear Salt Lake City Council Members, Attached is a letter from the Ballpark Community Council in support of a proposal to change the name of a small park in the Ballpark neighborhood from its current name, "People's Freeway Park" to "Ballpark Playground". We would like to do whatever we can to support this proposal and move it forward. Please let us know if we can answer any questions "in person" (over WebEx, Zoom, or another similar platform), telephone, or in writing. Thank you for your time and consideration, Amy J. Hawkins, PhD Chair, Ballpark Community Council https://www.facebook.com/BallparkCC/ *See Corresponding Attachment*	General/Other
3/9/2021 8:58	Kris Cusick	You are a racist, white supremacist, hate-filled, fascist. I proudly take my brown grandbabies before your white trash family. You probably are a "church going Mormon" that for centuries hated and reviled people of color and women. You hate NATIVE AMERICANS TOO? Drop dead. Resign and let good people run the beautiful city of Salt Lake! Sent from my iPhone Kris Cusick Attorney at Law Proud Grandma to the Trujillo Children.	Racial Equity

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
3/9/2021 9:01	Jen Colby	<p>Dear Councilmember Valdemoros and fellow members of the Salt Lake City Council, Below are my March 2nd formal hearing comments regarding the 200 S and Lincoln Street Rezoning application. Please note that these are my personal comments and do not represent any group or organization with which I may be affiliated. As indicated in my comments, I urge you to uphold and ratify the negative staff report recommendation and unanimous NO vote from the Planning Commission last year and simply vote no, unconditionally. I also attach my detailed analysis of the original over-the-counter Planning application submitted by the owner's agent. I reference this in my comments below regarding the misstatements etc. in the application and public process. This analysis was submitted as a part of the Planning Commission docket. That is an enormous staff report to wade through in its entirety so I attach them here for your reading pleasure should you care to do so. The application analysis references a second analysis I did comparing the Growing SLC Housing Plan Goals and Objectives to this rezoning request so I also attach that. I would note that Chaio-lh Hui - rather than the actual property owners or the registered agent in the application - has been the spokesperson for this request for a master plan and zoning map amendment during the public process up to and including the formal hearing. However, in the public record she is not listed as an owner of the properties in question nor a legal representative or agent by contract. As a daughter of PC Hui, she may be in line to inherit these parcels or the proceeds gained from any sale, but we are obviously not privy to any such future bequest intentions. I point this out to say that any supposed offers or threats she may be making on behalf of her father, uncle, and other family member owners regarding the fate of the current buildings and future development options should be seen in that light. *Continued 1/2*</p>	General/Other

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
	Jen Colby	<p>*Continued 2/2* For this and other reasons they should be taken with a very large grain of salt. Once a definitive no vote has been taken by Council, at that point the owners could finally go back to the drawing board and make plans that fit within the zoning. And the rest of us can move on, at least from this part of the process. I would note that for the past few months PC and Peter Hui (the principal owners) and various workers have been making a significant effort to clean up the properties and make improvements such as painting and apparent interior upgrades. They also re-rented 959 E 200 S (formerly China Blue, now painted white) to new tenants who have a year lease who were not informed of any rezoning or intention to demolish that house or any others. The public hearing signs in their front yard were the first they knew of it. It seems odd the owners would do this if they really intended to just tear the houses down forthwith. Then again, much that goes on across the street is inscrutable. We get conflicting stories all the time from the owners and family members. Regardless, a rezone here is utterly inappropriate. Indeed, the main reason cited by the few people (of over 1,000 unique respondents so far) to grant a rezone was simply the extremely poor management and maintenance. This has changed recently and we hope that will continue and they will be more responsible neighbors and community members into the future. Thank you for your consideration of my comments and your dedicated service to our city and community. Sincerely, Jen Colby, MPA District 4 resident *See Corresponding Attachments*</p>	
3/9/2021 9:03	Chris Nielsen	Racial equity is not a real thing and only seeks to widen the divide between different ethnicities, races and backgrounds. We need to seek for equality and equal opportunity. We are human-beings with aspirations and goals, not cattle to be herded through a system only to get the same result as everyone else. We all work differently, have different goals and seek for different opportunities in life. Equal opportunity is what we should be looking for, just as the Constitution of the United States provides for every citizen, whether we are black, white, hispanic, Middle-Eastern, Asian or anything else. Equity only seeks for the same outcome for everyone, no matter their aspirations, this is wrong and deeply divisive. Seek for equal opportunity and I will support the Salt Lake City Council and Mayor. I cannot support this "equity" you seek. Chris Nielsen	Racial Equity
3/9/2021 9:04	Phil Hansen	Our SLC council are a waste of money. Sad to say.	Racial Equity
3/9/2021 9:05	Steve Arnold	So nothing has been done. Great job. Pat yourself on the back.	Racial Equity

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Comment	Topic
3/9/2021 10:36	Jenn McArdle	Good Day, I find the Racial Equity in Policing "movement" to be absolutely ridiculous and hate the idea that my taxes help fund it. It's a waste of time and resources. Are their bad officers out there, yes. But the majority of our police are good, hard working people doing what what they think is best to keep our streets safe. Its what they are hired for. I'm not about to condemn the majority for a few bad apples. Stop falling in line with the masses and putting outlandish expectations, rules, and restrictions on those who serve our community. I don't see you out there risking your life, just like I don't see me out there risking mine. Thank you for your time. Jenn McArdle	Racial Equity
3/9/2021 11:21	Daniel Sowards	There is a growing homeless camp in front of the Liberty Wells Center (707 S 400 E) that no one is addressing. I've reported it through the city app, called the non-emergency line, and called the mayors office. Why is this camp being allowed to grow in a neighborhood, when just blocks away there are empty business/warehouse blocks? These camps have constant drug traffic during the day, and ruin the safety of the neighborhood. Please tell me what i should be doing.	
3/9/2021 11:45	Anonymous Constituent	I am writing with much frustration over the lack of the cities response to mulitple requests to relocate a homeless camp in front of the LDS church owned Liberty Wells Center. The camp is now starting to grow because there has been no action taken. This same thing happened in 2020 and it got so out of control that I'd really appreciate action immediatley. My heart goes out to all of those experiencing homelessness at this time. It is a challenge to not feel frustrated though when some of these good people are choosing to be homeless. The data supports that we have beds for them in shelters. So, if that is their choice, then mine as a homeowner and tax paying resident would ask that they simply move to a non-residential area (many within blocks of here) where the home values aren't affected by the trash, boxes, shopping carts, screaming matches and drug deals. I have witnessed and reported no less than 5 drug transactions right in front of my home. I am tired of it...and I do not expect that Mayor Mendenhall, nor any council member would stand for this in front of their properties. I am asking that the folks in the tents be forced to move to the warehouse/commerical areas where many other people experiencing homelessness are rather than allowing for this area to become overrun again by the problems we had last year. DO SOMETHING!	



March 7, 2021

Dear Salt Lake City Council Members,

On behalf of the Ballpark Community Council and its neighborhood residents, we are writing in support of a resident-initiated proposal to rename a small park in our neighborhood. The park is located at 1558 S. West Temple and is currently named the "Peoples Freeway Park". Our council and residents propose to rename and update the park's name to "Ballpark Playground" to reflect our neighborhood's identity and the park's central purpose.

In 2009, our community's name was officially changed from People's Freeway to the Ballpark neighborhood. We believe it is time to rename and update our park to reflect this change. The renaming of this park would fall under city code 3.65.050, rebuilding community recognition.

The Ballpark Community Council is a Recognized Community Organization whose purpose is to serve as a neighborhood advocacy organization by facilitating community input and the exchange of information between our local government representatives and departments. Our recent Community Council meetings have been held online via the Zoom platform to accommodate the public health concerns of the COVID-19 pandemic, and we have been encouraged by the spike of community engagement we've observed during this time. Our recent meetings have had an average 86 meeting attendees (December 2020, 50 attendees; January 2021, 156 attendees; and February 2021, 52 attendees). Our community concerns and meetings have recently been covered in media outlets including the Salt Lake Tribune¹, KUTV News², KSTU-FOX 13³, ABC4 News⁴, and Telemundo Utah⁵.

¹ Ballpark residents demand action after one man dead, two wounded in Salt Lake City shooting, December 22, 2020. <https://www.sltrib.com/news/2020/12/22/one-man-dead-two-people/>

² Leader in Salt Lake City neighborhood known for crime, violence wants change, December 24, 2020. <https://kutv.com/news/local/ballpark-area-crime>

³ Ballpark neighbors: Shooting, homicide highlight deeper crime problem in area, December 22, 2020. <https://www.fox13now.com/news/local-news/ballpark-neighbors-shooting-homicide-highlights-deeper-crime-problem-in-area>

⁴ Safety concerns in SLC Ballpark Community after homicide, August 28, 2020. <https://www.abc4.com/news/top-stories/safety-concerns-in-slc-ballpark-community-after-homicide/>

⁵ Incrementa la violencia en comunidad Ballpark de Salt Lake City, líderes aseguran trabajarán para traer de vuelta la seguridad, January 9, 2021. <https://www.telemundoutah.com/local/incrementa-la-violencia-en-comunidad-ballpark-de-salt-lake-city-lideres-aseguran-trabajarán-para-traer-de-vuelta-la-seguridad/2044258/>



During our community council meeting on February 4, 2021, the park renaming proposal was an item on our agenda. Ballpark resident Sach Combs explained the proposal and it received unanimous approval from all 52 meeting attendees. The Salt Lake City Parks & Public Lands Division has also been made aware of this proposal and has stated their full support.

We kindly request that you approve this proposal and allow for the updating of all official city documents, databases, and websites to reflect the name change. We would also request a new sign for the park with the park's new name: "Ballpark Playground".

Thank you for your consideration,

Amy J. Hawkins,

Chair of the Ballpark Community Council

Terrell Bodily, Vice Chair of the Ballpark Community Council

Jeff Sandstrom, Board Member of the Ballpark Community Council

Ernest Lloyd Cox, Board Member of the Ballpark Community Council

Original Letter sent January 30, 2020;

Re: PLNPCM2019-00683 & PLNPCM2019-00684,
Zoning Map and Master Plan Amendments at 949-963 East 200 South and
159 S. Lincoln Street

Dear Members of the Planning Commission and Staff,

I am writing to express my opposition to the request for Master Plan and Zoning Amendments at 949-963 E 200 South and 159 S Lincoln Street in Salt Lake City by the owners and their representatives. I urge you to definitively vote NO on this application.

My husband and I have owned and occupied the property at 160 S Lincoln Street since 2002. Our house is a single-story contributing Victorian eclectic frame house with an R-2 parcel zoning. The comments below are my personal opinions and comments and do not represent any group or organization with which I may be affiliated. My husband will be submitting his own personal comments.

I already submitted a set of comments about the consistency, or more accurately lack of consistency, of this application with the purposes, goals, objectives, and policies of the city as stated in the *2018-2023 Growing Salt Lake City Housing Plan* and incorporate those comments by reference (Amendment consideration criterion #1).

Here, I wish to comment on the Master Plan Amendment application itself as submitted by the representative of the applicants, Owner's Agent Mr. Graham Gilbert, Esq., on 7/19/19.

To do so, I downloaded the application from the SLC public portal, used software to complete text recognition of the PDF, and corrected any errors by comparing both copies. I then pasted the body of the application text into a new MSWord document, highlighted original text in gray, and am interspersing my comments directly following or adjacent to the sections of the application.

My overarching comments to summarize my response to the applications are these:

- 1) **The application contains numerous factual errors, misstatements misrepresentations, and elements of city plans and documents taken out of context, as noted in the following analysis.** In every instance, the Owners Agent uses these errors, misrepresentations, and out of context elements to support the case for the application well beyond what is actually contained in the plans and other records. Therefore, these misstatements do not appear random and are not amateur errors. Rather, they tend to prejudice a non-expert reviewer or member of the public towards the assertions in the application. Of course, parties seeking an amendment will present their case in the best light they can muster. However, this application appears to go well beyond that in its attempts to persuade.

- 2) ***Therefore, in my opinion, after a short review by city staff, this application should have been rejected outright as materially false and incomplete, and rejected pending further revisions.*** Instead, interested members of the community are forced to spend endless time at real personal cost to challenge the assertions of the applicants and attempt to share accurate information as private citizens. The staff report may well correct some or all of these assertions. However, the staff report comes out so late in the process that it is not useful to interested and affected parties unrelated to the applicants or their agents.
- 3) I believe that the fact that the Owner's Agent is a land use attorney employed by a prominent local law firm implies a veiled threat. Obviously, the owners may employ any qualified person as their agent. Development and land use issues can indeed be complicated and may require legal advice and counsel. However, for a small Master Plan Amendment, a lawyer strikes me as an odd choice at this stage of the process. It is well known that Salt Lake City Corporation leadership, both elected and appointed, tend to be risk-averse and lawsuit avoidant. This tips the scales by and large towards economically and socially powerful actors in our region who can afford to hire legal counsel.
I ask that the Planning Commission and city officials to ignore this veiled threat if indeed it comes across that way to you as members.
- 4) Given that the Owner's Agent is a land use attorney, the factual and material misstatements in the application are disappointing at best.

In sum, this application is inconsistent with the Central City Master Plan in so many ways that an amendment is utterly unwarranted and should not be approved.

Salt Lake City officials should continue to defend Council-approved district master plans. The goals, vision, descriptions, and residential land use policies (RLUs are even more relevant today than when the Central Community Master Plan was approved in 2005.

Supplemental Information for Project Description
Applicant: Chaio-ih Hui
Zoning Amendment Application

1. Owner Names and Address of Subject Property (or Area):

This Zoning Amendment Application applies to the parcels listed in the following table (collectively, the "Parcels").

Parcel No.	Owner	Address	Acres
16051350100000	Peter & Pik Chi Hui	[REDACTED]	0.15
16051350110000	Nung-Wa Hui; Pih-Fhai Hui; & Pik-Chi Hui	[REDACTED]	0.12
16051350120000	Pih Fhai & Pik Chi Hui	[REDACTED]	0.12
16051350130000	Hawk II; Pih-Phai Peter Hui; & Nung-Wa Hui	[REDACTED]	0.12
16051350140000	Pik Chi & Peter Hui	[REDACTED]	0.18

Parcel No. Owner Address Acres

“2. Project Description

a. A statement declaring the purpose for the amendment.

The Parcels are currently located in the City's R-2 Single- and Two-Family Residential Zoning District ("R-2 District"). The current zoning for the Parcels is shown on Exhibit A. The purpose of this Application is to amend the Zoning Map to include the Parcels in the RMF-35 Moderate Density Multi-Family Residential District ("RMF-35 District"). This amendment is necessary to allow Applicant's proposed use of the Parcels, which is described below.”

My Comments:

The assertion that this amendment is “necessary to allow Applicant's proposed use of the Parcels” is not relevant to the Master Plan Amendment, nor a rational basis for approval. Vast volumes of case law and precedent support the legal authority of government entities to control zoning and a wide array of land use activities on private parcels at various scales.

The mere fact that the owners wish to do something else with their properties that is not currently allowed in R-2 zoning is materially irrelevant. There are properly zoned parcels scattered throughout the city, including in the Central Community, which would allow for the use and development that the Applicant wishes to pursue. Real property is fungible and the Applicant can simply purchase the necessary parcels elsewhere and pursue the project in an appropriate area.

The Amendment should not be granted because the Applicant does not wish to comply with the current zoning regulations at these parcels. The owners have the option to sell them to buyers willing to follow current zoning regulations. Alternatively, they may redesign the project to fit the current zoning. There are many options available within the current land use classification and Master Plan to permit a variety of uses.

“b. A description of the proposed use of the property being rezoned.

Applicant proposes to construct a multi-family project with 16 dwelling units on the Parcels. A site plan for the Parcels is attached as Exhibit A.”

My Comments:

As noted above, any specific project concept or proposal is simply not relevant to the Master Plan and Zoning Amendment process. The site plan conceptual sketch may be a teaser, but mostly it serves as a distraction from the criteria and issues at hand in considering this amendment. The zoning is tied to the parcels and can transfer with the properties, whether or not the Applicant ever actually pursues these projects. Projects can fall apart for all manner of reasons, from changes in ownership, family or corporate dynamics and priorities, financing, and many other circumstances.

One of the proposals that has been floated by the Applicant and some city staff is to attach a development agreement to any amendments. This is entirely inappropriate to somehow then justify this amendment for multiple reasons. Most broadly, it gives city officials an artificial sense of control over any projects when in fact the city has failed to track and enforce agreements in numerous cases over time. This is simply an unworkable, bad idea that allows applicants to dangle shiny drawings or offers without any guarantee that they will materialize.

Worse, the project concepts submitted are entirely out of character and inappropriate to the scale, massing, design, and integrity of the 900 block of 200 South and the 100 block of Lincoln Street, so as proposed these shouldn’t even be structures desired by city officials, much less most neighbors and community members.

The one thing that an Amendment would result in immediately is an increase in the underlying valuation of the parcels. According to one real estate professional, each additional unit potential per parcel adds approximately \$20-25,000 in base valuation minimum. The current 5 properties have 9 current units according to the building records and owners; with R-2 zoning and 1 parcel already unit-legalized to a tri-plex, the owners have 11 total current possible units as is, they just have not chosen to maximize units, at least not officially. Using 11 as the basis, and Amendment that would grant 5 additional units would result in an immediate financial windfall of ~\$100-125,000. This is an unjustifiable “government giving” regardless of the track record of the owners in terms of property upkeep and management. In this case, given the decades of underinvestment, poor upkeep, regular lack of fit premise conditions for tenants, and apparent “demolition by neglect,” the idea that the City would reward this with a financial windfall is galling. But even if the properties were perfectly maintained, it would be inappropriate at best.

“c. List the reasons why the present zoning may not be appropriate for the area.

The Parcels are currently located in the R-2 District. They are adjacent to properties in the RMF-35 District. The immediately surrounding area has a wide variety of zoning districts, including the RMF-35 District; R-2 District; RMF-30 Low Density Multi-Family Residential District; RMF-45 Moderate/High Density Multi-Family Residential District; SR-3 Special Development Pattern Residential District; and UI Urban Institutional District. These zoning districts are shown on Exhibit B.”

The area surrounding the parcels has a mix of different land uses, including single-family homes; small, medium, and large apartments; commercial buildings; offices; and institutional buildings

(e.g., Salt Lake Regional Hospital). This mix of land uses results from approved, conditional uses and changes to land use policies over time.

My Comments:

This description of the current mix of land uses and zoning in the Central Community, specifically in the Central City Historic District (Boundary Increase), or Bryant Neighborhood is an argument AGAINST this Amendment rather than in support of it. Our area is already substantially over-zoned, as shown by ongoing efforts to downzone parcels rather than up-zone them. In fact, after a lengthy process and proposals, yet another effort died at the City Council inexplicably within the last decade or so.

In many cases, the underlying zoning exceeds the actual structures on site. This is the case for my own home, and many of my neighbors. Honestly, as a first-time homebuyer, like many people I was utterly ignorant of zoning and did not think to look up our zoning or that of surrounding properties, not realizing how deceiving appearances can be.

That said, one of the best things about living where we do is the mix of single family, multi-family apartment buildings, small and large commercial, and institutional uses. Vast swaths of our city – Sugarhouse, East Bench, Upper Avenues, West Side, have much more single-use and large blocks of consistent zoning. We are already highly diverse in land use types. It is the other neighborhoods that need more of a mix, not ours, at this point.

I wish to make one more key point. What appear in many cases to be single family historic residences in our area are, in fact, often unit-legalized multi-plexes, often tri-plexes but sometimes 4, 5, 6plexes and higher. After rounds of legalizations in the past, this process has apparently been slowed to a crawl. Unit legalization is a brilliant way to effectively increase density while encouraging preservation of the historic fabric of city neighborhoods. It is one of the strategies in the Growing SLC plan, but to date there has been little or no movement on this. Unit legalization is far preferred to zoning amendments, and can be much more readily tied to maintenance of the existing structure. Zoning amendments, on the other hand, are a recipe for teardowns.

“The Central Community Master Plan encourages use of residential zoning to provide opportunities for medium-density housing.”

My Comments:

Throughout the Zoning Ordinance, Title 21A, the preferred term is “moderate density”, though “medium density” is used once as a synonym. Meanwhile, the Central Community Plan Future Land Use Map uses “medium density” so I am going to assume these terms are interchangeable.

According to code definitions, low density is <15 units per acre, while moderate (medium) is <30 units per acre, moderate/high is <43 units per acre, and high is <83 units per acre.

While this statement is nominally true on its face when taken broadly, this is an example of a plan element taken out of context that appears to support the Application but in fact upon closer inspection does nothing of the sort.

I quote from the Central City Master Plan, pp. 5-6:

“Bryant neighborhood. The Bryant neighborhood is located between 700 and 1000 East from South Temple to 400 South. The layout of the lots and the residential architecture of the Bryant neighborhood are similar to those found in the neighborhoods directly west, across 700 East in the Central City area. Both have the same 10-acre blocks and several examples of early, adobe Greek Revival architecture. It has a rich collection of many architectural styles, including handsome large homes with classical porticos and expansive porches.

The neighborhood also has well-preserved inner courts unlike those farther west. These small streets that penetrate the ten-acre blocks, such as Dooley and Strong courts are still lined with small cottages dating from the beginning of the twentieth century. The combination of imposing homes on the main streets and the small dwellings of the inner-block courts indicate that the population of this area has always been a mixture of the rooted and the transient and the upper and lower income classes. The proximity to the Central Business District and the University of Utah campus prompted early development of the area and was a major factor in the original zoning of this neighborhood for mixed residential uses and larger scale apartments. **Pressure to develop or redevelop into higher densities has become one of the most significant issues confronting this area. [emphasis added]** ...

Issues within the East Central North neighborhood

Residential

- **Reduce excessive density potential, stabilize the neighborhood, and conserve the neighborhood’s residential character. [emphasis added]**
- Improve zoning enforcement, including illegal conversion to apartments, yard cleanup, “slum lords,” etc.
- **Encourage higher density housing in East Downtown, Downtown, and Gateway to decrease the pressure to meet those housing needs in this neighborhood. [emphasis added]**
- **Ensure new multi-family development is carefully sited, well designed, and compatible in scale. [emphasis added]**
- Provide more affordable housing (owner occupied and rental).”

“Managing future growth of the Central Community relies on successful implementation of this master plan and the small area master plans. The future land use designations described in each chapter suggest potential land use changes but encourage stability where land uses should remain unchanged. The Future Land Use map (page 2) depicts the desired general land use policy direction. Each land use chapter is linked to the Future Land Use map.

Implementation of this land use policy is supported through recommended zoning ordinances that are consistent and compatible with the Future Land Use map. Areas where existing zoning does not match the land use map will need to be considered for zoning changes to be consistent with the master plan.” (p. 8)

This Zoning Amendment application is INCONSISTENT with the Future Land Use Map p. 2 which clearly shows the parcels in question as Low Density Residential (1-15 units per acre).

Key Point: The assertion is false that the Central Community Master Plan “encourages” medium density zoning AT THESE PARCELS.

It also encourages infill development designed in a manner that is compatible with the appearance of existing neighborhoods.”

Unfortunately, the project conceptual drawings do nothing of the sort. Any redevelopment should retain individual structures on each lot (at R-2, either duplexes or single family), with separate lot setbacks to be compatible with the largely intact historic fabric, feel, and pattern language of the blocks in question.

My Comments:

“Similarly, the City’s Housing Plan recommends increasing medium density housing types and options.”

This statement is so generic as to be utterly meaningless when applied to this specific application for amendments. At the specific parcels, it is simply false.

My Comments:

“It recommends directing new growth towards areas with existing infrastructure and services that have the potential to be people- oriented.”

“The Housing Plan also encourages development of affordable housing.”

It is puzzling as to why the Owners Agent and Applicant would bring this up, given that the proposal that they are floating along with the request for amendments would demolish and remove 9 legal units that are currently highly affordable to low SES individuals and families, and replace them with “luxury apartments.” At the East Central Community Board meeting last fall, when pressed on this issue, the Applicant stated that the target rental range to make the financing work is \$2,200/month. According to the Zillow Rent Affordability Calculator, the monthly NET income to afford this rent is \$5,000/month <https://www.zillow.com/rent-affordability-calculator/>. That is at 33% of income. According to the Salary After Tax calculator for Utah, this requires a gross annual income of \$82,000. <https://salaryaftertax.com/us>

My husband and I own our house free and clear now thanks to an affordable purchase price at the time, favorable mortgage rates, and some luck in our lives. Simply put, we could not afford the proposed rents at our current household income.

Could you? Could most Salt Lake City employees? Teachers? Students?

Worse, many of the current tenants appear to be very low SES and highly vulnerable to falling into homelessness. Some tenants are elderly, others appear to have physical limitations and disabilities. We have been given estimates of 35-40 current tenants at these properties. I cannot fathom that any of them could afford one of the new units, even the teaser “affordable” one that has been dangled.

The displacement of these tenants if this application is approved will cause real and immediate harms to them. It will also exacerbate an already under-resourced homeless, housing, and social services patchwork system.

Unfortunately, some of our neighbors have “concerns” about some of the tenants and some of the ongoing behaviors at these properties that have led them to support this application in the name of “getting better neighbors.” That is pure NIMBYism and rewards poor management and lack of social services in favor of predatory developers and landlords.

Yes, there have been periodic complaints, and we have observed likely illicit activities, from substance abuse and dealing to open burning and fireworks. But those are manageable social problems that need to be dealt with appropriately rather than somehow justifying a return to the bad old days of “slum clearance” in the name of pushing out disadvantaged residents.

The first rule of holes is Stop Digging.

The city must stop digging bigger holes by facilitating the loss of natural affordable housing, both rental and owner occupied.

This amendment request is utterly contrary to the goal of increasing affordable units.

More units DOES NOT EQUAL more affordability. This is not just a supply problem. The housing market is fundamentally broken, just like the U.S. health insurance and medical system. Please stop breaking it further.

My Comments:

“The non-historic homes on the Parcels have been converted to apartments.”

It is hard to even know where to begin with this hot mess of a statement. Misleading is the kindest thing I will say.

The Owner’s Agent at best uses imprecise language to characterize the historic status of the homes. At worst, he misrepresents and misleads. If he means that the homes are not individually listed on the National Register, he should so state. He is a trained land use lawyer, after all.

In common parlance, “historic” means houses of a certain age. Under National Park Service regulations, that is effectively at least 50 years old.

More specifically, it means buildings designated as contributory to the historic district, per State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and National Park Service guidance.

The 5 buildings are designated as contributory as of the last inventory. The house at 159 S Lincoln St has had an unfortunate layer of siding added over the brick, but according to SHPO this is likely superficial and the house could be restored to its proper appearance.

Further, these buildings are a crucial component of the larger East Side Historic District (Boundary Increase).

According to SHPO, each house is named based on the original occupants. The houses are:

- ❖ 159 S Lincoln Street: known as the Samuel and Emma Bjorkland house; built circa 1889;
- ❖ 949 E. 200 South: known as the Hector and Clinton Griswold House; built 1893;
- ❖ 955 E. 200 South: known as the Louis and Agnes Farnsworth House; built 1893;
- ❖ 959 E. 200 South: known by SHPO as the Frances and John Jr. Judson House, also known locally as “China Blue” of more recent cultural significance; built circa 1897; and
- ❖ 963 E 200 South: known as the Roe and Nettie Frazier House; built in 1894

National Historic Districts confer vital tax credit opportunities to homeowners like ourselves (which by the way the city does a terrible job of promoting). To qualify as a National Historic District, a substantial number of buildings within the boundaries must be contributory. The continual erosion and loss of contributory buildings could lead to de-listing and loss of tax credits in the future. These 5 structures are vital to the look and feel of the district, even in their neglected state. City officials should not be making decisions to pave the way to their destruction.

As for the “have been converted to apartments” statement, as mentioned below there is some question as to whether one or more are actually being rented as SROs. Also, the house at 159 S Lincoln are described as single family, as is 963 E 200 S, so if they are being rented as apartments it is unclear what their legal rental status might be.

According to the SHPO files, the buildings at 949, 955, and 959 E were all built on spec by the same developers, who listed their occupations at “capitalists” at the time. Some things in the US never change. In any case, they were originally built as rentals and it seems appropriate that they continue as such today, with the caveat that they be well-maintained as fit premises (another regulation the City systematically fails to enforce).

My Comments:

“Existing City approvals permit 9 apartment units on the 5 parcels.”

As noted previously, the owners actually have the leeway to divide the two single family units into duplexes under R2, giving them 11 units with no teardowns. There is some question as to whether the owners have actually been renting some or all of the properties as single room occupancies (SROs), but that is a question of lack of enforcement of city regulation.

Additionally, were they to pursue unit legalization, they could probably get 1 more unit each at 949 and 959 E. Were the city to permit it, these structures might even accommodate 4-plexes in the renovated buildings at 949, 955, and 959 (these three were actually built as apartment buildings originally, according to SHPO records). That would give the owners 13-15 units. This is exactly the kind of density addition that is compatible with our national historic district and neighborhood fabric. In fact, it is the main pattern.

My Comments:

“The present zoning does not allow Applicant to develop its proposed multi-family project on the Parcels. As a result, Applicant requests an amendment to the zoning map to include the Parcels in the RMF-35 District.”

My Comments:

“This proposed amendment is consistent with surrounding zoning. Properties adjacent to and northeast of the Parcels are located in the RMF-35 District. Numerous other properties in the immediately surrounding neighborhood are in the RMF-35 District, or other multi-family zoning districts, like RMF-45 and RMF-30.”

My Comments:

This is an illogical statement with no basis in rationality. The mere fact of the existence other nearby properties with higher density zoning does not lead to the conclusion that such zoning is also appropriate at the parcels in question. It is a logical fallacy.

In fact, the extensive master planning process that led to the 2005 Central Community Master plan rejected this argument when it set the Future Land Use plan to reflect parcel-by-parcel, block by block zoning. Yes, much of it is mixed zoning in this area. Arguably, many parcels remain over-zoned. Over-zoning even more parcels is simply wrong.

The parcels in question are designated as low density housing in the Future Land Use Map and should remain in their current R2 zoning.

The balance has already been tipped too far to RMF zoning as compared to the existing buildings and uses on many nearby properties.

This leads to a series of negative impacts and undermines affordable housing—especially for prospective owner occupants who are getting regularly outbid by developers and investors for what from the street appear to be single-family homes. Affordability must be considered for homeowners as well as renters. With the population of SLC now tipped to more than 50% renters, city policies are driving people like us out because we could no longer buy back into the city. Over-zoning our historic neighborhoods is a key component of this problem.

Just because our neighborhood already has a mix of apartment buildings, it does not follow that additional ones on parcels not zoned for such use is appropriate. Quite the opposite, given that our

neighborhood is already the most diverse in terms of zoning and also the most dense, the city should focus development on priority areas that are properly zoned.

“A medium-density housing development is compatible with the existing neighborhood. The surrounding neighborhood has a variety of land uses, including small, medium, and large apartment buildings.”

This is utterly untrue. The East Side Historic District is already littered with unfortunate and aesthetically disastrous “medium-density housing development(s)” from the waves of “redevelopment” and infill in the 1960s and 1970s, with poorly constructed buildings, often with blank faces to the street and jarring the otherwise interesting and pleasing historic form and fabric of this neighborhood. Please do not make this mistake again.

As stated earlier, just because our neighborhood already has a mix of apartment buildings, it does not follow that additional ones on parcels not zoned for such use is appropriate. Quite the opposite, given that our neighborhood is already the most diverse in terms of zoning and also the most dense, the city should focus development on priority areas that are properly zoned.

As I have noted, at one level, the proposed development design is a distraction and irrelevant to the primary decision. We have unfortunate examples of what can happen, with the two teardowns on Lincoln St that now serve as excessive, frankly unneeded parking for the commercial buildings on 1000 E, with the loss of 2 housing units that have never been replaced.

That said, since there is some chatter about the option of tying a development agreement to any approvals (despite the history of failure of this strategy), I will address the concept design as submitted by the applicants briefly here.

In short, three parallel rectangular boxes running east-west across combined parcels would be a disaster to the streetscape and historic fabric of the blocks of 200 S and Lincoln St. Both have already had some degradation already, including the inappropriate commercial building at 970 E, the Madrid on 200S and the apartment building where Lori Hacking was murdered on Lincoln St. There should be no more loss of character allowed. Losing 5 contributing structures to teardowns for generic “luxury” apartments betrays Salt Lake City’s commitment to historic preservation www.slcdocs.com/historicpreservation/Policy/presphilosophy.pdf.

Further, the pattern language of these two streets is complimentary but different, with larger and more imposing, often 2-story historic residences lining this block of 200 S, while the mid-block street of Lincoln Street is comprised of mostly more modest, Victorian eclectic single story houses that were built as workforce housing and remain that today, even with the egregious run-up in real estate prices in recent years as compared to the stagnation of our incomes.

If any teardowns and redevelopment occur on these parcels, they should be single-family or duplexes within the bounds of existing R2 zoning, with appropriate setbacks between the structures to maintain the pattern language of the 200 S block from 900 E to 1000S. Of course, I would personally prefer restoration and preservation of the existing structures but if one or more

are lost, they should be replaced with appropriately designed residences that fit the neighborhood. There are good examples of this at 165 S 1100 E and 1042 E 200 S, among others.

One of the more problematic elements of the project concept design is ground-level parking garages with the living units above. As is standard in our historic neighborhoods, private off-street car storage—where it exists—is in stand-alone garage structures, some of which are alley-accessed. Incorporating ground level parking is utterly inconsistent with this National Historic District pattern language. Sadly, the city has failed to create form-based design standards for national historic districts which leads to this kind of problem.

Also, it is well documented that ground-level parking deadens street life and kills neighborliness. High density housing developments that the City has permitted continue to do this in the TOD corridor and elsewhere, a terrible mistake. To allow this at the 4 properties facing 200 S would add insult to injury.

My Comments:

“As recommended by the Housing Plan, the proposed development will increase medium density housing stock in an area with existing infrastructure and close proximity to mass transit and services (e.g. medical and commercial services).”

Please see my analysis of the Growing SLC Housing Plan. In short, the Plan does not call for overturning existing master plans to meet the goals of the Plan.

Did the Owner’s Agent and Applicant actually read the Housing Plan? The statement above does not appear as an actual goal or objective of the Housing Plan.

The closest to this might be: “Objective 1.1.2: Develop in-fill ordinances that promote a diverse housing stock, increase housing options, create redevelopment opportunities, and allow additional units within existing structures, **while minimizing neighborhood impacts.**” [emphasis added]. This is about revising ordinances, not about approving amendments. It also emphasizes preserving existing structures and limiting neighborhood impacts. These amendments would do exactly the opposite if approved.

The key strategies described in this Objective description is unit legalization. Indeed, one of the properties in question is a legal triplex thanks to an earlier round of legalizations.

Additionally, “existing infrastructure” is a serious issue in this area, with extremely old water, sewer, and stormwater utilities. Storm drains regularly clog and overflow downslope on 200S. That said, unfortunately, Salt Lake City officials sometimes see these types of proposals as opportunities to transfer costs to developers rather than the broader city population. Please refrain from that impulse. We voted in favor of a general tax increase for this purpose.

This assertion in the application is not supported by the actual Growing SLC Housing Plan.

Further, as already repeatedly noted, there are various parcels properly zoned for medium density in appropriate locations near transit for the concept project that these owners say they wish to pursue. Rezoning these parcels is not justified. Moreover, this assertion is a misrepresentation of the Growing SLC Housing Plan Objectives.

My Comments:

In addition, Applicant is willing to work with the City to provide one affordable housing unit in the project.

As noted above, the amendments relate to the parcels and any project concepts are largely irrelevant. Therefore, this offer is a distraction.

My Comments:

“For these reasons, Applicant requests that the Parcels be rezoned to the RMF-35 District.”

My Comments:

Based on the analysis of this application and the purposes, goals, objectives, and policies of the city as explained previously, this request is not consistent with these, and does not meet the standards for approval.

Therefore, the Planning Commission should vote No on this request.

“d. Is the request amending the Zoning Map? If so, please list the parcel numbers to be changed.

This Application proposes amending the Zoning Map for Salt Lake County Parcel Nos. 16051350100000; 16051350110000; 16051350120000; 16051350130000; and 16051350140000. Additional information regarding the Parcels may be found in the table, above.”

No comment.

e. Is the request amending the text of the Zoning Ordinance? If so, please include language and the reference to the Zoning Ordinance to be changed.

This Application does not request amendments to the text of the Zoning Ordinance.

No comment.

**Goals of Growing SLC –
Analysis of Consistency with Map and Master Plan Amendment Applications PLNPCM2019-00683 & PLNPCM2019-00684**

By Jen Colby, M.A. Public Administration, and resident at [REDACTED], SLC, 84102

In order to assess whether the Map and Master Plan Amendment Applications PLNPCM2019-00683 & PLNPCM2019-00684 is consistent with the Growing SLC Housing Plan, I:

- Downloaded the Progress Report from Dashboard found at <https://www.slc.gov/hand/programs/> 10-2-2019
- Deleted the information in the third column;
- Changed the table third column title to **“Is the Application Consistent?”**
- Completed my personal review of the application as compared to the goals and objectives of the Housing Plan.

My conclusions are below. Note that all text in standard font is copied directly from the Progress Report. I have included all of the Goals and Objectives even though several of them are directed at city staff or council for action and are not directly applicable. In that case, I have noted “N/A” in the third column to indicate that the particular item does not pertain to this application, or the amendment process more generally. My own additions and notes are in *italics* and highlighted **yellow**.

In summary, this reviewer has read the entire Growing SLC Plan in detail, including attachments, and working through every single goal and objective. Based on this review, the Map and Master Plan Amendment Application is entirely inconsistent with the Growing SLC Plan in every category that applies to the application in question. The emphasis of the Growing SLC Plan is 1) to preserve and enhance affordable housing and 2) promote and enhance fair and equitable housing. The application is entirely contrary to these overarching goals. This contradicts the claims made by the applicant (owner representative Graham Gilbert) at the East Central Community Council general meeting in September that the Housing Plan supported the proposal. The mere fact that Salt Lake City “has a housing crisis” does not logically support this application because the crisis is one of affordability and preservation and expansion of affordable units, not just units in general. This application, were it to be approved, would set the stage for the demolition of 5 contributing historic houses with 9 legal and affordable units, to be replaced by “luxury” apartments. See below for the summary of my full analysis.

Based on this analysis, the applications should summarily be rejected with a negative vote by the Planning Commission.

GROWING SLC Goals and Objectives:

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

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

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

Objective	Action	Is the Application Consistent?
1.1.1	Develop flexible zoning tools and regulations, with a focus along significant transportation routes.	N/A
1.1.2	Develop in-fill ordinances that promote a diverse housing stock, increase housing options, create redevelopment opportunities, and allow additional units within existing structures, while minimizing neighborhood impacts.	<p>NO.</p> <p>The current structures already represent diverse housing stock and the “missing middle” as described in the Plan. They have housed diverse tenant occupants over the years. Furthermore, one of the structures is a legal triplex which was established thanks to the prior unit legalization process. The discussion of the Objective in the GROWING SLC document (p. 19) recommends reestablishing unit legalization. If that were to happen, the two current duplexes could be converted to tri-plexes, adding 2 net units. The two current single family structures could possibly become duplexes under current zoning, with a total of 13 units on the 5 properties under CURRENT R2 ZONING. The application proposes to create significant negative impacts to the National Historic District neighborhood character as well as to the surrounding properties by setting the stage to tear down these examples of diverse housing stock and replacing them with luxury apartments that, based on preliminary drawings, detract from the block face and character of the street.</p>
1.1.3	Revise the Accessory Dwelling Unit ordinance to expand its application and develop measures to promote its use.	N/A

Objective	Action	Is the Application Consistent?
1.1.4	Reduce parking requirements for affordable housing developments and eliminate parking requirements in transit-rich, walkable neighborhoods or when the specific demographics of a development require less parking, such as senior populations.	N/A

Objective 2: Remove impediments in City processes to encourage housing development.

Objective	Action	Is the Application Consistent?
1.2.1	Create an expedited processing system to increase City access for those developers constructing new affordable units.	N/A

Objective 3: Lead in the construction of innovative housing solutions.

Objective	Action	Is the Application Consistent?
1.3.1	Lead in the development of new affordable housing types, as well as construction methods that incorporate innovative solutions to issues of form, function, and maintenance.	NO. The current structures are all rented as affordable units according to information provided by the owners and tenants. The proposed replacement structures will be aimed at a "luxury" market with rents targeted at ~\$2,000 per unit, according to information provided in various forums by the owners or family representatives. They have indicated their willingness to consider adding one "affordable" unit in the new buildings they propose, which means a net loss of 8 currently affordable units as well as the contributing historic houses they are located in.
1.3.2	Establish partnerships with housing industry leaders to construct innovative and affordable developments.	NO. The owners have not disclosed who their developer partner would be so we do not know if they would qualify as an industry leader. However, based on the information they have provided the buildings would not be either innovative nor affordable. Quite the contrary.

Objective 4: Provide residents, community advocates, business leaders, and elected officials with high-quality data to drive decision-making.

Objective	Action	Is the Application Consistent?
1.4.1	Maintain a public-facing set of housing metrics to provide insight into market characteristics and the performance of regulatory changes that will drive decision making.	N/A

GOAL 2: AFFORDABLE HOUSING: INCREASE HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES AND STABILITY FOR COST-BURDENED HOUSEHOLDS

This goal is dedicated to serving and addressing the needs of those most vulnerable in our community. It is driven by a strong belief that housing stability is good for the entire city, adding income to small businesses, creating food stability for children, and allowing residents to enrich their neighborhoods. Salt Lake City needs to pursue a combination of strategies outlined in the objectives below to achieve this goal. There is no singular initiative that will resolve this crisis, it must be addressed with a range of strategies to best fit the diverse needs of our entire community.

Objective 1: Prioritize the development of new affordable housing with an emphasis on households earning 40% AMI and below.

Objective	Action	Is the Application Consistent?
2.1.1	Convene a Blue Ribbon Commission for affordable housing comprised of industry experts, advocates, partners, and government entities.	N/A
2.1.2	Consider an ordinance that would require and incentivize the inclusion of affordable units in new developments.	N/A
2.1.3	Offer incentives to developers of affordable housing such as land discounts and primary financing options.	N/A. However, there are existing programs that the current owners could tap to upgrade and rehabilitate the current structures and retain them as affordable units instead of requesting these amendments with the intent to tear down the structures and replace them with generic-looking "luxury" apartment buildings. These include state historic preservation tax credits and federal tax credits.

Objective 2: Pursue funding for affordable housing opportunities.

Objective	Action	Is the Application Consistent?
2.2.1	Propose a significant, long-term, and sustainable funding source for the development, preservation, and stability of affordable housing.	<i>N/A. However, there are existing programs that the current owners could tap to upgrade and rehabilitate the current structures and retain them as affordable units instead of requesting these amendments with the intent to tear down the structures and replace them with generic-looking "luxury" apartment buildings. These include state historic preservation tax credits and federal tax credits.</i>
2.2.2	Pursue legislative change at the state and federal level that would create opportunities for new incentives and revenue sources.	N/A

Objective 3: Stabilize very low-income renters.

Objective	Action	Is the Application Consistent?
2.3.1	Work with housing partners and government entities to create an incentivized rent assistance program.	<i>N/A. That said, continuing to erode the net number of existing naturally affordable unit housing stock, much of which is in older and historic buildings, just increases the need for these programs and costs the city more \$.</i>
2.3.2	Work with housing partners and government entities to continue supporting and enhancing service models that meet the needs of the City's [sic] most vulnerable households.	<i>N/A. That said, some of the current tenants would likely qualify as most vulnerable households. For example, when asked about what they would do if they lost their leases, some of the tenants said they had nowhere to go and other rentals were far too expensive. When you are in a hole, first stop digging.</i>

Objective 4: Secure and preserve long-term affordability.

Objective	Action	Is the Application Consistent?
2.4.1	Create an Affordable Housing Community Land Trust.	N/A.
2.4.2	Work with community partners and government entities to acquire hotels, multi-family properties, and surplus land to preserve or redevelop them as affordable housing.	<p>NO.</p> <p>Instead, these properties could be acquired, rehabilitated, and maintained as public affordable housing. The two smaller single-unit structures would be terrific as affordable owner units, with the underlying land retained by the city but the residents buying into the structures and building equity, like the program in Burlington Vermont: https://www.burlingtonvt.gov/CEDO/Buy-a-Home</p>
2.4.3	Structure renovation programs to reduce utility, energy, and maintenance costs while promoting healthy living.	<p>NO.</p> <p>The owners request the amendments with the clear intent to demolish rather than rehabilitate or renovate the existing structures.</p>

Objective 5: Work with landlords to improve their housing stock and rent to very low-income households earning 40% AMI and below.

Objective	Action	Is the Application Consistent?
2.5.1	Support and potentially expand incentives for landlords to rent low income households, including landlord insurance programs.	<p>NO.</p> <p>The owners request the amendments with the clear intent to demolish structures with 9 currently affordable and replace with luxury units. The current city ordinances and programs, sadly, seem to encourage this type of development proposal rather than discourage or disincentivize it.</p>
2.5.2	Enhance neighborhood development programs to entice landlords of substandard properties to improve their rental units.	<p>NO. The City has consistently failed to enforce its EXISTING landlord licensing, fit premise, building permitting, business licensing, property maintenance, and other current ordinances that would have helped prevent these properties from becoming so substandard in the first place. The current state of the properties is what is clearly leading to whatever small amount of support there is in the neighborhood for this proposal because some people say "anything would be better than the current situation". This is an enforcement, not zoning problem. Landlords who rack up numerous violations should be disqualified from receiving incentives for some period of time until they are consistently operating their rental units within the law. Good landlords and rental unit owners would seem to be penalized if those who operate in a substandard fashion then receive incentives not to behave quite so badly.</p>

Objective 6: Increase home ownership opportunities.

Objective	Action	Is the Application Consistent?
2.6.1	Increase funding, marketing, and partnerships that will lead to more affordable homeownership programs within the city's network of homeownership partners.	N/A. <i>The properties in question are currently rentals and the owners have indicated their intention to keep them as such. However, as noted above, the two smaller single-unit structures would be good candidates as affordable ownership units (159 Lincoln St and 963 E 200 S). Property is fungible and the owners could decide to sell these properties and buy other parcels in an already appropriately zoned area for their desired new construction.</i>

GOAL 3: EQUITABLE & FAIR HOUSING: BUILD A MORE EQUITABLE CITY

Equity is not only about eliminating discrimination, it is also about increasing access to opportunity. One of the guiding principles of Plan Salt Lake is to create an equitable city by ensuring “access to all city amenities for all citizens while treating everyone equitably with fairness, justice, and respect.” The City will accomplish this by working to eliminate housing discrimination, strategically investing in neighborhoods that stand the most to gain, and building a city that meets needs of a diverse population.

Objective 1: Eliminate incidences of housing discrimination in Salt Lake City.

Objective	Action	Is the Application Consistent?
3.1.1	Utilize data and evaluation efforts developed by partner organizations about housing discrimination to meet the City's requirements under the Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing ruling.	N/A

Objective	Action	Is the Application Consistent?
3.1.2	Work with partners to enhance awareness and resources around tenant rights and responsibilities.	<p>NO.</p> <p><i>Unfortunately, tenants have very few rights in Utah as it is, and city outreach to tenants is basically nonexistent. According to some of the current tenants, if they complained about unfit premises they were threatened with or in fact evicted. They report routinely doing their own (unpermitted) work to try to keep up the current properties, for which the owners indicate they will be compensated but then never do so. These particular tenants have now been threatened with eviction if they speak to some of the neighborhood organizers who oppose the amendments, or if they themselves speak up. The City is utterly failing to uphold tenant rights or owner responsibilities. Further, the tenants' fundamental federal constitutional rights of free speech, assembly, and public participation are undermined when the consequence of expressing such rights is potential eviction and loss of housing.</i></p>

Objective 2: Align resources and invest in strategic expansion of opportunity throughout all neighborhoods of the city and access to existing areas of opportunity.

Objective	Action	Is the Application Consistent?
3.2.1	Align financial resources to increase opportunity in neighborhoods that score below 4.0 on the Opportunity Index's 10 point scale.	N/A
3.2.2	Make strategic affordable housing investments in high opportunity neighborhoods.	N/A. That said, continuing to erode the net number of existing naturally affordable unit housing stock, much of which is in older and historic buildings, just increases the need for these programs and costs the city more \$.
3.2.3	Work with partners at the Kem C. Gardner Policy Institute to produce an updated Opportunity Index assessment as a tool for guiding City investment.	N/A

Objective 3: Implement life cycle housing principles in neighborhoods throughout the city.

Objective	Action	Is the Application Consistent?
3.3.1	Support diverse and vibrant neighborhoods by aligning land use policies that promote a housing market capable of accommodating residents throughout all stages of life.	NO.

Note that the Housing Indicators page has not been updated since Q2 of 2017. <https://www.slc.gov/hand/housing-indicators/>