

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/11/2026 10:23	Kai SHAYS	Formal Objection to Proposed Quiet Hour Changes – 543 South 1200 East	<p>To the Salt Lake City Council, I am writing as a supportive friend and long-term guest of the residents at REDACTED. It has come to our attention that the HOA is considering shortening the standard window for social activity by moving quiet hours earlier than the established norms of our city and state. On behalf of Wyatt, Rishi, Carson, and James, I am urging the board to maintain a schedule that aligns with the standard 10:00 PM to 7:00 AM window used by Salt Lake City and Salt Lake County. Imposing a more restrictive "curfew" is not only professionally unnecessary but creates an impractical environment for residents balancing academic and social lives. Our argument for maintaining the 10:00 PM standard is based on three pillars: 1. Consistency with Local Law and Civic Standards Salt Lake City (and Salt Lake County) has established 10:00 PM as the professional threshold for residential quiet hours. This standard exists because it represents a fair balance between the right to rest and the right to social liberty. By deviating from this, the HOA risks creating a "policing" environment that is more restrictive than the law itself, which often leads to unnecessary friction and a decrease in resident satisfaction. 2. Legal Precedent and "Reasonable Use" Under the Utah Community Association Act (57-8a-218), HOA rules generally should not interfere with activities within a dwelling that comply with local ordinances unless those activities constitute a genuine "nuisance." The current residents at 543 South 1200 East have maintained a safe, welcoming, and respectful environment. Shortening quiet hours effectively "redlines" their ability to engage in standard social behaviors—like hosting a dinner or a small weekend gathering—that are perfectly legal and common throughout the rest of the city. 3. Preserving the "Social Fabric" of the Neighborhood The undergraduate years are a vital time for building community. These residents have worked hard to build a positive reputation and a safe space for their peers. Moving quiet hours to an earlier time (such as 8:00 PM or 9:00 PM) creates a "dormitory" atmosphere that is inconsistent with the reality of living in a vibrant, urban neighborhood near a major university. It penalizes responsible residents for the sake of an arbitrary standard that does not reflect the lifestyle of the community's majority. _____ A neighborhood thrives when rules are predictable and fair. We believe that the current 10:00 PM standard is the most professional and equitable solution for all parties involved. We hope the board will choose to align with Salt Lake City's established ordinances rather than imposing further restrictions. Sincerely, Kai Shays</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/11/2026 10:24	Jared West	City council meeting March 10, 2026 - Urgent Request for Stronger Enforcement on Ongoing Nuisance Party Houses in Our Neighborhood	<p>I am writing as a long-time resident who is deeply concerned about the ongoing issues our neighborhood is facing with repeated nuisance party houses and the lack of effective enforcement to address them. My partner and I have lived in our home for nearly 19 years. We chose this neighborhood because of its strong sense of community and because it has historically been a place where neighbors look out for one another. Over the past several years, however, the situation with large student party houses has steadily worsened and has reached a point where many residents feel unsafe and unheard. For more than four and a half years, our neighborhood has been dealing with repeated large and disruptive gatherings at rental properties. One property in particular, 1233 E 600 S, has been a significant source of disturbance since approximately October 2024. These gatherings routinely involve large crowds late into the night, loud music, shouting, and people spilling out into surrounding yards and streets. Residents frequently have to call the police simply to restore basic peace in the neighborhood. Unfortunately, the issue does not end when police disperse the parties. In many cases, this is when a secondary and often more damaging problem begins. Groups of partygoers leave the property and walk through the neighborhood yelling, screaming, vandalizing property, and disturbing residents as they disperse. Neighbors have witnessed underage drinking, public intoxication, and individuals leaving these gatherings and driving while impaired, which raises very serious public safety concerns. This past weekend the situation escalated in a way that no resident should have to experience. During a gathering in the area, individuals vandalized our home by throwing eggs at our house, causing property damage that we are now having assessed. While doing so, they repeatedly yelled homophobic slurs including “fags” and “faggots.” The harassment was aggressive and deeply unsettling. Police responded and documented the incident under case number 26-47172, and we have preserved video footage and documentation. After nearly two decades in this neighborhood, it is heartbreaking to feel that our home — the place where we have invested years of our lives — has become a place where we must install cameras and security measures simply to feel safe. I want to emphasize that this is not about being anti-student or anti-university. Many students are wonderful neighbors. The issue is a systemic pattern of nuisance properties where tenants host repeated large gatherings with little accountability, and the surrounding neighborhood bears the consequences. What we are asking for is straightforward: • Stronger and more consistent enforcement of nuisance and disorderly conduct laws • Greater accountability for property owners who allow repeated nuisance activity • Better coordination to address the secondary issue of large groups dispersing through neighborhoods causing damage and disturbances • Clear consequences that deter repeat behavior</p> <p>Residents should not have to spend years documenting disturbances, installing security systems, and contacting city officials just to protect their homes. We love this neighborhood and want it to remain a place where families, long-term residents, and students can coexist respectfully. But without stronger enforcement and accountability, the current trajectory is not sustainable. We will be attending the upcoming council meeting and hope the City will take meaningful action to address these ongoing issues. Thank you for your time and for your commitment to our community. Best Regards,</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/11/2026 10:26	Nathan Starley	Request for Stronger Enforcement and Accountability for Nuisance Properties	<p>Dear Salt Lake City Council Members, My name is Nathan Starley. My husband and I first moved into the Douglas neighborhood as renters in the fall of 2006, and we purchased our home here in October of 2008. We live one block southwest of the U. I am also a graduate of the University of Utah and rented in this area myself during college. For many years we loved living in this neighborhood because it felt safe and connected to the university community. Unfortunately, over the past several years the situation has changed dramatically. An increasing number of nearby homes have transitioned into high-turnover rental properties that regularly host extremely large gatherings. These are not occasional celebrations. These are frequent disruptive parties that spill into surrounding streets and yards and occur at all times of day — sometimes beginning in the morning or early afternoon and continuing late into the night. The impact on the neighborhood is significant. The noise is not only heard outside; residents often hear crowds and music inside their homes even with the windows closed. In some cases speakers placed on the ground send vibrations through the ground and into surrounding houses. At the same time, intoxicated crowds move through residential streets yelling, leaving trash, urinating in yards, and sometimes vandalizing nearby homes. This affects everyone — homeowners, renters, and even other students who simply want a quiet place to live and study. My husband and I have spent years trying to address this issue through every available channel. We have contacted property owners, spoken directly with tenants, worked with the university, called law enforcement, and documented repeated disturbances. We have spent countless hours trying to resolve these issues appropriately. Despite those efforts, many residents feel that nothing changes. In fact, many feel the situation has worsened over time, and some long-time residents and renters have chosen to move away because of the ongoing disturbances. A recent incident on February 28 illustrates how serious the situation has become. During a large gathering at a nearby rental property, intoxicated individuals leaving the party moved through the neighborhood late at night. When my husband and I simply asked people to keep the noise down out of consideration for nearby families and elderly residents, eggs were thrown at our home and we were subjected to homophobic slurs. Police responded and documented the incident. No one should feel unsafe in their own home for asking for basic respect. This issue is not about preventing students from enjoying their college experience. It is about ensuring that a small number of repeat nuisance properties do not repeatedly disrupt an entire neighborhood. I respectfully urge the City to consider stronger nuisance property enforcement measures, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fines tied directly to the property for repeat disturbances • Greater accountability for landlords whose properties repeatedly host nuisance activity • Stronger enforcement within the Good Landlord Program, including loss of incentives for repeat violations • Ensuring rental licensing and compliance are actively enforced * Enforcement of the \$1,000 fine (I heard only 5 have been issued out all the many, many disturbances and reported disturbances since this was enacted) <p>These types of tools can help ensure that a small number of problem properties do not continue to negatively impact an entire neighborhood. Everyone deserves the quiet enjoyment of their home and to feel safe where they live. Thank you for your time and consideration. Sincerely, Nathan Starley Douglas Neighborhood Resident</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/11/2026 10:31	Havilah Zeller	Temple Square Street Closures	<p>Esteemed Council, As the petition to close North Temple during the Salt Lake Temple Open House is considered, it may be helpful to also account for the daily transportation needs of the many students, parents, faculty, and staff who travel to West High School from the Avenues, Federal Heights, and other neighborhoods east of downtown. North Temple serves as one of the most direct east-west routes to the school. If both North Temple and South Temple are closed, families and buses will likely be pushed several blocks farther south, creating longer and more complex commutes—particularly challenging for student drivers who are still gaining experience. Those detours may also place school traffic into already busy areas near the Salt Palace and Delta Center. School bus routes that normally use North Temple would also be affected. Delays could make it difficult for students to arrive on time, and some may miss the opportunity to eat breakfast at school—whether through the free breakfast program or by purchasing a meal. Adjusting bus schedules to compensate may be difficult, given existing driver shortages and the complexity of coordinating routes that serve multiple stops before reaching West High. Reliable access to the school is important not only in the morning and afternoon but also in the evenings, when many families return for performances, games, and meetings. Parents sometimes need to reach the school quickly during the day as well. Detouring traffic as far south as 400 South in order to cross downtown and then return north could add several miles of stop-and-go driving to each trip and significantly increase travel times for families commuting between the Avenues and West High. With these factors in mind, it may be worth exploring whether there are alternatives that could accommodate visitors to Temple Square while still preserving practical access to the school. Possibilities might include a temporary pedestrian bridge across North Temple or temporarily allowing two-way traffic through City Creek Canyon during school days. The surrounding community has adapted to years of construction and lane reductions in this area, often with the understanding that full closures would be limited to weekends, evenings, or non-school days. Ensuring that students and families can continue to reach their neighborhood public school reliably each day would be deeply appreciated as part of this decision-making process. Thank you, Havilah Zeller Constituent District 3</p>
3/11/2026 10:32	Anonymous Constituent	Noise Ordinance Change	<p>Dear Neighborhood HOA, Respectfully it is a clear unreasonable expectation for there to be a noise ordinance at 7pm. A noise ordinance of 10pm has been reasonable for many neighborhoods before including mine which has had a heavy college student presence. While it is reasonable to asses a new noise policy it is unreasonable to push it that early. Furthermore while not to push all the pressure on the university the neighborhood in question is in a predominantly sub-leased area to University of Utah students who are young and with classes are expected to be social in the later hours. While I completely understand the concerns expressed by some of the other households it is unreasonable to push a noise ordinance that comes before even sunset. This is clearly just a very small minority group of households trying to use their advantage of home ownership in the area to strong man out the students who already have very limited housing without insane rules and restrictions. -Sincerely, Anonymous Student</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/11/2026 10:33	Caroline Dillon	Community Perspective on Proposed Restrictions Near the University	<p>Hello, my name is Cali Dillon, and I am a resident living near the university. I am writing regarding the recent concerns about parties and gatherings in the neighborhood. I understand that there have been some instances where parties have gotten out of hand, and I agree that those situations should absolutely be addressed. I want this neighborhood to be a safe place to live for everyone, and I do not support unsafe or disruptive gatherings. At the same time, I do not believe it is fair for the entire community to face strict restrictions because of the actions of a small number of people. Many students who live in this area are respectful neighbors who do not participate in large or disruptive parties. In fact, some of us have built positive relationships with the people who live around us and work to maintain friendly and respectful connections within the neighborhood. We care about the community we live in and want to continue being good neighbors. It would be unfortunate if responsible residents were prevented from simply having friends over, hosting small gatherings, or spending time with others in lawful and respectful ways because of a few isolated incidents. I believe the better approach would be to address and enforce rules specifically when problematic behavior occurs, rather than placing broad restrictions on everyone. This neighborhood exists alongside a university, and naturally that means students will be part of the community. College towns across the country balance the presence of students while still maintaining safe and respectful neighborhoods. With fair enforcement and clear expectations, it is possible to address unsafe behavior while still allowing responsible residents to live normally. I hope the council will consider solutions that focus on the specific problems without placing unnecessary limitations on the many residents who are doing their best to contribute positively to the community. Thank you for your time and consideration. Sincerely, Cali Dillon</p>
3/11/2026 10:35	Rob Kertesz	Public comment on street closures	<p>Wasn't able to finish.... Here's my complete comment... Good evening and thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed street closures My name is Rob Kertesz. I live right across the street from Temple Square and I serve on the board of the Downtown Community Council. I'd like to share our council's thoughts on the proposed street closures associated with the Salt Lake Temple open house. First, we want to thank The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints for its clear effort to be a good neighbor as it prepares for this event. We especially appreciate the staggered workforce schedules, the transit passes offered to employees, the attention to pedestrian safety, and the plans for off-site parking and shuttle service. These steps show a real effort to reduce pressure on downtown streets and parking. At the same time, closing several city streets for an extended period raises important questions about balancing major events with everyday downtown life. Downtown Salt Lake City is not just an event space—it is a neighborhood where people live, work, run businesses, receive deliveries, and depend on reliable street access. The North Temple closure alone affects several UTA bus routes and one of the key connections between downtown and the west side. For these reasons, we echo the concerns already expressed by city council members and encourage the city and the church to continue working closely with residents and businesses to ensure clear timelines, strong communication, and dependable access during the open house period. We also see the closure as an opportunity. Temporary closures could help the city evaluate whether more pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly streets might work downtown in the future. Finally, one constructive step would be offering free transit access on during the open house—partnering with the city to offer free public transit for everyone, not just church employees and their guests. This event will bring the world to Salt Lake City, and it is also an opportunity to show how a city and a major institution work together to care for the people who live and work here every day. Rob Kertesz</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/11/2026 10:41	Julia Lyon	concern over closure of North Temple	<p>Hello, My name is Julia Lyon and I am a parent of two students at West High School. I am extremely concerned about how the proposed closure of North Temple in 2027 will impact students' ability to attend school on time. The school bus from the Avenues to West High School is always full of dozens of students who may have no other transportation to school. Most of these students have two working parents and rely exclusively on the bus. Students at West are from a broad socio-economic range and may have no other solutions without the school bus. Some students from Central City also take advantage of this bus and walk into the Avenues to catch it. I know Governor Cox is extremely concerned about improving academic achievement for students in Utah. It seems like there must be some kind of compromise that could be reached to decrease the impact on students. It is extremely concerning that making it harder for students to get to school could actually discourage students from going to school at all. 1. Could North Temple's closure be restricted to fewer months -- only during June/July and stop once public schools reopen in Salt Lake City? 2. Could North Temple's closure take place ONLY during the weekends? It seems like there MUST be a compromise that could be reached rather than an all or nothing approach. Thank you for your consideration. Best, Julia Lyon</p>
3/11/2026 10:43	Nancy Bush	Residents need the City to Help with real solutions for ongoing extreme party and nuisance issues	<p>Dear Salt Lake City Council, For many years, residents in my neighborhood have been dealing with ongoing nuisance activity, including large late-night parties, excessive noise, public intoxication, and property damage, not to mention junk in front yards and unkept yards. Neighbors have repeatedly attempted to resolve these issues by speaking with tenants, contacting landlords, and reporting incidents to the city. Unfortunately, despite these efforts, the situation has continued to worsen. The current system often allows repeat offenders to continue disruptive behavior without meaningful consequences. The behavior includes not only extreme parties, shouting in the streets at all hours, underage drinking and excessive drinking in general, vandalism and threatening language to homeowners trying to protect their property and quality of life. I support the city's efforts to address nuisance activity, but the ordinance must include strong enforcement and accountability, including holding property owners responsible for repeated nuisance activity, stronger penalties for repeat incidents, increased enforcement presence in problem areas, and clear pathways for residents to report and track violations. Residents should not have to endure ongoing disruption and safety concerns in their own neighborhoods. I have lived in my home on Douglas Street for over 40 years and I am committed to the neighborhood. I am disgusted that the city has let it deteriorate, by not holding property owners accountable for their tenants and for not taking care of their properties. Sincerely, Nancy Bush</p>
3/11/2026 12:06	Carol Wicks	Affordable Housing in Salt Lake	<p>Why hasn't someone suggested reversing the down going of that occurred in the early 1990 I have a a duplex (which is now non conforming) which is a 1000 sq foot print on .37 acre If anyone is really interested in affordable housing then come up with a plan to prevent removing housing in residential zones from the nightly rentals or at least collect high highly sales tax On the income derived from doing short term rentals. I will answer the survey but be very clear the economical benefit to build more units on residential property will produce enough housing to satisfy the need as the cost of construction is Is exceedingly expensive. I am a land lord of duplexes and single families and keep running numbers if should develop my one property that is currently r 30 and it makes no sense financially. I highly prefer more housing in residential neighborhoods rather than that multiple massive apartment buildings that have totally destroyed the charm and ambiance of salt lake Vintage 1990s. Stop californicating salt lake city. Carol Wicks</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/11/2026 13:48	Dale L LESSING	closing part of south temple for the Temple open house	I believe closing part of North Temple during the Temple open house will cause more traffic problems than it will help.
3/11/2026 15:34	Douglas KOHLER	Parking problems for LDS Temple Opening	<p>Good afternoon, I was unable to attend the City Council meeting last night; March 10th and I wanted to comment on the parking problems that will occur with the LDS Temple opening next year. As a resident of downtown, I currently have a parking permit for Area 5. I am deeply concerned that myself and the other residents along 1st Avenue, 2nd Avenue and Canyon Rd up into City Creek Canyon are going to have extreme difficulty in finding parking. It is hard enough parking in Area 5 when the Spring and Fall LDS Conference's take place. All of us who live in this area should not be pushed out of what we have paid for and forced to find a parking spot that is block's from where we live. Many of us who live here are not all working 9-5 jobs. We come and go at different hours of the day. What are the contingency plans for us residents living and parking in Area 5? Having your parking compliance folks come along and issue citations is not going to help us at all. People who are here to visit the Temple will just park their cars for hours, which occurs when the Conference takes place twice a year. I certainly hope that we are not going to be ignored. Having to face the potential parking nightmare seven days a week for seven months is not going to sit well with us. Thank you, Douglas Kohler</p>
3/11/2026 15:36	Jen Colby 1/2	My comments about proposed SLC Temple celebration street closures - please postpone vote until issues can be addressed	<p>Dear Members of the City Council and Mayor's Office, Below are the prepared personal comments that I read at the March 10 council meeting hearing regarding the "Temporary Street Closures for 2027 Temple Reopening Celebration." I believe the proposal should be substantially modified prior to adoption of any ordinance to truly meet the goals of safety, access, and traffic mitigation. Given the celebration is more than a year away, there is plenty of time to do so. To put it mildly, this proposed closure is simply not comparable to any previous event closures since I have lived in Salt Lake City - including the 2002 Olympics. A seven-eight month complete, fenced-off public closure for the 2 major streets in question is unparalleled. After attending the hearing and doing more research, I am even more concerned that this proposal is not adequate as drafted. Many specific questions have been raised and more details should be clarified. Existing car traffic counts have not been provided nor estimates of additional traffic due to the celebration even with some TDM (travel demand management). Cycling counts and access is also ignored. Visitor estimates seem like guesses. Given that this will be a ticketed event with specific opening times and visitor capacity controlled, planners should be able to better predict and manage daily attendance. If the temple is closed to visitors on Sundays, why are closures needed those days? Ditto during the closed hours - from 9 pm to 9 am if the general Temple Square summer hours are representative. Instead, the existing model of temporary closures during the Corporation of the President of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints' General Conferences is much more appropriate and far less disruptive. From their website: https://www.churchofjesuschrist.org/events/temple-square-guidelines?lang=eng : Temporary Road Closures to Ensure Safety During major events in the Conference Center, North Temple between Main Street and West Temple will be restricted to pedestrian access. Restrictions will start two hours before the event. (see diagram of the movable barriers, not fencing, on that webpage). I will send additional comments in a separate message but wanted to get my initial public comments into the written record. Sincerely, Jen Colby, MPA East Central District 4 Salt Lake City resident</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/11/2026 15:36	Jen Colby 2/2	CONTINUED!! My comments about proposed SLC Temple celebration street closures - please postpone vote until issues can be addressed	<p>I support open streets events and pedestrianized urban zones. But looking closer at this proposal I have serious concerns and ask that the ordinance be revised. We are still a year out so please do not rush to vote on this until these issues are resolved. I am glad to see that event organizers recognize that it is the cars that are the problem and safety threat, not the people outside of cars. If only they would argue for safer streets by design more broadly. Anyway, my concerns here include the exclusivity clause, the proposed fencing, the scope of the closures, and potential discrimination. I object to the apparent closure of the streets to bicyclists, especially in the critical West Temple lanes. The 10-acre blocks make walking and bicycling detours burdensome especially given the lack of a complete, safe, protected bike lane network downtown. I ask that the car traffic be blocked with appropriate barricades, but no fencing be allowed. I do not think Salt Lake City should sell out the people's rights of general public access to our streets. The city should simply temporarily restrict the ability of car drivers to use them. I also suggest considering only the closure of eastbound North Temple in both blocks and only the northbound car lane of West Temple. Several UTA buses use North Temple and celebration visitors and residents alike should be able to use them. I am particularly worried about potential discriminatory actions against certain groups of people, especially if the exclusionary zones are fenced and access points are controlled by the Church. President Oaks has led the legal charge to maintain a religious privilege to discriminate. This is currently aimed mostly at people who identify as LGBTQIA+. All people should be able to use our public streets and sidewalks freely and without fear of bias or discrimination. Please do not sell out these rights, even temporarily. Therefore, I ask that you:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modify the language of the ordinance to remove the word "exclusive." • Also please add a section that specifies full non-discrimination during the closure for all people. Restricted access should only be for private cars. • Please also forbid fencing closures. <p>With those changes and other community suggestions, this could be a wonderful open streets season that truly celebrates the restored Salt Lake Temple and welcomes the world. As is, unfortunately it may risk driving more division and community conflict. In times such as these, peacemaking is sorely needed. Thank you.</p>
3/11/2026 18:01	Jennifer Ortiz	Comments regarding street closures around Temple Square	<p>I was unable to make the city council meeting when this conversation happened, but I wanted to flag my concern as a Marmalade district resident regarding the street closures proposed around Temple Square. I am curious to hear more about how the city has weighed this request against already planned street impacts along 300 west for the planned Smith Entertainment plaza construction slated for early 2027. With both the projected street closures around Temple square and traffic impacts with 300 west, this effectively cuts off the Marmalade neighborhood from downtown. In order to get downtown from the Capitol or west, you must now go clear across to 400 west or the freeway or down state street which is already so heavily trafficked. I'd like to hear more consideration about how these two events will overlap and severely impact surrounding neighborhoods. While I understand safety concerns for people visiting Temple Square, this becomes a long period of time to navigate what has already become a very congested neighborhood.</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/12/2026 12:13	Stephanie Tonin	Temple square road closures	<p>I'm asking the council to consider the very negative impact of closing the streets around temple square next year as requested by the LDS church. I live in the upper avenues. North temple is the only way I can get my child to and from West High. The upper road from 11th Ave through city creek canyon is under construction already and not a reliable route to northern downtown for those in the avenues. It is already quite challenging for those of us in this neighborhood to get in and out from the north. We've been patient with the church construction for a long time and lived with many impacts. This is a big ask at this point for those of us who have already been impacted for a long time. There needs to be a workable way for students to get to west high from the avenues.</p>
3/12/2026 16:36	Jared Schroeder	Request to Expand Hive Pass Eligibility	<p>Hello Salt Lake City Council, My name is Jared Schroeder. I am writing to ask that Salt Lake City consider expanding Hive Pass eligibility to include people who work in Salt Lake City but live outside city boundaries. I live in Weber County and work for the Salt Lake County Sheriff's Office. I would like to use FrontRunner to travel into Salt Lake City for work and then use GREENbike once I am in the city. A program like this would make commuting easier for workers who come into Salt Lake City every day and would encourage more people to use public transportation instead of driving. Right now, the Hive Pass is very helpful for city residents, but there are also many of us who work in Salt Lake City, contribute to the city each day, and would benefit from a commuter-based option. I hope you will consider creating a version of the Hive Pass for non-residents who work in the city. Thank you for your time and consideration. Sincerely, Jared Schroeder</p>
3/12/2026 16:40	Victor Hamburger	Temple Street Closures	<p>Dear Council Members, As a Resident of the Avenues, I beg the council to not close North and South Temple for the Churches open house period. For the past 5 years we have labored through road closures and construction knowing that the end was soon near. We have put up with flat tires, damaged suspensions on vehicles and longer than normal commutes for the construction. My family has had 5 flat tires in the past year from driving through the constant construction 4 times a day and any more closures add insult to injury. The open house is happening. Those gloriously large cross walks will work perfectly fine. Tourists and economic boom are coming whether the roads are closed or not. This is not a safety issue at all and the traffic congestions from closures will only hinder economic development rather than boost it. The Church is another Billionaire looking for a Salt Lake City handout and enough is enough. Please stand with the people and serve public interest by refusing to close Public Roadways. Victor Hamburger Avenue's Resident</p>
3/13/2026 15:29	Lynn Pershing	NO to Hotel at Sugarhouse Park 1300 E/2100S	<p>Dear City Council members I strongly urge you to vote NO on the proposed multi family residence at REDACTED contiguous to Sugarhouse Park This location is part of an extremely busy/chaotic traffic intersection that is close to a major interstate exchange. Entry/exit in any direction of the proposed excessively tall building will be problematic. Further, giving density bonuses beyond what the recent citywide upzoning already allows is inexcusable and should not be allowed. Enough is enough. Either the City has Zoning codes or not. Thank you for your service Respectfully Lynn K. Pershing, Ph.D. District 6</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/16/2026 11:47	Anonymous Constituent	Temporary Street Closure for Temple Square 2027 Reopening	NO GATES in public space!!! This is not for a weekend, this is for half a year. If you allow them to put up gates, they will close them. Look what they did to the Main Street Plaza, once accessible for public, now exclusive use for tourist-visiting-hours only. (SLTrib: Salt Lake Temple reopening crowds will be like a General Conference session every day for 6 months. Here's what's ahead.) "Boosters for downtown merchants, restaurants and taverns say the church expects to operate free but ticketed tours of Temple Square for 10 to 12 hours a day, seven days a week — for an estimate of 3,000 guests per hour. While that is a large flow of visitors, “we need not be overwhelmed by that number,” said Dee Brewer, executive director for the Downtown Alliance, which represents more than 2,500 businesses and property owners in the urban core." 3000 people an hour, the majority being shuttled in to designated waypoints and spending their time inside the blocks is NOT an overwhelming amount that requires closing these streets. How many people are on our streets for a Salt Palace convention? A lot more than this projection, and we don't have to close major roadways or put up security gates.
3/16/2026 16:37	Kim Russo	CDBG grant comment	Good morning--I am a social worker who has been working in homeless services for over 15 years. I am writing in regards to the CDBG grant, and to respectfully request that you consider Ruff Haven Crisis Sheltering as a 2026 recipient of this grant. I have witnessed their work, their drive and compassion to assist and ensure safety to the vulnerable community. I am grateful to Ruff Haven for providing shelter and safety to my clients seeking mental health or substance relapse/addiction inpatient services. Those seeking shelter and safety from domestic violence, and trafficking have been offered shelter and safety for themselves and their pets by Ruff Haven . I doubt that I would be able to provide a holistic approach to client care without the assistance of Ruff Haven. They have a deep commitment to the client, their pets and to our community. Please consider Ruff Haven as a recipient of the CDBG grant so that they may continue their good work for our vulnerable community. Respectfully, Kim M. Russo, MSW, LMHO, CCW
3/16/2026 16:40	Jessica Christiansen	ICE facility	Dear Salt Lake City Council Members, I'm a Utah resident. I urge the City Council to take immediate, formal action against the planned conversion of the warehouse at 6020 W. 300 South into an ICE detention facility. I have heard so many stories of people shackled for days, fed only one sandwich a day, kept for weeks at a time in a bathroom, sexually assaulted. I've heard stories of people who died of extremely preventable causes when guards wouldn't take them seriously, women who spontaneously aborted their babies when guards wouldn't take them seriously. I've heard of thousands of people who disappeared from where their families and legal representation could track them. We do not need this inhumanity in our state. I do not want Topaz Camp here again. I urge you to: • Pass a formal resolution opposing the facility's use as an immigration detention center • Direct city departments to conduct an exhaustive zoning, building code, and infrastructure compliance review • Hold public hearings to give West Side residents an official voice in this process • Support Mayor Mendenhall's efforts with the full weight of the legislative branch I am begging you to act on this immediately. The thought of being so close to a facility like this is unbearable. I can't live like this. With urgency, Jessica Christiansen, South Jordan UT

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/16/2026 16:50	Marsha Hanks	Sidewalks closed in Sugarhouse!	<p>Hello, I'm calling to leave a message for my council member and the rest of the council. I have lived in Sugar House for over 50 years, and I'm very frustrated with what has been happening to the neighborhood. From my perspective, the recent changes have made things worse rather than better. you guys did absolutely piece of crap to Sugarhouse. Today I noticed signs saying the sidewalks are closed on both the east and west sides of 2100 South and 900 East. If the goal is to make Sugar House more walkable, this situation makes it extremely difficult—especially for people with disabilities who rely on safe and accessible sidewalks. I don't understand how someone using a wheelchair, walker, or other mobility aid is supposed to get through that area. and this is absolutely violent for the disability people. I'm also concerned about the bike lanes placed in the middle of the road. In reality, many cyclists still ride on the sidewalks, which creates additional challenges for pedestrians who are trying to use the walkway safely. I strongly urge the council to take a closer look at these issues and work toward solutions that actually improve accessibility and safety for everyone. After living in Sugar House for more than five decades, it's disappointing to see the area becoming more difficult to navigate instead of better for the community. The worst thing in Utah is Sugarhouse. Thanks</p>
3/17/2026 11:26	Lisa J Remal 1/2	Opposition to street closures for LDS temple open house	<p>Dear Olivia Erickson, I live in Chris Wharton's district and am, in fact, his neighbor. I have owned a home at REDACTED in Salt Lake since 1984. I am writing to urge Chris and all other city council members to vote against the LDS church's request to close streets and traffic lanes around the temple for six months in 2027. I believe the request is extremely unreasonable and not in the best interest of the residents of Salt Lake City. I would feel differently if their request were for a two or three week period of time, similar to changes that were instituted during the 2002 Olympics; such a short time period is temporary enough that it would be a reasonable request. However, a six month period of road closures/lane reductions is not even close to reasonable. This is especially true because of other closures and lane reductions already underway in the same area, or planned for the same time period - construction of the Salt Palace, the West High School construction, and construction in the area of the Delta Center. In addition, 200 West is closed off fairly regularly when the Salt Palace has events to create a parking area for large trucks west of the Salt Palace. Of course, Main Street has been permanently closed between North and South Temple for many years after Salt Lake City allowed the LDS church to purchase it to create parking for itself. All of this means that residents like me and others who live in my neighborhood will struggle to find a way to get into, or out of, our homes because of the lack of accessible roads. In addition, having daily crowds in/near our neighborhood equivalent to the crowds we already endure for the LDS church's general conferences will be, frankly, awful. During those conferences, cars usually fill up the parking places in front of my home and the homes of my neighbors, leaving no place for us to park. For two days twice a year, it's annoying and inconvenient, but we can deal with it. However, having that occur every day for 6 months would be an unreasonable burden.</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/17/2026 11:26	Lisa J Remal 2/2	CONTINUED!! Opposition to street closures for LDS temple open house	<p>If the city council does vote to allow the church to close roads/reduce lanes as they have requested, I suggest some methods to mitigate the effects and inconvenience to residents affected by the measures, such as: 1. Greatly shorten the time period where it will be allowed. Two weeks or even one month is much more reasonable than the current six month request. 2. Require the church to pay the construction companies who are doing work in the neighborhood during this time period to cease construction while the open house sessions are occurring so additional road closures/lane reductions are not happening then. 3. Create Resident Only parking areas in the affected neighborhoods, giving us residents parking permits to park on the streets by our homes, and prohibiting visitors to the temple from parking in our neighborhoods. Although some Resident Only parking is already in place near my home, it does not exist for 200 West and, I believe, streets west of 200 West. Also, I suggest requiring the church to pay for increased numbers of persons to be hired as SLC parking enforcement employees to ticket parking violators. The parking violation fees should be shared with the residents who are impacted by the parking violations. 4. Require the church to pay a monthly stipend to residents who are impacted by either/both the street closures and visitors parking in front of our homes. I think it's likely that residents would be considerably more forgiving of the many problems created by the open house sessions if we received payments from the church of, for instance, \$500.00 per month. The LDS church is a wealthy institution and can certainly afford to provide such stipends. 5. Disallow the closure of 200 West behind the Salt Palace for truck parking during the time period of the open house sessions, thus assuring that the street will be open to traffic. For all of these reasons, I urge Chris and other city council members to vote against the church's request for road closures, or to, at least, mitigate the impact for those of us that live in the affected area. Thank you for taking the time to read my comments. I am happy to discuss this further if needed. Lisa J. Remal</p>
3/17/2026 14:51	Josh Poulsen	NO on Detention Center	<p>I am a Utah resident against the planned conversion of the warehouse at 6020 W. 300 South into an ICE detention facility. ICE has amassed in a short time a record of cruelty to individuals, families, and communities, with a court-documented disregard for the law. Regardless of your personal policy on immigration, ICE has proven itself to be untrustworthy and dangerous at this time. Use whatever means available to oppose and remove them from Utah communities. I urge you to act with urgency and courage. • Pass a formal resolution opposing the facility's use as an immigration detention center • Direct city departments to conduct an exhaustive zoning, building code, and infrastructure compliance review • Hold public hearings to give West Side residents an official voice in this process • Support Mayor Mendenhall's efforts with the full weight of the legislative branch Josh Poulsen, Provo Utah resident</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/18/2026 10:43	Carl Smith	Street closures for temple reopening.	<p>Dear Council members: No. East/West divide means nothing then. Do you think that it's only access points on the West Side? North Temple to State Street is probably one of the worst barriers to access between the East and West sides. Start looking on the East side for barriers and you will be surprised. Everything is interconnected in a system. You seem to compartmentalize. I've noticed a significant slowdown and increased barriers to the East side and back since you started your initiative. Plus, who decided to put 15 mile an hour speed bumps on 20 mile an hour streets? Have you compared them to the bumps on the East Side? It's the speed bumps that are a surprisingly physical clear tell of bias. Do you know the economic impact of slowing down or reducing access to either side? What the Church will pay, for the privilege, pales in the reduced business losses because this will only cause congestion across the city, and into the city from the north. Compromise is fine. Here is an alternate plan. Weekends only for a month. Same payout to the City. Millions of people coming to see the same Temple that has been structurally upgraded? Why? What's the motivation? It's not Mecca where you have to try to go if you're Muslim at least once. It's not in any LDS scripture. No motivation. It will be about the same as any new temple opening. Use that as the yardstick. Use Conference weekend as the yardstick. This seems way way over the top. If you do this, it should be at least worth 10 Sorensen Centers on the West Side. Most off, I'm upset about it, but don't need to go to the East side that often. There will be sooooo many upset people that will just keep getting angrier over time and then need someone to blame. People trying to get to the U or the U Hospital, or Huntsman Cancer... It takes longer to get to that major node of activity from the West side, than to Magna, Sandy, Sugar house, etc... than to the U. I'm just trying to help you figure it out. There are more political forces here now that are more powerful than they used to be. Placating might have been politically expedient 7 years ago, but things you've already done have changed the equation. Now there are more consequences you may not see. Just coming from a dude with a degree in Political Science and another in Economics that's observant. Politics is basically just showing up. More people will show up. So, your City needs you to think of them. Carl Smith 4th Generation Salt Lake resident.</p>
3/18/2026 14:15	Ben Thronsen	Sugarhouse park hotel rezone	<p>Just curious why this is even being considered. I this hotel going to benefit the local community in any way? I only see it as generating income for a select few and grossly adding to traffic while taking away more space that could be used for the good of the public.</p>
3/18/2026 15:24	Leeaine Burnett	Please don't approve the ICE detention warehouse	<p>Dear Dan - I am writing to ask you to vote AGAINST allowing the ICE detention warehouse being approved in Salt Lake City. I am disappointed that the building was purchased in a sneaky way and I do not want it in our city. Please use your vote to keep it from being a burden on our community and allowing it to be forced on us when it isn't wanted here Thank you for your service and representing our district. Leeaine Burnett</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/18/2026 15:50	James HEMMERSMEIER	D3/ Proposed Street Closures for Temple Square Reopening Causing Traffic	Councilman Wharton, First of all, I am grateful that you have chosen to serve in the Salt Lake City Council. It takes a lot of time. Thank you. I remain deeply concerned about the traffic plans that I read about with the re-opening of the Salt Lake Temple. It appears that your constituents will shoulder an undue burden of the interruptions. I live in a neighborhood behind the Capitol. It is not a reasonable ask for us to experience major delays in getting to and from our homes for 6 months. I read about the predictions of 22 to 29 thousand visitors per day. The LDS church could ensure those types of crowds do not happen. They could issue a set number of tickets at a much lower number. There are probably many other mitigation options that could be employed. Those of us who live and work in this area should not be expected to have this level of interruption to our lives for 6 months. You represent our district. I implore you to fight for a reasonable accommodation that does not force your constituents to spend countless more hours in our vehicles because of this open house. Chris Hemmersmeier
3/19/2026 10:35	Beth Allen	D2/ Comment Against ICE Warehouse in SLC	I want to go on record to voice my strong opposition to allowing SLC or the state of Utah to participate in housing immigrants in our city and state. We need to call these facilities for what they are "concentration camps" with inhumane conditions. To allow these facilities in our state is reprehensible and immoral. Please use your authority as city leaders to oppose this activity no matter the Trump administration promises in return. We know that his administration cannot be trusted to carry through on promises and this situation is no exception. Thank-you. Beth Allen Taylorsville
3/19/2026 15:47	Wil Ogilvie	Cesar Chavez Blvd	Will the City Council act to remove the name of Cesar Chavez from our city's streets, 500 S. ? He has been exposed as a serial sexual predator and his name on our streets is an insult to all women. The Council should act decisively. Wil Ogilvie
3/19/2026 16:04	Anonymous Constituent	500 South	The new name for this street could and should be Sex Abuser Blvd.
3/19/2026 17:29	Michael Porcelli	Road Closures at Temple Square for 2027	I saw that the projected number of visitors for the 2027 Temple Square Open House, in practical terms, equates to a *maximum* of ~3,000 visitors per hour. This is spread across more than 40 acres. That comes directly from the Executive Director of the Downtown Alliance, Dee Brewer. Is 3,000 people per hour enough to justify closing two major downtown through-streets, each measuring ~90' x 660'? From everything I have seen, there will be no extra on-street programming or usage of the street-space, as our experience has been with the Mayor's annual Open Streets program on Main. There are also no SLC businesses on these blocks, to benefit from a pedestrianized zone... Most visitors will instead spend their time inside the block interiors, off the streets, within the existing Temple Square (which already includes overbuilt 12'-14' security walls). I'll ask again: is such a major inconvenience, the closing of these streets, justified for an entire half year? Perhaps instead of closing Temple streets, we should move our Open Streets on Main to the spring months of 2027 and align with this Temple celebration—this could keep the Temple streets open to through traffic, but encourage all our new visitors to continue their downtown experience along Main and encourage them to patronize our businesses. One last time: the estimate is only ~3,000 visitors per hour, maximum, spread across more than 40 acres of D-1 downtown space. That may be a lot for a typical SLC day, but it does not seem like an overwhelming amount of people. Compare that to a Jazz game, to a Salt Palace convention, to the Twilight concert series! Penn Station in NYC sees 600,000 visitors a day and their wide avenues are narrower than SLC streets, their sidewalks not much wider either. Yet they do not have to close their surrounding roadways for pedestrian safety...

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/19/2026 21:11	Jonathan Liddle	Sugarhouse hotel support - old sizzler	The hotel plan looks good. Thanks for stopping the cum and go!
3/19/2026 21:58	Anonymous Constituent	Sugar House	I'm against having a hotel next to Sugar House Park. Seven stories is too big.
3/20/2026 11:46	Michael Porcelli	Proposed Street Closure for Temple Square Reopening	Hello Council Member Wharton, I am your constituent and neighbor in District 3, Capitol Hill. I am writing to you about my concerns on the pending proposal to lease public streets surrounding Temple Square for private and exclusive use by the Church. I was in attendance for the March 10th council meeting where this was discussed, and I wanted to thank you for your nuanced and thoughtful summary about the complexities and issues that could arise from this proposal, were it to pass. I would like to offer some of my own thoughts or feedback on the subject, some in line with what is being discussed and negotiated, but others I have not seen weighed or addressed by any stakeholder publicly. My main criticism thus far has been a problematic conflation between the concept of making "safe streets" for visitors and making "private exclusive-use" streets for visitors, which are not remotely the same thing. I completely support Open House visitors coming to celebrate in our community, and as an active streets-user, I obviously support keeping streets safe for everyone. But I think public space needs to remain a shared space. I'm sure you get hundreds of emails, so instead of expanding on each concern, I've composed some quick visuals: map overlays with short summaries illustrating my thoughts. If these would be more useful as written text, please let me know and I will compose and forward that along instead. Hopefully you and the other stakeholders find this feedback useful. I am not against a fair compromise for all parties, I just want to make sure the people leading the negotiation are fairly weighing the costs and concerns of community members. Thank you for your understanding on this matter. Michael Porcelli Capitol Hill resident
3/20/2026 12:31	Alan Hayes	Closure of Streets Around Temple Square	Hello Chris, Congrats on your re-election. I would like to register my disapproval of the church closing North Temple from April to October 2027 during the temple reopening events. North Temple is a vital access route into and out of the Avenues. It was bad enough that access was limited for the last couple years, but at least the street was almost always open, even if it was constricted and sometimes backed up and quite inconvenient. But closing North Temple for seven months is just way too disruptive to automobile traffic. There must be some other way to allow safe access to Temple Square without closing North Temple. I would wager that 60% of my automobile trips utilize North Temple. There is really no easy way around that block. I vehemently oppose the closing of North Temple for seven months. Thanks and keep up the good work, Alan Hayes
3/20/2026 15:48	Scott Daniels	Cesar Chavez avenue	Please rename this street
3/20/2026 16:15	Jania SOMMERS	Sugar House hotel rezone, VOTE NO	Dear Council members, I cannot say forcefully enough how much I am opposed to putting a hotel on the edge of Sugar House Park. The very last thing that intersection needs is more traffic, already challenging, already pedestrian and bike unfriendly. Other than greed, what is the point of this project. Add the land back to the park and make it an integral part of nature. Paving over Salt Lake City is monstrously bad idea.
3/20/2026 16:17	Tonua Hamilton	No to the rezone at 1300 E 2100 South to allow a mega hotel!	The character of Sugarhouse has already been ruined with the increase of high density housing and already a hotel. Another hotel in this high traffic location will make it even more difficult to navigate this intersection. It will also destroy the 'atmosphere' of the park and make it yet another 'business district'. This is such a bad choice! Tonua Hamilton

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/20/2026 16:19	Lynne Olson	Opposition to Sugar House Hotel Rezone	<p>Dear City Council Members, The pond in Sugar House Park is a popular recreational feature, but in the event of a flood, it is a major retention basin in Salt Lake City's flood plan. The State Flood Zone map indicates that all of the Park property is in the Parley's Creek flood zone area. The map does not designate the private land being proposed for development, but major flood events have never made allowances for private property. Floods have always threatened the Sugar Business District. In 2005, water flows through SH Park reached 200 cubic feet per second. Major flooding occurred here in 1922, 1952, 1956,1983, and 2017. When sewer and water lines reached capacity, excess water was diverted to nearby streets or properties using sandbags to construct temporary water channels. Debris swept up by floodwater blocked segments of the creek, forcing the water to flow onto private property. Despite the diligent efforts of City and County engineers and public officials, no one can foresee events like cloudbursts and flashfloods (1952). Despite the optimism of the Magnus developers, it is foolish to deny that Sugar House Park is, first-and-foremost, a flood detention basin. Respectfully, Lynne Olson</p>
3/20/2026 16:53	Bim Oliver	D7/ Comment Against the Sugar House Hotel Proposal	<p>Council Member Wharton: I am writing to urge you to deny Sugar House Hotel LLC's proposal to amend the zoning of the property at approximately 2111 South 1300 East from MU-3 (Mixed-Use 3 District) to MU-8 (Mixed-Use 8 District) and to amend the Sugar House Community Master Plan Future Land Use Map from Mixed Use-Low Intensity to Business District Mixed-Use – Town Center Scale. Please review the attached document that outlines the numerous arguments for denial. Each is substantial enough on its own merits to warrant denial. Collectively, they present an overwhelming justification for denial. Don't hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention. Bim Oliver Salt Lake City</p>
3/20/2026 16:56	Jack Kay	D4/ Rename Cesar Chavez Street	<p>Olivia, Chris, I am writing as a resident of Salt Lake City's 3rd District. Like many of my neighbors, I am shocked and deeply troubled by the allegations of serial sexual abuse against Cesar Chavez brought to light in a recent New York Times investigation. I am writing to urge you to take immediate action to rename the sections of 500 South currently bearing his name. I must be frank about my concern with the City Council's statement that you will "continue to monitor developments and consider next steps as more information becomes available." I find myself asking: what further information is needed? The delay risks sending a troubling message: that the Council is more concerned with protecting the reputation of a deceased abuser than with standing firmly against sexual violence. Many other cities have already acted swiftly and decisively. Denver and Los Angeles, to name a couple, have proceeded in renaming honorary streets, removing sculptures, and retiring holidays. I do not believe they are moving too quickly. I believe they are moving appropriately. I would also push back on the instinct to rename the street after another individual. The true heroes of the farmworker unionization movement were the workers themselves, not any one person. With that in mind, I would like to suggest renaming the relevant sections of 500 South "Farmworkers Boulevard". Respectfully, I urge you and your colleagues to act without further delay. With respect, Jack Kay</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/20/2026 16:58	Kara Pettit	Proposed Street Closure for Temple Square Reopening	<p>I recently learned of this proposal to close N. Temple, S. Temple and W. Temple for 7 months, so I listened to the Council meeting from February at which City Staff made their presentation. I appreciate the advocacy for your constituents that both of you demonstrated at the February meeting. Chris knows me and I live in his District. Ms. Petro, I've copied you on this email as well because I thought your comments, questions and concerns were spot on. After listening to the Staff presentation, I was left with the following questions: 1. What is the basis for the estimate there will be 22K-29K visitors each day for 6 entire months? Does the City have an understanding of the correctness of that estimate, and the extent the Church is using the Conference Center for visitors in addition to Temple Square? 2. I did not hear any data on traffic or pedestrian counts for any of the streets that were proposed to be closed. I suspect the traffic count on N. Temple far exceeds the counts on either S. Temple or W. Temple. Because, as you both pointed out, N. Temple is the primary east-west arterial for anyone coming from north of S. Temple. Thus, the impact of closing that street is tremendous, and for 7 months! It was a disaster when they closed it for much shorter periods for the construction contractors. 3. Has the City evaluated alternatives to closing N. Temple? Could temporary pedestrian bridges be built? Please ensure alternatives are explored. 4. Please also ensure the analysis of this proposal includes a comprehensive assessment of other temporary road closures that may occur during these 7 months. The work on the 600 North bridge is impacting east/west traffic now, and I am uncertain of the timeline for that project. Ms. Petro also mentioned 400 S may be partially closed for construction at some point. 200 West is likely to be closed at some level during this time for construction of the new school. Closures for events at the Delta Center, etc. etc. 5. Someone at the February hearing phrased this a closure during summer months, implying it would not have as much effect on students traveling east/west. The proposal includes the last 3.5 months of the 2026-27 school year and the first 2 months of the 2027-28 year. It will have a significant impact on students and families. 6. Why does the Church need to use private buses to shuttle people from an area near the Fairpark to Temple Square, instead of utilizing Trax? I thought Councilman Puy's comment on the impact on air quality was well-taken. The buses will also add to the traffic congestion caused by the closure of N. Temple. Is there something the City, in conjunction with UTA, can do to minimize additional traffic from buses and encourage the use of Trax or existing transit? Thanks for your consideration and service.</p> <p>Sincerely, Kara Pettit</p>
3/21/2026 11:20	Eric Gardiner	Sugarhouse hotel - SUPPORT	I support the hotel rezone next to Sugarhouse park. It will be such a great destination in our city and community.
3/23/2026 12:14	Lauren Webster	Renaming Cesar Chavez Street Suggestion to Dolores Huerta	<p>Hello, I noticed the city council is looking at re-naming Cesar Chavez Blvd due to sexual abuse allegations; I wanted to suggest re-naming it after Dolores Huerta. She is a leader of the American labor movement and a civil rights & feminist movement activist, and co-founded the National Farm Workers Association. I feel like this change would continue to show support for the movement that inspired naming the street after Chavez and honor that history, while also making a statement against sexual abuse and showing support to the victims of such.</p> <p>Thank you so much for your consideration! Lauren Webster</p>
3/23/2026 12:20	Sara Matson Westover	Create a Lawsuit Against the Department of Homeland Security	Please take action and bring a lawsuit against DHS! Sara Westover

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/23/2026 12:26	Brigitte BEBEY	ICE detention shift to focus on more local solutions	<p>To Salt Lake City Council Members, I am writing to share my perspective regarding the city's current approach to immigration enforcement, particularly the decision to engage federal agencies at the local level. I want to begin by acknowledging that I have, in the past, supported the enforcement of immigration laws, including the deportation of undocumented individuals. I believe that laws exist for a reason and should be upheld. However, my support has always been rooted in a belief in balanced, fair, and community-conscious enforcement. It is for that reason that I feel compelled to express concern about the current tactic of involving federal agencies in what I believe are matters that can and should be handled by our local institutions. Our local law enforcement agencies are capable, accountable to our community, and better positioned to carry out their responsibilities with an understanding of the people they serve. Beyond concerns about jurisdiction and efficiency, I am also troubled by the financial implications of this approach. The cost of hiring or coordinating with federal agencies places an additional burden on our city's resources—funds that could otherwise be directed toward community programs, infrastructure, or public safety initiatives that more directly benefit residents. Equally important is the cultural impact of these decisions. Our city has long prided itself on being a place of friendliness, openness, and acceptance. Policies and actions that create fear or division within our community run counter to those values.</p> <p>Even when enforcement is necessary, it should be carried out in a way that reflects who we are as a city—measured, respectful, and mindful of the broader social fabric. I urge the Council to reconsider the current approach and to prioritize solutions that rely on our local agencies, uphold the law, and remain aligned with our community's values. We can maintain both order and compassion, and I believe our city is strongest when we do both. Thank you for your time and consideration. Sincerely, Brigitte Bebey, Utah Resident</p>
3/23/2026 12:31	Erica Oliver	Action against ICE Detention center	<p>Dear city council members, I am writing to you today as an outraged constituent who demands immediate action. The acquisition of a warehouse in Salt Lake City to be converted into an ICE detention facility is an affront to the values of this community, and I expect you — as my elected representative — to do everything in your power to stop it. This is not abstract policy. This is a mass detention facility being built in our city, in our neighborhoods. Salt Lake City is a community built on the labor, culture, and contributions of immigrants. A detention facility of this scale does not make us safer — it makes us complicit in a system that has repeatedly been documented for its inhumane conditions, lack of medical care, family separation, and due process violations. I want to know, explicitly and on the record: What are YOU doing to stop this? Are you coordinating with the mayor's office? Are you exploring every legal, legislative, and regulatory tool available to block or delay this facility? Are you consulting with civil rights attorneys and immigration advocates? If not — why not? Your silence or inaction on this issue will not be forgotten. The residents of Salt Lake City are watching. We will remember who stood up and who stood aside when it mattered. This is your moment to lead. I expect nothing less than your full, public, and aggressive opposition to this detention center. Demanding action, Erica Oliver</p>
3/23/2026 12:42	Rolayne Fairclough	ICE Detention Facility	<p>Hello Council Member Dugan, this is Rolayne Fairclough. I live just behind you on Skyline Circle. I'm calling about the detention center. I read an article about all the government tax money that's going to come in. Well, the federal government does not pay taxes to local government, real estate taxes, because of the Constitutional Supremacy Clause. So that whole piece of their argument is a lie. I wish the city council would make a law, or a ruling, that it is illegal to have a detention center in Salt Lake and do it before they start filling it up. This is appalling, and it's just, there's no other word, it's appalling. If you have any questions, please give me a call: REDACTED Thank you, good-bye.</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/23/2026 12:45	Bim Oliver	Deny Sugar House Hotel Proposal	Council Member Dugan: I am writing to urge you to deny Sugar House Hotel LLC's proposal to amend the zoning of the property at approximately 2111 South 1300 East from MU-3 (Mixed-Use 3 District) to MU-8 (Mixed-Use 8 District) and to amend the Sugar House Community Master Plan Future Land Use Map from Mixed Use-Low Intensity to Business District Mixed-Use – Town Center Scale. Please review the attached document that outlines the numerous arguments for denial. Each is substantial enough on its own merits to warrant denial. Collectively, they present an overwhelming justification for denial. Don't hesitate to contact me if you have any questions. Thank you for your attention. Bim Oliver Salt Lake City
3/23/2026 12:49	Pat Murdoch	Bad Idea to House Undocumented Individuals in Utah	Please add my name to oppose the location of the ICE facility in Salt Lake City and file a lawsuit against DHS. I believe it is a terrible idea to house undocumented individuals in our state and I certainly do not agree with Gov. Cox on this. Pat Murdoch, Murray, UT
3/23/2026 13:10	Kara Boeckmann	Lawsuit against DHS	Dear Councilwoman Lopez Chavez, I am begging you to take action and bring a lawsuit against DHS. What would doing this accomplish? It would protect our civil liberties and human rights—both for ourselves and for our neighbors. It would create red tape for ICE and set back their timelines. It would also empower public officials like yourself to take brave action against this inhumane threat to our community. Sincerely, Kara Boeckmann
3/23/2026 13:32	Camille Thorpe	Not a Win-Win	Not a Win-Win Purchasing the Iconic mountain range view, in the middle of a safe Sugar House location, and trade for traffic and trouble -- is NOT a win-win.
3/23/2026 14:34	George Chapman	Best arguments against Sugar House Hotel Rezone	The right hand lane of 1300E for turning east onto 2100S is way too busy to have a parking lot entrance on 1300E. It will create traffic problems similar to 5+ drive throughs on that corner that SLC has recognized and PROMISED to stop. In addition, the tall building will create hazardous conditions during winter for bicyclists and pedestrians. The height is way too tall for community and pedestrian safety. Finally, a big parking garage and the large number of vehicles will endanger the nearby waterway due to runoff. Please work with developers to provide the least impact to the community. It should be obvious that a 5 story hotel should be economically viable (less than half the size and height). Don't let developers run roughshod over the community in order to let them make a bigger profit. George Chapman

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/23/2026 14:36	Andrea Schaefer	March 24 City Council Meeting / Statement of Support for Ruff Haven Crisis Sheltering Housing Funding Application	<p>Subject: Statement of Support for Ruff Haven Crisis Sheltering Housing Funding Application March 24th, 2026, Salt Lake City Council Hearing</p> <p>Dear Salt Lake City Council Members, I am writing to express my strong support for Ruff Haven Crisis Sheltering and their proposed outreach project serving unhoused individuals with companion animals in our community. As the Executive Director of the nonprofit Tailwinds Rental Assistance-dedicated to keeping people and their pets together by reducing barriers to pet-inclusive housing- particularly through assistance with pet deposits and pet fees - I have had the privilege of getting to know Ruff Haven's leadership team over the past three years. During that time, I have watched their impact in the Salt Lake community grow in both scale and effectiveness. They have become a trusted and influential voice in addressing the critical intersection of housing instability and pet ownership—and their work, in fact, directly inspired the creation and mission of Tailwinds. It is essential that our community recognize what national data clearly demonstrates: companion animals are not a barrier to stability, but a vital lifeline. For many individuals experiencing housing insecurity, pets provide emotional support, safety, and a sense of purpose. Any effort to address affordable housing or homelessness that does not account for companion animals risks falling short of meaningful, lasting impact. Ruff Haven's street outreach model reflects what we know to be the gold standard in serving vulnerable populations—meeting people where they are, building trust through person-to-person engagement, and connecting them to resources in a way that is both compassionate and practical. Their targeted outreach to individuals with pets is not only innovative, but necessary, particularly given that many remain unaware of evolving pet-inclusive shelter options. I can personally attest to the strength of Ruff Haven's leadership. They are courageous, strategic, and deeply committed to serving this often-overlooked population with dignity and care. Their ability to rapidly expand their reach while maintaining thoughtful, high-quality programming speaks to both their capability and their integrity. I strongly urge you to consider funding this outreach initiative. Investments in programs like Ruff Haven's do more than address immediate needs—they create pathways to stable housing, strengthen community trust, and reflect the compassion and forward-thinking values of Salt Lake City. It is difficult to imagine a more impactful use of resources in advancing both housing solutions and humane care.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration and for your continued commitment to our community. Sincerely, Andrea Schaefer Executive Director Tailwinds Rental Assistance</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/23/2026 14:46	Lynn Schwarz 1/2	PLNPCM2025-00622, PLNPCM2025-00624	<p>Re: General Plan Amendment and Zoning Map Amendment for Sugar House Hotel Parcel Not generated by A.I. The massive Mixed Use Zoning Consolidation has just recently been enacted. The Planning Department up-zoned and increased the density potential for the Sugar House Business District (SHBD). It is therefore noteworthy that the proper zoning for this parcel, which abuts Sugar House Park (SHP), was deliberately designated as MU-3. The proposed re-zone does not preserve open space and critical environmental areas. It does not accommodate and promote an increase in Salt Lake City's population. It does not protect water quality and supply by protecting ground water sources. To the contrary, it puts these fragile resources in danger. This re-zone does not identify, preserve and enhance view corridors and vistas, including views of natural lands around and within the City. This re-zone does not support and encourage architecture, development and infrastructure that is people focused and responsive to its surrounding context to enhance the public realm. In fact, it does the opposite. The Sugar House Master Plan (SHMP) does not, in any way, contemplate expansion of the Business District east of 1300 East. In fact, it very clearly excludes the area east of 1300 East from the Business District and emphasizes the parcel is considered on the periphery of the Business District. The SHMP values maintaining its historic character and encourages compatible development. The SHMP states the Town Center Scale should be centered around Monument Plaza and ends at the west side of 1300 East. Monument Plaza is considered the Gateway to Sugar House, not this parcel. The Community Benefits identified as pertaining to this project to support the re-zone are B - providing commercial space for local businesses and F - expanding public infrastructure that expands capacity for future development. For B the project proposes providing 25% below market rent for 3500 sq. ft., to be divided into 2 spaces, as well as an interest free loan for build out. Free space for community use, without free or reserved garage parking. A Greenbike station on Sugar House Park property. Public use of underground parking, which will not be free or reserved. 50 proposed FTE jobs (this is misleading as most will be part time with no benefits, as is customary in the industry). Except for the space for local businesses, none of these should be considered as meeting Community Benefit B. It is also a problematic conclusion that local eateries will welcome more competition from the hotel facilities.</p>
3/23/2026 14:46	Lynn Schwarz 2/2	CONTINUED!! PLNPCM2025-00622, PLNPCM2025-00624	<p>For F the project proposes that the hotel will provide 24 security for Sugar House Park. However, Sugar House Park is not a 24 hour destination and trying to make it one or an adjunct to this project is contrary to the use and purpose of the Park. Also that the public will have use of the garage. It also posits that the cost of the garage is a future expansion of public infrastructure. It also touts integrated Park improvements, which are clearly not future infrastructure expansions. None of these can realistically be considered as meeting section F. Other assertions are that the project will compete with AIRBNBs. It will not. While it is nice to believe that most of the hotel patrons will arrive with and use public transit while at the hotel, this is naive. While Sugar House is a great place to live, it is not a destination. Most visitors will go skiing or downtown. Since public transit does not run late enough for people to return in the evening, use of public transit is not practical. The General Plan Amendment and Zoning Map Amendment will stay with the parcel, not with the project. Therefore, any use allowed in MU-8 would be possible, whether suitable for a parcel which abuts a park or not. For all of the above reasons, the General Plan Amendment and Zoning Map Amendment should both be denied as inappropriate for this parcel and MU-3 should continue to be the proper zone.</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/23/2026 14:49	Jennifer Plumb	Support for Ruff Haven Street Outreach and ESG Funding	<p>Dear Council Members, As the founder of Utah Naloxone and a community partner, I've seen firsthand the impact of Ruff Haven's street outreach team. Their work aligns directly with Salt Lake City's priorities to invest in wraparound services beyond shelters and expand mobile homeless resources. By bringing veterinary care, supplies, and support directly to unsheltered individuals with pets, they remove a critical barrier to accessing healthcare, shelter, and housing. We regularly see individuals refuse shelter or housing if it means being separated from their pets. Ruff Haven's work helps address that barrier and creates a pathway for people to engage with services. This outreach builds trust, connects people to care, and supports better outcomes for both individuals and the broader community. I strongly support ESG funding for Ruff Haven's street outreach program.</p> <p>Please reach out to me with any questions! Sincerely, Jen Jennifer Plumb,</p>
3/23/2026 14:51	Marian Florence	No ICE in Salt Lake City	<p>I am writing in hopes that you can follow the examples of Maryland and Roxbury, New Jersey in their efforts to block ICE detention centers from being built and bring a lawsuit against the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). We have so many other priorities in Salt Lake City to make our home safe, healthy and economically vibrant. I am not able to attend tomorrow's City Council meeting due to rehearsal so I hope this comment can be brought officially to the Council before or during that meeting. Thank you, Marian Florence Salt Lake City 84102</p>
3/23/2026 14:53	John Spangler	SUPPORT ICE AND THE RULE OF LAW	<p>I urge you to reject attempts to place any restrictions on propose ICE detention facilities in Utah. The wild exaggerations by activists claiming massive abuse of detainees are not accurate, (although no organization is ever 100% in execution of their duties). We need to stand for the rule of law, and apprehend people who have broken our laws and if illegal immigrants to remove them from our country. If you oppose ICE, then you are favoring criminals over law abiding citizens, and need to tell us all the laws that we residents of Salt Lake County are free to ignore if we don't like them. NO new restrictions on ICE! Thank you. John Spangler Salt Lake City resident and voter.</p>
3/23/2026 15:06	Emily White	DHS lawsuit	<p>Dear Salt Lake City Council, My name is Emily White. I live in Salt Lake County and work as an English Language educator in higher education. I am very opposed to the ICE detention center in Salt Lake County. I work with legal immigrant populations who are highly committed to seeking education to improve their lives, our communities and economy. The proposed ICE detention center creates an imminent threat for all in our communities and will make irreparable harm to the inclusive culture and development of our state. I ask that you consider filing a lawsuit against the Department of Homeland Security to deter and prevent the the detention center in Utah. With respect, Emily White</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/23/2026 15:20	Kaitlyn Rowbotham	Urgent: Oppose ICE Detention Facility & Pursue Legal Action	<p>Dear Council Members, I am writing to express my deep concern and opposition to the reported plan for an ICE detention facility in Salt Lake City. While our community successfully pushed back against a similar proposal in January, it is alarming to see renewed efforts to establish a detention center here. Across the country, these facilities have been linked to serious reports of abuse, inadequate living conditions, and violations of due process—including the detention of U.S. citizens and lawful residents. Salt Lake City has an opportunity—and a responsibility—to act. I urge the City Council to work in coordination with the County Council to pursue legal action against the Department of Homeland Security to block this facility. Other jurisdictions, including those in Maryland and New Jersey, have taken steps to challenge similar developments. We should do the same. Taking action would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protect the civil liberties and human rights of our community members • Create necessary legal barriers to delay or prevent harmful implementation • Demonstrate moral leadership in the face of a serious threat to our community <p>This is a moment for courage and clarity. I ask you to stand with your constituents and take decisive action. Sincerely, Kaitlyn Rowbotham, Sandy 84092</p>
3/23/2026 15:21	Ranee Lee	Ice Facility	<p>Hello, I'm writing to oppose the ICE facility in Salt Lake City. This is an abhorrent action that we must work against. Please say no to ICE in our city! Your constituent, Ranee Bullard, MED</p>
3/23/2026 15:22	Randall Carlisle	Federal Grants	<p>Dear Council Members, I'm writing as a community partner and board member to share the impact of Ruff Haven's street outreach team. Their work removes a key barrier for unsheltered individuals with pets by providing supplies, veterinary care, and support. This allows people to access shelter and services without having to give up their animals. Just as important, the team builds trust and connection with individuals who are often disconnected from traditional systems. I've spent the last ten years working at Odyssey House and for many years people have said they wanted our residential help with substance use disorder, but they had nowhere to keep their pet. Odyssey worked out an arrangement with Ruff Haven and now dozens of people have found recovery in our programs while Ruff Haven fostered their pets. It's another tool as the City works on solutions for the unsheltered. This work is making a meaningful difference in our community, and I strongly encourage continued support. Sincerely, Randall Carlisle Odyssey House of Utah</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/23/2026 15:27	Annette Judd 1/2	Constituent Opposition: Tuesday Meeting regarding ICE activities	<p>Constituent Opposition: Proposed ICE Facility in Salt Lake City, Utah. I live in the downtown district near Little America. I have lived most of my life in Bountiful, Utah. I have lived in Utah since the late 1950's. I was raised in an LDS environment and am well versed in Mormon beliefs and history. I have lived in other states, cities in Utah and across the ocean. I have traveled internationally for decades. I am deeply concerned about the environment and effect that this current administration in Utah and in the U.S.A. is having for our citizens and globally. The whole world knows that what happens in the U.S. affects them, even in their isolated little village or town. As a Nation we are celebrating our democracy experiment of 250 years, and we are failing horribly respecting that sacrifice and ideal. This current administration made promises cloaked in division, regression, fear and chaos. They are striving to destroy everything that was what made our country admired, and valued. History teaches, if we are willing to learn and employ the lessons offered from that history. Utah has been a place of refuge and freedom from oppression and divisive beliefs. I am old enough to remember that Utah and religious institutions of this State have been a haven of hope, peace and refuge to many from Nations around this globe. Offering programs to teach, integrate and gather for those oppressed and hunted by those who live and operate in the realms of greed, fear and evil. During WWII Utah citizens gave into this same fear and fenced in a group of citizens in our west desert, Topaz. We can learn from this mistake and heartbreak. I urge our local elected officials, from the U.S. Senate/Congress down to our City and County representatives. I plead with you, let Utah be the Light to the World that we once professed to be; and hold our State and its citizens as a "lighthouse" of hope, faith, love, inclusion, opportunity, and refuge. Demand that the evil and divisiveness that is this current administration leave our State, immediately. Let them know with a sounding voice that our community will remain as it has been defined by stability, compassion and love for humanity. Our community ideals and practices are not, nor will they be a place of fear, division, hate, racism, misogyny, fascism, or detention. Detention Centers and the current activities of ICE go against local values of compassion, inclusion, and safety. With the current economic environment and lack of stability city resources should focus on supporting residents, not on aiding federal detention infrastructure. I would urge the City Council, County Council members to use this opportunity to pass formal resolution statements that resounding oppose not only the ICE Detention Center, but all activities that these types of activities create. Federal immigration enforcement officers utilized increasingly aggressive arrest and crowd control tactics during operations in this last year plus has resulted in numerous allegations against officers for violating individual rights, using unnecessary force, and racially profiling. Options to hold the federal government and officers accountable are complicated, but some states and localities have stepped in to make this path easier.</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/23/2026 15:27	Annette Judd 2/2	CONTINUED!! Constituent Opposition: Tuesday Meeting regarding ICE activities	<p>Other such targeted states and localities have created mechanisms to collect evidence and document patterns of federal agents violating the rights of community members: • Illinois Governor JB Pritzker created the Illinois Accountability Commission to investigate and document civil rights abuses stemming from federal immigration enforcement operations in the Chicago area. • The California Office of the Attorney General launched an online portal for members of the public to submit reports of potentially unlawful actions in the state by federal agents, to inform possible legal actions that the state may take to protect Californians. • The New Orleans City Council published a Know Your Rights webpage that asks residents to upload videos of potential misconduct by federal immigration officials and publishes Know Your Rights information for community members. Bolstering intragovernmental coordination efforts with city wide, county wide planning and response of community members and local law enforcement members can help unite our ever-dividing communities allow for coordination of efforts and training to show our collective opposition to these types of federal overreach programs and efforts. Please do all in your power to keep an ICE facility of deprivation and despair out of our borders. I am depending on you to do the right thing, regardless of your politics or religious beliefs. This is about human lives, humanity and our future upon this planet. Let us be that Lighthouse to the rest of the world, as we were a state founded by emigrants, outcasts, and the unwanted. Let us reignite those. Annette Judd</p>
3/23/2026 15:33	Andrew Katsohirakis	LUZ Comment	<p>SHCC Comment Form List of Proposals Sugar House Hotel First Name Andrew Last Name Katsohirakis Email REDACTED Your Comments for the Planning Commission I actually like the plan for the hotel, for the most part. Something was always going to be developed on this corner, people need to be realistic. However, this is a prime opportunity to mandate that the developer maximize good urbanism at this location, to better increase the quality of life of Sugar House. In order to better integrate with the adjacent Parleys Trail, the developer should include a large amount of bike parking, so that cyclists can stop at the future hotel cafe and enjoy the view of the park and of Mt Olympus. This would be extremely beneficial to the hotel, as well, by guaranteeing a customer base of avid cyclists. To that end, the developer should also sponsor a Greenbike bikeshare station as well (either on site or close by in Sugar House Park). The Greenbike system increases in convenience and usability via the network effect, aka you need to expand the network in order for it to be actually accessible and useful for people. This is a much better option than if the developer partnered with a private bikeshare service that didn't integrate with the larger city network. Finally, I would like to see more robust infrastructure that actually connects the hotel to the park and to Parleys Trail. That old Sizzler corner has long been disconnected from Sugar House Park. This is the opportunity to rectify that</p>
3/23/2026 15:40	Allan Sanderson	Late but I hope useful **Attachment 1 - 3 Pages	<p>Hello Judi, Please find attached my comments to SLC Planning regarding the Sugarhouse Hotel zoning proposal. Though too late for your letter I hope you will find it helpful. I will admit to being rather behind in following all of the meetings but will Sugarhouse CC being holding any additional meetings for this proposal or has it now shifted to the City and the Planning Commission? You might recall my name as sometime ago we had very good discussion regarding the early 21 & 21 redevelopment. Still today I use your example of those who live in the condo to the north and their complaint about the proposed six or seven story building blocking their view. You were so very eloquent in pointing out that without the zoning change a building just as tall as theirs could be built. Which is exactly what happened. As I tell people, it is a lesson in civics and due diligence. Thank you and thanks for your perseverance all these years. Cheers, Allen Allen Sanderson</p>



Salt Lake City Planning Commission
City Hall
451 South State Street
Salt Lake City UT, 84111

Re: Petition Number: PLNPCM2025-00622 & PLNPCM2025-00624
Redevelopment of property at 2111 South 1300 East

To the Salt Lake City Planning Commission,

I am writing in opposition of the applications for a Zoning Map Amendment and a Master Plan Amendment for the property at 2111 South 1300 East.

This property is adjacent to Sugarhouse Park which is a regional landmark public park. As such development adjacent to it must be befitting of a regional landmark public park that is enjoyed by tens of thousands of people from not only Salt Lake City but from the surrounding communities.

A seven story hotel is not an appropriate usage that is worthy of a Zoning Map Amendment and a Master Plan Amendment. Especially given the proposed Zoning Map Amendment would rezone the property from MU-3 to MU-8. Zones that were newly adopted by the City Council less than two months ago (7 July 2025).

A seven story hotel while potentially providing tax revenue will not benefit the park or the local and greater community. A hotel is for out of the area visitors not the local and greater community.

Though the hotel will have a on-sight restaurant and coffee shop they will not be utilized by the local and greater community. Rare are hotel restaurants “destination” restaurants. That is, hotel restaurants are mainly patronage by those staying at the hotel. Local hotels with “destination” restaurants are located in downtown business/entertainment districts which support more traffic.

Similarly for the coffee shop will mainly be patronage by those staying at the hotel. Most people visiting a coffee shop want quick, easy access. The hotel location is not conducive to such access especially given the proposed access through Sugarhouse Park.

Retail space is also proposed with in the hotel. Such space is non-sensical within the hotel as it is not adjacent to other properties which to attach customers. That is, it will be difficult for a stand-a-lone business to thrive.

For each of the above there is also an accessibility issue. The hotel proposes approximately 145 rooms. Yet will only be constructing approximately 180 parking spaces. If the hotel is “fully” occupied with each guest using a vehicle, that leaves 35 parking spaces, the majority of which will be needed by the employees as there is no additional parking within the area. As such, there is will be no parking for non-guests.

It should be noted that to accommodate 180 parking spaces which are all to be underground and assuming intermediate parking efficiency of 360 sq ft per space, it would require approximately 64,000 sq. ft.. Given the small lot size, 35,800 sq. ft. the parking would require a minimum of two, likely three underground levels. Such a parking structure is not inviting and would have a reduced level of Service (LOS) as the majority of the parking spaces would not be on "flat" parking surfaces.

Specific comments from the application.

The hotel would not be a "pedestrian first", "vibrant character", "mixed-use" project. It would be an isolated hotel on the far edge across a major roadway. Walking through the tunnel is often unappealing because of the unhoused persons living there. There would be no mixed usage as all of the facilities would be hotel guest focused. Vibrant character is subjective and speculative.

The while perhaps aligned with the development to the west, it is not aligned with the development to the east. There is a reason for zoning boundaries. 1300 East is such a boundary that must be respected.

The proposed project is not designed to provide services for park visitors it is designed to provide services to hotel guests. Given the project's desire to utilize the Sugarhouse Park roads for egress the hotel will detract from the park because of the increase in traffic. Especially given that the park road way is one way plus has a bike and pedestrian way co-located.

The project falsely claims it will construct sidewalks providing easier access. Further, the conceptual plans do not even show a side walk between the project and the tunnel. The project as sketched will remove multiple landmark trees that currently shield the private property from the park. Note it is not clear if the trees are on private or public property.

The project speciously claims that it will improve security. Crime has not been an issue in the park.

The project would not be a connection or a gateway. The current tunnel serves that purpose. The project would not strengthen the neighborhood as there is no immediate neighborhood. The project would not improve the public open space unless it would be to the benefit of the project not the public. The project would not strengthen the Sugarhouse business district. Most of the business are, in general focused on the local residents not visitors.

A 7th floor restaurant is not needed to provide views of the surrounding area and mountains. A 3rd floor restaurant would provide the same views.

The project falsely claims denying the application would deter future development initiatives. There have been two proposals, a gas station and a hotel. The property in its current state is not a blight. The previous building has been removed. All that remains is an empty lot. Denying the application would not impede the broader neighbor redevelopment. There is no immediate neighborhood just a park. The redevelopment to the west has continued unimpeded for over a decade. There is no redevelopment to the north. To the south is an interstate.

The offer for the community to the utilize the project's meeting rooms is not feasible because of the lack of parking.

All-in-all the project makes many many specious claims to benefit the local community but when examined they fail. The benefit would simply be for those staying at the hotel.

To approve the application the burden is on project to demonstrate that there is a substantial need not being currently met. Within the Sugarhouse Business District there are two existing hotels. There are also multiple existing coffee shops as well as many restaurants. The application fails to meet the burden. For that reason and those previously listed the application must be denied.

The above should not in any form be construed that development at that location is not appropriate. Development is appropriate but it must be befitting of a regional landmark public park that is enjoyed by tens of thousands of people with the primary purpose of serving the local residents while fitting within the existing zoning.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Allen R. Sanderson". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Allen Sanderson

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/23/2026 15:43	Natalie Taylor	Take action and bring a lawsuit against DHS	Dear Council members, I am writing to implore you to protect our civil liberties and humans rights for ourselves and our neighbors and bring a lawsuit against DHS. We do not need a detention center in the state of Utah. Please take brave action against this threat to our community and block the ICE detention center from being built. Sincerely, Natalie Taylor
3/23/2026 15:45	Anonymous Constituent	ICE facility	please take necessary decision to stop property for the ICE detention. I am fully opposed on this. Thanks Thomas Chancellor
3/23/2026 16:28	Anonymous Constituent	ICE facility	Hello. I'm a very concerned citizen, Salt Lake City citizen, about an ICE detention center being put out by the airport. I think it's just an abhorrent, horrible idea for many, many reasons. So I'll just, let you know how I feel. Please leave this very, very seriously. Thank you. Bye bye.
3/23/2026 16:34	Donna Shattuck	ICE facility	My name is Donna Shattuck. I live a REDACTED. I'm in District 6. And I'd like to leave a comment about the iced purchase of a warehouse on the West Side, and I want our city council to where they can to make sure that that facility is run with calm kind, common sense dignity to anyone who has to be housed there. Thank you.
3/23/2026 16:41	Sheila Gilman	ICE facility	Hi. This is Sheila Gilman, and I don't live in the city. I live at 84124, but I spend a lot of time in the city. So I live in Mill Creek, but I prefer to say Salt Lake City. So, I am against the ice. I think it was lucrative. I think they spent a huge amount of money, and I think it's an immature city. But I also think that a bigger embarrassment is a dry Salt Lake. So we have to do something. The air is terrible today, dust and sand, and, we need to preserve Salt Lake or maybe change the name if we don't have a lake. So I'm calling for both reasons, but I really think that the city should come out against the ice. Thank you. Bye.
3/23/2026 16:42	Paul Zuckerman	Sugarhouse Hotel Rezoning Request	Good Evening Paul Zuckerman Salt Lake homeowner Graduate Degree in Park and Recreation Management I oppose changing the rezoning of this parcel. At an earlier council meeting, a developer was proposing a new condo to be built on the corner of 13th South and State Street. It would represent a welcomed upgrade to the aging, underutilized existing strip mall. Rightly so, council members took the time to ask if the building would be no more than 2 or 3 stories in height, presumably to fit with surrounding businesses, if it would provide ample set-back from the sidewalk and if trees would be planted. It was also requested that the featureless side of the building facing State Street could be redesigned to be more visually appealing. In short, would it fit. There seems to be no such concern regarding the placement of a proposed 7-9 story hotel on less than an acre of land with four public facing elevations. Judging by artist renderings, it would necessitate a hotel be built with little attention to those same aforementioned concerns. It would be visually monolithic in order to maximize its footprint on a limited lot. Walt Disney required the buildings along Main Street be reduced in scale for good reason. He understood the psychological effects on people of buildings that are tall and close to thoroughfares. Secondly, it was put forth that this structure is just a natural extension of what has been built in the Sugarhouse business district of late. It clearly is not. It would be far apart, standing alone and imposing. It would represent a jumping of the wildfire of development going on in the Sugarhouse business district. It would establish a new single structure district of its own. The six lanes along 13th East and 21st South present us with a logical, opportune fire break, if you will, to keep the business district contained in its present appropriate concentration of similar structures. I ask that the council deny the request for rezoning.
3/23/2026 16:46	Mary Jo Hinsdale	ICE facility	Hi I live outside of the SLC, I'm the resident of Millcreek and I really hope that Council will join a lawsuit against the ICE facility. Thanks - Mary Jo Hinsdale 84109

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/23/2026 17:00	Mindy Gautreau	ICE detention Facility	<p>Dear Council Members, I am writing as a concerned resident to strongly oppose the establishment of an ICE detention facility in Salt Lake County. I believe that facilities of this nature raise serious humanitarian concerns.</p> <p>Across the country, immigration detention centers have been widely criticized for unsafe conditions, lack of adequate medical care, and the emotional and physical toll they take on individuals and families. Bringing such a facility into our community does not reflect the values of compassion, dignity, and responsible governance that Salt Lake City strives to uphold. Beyond the moral concerns, I am troubled by the long-term impact this decision could have on our city's reputation. Approving a detention center risks associating Salt Lake City with policies and practices that many residents find deeply troubling. This could leave a lasting negative mark on our community. I would also urge the Council to reconsider how public or private resources are being allocated in this effort. If those same funds were directed toward humane and constructive solutions—such as legal assistance, community-based case management, or support for voluntary relocation—our city could be part of a more effective and compassionate approach to immigration challenges. I respectfully ask that you reject any proposal that would allow an ICE detention facility to be established in our county. I hope you will stand with the many residents who want Salt Lake City to lead with humanity, fairness, and integrity. Thank you for your time and consideration. Sincerely, Mindy Gautreau Resident of Cottonwood Heights</p>
3/23/2026 20:50	David Leta	Proposed Sugarhouse Hotel project on the SW corner of 1300 E 2100 So.	I serve on the East Bench Community Council. I'm opposed to this project, as currently proposed, for the following reasons: (1) inadequate consideration and mitigation of environmental impacts, including possible pollution of ground water due to the high water table of the subject property; (2) inadequate consideration of traffic and mitigation of vehicle congestion; (3) contrary to applicable Master Plan; and (4) contrary to City's goals for more affordable housing and inadequate consideration of need for additional hotel units in the area.
3/24/2026 9:42	Anonymous Constituent	Voicemail to City Council	Hi, I'm very much against a big, tall hotel going in on the west-north side of Sugar House Park. I think it's a terrible idea, and that should not be zoned. It's going to block the view of the mountains for so many people, even people at that intersection, and Utah is going to go the way of California and just killing all of the natural beauty in the name of the almighty dollar. Please keep that just a one-story building to be built there. Please, let's think about our future and not just getting the most money that we can right now. Thank you very much. Bye-bye.
3/24/2026 10:00	Roxanne Wallace	Sugar House Hotel	I support the Sugar House Hotel project. I think that having restaurants, easier park access, and the ability to rent park/lawn games is a great asset to the neighborhood. I am ok with their proposed parking solution - honestly anything built on that property will cause more traffic than the empty lot currently does. I'm not too worried about the impacts on traffic, I-80 is and will be worse than whatever this hotel could do. Thanks!
3/24/2026 10:02	Amanda P Brown	Cesar Chavez Blvd renaming	Hello, I'm a resident of SLC and currently live on 500 S / Cesar E Chavez Blvd. I would love to see this street renamed in honor of a significant person in Utah / Salt Lake City history such as Seraph Young Ford or Horace H. Voss. I think this would allow the street to retain an honorary name while also being more SLC-focused. Thank you, Amanda Brown

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/24/2026 10:03	Marilyn Britton	Sugarhouse Hotel plan	<p>I moved to the Legacy of Sugarhouse 2 years ago from a location in South Carolina that still had some undeveloped areas. In the 5 years living there developments are where trees once grew and traffic has become unbearable. I was so taken with the beautiful park and open area. Why another hotel a d the destruction of open land. Plant some trees, place benches and make the area welcoming without having to watch a building event all block nature's views. Marilyn Britton</p>
3/24/2026 10:06	Mario Palacios	<p>Formal Suggestion: Noise Control for Vehicle Exhaust on 600 S & State St (Downtown)</p>	<p>Dear Mayor Mendenhall, I am a resident of REDACTED, Salt Lake City, UT 84111. I am writing to share a formal suggestion regarding the excessive and disruptive noise caused by vehicles and motorcycles with modified exhausts and resonators. While I understand that living downtown involves urban activity, the frequent, high-decibel noise from these modified vehicles is a direct violation of City Ordinance 9.28.060. Specifically, the intersection of 600 South and State Street has become an unbearable hotspot. State Street is consistently the loudest area, acting as a corridor where drivers accelerate with loud resonators, particularly late at night. I would like to emphasize that this is not just an inconvenience; it is a health and safety issue for our families. We have a baby at home, and there are many other children living in this building whose sleep and well-being are constantly disrupted by these illegal exhausts. To address this, I propose the following solutions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of "Noise Cameras": I suggest Salt Lake City look into the pilot programs used in New York City, which utilize sound-activated enforcement cameras to automatically ticket vehicles that exceed legal decibel limits. This technology would provide consistent enforcement at loud intersections like 600 S and State St. • Residential "Quiet Zone" Signage: I recommend installing official "Quiet Zone" signs along 600 South and State Street to remind drivers that they are passing through a high-density residential area where children and families live. • Targeted Enforcement: Increased patrols by SLCPD specifically focused on equipment violations (modified mufflers/resonators) during peak nighttime hours at the State Street entry points to the city. As Downtown continues to grow with more families moving into residential units like 600 Lofts, it is vital that we balance urban vibrancy with a livable, quiet environment for our children. Thank you for your time and for your dedication to making Salt Lake City a better place for all residents. Best regards, Mario Palacios
3/24/2026 10:07	Rosalie Mae	ICE Warehouse in SLC	<p>Hello, I am writing to ask the City Council to block the warehouse purchased by DHS from becoming an ICE detention center. Detention centers in other states have been marked by reports of abuse, inadequate food, and dangerous conditions. People across the country, including citizens and lawful residents, have been detained without due process. We can learn from what other states & counties like Maryland and Roxbury, New Jersey have done to block ICE detention centers from being built and ask our city and county council to bring a lawsuit against the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). This is necessary to protect our civil liberties and human rights for ourselves and our neighbors. This is a true threat to all in our community, and no one knows that better than the people living in and governing Salt Lake City. Thank you for your time, Rosalie Mae Salt Lake City, UT 84115</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/24/2026 10:15	Relina Sombrero	Zone change for sugar house	Hello, I am emailing as a concerned citizen that it's a terrible idea for 6-7 story hotel to be built at the corner of the sugarhouse park. There is already traffic congestion and the park is over lived by the people. Adding a hotel to the area will diminish our way of life. There are many other areas the developer could use like in Draper or other open areas. The quality of life is at stake here! The residence are barely fighting for what is left after all the high tower buildings have gone up. This is a terrible idea. Please hear me and vote no. There are already two hotels in the area and this will not only cause an uptick in crimes, but vehicles, scarce parking, and it will also bring down the value of homes. Nobody wants to live next to a hotel. Thank you. Sincerely, Relina Sombrero
3/24/2026 10:16	Tricia Annoni	CONCERNED UTAHN	PLEASE join with the county council and bring a lawsuit against DHS! NO ICE detention centers in Utah! THANK YOU pat annoni
3/24/2026 10:17	Sally Brush	Hotel at 1300 E. 2100 South at Sugarhouse Park	I feel that building a hotel of any size on that corner would contribute to congestion and traffic slow down. Why would we want a hotel on the corner of a great park, beloved by the community? Who stands to benefit from this plan? Why doesn't the city or county buy the plot and add it to Sugarhouse Park? That would be a more foreword looking use. Sugarhouse are is over built currently with traffic issues and too many big apartments. Thank you for your consideration, Sally Brush
3/24/2026 10:20	Donna Robles	Sugarhouse Park	I have lived in Sugarhouse over 55 years. When my children were little and we had very little money. My sons loved to go to this park to throw rocks in the stream and play on the playground. The view of the mountains without a over the top building is fantastic . Sugarhouse already has so many new apartment buildings and the congestion is real. All those people have no yard , the park gives all of us some fresh air. We DO NOT NEED more buildings. We need to be able to see our beloved mountains. When our children are playing in the park. Not to worry that someone that close could take them. A small restaurant where we can enjoy a meal or cold drink, with outdoor seating to be able to keep the feeling of a park. Not a big building with cars going in and out. And only a small amount of people to enjoy the view. DO NOT TAKE AWAY OUR LAST OPEN AIR In SUGARHOUSE , PLEASE!!
3/24/2026 10:20	Donna Robles	Sugarhouse Park	There is no open space anymore, but the park. The apartment buildings are everywhere!! Sugarhouse used to be a nice little place, where families could walk to enjoy a few shops and walk our children to the park. Now it's hard to drive on 1100 East or 1300 East with all the traffic!! You don't dare to let your children walk alone to the park as so many cars. With a big apartment building at the edge of the park. No one is safe!! We need to be able to see our beloved mountains and enjoy as families a park. Not another building!! Small restaurant where you can get a snack or meal. A cold drinks and ice cream in the summer and hot chocolate in the winter, after going down the hill. Sitting outdoors to be able to enjoy the fantastic view. Not the same old giant building, that is cold unforgiving. We already have enough of those!! We need space to enjoy.
3/24/2026 10:21	Brynnli Borrowman	DHS Warehouse in SLC	Hello! My name is Brynnli Borrowman, and I am a constituent of district 7. I am emailing in regards to the new warehouse that DHS has acquired in Salt Lake City. I can't make it to the city council meeting tomorrow and I wanted to urge you and the council to please join the county council in bringing a lawsuit against the DHS. Utah already shamefully participated in human rights violations with the Topaz Internment Camp during WWII, and now we have a chance to be on the right side of history with a similar issue. Thank you! Brynnli Borrowman

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/24/2026 10:22	Melanie Adamson	ICE facility	<p>Dear City Council Members, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed ICE detention facility in our community. Immigration detention centers have been widely criticized for inadequate living conditions, limited oversight, and the separation of families. Bringing such a facility into our community risks associating our city with these harmful practices. Beyond humanitarian concerns, this facility could negatively affect our local economy and community well-being. It may deter tourism, strain public resources, and create tension among residents. Our city should be focused on initiatives that promote inclusivity, safety, and long-term prosperity—not ones that divide and harm vulnerable populations. Our city also touts a culture where strong family values are of the utmost importance. I cannot think of anything more antithetical to those values than a detention center that will rip families apart. It's deplorable. I urge the council to carefully reconsider this proposal and prioritize policies that reflect our community's values of family, compassion, fairness, and respect for human rights. I also request greater transparency and opportunities for public input before any decisions are made. Thank you for your time and consideration. Melanie Adamson</p>
3/24/2026 10:24	Breanne CLEMENT	Public Comment for March 24 Meeting Sugarhouse Hotel	<p>Hello, I plan to make a public comment at tomorrow's meeting and wanted to share my remarks in advance: My name is Breanne Clement, and I live in District 7. I oppose the proposed zoning change for the property adjacent to Sugar House Park that will allow a 90ft hotel. I was fortunate to receive an email from the Sugar House Community Council about this issue, and I want to thank them—especially Judi Short—for keeping me and our community informed. Despite their efforts, most people still have no idea this is happening. So this weekend, I went to Sugar House Park to inform people myself. I handed out nearly 300 flyers and spoke with at least 500 people. Out of all those conversations, only six people had even heard about the hotel proposal. No one knew it involved a zoning change. And no one knew it was on tonight's agenda. I went into those conversations open, ready to hear different perspectives. But I never had that chance—because not a single person I spoke with supported it. Not one. I met people from all walks of life and diverse backgrounds. They were grateful just to be included, informed, and heard. And the concerns were the same: traffic, parking, the scale of the project, and a feeling that this doesn't reflect the community around it or the community's needs. Have you been to the park lately? It's packed. What struck me most was how much people love that park. It's not just a park—it's a gathering place, a shared space, something people feel proud of. This weekend made me feel that too. I know not everyone who cares about this could be here tonight. Life is busy. The process isn't always clear. But I hope you'll consider their voices as well. I spent this weekend listening to members of this community. I hope you will take what I heard into consideration and oppose this zoning change request.</p>
3/24/2026 10:24	Laree Thomas	No Sugarhouse Park Hotel	<p>Please DO NOT zone the corner of the historic Sugarhouse Park for a multi-story hotel! I know we don't necessarily get to choose who does invest in that corner, but the community hopes that for something interesting, educational, fun, aesthetically pleasing, and Park - Appropriate. Sincerely, Laree Thomas</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/24/2026 10:26	Jim Jenkin	E7 Ordinance: Sugar House Hotel Master Plan and Zoning Map Amendments at Approximately 2111 South 1300 East	<p>Dear Councilperson, This Council has wisely required a public benefit to justify a rezoning. I respectfully submit that there is no net public benefit for either the proposed rezone or the high rise project that would eventually fill it. My understanding is that the developer has suggested that they will provide reduced cost retail and meeting space for community members and organizations in their building. The provision of reduced cost retail space is a two-edged sword at best, in that it will serve to draw established neighborhood businesses, in search of tourist dollars. On the other hand, Park users will be damaged by the physical overshadowing of the park with a high-rise building, inconsistent with the development pattern. The public's enjoyment of Park activities will be lessened by luxury hotel patrons looking down on them; and hotel patrons will be provided a de facto private entrance to a public park. Sugarhouse Park comprises a unique city-wide resource and a character defining element for the City. The precedent that would be set for other Parks, and the damage to this one, cannot be undone once approved. I submit that the Proposal damages the Public interest and benefits primarily the developer, their patrons, and that the zoning should stay height compatible with other buildings around the Park. Thank you. Jim Jenkin</p>
3/24/2026 10:35	Sara Hillring	ICE in Utah	<p>Dear City Council Members, I am writing to you all today as a concerned resident of Salt Lake City to express my strong opposition to the development of an ICE detention center in our city. Allowing such a facility in our beautiful home goes against the values of safety, compassion, and community that I believe we as a collective stand for. Detention centers are known to have severe negative impacts on the physical and mental health of detainees, separating families and hurting vulnerable populations. They are places of abuse, cruelty, violence against women, and detaining individuals without due process. Furthermore, I do not believe that using city resources or land to facilitate federal immigration detention serves the best interests of our community and residents. I urge the council to oppose any partnership with ICE or private prison corporations regarding this facility. Please keep Salt Lake a welcoming and safe place for all. Please choose to be on the right side of history. As a proud Utah, this hurts my soul, my heart, and makes me embarrassed to live in a place that would allow for such injustice to darken our state's history. The United States government as a whole is already cultivating injustice, revoking rights, and creating a very dismal landscape and environment to live within. Please do not contribute to this narrative. It is time to have a spine, stand up, and fight for the freedoms and justice for all. Is that not what America is all about? Thank you for listening. Take care and be well! In health & happiness, Sara Hillring, MS, RDN, CD, SFP-MRC</p>
3/24/2026 10:55	Esther Hunter	Public Comment - Sugar House Hotel **Attachment 2 - 2 Pages	Please consider our comments in the attached letter. Thank you. Esther Hunter ECC Chair & Governing Board Director East Central Community Council



March 23,2026
Salt Lake City Council
Salt Lake City Corporation
451 South State Street
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Regarding: Sugar House Hotel Master Plan and Zoning Map Amendments at Approximately
2111 South 1300 East

Subject: **The protection of Sugar House Park’s boundary – a “Soul Decision”**

Dear City Council Members,

As deeply invested members of the Salt Lake City community, we are writing to express our significant concerns regarding the proposed rezone and master plan amendment that would allow a high-rise hotel development on the corner directly next to Sugar House Park.

While we recognize the need for thoughtful urban growth, this specific location requires more than a review of individual pieces of technical data; it requires stepping back to consider the meaning of this park to the residents of this city, now and for the next 100 years of our park’s horizon. This is a **“soul decision.”**

We believe that adding a 90-foot hotel on the boundary of the park isn’t "completing" the business district; we believe it is "over-extending" it beyond the natural boundary of 1300 East, and is contrary to the original intent of **keeping the park a green respite for the community.**

Because of this request’s location, we believe that this requires more than a simple review of individual technical aspects; it requires stepping back to consider the meaning of the park to this city. While our concerns related to this proposal are **many**, in this letter we are addressing the psychological and social impact this project will have on this significant landmark of our city. We urge the Council to prioritize the following three areas:

1. The "Wall Effect": Visual Privatization and Public Exclusion A high-rise on the park’s edge creates a physical and psychological "Wall Effect." While the hotel may offer "exclusive access," this creates a sense of privatization of a public resource. While the public enjoys the park from the ground, hotel guests would receive an exclusive, bird’s-eye view. This turns a public resource into a private backyard for the wealthy and diminishes the sense of openness for everyday park users. Does the City believe a 7-story wall is the appropriate gateway to our most beloved park? The park should remain an open, inviting refuge for all residents.

P
a
g
e
|
1



2. The "Private Backyard" Effect – A Psychological Barrier Sugar House Park is a crown jewel because it feels like it belongs to everyone. When you place a high-density, luxury-oriented hotel directly on the park boundary, you fundamentally change that DNA. It creates a "Private Backyard" atmosphere where the public suddenly feels like guests or intruders in a space they own. The hotel's exclusive access points and overlooking windows will make everyday park users feel watched and marginalized, effectively ceding a corner of our public land to a private interest. A private hotel entrance facing a public park creates a "psychological barrier" that makes the public feel like they are trespassing on hotel grounds just to use their own park.

3. Overpowering the Park's Scale Parks are meant to be a release from the vertical pressure of the city. The sheer mass of a high-rise at this location will "smother" the corner of the park and destroy the "sky-space" that makes this refuge vital. We believe that the offered community benefits—such as a bike rack and discounted office space—are not proportional to the permanent loss of the park's visual integrity.

Sugar House Park is one of the significant "Central Parks" of our city. Once we allow high-density "district creep" on its immediate borders, we set a precedent that cannot be undone. Our position has never been anti-development, but it is pro-responsibility, pro-stewardship, and pro-community. ***This is not just about a building; it is about the erosion of the public's right to feel completely at home in their own park.***

We are at a tipping point. If we allow 90-foot structures to swallow the boundaries of Sugar House Park, we are signaling that private commercial interests outweigh one of our city's most significant public refuges, which is also the soul of the community.

With respect and commitment to collaborative growth and on behalf of the East Central Community Council and its Executive Board,

Esther

Esther Hunter
ECC Chair & Governing Board Director
East Central Community Council
[REDACTED]

cc.
Erin Mendenhall, Salt Lake City Mayor
Nick Norris, SLC Planning Director
Tim Cosgrove, Mayor Liaison District 4 and City wide
Eva Chavez Lopez, City Council Representative District 4
East Central Community

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/24/2026 10:57	Kye Nielsen	Proposed Rezone at 2111S, 1300 E. for Proposed Sugar House Park Hotel	<p>Members of the Salt Lake City Council, I'm writing to ask that you deny the proposed rezone for the proposed Sugar House Park Hotel. As a Salt Lake City resident and a developer myself, I want to clarify that I'm not a NIMBY, who is anti-development. Developments are a necessary part of our city and they are needed to accommodate the city's growing population and the community's ever-changing needs. But we need to advocate for smart development. New projects need to be constructed in a way that adds value to the residents and that doesn't detract from the community. Sugarhouse Park is a gem in our city. As a critical space for our community, we need to protect it. A seven-story structure would be overbearing on that parcel. After reviewing the submitted drawings, As a developer myself, I'm skeptical at the ability of the parcel to handle adequate parking and traffic circulation. I'm concerned the flow of traffic and parking for the proposed development will be detrimental to the park and will make it unsafe for runners, cyclists, and other park users who go to Sugarhouse Park to specifically get away from traffic. Some of the plans even show a road connecting the hotel parking lot to the Sugarhouse Park Road. While a road connecting the hotel parking lot to the Park Road would be catastrophic to the park, even completely separate access that is limited to 21st South and /or 13th East would degrade the park experience. The parcel is small enough that traffic and parking will inevitably spill into the park and create more traffic. Members of the community do not want The Park to turn into the circulation road and parking lot for a hotel. This will make the park unsafe for the residents who specifically utilize the park as a place to recreate away from traffic. In addition, this rezone sets a dangerous precedent for future development. It's clear that the developers paid too much for this property and now they are relying on the city council to approve this rezone so they can achieve their desired returns. By approving this rezone, the council will be justifying the inflated price. This means brokers and land sellers are going to demand higher prices in the area, which makes future development in the Sugarhouse area even more difficult. With housing prices being at an all-time high in our city, higher land prices will make affordable housing projects even less achievable for other developers. If Magnus wants to develop this site, there is no reason why they can't work within the current zoning regulations. There's no need for them to go above the current 40' maximum height limit, other than to improve their financial situation. Increasing the height for a hotel use does not benefit the local community, but it will generate more traffic in and around the Park, which hurts everyone. Whatever is developed on this corner should be a low-impact use that won't have any negative impact on the park. As you prepare to vote on this item, I would implore you to deny this rezone and ensure that The Park stays a beautiful, safe, and low-traffic place for Salt Lake Residents to enjoy. Let's set a precedent for smart development. Let's advocate for density in the right locations, for uses that benefit the community, such as affordable housing. And let's set a precedent to preserve community space and not allow commercially-driven developments with little community benefit to devalue and encroach on these areas. Signed, Kye Nielsen A Sugarhouse Resident and a developer</p>
3/24/2026 11:25	Veronica Bolton	ICE detention center opposition complaint - SLC Council	<p>We don't want or need an ICE warehouse here!!!! The people of this city feel strongly about it and are unified. Do NOT put that monstrosity here. ICE breeds violence, fear, disruption, and reps apart communities. Please here us. Veronica Bolton Herriman Sent with Proton Mail secure email.</p>
3/24/2026 11:46	Kathy Hicks	Voicemail to City Council	<p>Hi, my name is Kathy Hicks and I am calling to put in my vote. I won't be able to attend the council meeting this evening on the MU3 to MU8 boutique hotel. They want to plant and grow through at sugar house, which is already way too congested. And this is not about money. This is about character of the area, Salt Lake City, the homes, the community. So I'm voting a strong no against this 90 story or 40 foot, 40 story hotel that they want to put in right across from Sugar House Park. It is wrong and it is not ethical. That's a vote by Kathy Hicks and I am a registered voter. If you need my registered voter number, let me know. Thank you</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/24/2026 11:55	Dee Jost	Voicemail to City Council	Good morning. My name is Dee Jost and I'm calling about the proposed redistricting of Sugar House Park property for a hotel at the corner. I am really against this. The congestion in that area now is so bad with all of the mixed use area for adding a hotel to this I can't see how people would get in and out of this safely without adding more congestion to the many people who live in condos and apartments and go to restaurants on that two-block area. Many, many more useful places for a hotel. Please use this for park space, for something that doesn't add congestion but adds to the quality of life. of the people in the area. Thank you. Bye.
3/24/2026 11:57	Kristina Robb	ELPCO's Letter in Reference to the Proposed Sugar House Hotel **Attachment 3 - 10 Pages	Please accept this letter from East Liberty Park Community Organizations regarding: Ordinance: Sugar House Hotel Master Plan and Zoning Map Amendments at Approximately 2111 South 1300 East Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns. Kindly, Kristina Kristina Ann Robb, Chair East Liberty Park Community Organization (ELPCO)
3/24/2026 11:58	Cory W Bauman	ICE detention center opposition complaint - SLC Council	Please oppose the new ICE center in SLC. The immigrants who will be held there will not be treated humanely. Think of the Topaz camp in Utah that incarcerated Japanese members of our society. Think of the concentration camps that imprisoned Jewish citizens of Europe, the LGBTQ, and other people who were reviled by a Nazi regime. Think of how many died. Immigrants who are arrested by ICE are still guaranteed their civil rights. Please stand up against this appalling, undemocratic move by the federal government. It's also disgraceful that someone sold the warehouse for an obscene amount of money without any regard for those who will be locked up there. Thank you, Cory Bauman Sent from my iPhone
3/24/2026 12:00 PM	Anonymous Constituent	NOT in favor of hotel	I am not in favor of any hotel next to Sugarhouse Park. My concern is traffic congestion (eg my clinic visits at the U's Sugarhouse facility nearby) and ambiance at the park (where I take my lunch frequently). Let's please give Sugarhouse some breathing room. Thank you!
3/24/2026 12:02	Dr. clotilde Houchon	Dear Members of the Salt Lake City Council and Housing Stability Division **Attachment 4 - 3 Pages	Dear Members of the Salt Lake City Council and Housing Stability Division— I am Dr. Clotilde Houchon, Co-Chair of the Rio Grande Community Council and a fifteen-year resident of the Rio Grande neighborhood. I am submitting the attached materials for Tuesday's public hearing on the 2026–2027 HUD federal funding recommendations. My submission raises a specific federal compliance question — under 24 CFR § 5.856 — regarding the screening obligations of subrecipients recommended for ESG, HOME, CDBG, and Funding Our Future awards in this cycle, with particular attention to the Road Home and its programming at St. Vincent de Paul. Attached: 1. Written Submission — Rio Grande Community Council (one-page brief with funding data, geographic context, legal record, and formal ask) 2. Public Testimony — prepared remarks for the 7:00 p.m. hearing I intend to speak in person Tuesday evening. Should circumstances prevent my attendance, I respectfully request that this written submission be entered into the public record in full. I am available for follow-up questions. Respectfully submitted, Dr. Áine Clotilde Houchon, PhD, FRGS Co-Chair, Rio Grande Community Council Rio Grande Neighborhood. Salt Lake City
3/24/2026 12:03	Forrest Rhinehart	No ICE in Utah	Hello, I am writing to express my concern about ICE detention centers opening in Salt Lake City. Detention centers in other states have been marked by reports of abuse, inadequate food, and dangerous conditions — and people across the country, including citizens and lawful residents, have been detained without due process. I am asking the City and County council to bring a lawsuit against DHS to block the building and operation of any detention centers in Salt Lake City. Thank you for your time and consideration, Forrest Rhinehart



EAST LIBERTY PARK community organization

05 February 2026

RE: Sugar House Hotel – ELPCO Response

Dear Chair and Members of the Salt Lake City Council,

We write on behalf of our residents as members of the East Liberty Park Community Organization Land Use and Transportation Committee (ELPCO LUTC) and Board of Directors to express our strong opposition to the proposed rezoning of the sole private parcel directly adjoining Sugar House Park to allow for the construction of a 90-ft tall hotel at the corner of 2100 South and 1300 East.

This lone parcel — the sole private property in the area otherwise devoted entirely to public purposes — is an anomaly. If it didn't exist, the city would never create it. Rather than being asked to incorporate this parcel into the Park, the Council is now being asked to up-zone the property to MU-8 so as to permit far more intrusive development at the very edge of the park.

In an ideal world, the city would have bought this lone parcel and incorporated it into the Park some time ago. It is now being asked to up-zone the property to MU8 so as to permit *more intrusive* development at the very edge of the park.

The Planning Division staff report, which reads more like developer advocacy than a balanced analysis, manages to rationalize this step as being consistent with accepted planning doctrine. The report presents only information supporting approval, never explores lower-intensity alternatives such as MU-5 or MU-6 zoning, and dismisses every community concern by deferring to future design review processes. A more detailed analysis of the staff report is attached to this letter. The report provides no real rationale for rezoning this isolated parcel adjoining the park to MU-8 — rather than MU-5 or MU-6, which would permit development at 50 or 65 feet respectively — and adding it to the central business district of Sugar House. Even if concepts of density have changed since the 2001 Sugar House Plan, they provide no support for the step-change of bringing the central business district across 1300 East to the corner of the park itself. Nor does the report analyze what precedent this would set for other park-adjacent properties citywide.

The parcel owner has the right to develop this property under existing zoning, but it has no legal right to a dramatic up-zoning that would more than double the allowable height of construction. The difference in visual impact between a low-rise restaurant and a 90 ft tall hotel largely filling the site will be obvious to anyone driving or walking past the site. It is impossible to regard the requested zoning change as being in the public interest.

Sincerely,

East Liberty Park Community Organization:

Kristina Robb – ELPCO Chair

Jeff Larsen – ELPCO Vice-Chair

Jeanette Young – ELPCO Secretary/Treasurer

J. Alan Crittenden – ELPCO Land Use Committee Chair

Judi Short – ELPCO Land Use Advisor

Marshall Baillie – ELPCO Sustainability Coordinator

James Birchler – ELPCO Board Member

Michael Mayo – ELPCO Board Member

David Jones – ELPCO Board Member

Janet Wade – 9th and 9th Business Liaison

About ELPCO

ELPCO is the East Liberty Park Community Organization—a local, city-sanctioned community organization that represents the residents and businesses in the East Liberty Park area of Salt Lake City. The area covered by ELPCO is defined by the boundaries of Liberty Park, 700 E to 1300 E and 800 S to 1700 S. ELPCO meets online on the fourth Thursday of every month starting at 7:00 p.m..

APPENDIX

Sugar House Hotel GP + Zoning Map Amendments - Brief Analysis
1/22/2026

ELPCO conducted a brief review of the Planning Division Staff Report on the Sugar House Hotel General Plan and Zoning Map Amendments. On reading, the report seems imbalanced, presenting a mostly one-sided case for approval while omitting analysis that planning commissioners would likely need to make an informed decision on these amendments. This effort summarized some of this in the tables below to show specific examples of this imbalance—what the staff emphasizes versus the questions left unaddressed.

The 20 pages of the main document contain no discussion of reasons this proposal should be denied, no exploration of compromise alternatives (such as MU-5 or MU-6 zoning), and no genuine weighing of whether the community benefits are proportional to tripling the building height permitted by the 2001 community plan. The report also fails to highlight what I think are some key facts: the Planning Commission denied a use at this exact site just two years ago for environmental reasons—a decision upheld on appeal—yet the current report mentions this only in passing and never analyzes what changed or how the current proposal is different. Every

concern raised by the public or by the city's own 2001 master plan is dismissed with assurances that issues will be addressed through design review or other future processes, deferring fundamental land use decisions that could (and possibly should) be made now. The pattern is consistent throughout: the report documents compliance with technical requirements while avoiding any discussion of whether this is the right development, at the right scale, in the right location.

KEY QUESTIONS MISSING IN STAFF REPORT

- **What are the downsides of this proposal?** Not mentioned anywhere in 20 pages.
- **Are there compromise zoning options?** MU-5 (50 ft) or MU-6 (65 ft) never explored as middle ground.
- **Why did Planning Commission deny a use here in 2023?** Briefly mentioned in one sentence with no analysis of environmental concerns that led to denial.
- **What happens when the next property requests the same treatment?** Precedent and cumulative impacts not discussed.
- **Is tripling the building height from the community plan's vision appropriate?** Report simply declares 2001 plan "outdated" and moves on.
- **How will public concerns actually be addressed?** Every issue gets deferred to design review or building permits instead of being decided now.

THE IMBALANCE AT A GLANCE

Topic	What Staff Report Says (Supporting Approval)	Critical Questions NOT Addressed
Plan Consistency	"Sugar House Plan supports expansion of Business District to 1300 East" (p. 7)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2001 Plan says 2-4 stories; this is 7 stories (250% increase) • Should community have input on changing the vision? • What are the limits to calling a plan "outdated"?

<p>Building Height</p>	<p>"90 feet provides appropriate transition between higher and lower-scale zones" (p. 19)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why not MU-5 (50 ft) or MU-6 (65 ft) as compromise? • What happens when other properties along 1300 E request same treatment? • Are community benefits actually proportional to going from 40 to 90 feet?
<p>Environmental</p>	<p>"Property is within Groundwater Protection Overlay, which adds additional regulations" (p. 19)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Commission DENIED use here in 2023 for environmental reasons—why is that not discussed? • What specifically changed to make environmental concerns manageable? • What are the construction impacts of underground garage excavation?

<p>Views/Character</p>	<p>"Even current 40-foot zoning would block views" (p. 18)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How much MORE impact does 90 ft have vs. 40 ft? • Is preserving mountain view corridors a legitimate community interest? • Should degree of impact matter?
-------------------------------	--	---

<p>Public Opposition</p>	<p>"Valid considerations...will be carefully addressed through design review" (p. 19)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What if design review CAN'T address concerns? • Should fundamental land use decisions be made now, not deferred? • How much weight should be given to community input?
<p>Traffic/Parking</p>	<p>"Traffic study found to meet industry standards" (p. 17)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What about cumulative impact if other properties rezone? • Will 150+ hotel guests per night actually use GREENbikes instead of cars? • Is overnight street parking impact analyzed?

DETAILED ANALYSIS BY ISSUE

1. PLAN CONSISTENCY

<p>Staff Says</p>	<p>Missing Analysis</p>
<p>"The Sugar House Plan supports the expansion of the Business District...to 1300 East" (p. 7)</p>	<p>No discussion of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether tripling allowed height (40→90 ft) is what "expansion" meant

<p>"Because the definition of high density has evolved since 2001, it is no longer reasonable to deem two-to four-story structures as high-density"*** (p. 16)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whether community should vote on changing 2001 vision • What other "outdated" plans could be overridden this way • Whether 24 years is actually that old for a master plan • Whether there's ANY limit to intensity increases under this logic
--	---

2. ZONING & HEIGHT

Staff Says	Missing Analysis
<p>"MU-8 aligns with recent development patterns...particularly across 1300 East in the MU-11 zone" (p. 17)</p> <p>"The rezone does not encroach on the existing single-family neighborhood to the north"*** (p. 17)</p>	<p>No discussion of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why not MU-5 (50 ft) or MU-6 (65 ft) as middle ground? • Precedent: What happens when next property requests MU-8? • Is "not encroaching on SF neighborhood" the ONLY relevant standard? • How does this fit with citywide view corridor protection goals? • Cumulative impact if multiple properties follow suit

3. ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS

Staff Says	Missing Analysis

<p>"The property is within the Groundwater Protection Overlay, which adds additional regulations" (p. 19)</p>	<p>Never mentions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Commission DENIED use here in 2023** for environmental concerns (PLNPCM2022-00053) • Appeals Officer upheld the denial • What changed in 2 years? • How is hotel environmentally different from gas station? (This distinction matters but isn't explained)
--	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction impacts of excavating 180-space underground garage • Stormwater runoff into Parley's Creek • Any specific environmental mitigation measures
--

4. COMMUNITY BENEFITS

Staff Says	Missing Analysis
<p>Below-market retail space, free meeting rooms, GREENbike station, public parking all listed as benefits (pp. 10-12)</p>	<p>No discussion of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are these benefits proportional to 125% height increase? • GREENbike station requires Park Authority approval—not secured • "Public parking" won't be free—is this really a community benefit? • How do these compare to benefits required for similar rezones? • Gateway signage benefits developer's visibility—is this really a public benefit?

5. TRAFFIC & PARKING

Staff Says	Missing Analysis
<p>"Traffic study...found to meet industry standards" (p. 17) "The study concludes that projected traffic would have minimal effect"*** (p. 17)</p>	<p>No discussion of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 145 rooms = ~150 guests/night—where will they park if garage full? • PM peak hour backups already identified by Transportation staff • Will hotel guests realistically use bikes/transit vs. personal cars? • Impact during construction (mentioned as "coordination required" but not analyzed) • Cumulative impact if surrounding properties redevelop at higher intensity

6. PUBLIC OPPOSITION

Staff Says	Missing Analysis
<p>"Valid considerations...will be carefully addressed through design review, environmental analysis, and transportation planning" (p. 19) Park access concerns are "inaccurate information" (p. 19)</p>	<p>No discussion of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What if design review CAN'T address scale/character concerns? • Should land use decisions be made NOW or deferred to later? • Three proposals in 5 years (2020, 2023, 2025)—pattern of community opposition • Is framing concerns as "misunderstanding" appropriate? • 2001 Plan involved extensive community input—should that matter?

7. SITE HISTORY

Staff Says	Missing Analysis
<p>"2023 – The Planning Commission denied a Conditional Use permit...intended to build and operate a gas station" (p. 5)</p> <p>Appears only in "Background" section with no analysis</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Denial was for ENVIRONMENTAL reasons at this specific site • Appeals Officer upheld the denial • What makes hotel environmentally different? (Should explain this) • Site established as environmentally sensitive • How to ensure consistency in decision-making • Whether this affects the current proposal at all

THE PATTERN

Every issue receives the same treatment:

Never discusses:

Public Concern → Staff Dismissal → No Further Analysis

Examples:

- Views blocked → Staff says even current zoning would block views → No discussion of degree of difference between 40 ft and 90 ft
- Plan says 2-4 stories → Staff says plan is outdated → No discussion of community process to update vision
- Environmental concerns → Staff says overlay regulations exist → No mention of 2023 denial for environmental reasons
- Traffic concerns → Staff says study meets standards → No discussion of real-world parking behavior
- Public opposition → Staff says concerns will be addressed in design review → No discussion of what happens if design review can't resolve concerns

WHAT'S MISSING

The staff report contains no discussion of:

- **Reasons this should be denied**
- **Alternative zoning options** (MU-5, MU-6, modified MU-3)
- **Precedent concerns** (what happens next)
- **Genuine weighing of tradeoffs**
- **Community vision vs. development pressure**
- **Cumulative impacts** (if trend continues)
- **Limiting principles** (how tall is too tall?)
- **What the 2023 denial means for this proposal**

THE BOTTOM LINE

Question	Answer in Staff Report
Does staff recommend approval?	Yes (p. 1)
Does staff present any reasons for denial?	No
Does staff discuss alternatives to MU-8?	No
Does staff explain what changed since 2023 denial?	No

Question	Answer in Staff Report
Does staff analyze whether benefits are proportional?	No
Does staff discuss precedent/cumulative impacts?	No
Does staff genuinely weigh tradeoffs?	No
Does staff acknowledge legitimate policy conflicts?	No

This report reads as advocacy for approval rather than balanced analysis to be used as input by decisionmakers.

SUBMITTED TO THE SALT LAKE CITY COUNCIL

HUD Federal Funding Public Hearing | March 24, 2026

Dr. Áine Clotilde Houchon, PhD, FRGS*Co-Chair, Rio Grande Community Council***THE COMPLIANCE QUESTION**

Federal law — 24 CFR § 5.856 — requires that any organization receiving HUD funds establish standards that screen residents for lifetime sex offender status before admission. This requirement is mandatory, not discretionary, and applies to all subrecipients of ESG, HOME, CDBG, and comparable funding streams.

The question before this Council tonight: has the Housing Stability Division verified that each recommended subrecipient maintains an active, compliant screening policy under this statute — before funds are disbursed?

THE ROAD HOME: 2026–2027 RECOMMENDED FUNDING

The Road Home appears on the 2026–2027 recommended funding list across multiple programs, with total recommended awards approaching one million dollars:

Program	Funding Source	Recommended (\$)
Housing Staffing	CDBG	\$50,000
Gail Miller Resource Center	CDBG	\$72,212
Tenant-Based Rental Assistance	HOME	\$350,000
Shared Housing	Funding Our Future	\$135,800
Supportive Housing Case Management	Funding Our Future	\$210,200
House 20	Funding Our Future	\$154,800
TOTAL RECOMMENDED		\$973,012

GEOGRAPHIC CONTEXT: THE RIO GRANDE CORRIDOR

The Road Home's only active operation within the Rio Grande corridor is its programming at St. Vincent de Paul. That facility operates within walking distance of:

- The Gateway Children's Discovery Museum
- The Planetarium
- Higher Ground for Learning (Pierpont Avenue)
- Recursion Daycare
- Public playgrounds
- Family facilities under development in Pioneer Park

LEGAL AND AUDIT RECORD: THE ROAD HOME

2023 Lawsuit (Negligence & Safety)

A lawsuit filed by local business owners against Shelter the Homeless and The Road Home alleged the organizations permitted illegal drug use in restrooms, failed to report violent incidents to police, and allowed weapons inside the facility in violation of city operating permits.

2018 State Audit

A state audit revealed “chilling” details of drug use, violence, and failure to enforce safety rules at the then-operating downtown shelter. Legislative oversight found staff routinely failed to enforce zero-tolerance policies.

Security Failures

Allegations include that private security staff were restricted from conducting thorough searches of residents, even when metal detectors alerted, allowing weapons and controlled substances inside facilities.

Leadership

In 2019, the organization’s longtime executive director was terminated following an arrest related to a domestic dispute.

Rapid Rehousing Concerns

Former program participants have alleged they were left with significant debt and eviction judgments following exits from the organization’s rapid rehousing programs.

THE ASK

The Rio Grande Community Council respectfully requests that the Salt Lake City Council require the Housing Stability Division to certify, in writing, that each subrecipient receiving ESG, HOME, CDBG, or Funding Our Future funds in the 2026–2027 cycle maintains an active policy screening residents for lifetime sex offender status before admission — in compliance with 24 CFR § 5.856 — before any funds are disbursed.

This is not a barrier to services. It is the floor of federal accountability — and the least we owe the children of this corridor.

Dr. Áine Clotilde Houchon, PhD, FRGS | Co-Chair, Rio Grande Community Council

PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Salt Lake City Council | HUD Federal Funding Public Hearing

March 24, 2026 | 7:00 p.m.

Dr. Áine Clotilde Houchon, PhD, FRGS

Co-Chair, Rio Grande Community Council

My name is Dr. Clotilde Houchon. I am co-chair of the Rio Grande Community Council, and I appear tonight not in opposition to homeless services funding — but in defense of the children who live, learn, and play in the Rio Grande neighborhood — my neighborhood — whether they are housed or unhoused. This is a children’s rights argument.

Federal law — specifically 24 CFR § 5.856 — requires that any organization receiving HUD funds screen residents for lifetime sex offender status before they are admitted. That requirement is not discretionary. It is mandatory — enacted in large part to protect children.

The Road Home is before this Council tonight with nearly one million dollars in recommended awards across multiple programs — CDBG, HOME, and Funding Our Future. Within the Rio Grande corridor, the Road Home operates programming at St. Vincent de Paul — its only active operation in my immediate neighborhood since the demolition of the 400-bed shelter one block from my home. In this corridor, the stakes are visible and specific — the Gateway Children’s Discovery Museum, the Planetarium, Higher Ground for Learning, Recursion Daycare, public playgrounds, and the family facilities now under development in Pioneer Park — all within walking distance of the current Road Home operation at St. Vincent de Paul.

This Council is already navigating significant uncertainty around federal HUD funding — grants that are being scrutinized, delayed, and restructured at the federal level right now. A compliance failure on sex offender screening — federally mandated and publicly auditable — is precisely the kind of liability that draws HUD Office of Inspector General attention. The OIG has already found, nationally, that thousands of households containing lifetime registered sex offenders were subsidized in violation of this statute.

I am asking the Council to do one thing: require the Housing Stability Division to certify, in writing, that each subrecipient receiving ESG, HOME, CDBG, or Funding Our Future funds in this cycle has an active policy screening residents for lifetime sex offender status before admission — under 24 CFR § 5.856 — before funds are disbursed.

That is not a barrier to services. It is the floor of federal accountability — and the least we owe the children of this corridor.

Thank you.

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/24/2026 12:04	Munashe Tanjani	What Supporting Phase 2 Means to Me	Dear Council Members, Hi, my name is Munashe Tanjani. I am a participant in Spy Hop's Phase 2 Productions Advanced Apprenticeship. I finished my training last year around November and since then have received work experience that has furthered my career and stabilized my financial situation in less than six months. The mentorship has also evolved my outlook and understanding of the industry I hope to thrive in. I've gained hands-on training in film production and earned skills that directly support my career goals. This program provides real workforce pathways for young adults in Salt Lake City while also supporting local businesses and nonprofits through creative work. I encourage you to consider supporting programs like Phase 2 that expand economic opportunity and invest in the next generation of Utah's creative workforce. Thank you for your time and consideration.
3/24/2026 12:15	Dayna McKee	Rezone Sugar House hotel project	The thing that concerns me about any project on the corner of 2100 S and 1300 E is that the traffic congestion is so bad already. Adding 180 parking spots and more traffic congestion in and out of a hotel to an already maxed out intersection seems like a pretty bad idea. Please consider the impacts to traffic and pedestrians as well as pollution and the possible detriment to the earthen dam in the park. The city should work with the county to reincorporate the parcel into the park rather than build on it. Please stop building in this neighborhood for a while. Pick another one. We need a break.
3/24/2026 12:21	Janet Jamison	Sugarhouse zoning change	Dear City Council, I am very opposed to changing the zoning rules to allow a 7-9 story hotel to be built on the old Sizzler lot. I have lived in this neighborhood for 35 years and am a frequent visitor to Sugarhouse Park. It is a peaceful place to walk and enjoy nature. Having a huge building would mar the whole experience. Sincerely, Janet Jamison
3/24/2026 12:21	Kelly Ratchinsky	ICE detention center opposition complaint - SLC Council	Hello, My name is Kelly Ratchinsky and I am a constituent in SLC. I'm writing to inform you that a ICE detention facility is NOT welcome in SLC in my opinion . There are human rights violations reported from similar facilities and it would indescribably inhumane to host this kind of facility in any of our districts. Let's protect humans of all ethnicities are origins. No to ICE detention facilities!! Please acknowledge receipt of this note. Kelly
3/24/2026 12:28	Patrick Murphy	ICE detention center opposition complaint - SLC Council	As a resident of Salt Lake County, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the presence of an ICE facility in our community. I urge you to take immediate action to prevent this facility from being established. Sincerely, Dr. Patrick Murphy West Valley City, UT 84128

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/24/2026 12:50	Karen HORNE	PLEASE DENY ZONING CHANGE FOR SUGARHOUSE PARK HOTEL	Dear City Council, I'm a business owner and resident of the Sugarhouse area (south liberty) since 1996. I also grew up in Utah in the 1970s. I loved working next to Granite Furniture on 21st south in the late 1990s, early 2000s. I frequented 1300 E., 1100 E and 2100 south area for years, but have since been disappointed by the level of vertical construction in recent years, and find navigating that neighborhood more stressful. I STRENUOUSLY OBJECT to the proposal the council is considering to relax zoning protections to introduce yet another high rise into the neighborhood - a hotel bordering a public park no less. 1. BLOCKS OUR MOUNTAIN VIEWS - This will change the experience of the park, as well as anyone looking towards the mountains from below. We'll see a looming building, instead of our beloved mountain range. One of the things I enjoy most about SLC are the vistas, and being able to look up towards our Wasatch mountains, and down towards the Oquirrh. 2. TRAFFIC IS ALREADY HIGHLY CONGESTED THERE. 1300 east is heavily used, and 2100 South even more so. What a Terrible idea to create more traffic at that intersection. I have a friend whose grandchild was almost mortally injured crossing 1300 south at 2100 s. and had to have intensive years long treatment to begin recovery. 3. INTRODUCES BIGGER COMMERCIAL ENTITY IMPINGING ON OUR PARK - Keep parks for the public! And keep this parcel less intensive so it doesn't interfere with the public good. A one-story Sizzler is hardly like a nine-story Hotel. Thank you for your consideration of these concerns Karen Horne
3/24/2026 12:56	Adam Meister	Sugar House Hotel Master Plan and Zoning Map Amendments March 24th hearing	The proposed Sugar House hotel is a great example of the potential results of an abundance mindset that progressive cities should adopt. I live in Sugar House and I walk by the extended stay hotel almost every day. I cringe when I see it and wonder why this great neighborhood does not have a high class hotel where I could (and would) house my out of town family during visits. All sorts of visitors to SLC will love making their base of operations Sugar House thanks to this hotel. Get rid of the zoning bureaucracy and make the hotel a reality ASAP. I often end up near the ugly empty lot where the hotel will be located. It is a dirty nuisance that should be replaced with a productive hotel. Adam Meister
3/24/2026 13:04	Elizabeth Reily	Hotel at Sugarhouse Park	Dear Council members, Please vote NO to any plan to build a multi level building at the North/West corner of Sugarhouse Park. Please keep Salt Lake City as beautiful as it is. The view from that corner brings peace to thousands of commuters! It's a lovely view of the Wasatch Front, and I consider it a quality of life issue. Millions of dollars are always considered by cities, and natural beauty is destroyed. Also, the hotel will invariably produce pollution of one form or another. That property sits right by a stream, which flows to the Great Salt Lake. PLEASE vote no. This is not California, and as someone who grew up in California's Bay Area, I saw orchards disappear one by one for Silicon Valley to be built. I moved to Utah 8 years ago and can attest that once you go down this path, there will be no end. Not everyone can afford to live in the areas right next to the mountain. The views are already disappearing. Look at the giant structure in Mill Creek now, and what once was a lovely view from Harmons is now a building. Is this truly necessary? Please consider this question. A one story building is the best bet for maintaining quality of life for us citizens, and also protecting the stream, as well as the immense increase in traffic if a hotel is built there. Thank you very much. A. Reily Salt Lake city
3/24/2026 13:13	Anonymous Constituent	Phone call to City Council	Caller has 3 concerns about the proposed Sugar House hotel. 1. The increase in traffic in the park. People will use that area to turn around, park or drive through for no reason. 2. This is one of the last clean and comfortable parks in the city. I am concerned about pollution and over crowding. 3. A large story building will block the gorgeous view we currently have. Please vote no against the multi story and only allow a single story building. We don't want it to look like California and lose all the beauty due to money

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/24/2026 13:15	Michael Rowley	Phone call to City Council	Objects to 90 foot high rise on the corner of 2100 S and 1300 E. Caller says with the concentration of developments in Sugarhouse that it will make this area unlivable and asks for the Council Members to not approve the rezone for the high rise.
3/24/2026 13:56	Perrine Anderson	Sugarhouse Hotel	Hello, I'm calling to leave a comment. I'm strongly opposed to replacing the old Sizzler in Sugar House with a new high-rise hotel. That area is already very busy, and I often avoid it because of traffic. I've lived in Sugar House for a long time, and I don't think adding more traffic near the park is a good idea. Thank you.
3/24/2026 14:02	Bonnie Gordon	Meeting tonight 3/24/26 RE proposed zoning change	It is my opinion that we need to keep the height restrictions low so that as many people as possible around the Sugarhouse Park can see the mountains, and any other greenery possible, in order to fully enjoy this public health benefit of open space and beauty. Please do not allow views to be blocked. I am against a change to zoning. Thank you, Bonnie Gordon
3/24/2026 14:05	Terri Sofarelli	Proposed Sugar House Hotel Rezone comment	To whom it may concern, As a long time resident, home owner and tax payer living in Sugarhouse, I am adamantly opposed to changing the zoning at 2111 S 1300 E from MU-3 to MU-8. Sugarhouse has undergone extensive, and what seems like unchecked housing and commercial development over the past 25 years, and residents do not need or want more. Sugarhouse is now overcrowded, with heavy foot and automobile traffic. There is increased noise, light pollution and visual obstruction of the mountains. The quaintness, charm and personality of Sugarhouse has changed. Please do not allow this rezoning to proceed. Thank you for your time. Sincerely, Theresa (Terri) Sofarelli
3/24/2026 14:06	Larry FERICKS	Voicemail to City Council	Good afternoon. This is Larry Castle-Ferricks, and I am commenting on the proposal for zoning change at the old Sizzler property at the corner of Sugar House Park. As a 30-year resident of Sugar House Park, we've experienced all of the many changes that have happened in the Sugar House area, and many of the changes have improved the traffic situation but to put a nine-storey hotel at the corner of Sugar House Park detracts from the park itself and the general area that corner needs to remain open and should in fact, the property should in fact be incorporated back into the park rather than into a hotel. The traffic at that area cannot manage hotel traffic and the majority of people do not use ride share to get to places like that and therefore there's no easy access with the public transportation so it would be an additional problem for traffic and I avoid most of that area and the businesses that are in that area are I think affected by a lot of locals who do go around and try to avoid getting stuck in the traffic in Sugar House. So my comment is to say no on the zoning change for the Sugar House Park corner, northwest corner. Thank you. Bye.
3/24/2026 14:09	Becky Wilson	Voicemail to City Council	Hi, my name's Becky Wilson. I live in the Sugar House area, and I'm calling to leave a message in opposition to a change in zoning that you're considering on March 24th at 7 p.m. There's a plan. A developer would like to change the zoning code to allow a seven- to nine-story hotel at the corner of Sugar House Park, and I urge you not to allow that. I spend a lot of time in the park, and I also live in the area, so I spend quite a bit of my time in the Sugar House area, and the traffic is just horrendous. So that's one reason why I'm opposed to it. It would be a spot where people would need to enter and exit frequently, and it just does not make any sense there. Also, the size is quite large and large. just doesn't fit in with the area, and also I think earthquake issues would make it kind of a silly height to have there. I don't think it would be safe. Anyway, I would urge you to vote against that zoning change. It just does not fit in with the area, and traffic is just horrendous in that area. It's a key spot for people to get on and off the freeway and to also do grocery shopping there. And plus, it's just a terrible eyesore in the park area. Anyway, thank you again. My name is Becky Wilson, and I'm a citizen of Salt Lake City, and I urge you to consider my opinion. Thanks. Bye.

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/24/2026 14:13	Karen Horn	Voicemail to City Council	Hello, this is Karen Horn, a 30-year resident of South Liberty and Sugar House. I'm calling to urge the council to reject the change in zoning that would allow a 90-foot hotel on our public park. I'm already concerned about traffic congestion in the area, and this would only increase it And also, one of the things I enjoy most about our neighborhood is views of the mountain and down towards the sunset. And this high rise will block our mountain views and really change our experience in the neighborhood. Also, intense private development should not take place alongside our public park. Thank you for your consideration of these issues. Thanks again.
3/24/2026 14:14	Kim Hills	Sugar House Hotel Rezone	Dear SLC council, Re: the property at 2111 South 1300 East (Old Sizzler Steakhouse property) As a longtime Sugarhouse resident I frankly do not like the suggestion of allowing a change to the zoning to permit a hotel to be built in the Sugarhouse area at that location. To my knowledge there is already at least one existing hotel in Sugarhouse. I see no benefit other than someone's plan to enrich themselves by building a hotel at that location. I recognize that there will be some financial benefit to existing businesses but the disruption of construction hinders benefits until some unknown time in the future. Necessary utility upgrades may be a concern which means more expense for existing residents in the city especially in light of the current inflationary pressures on residents. If SLC is to be benefitted, no tax deferments should be allowed because of the tax burden on existing taxpayers/residents. The 90 foot height should never be allowed because it mocks existing housing and businesses. Even five Story buildings next to single family residences are not pleasant to look at and can destroy the feeling of community. Wide spacing (large lots) between such buildings and single family housing might mitigate some of these concerns. However a single story business at that location is the preferred type of use for that property. If Salt Lake City bought that property it could be used for a Sugarhouse Park enhancement which would be a better use and less of an eyesore for residents. In short I request that you do not allow the zoning change for that property. Sincerely, Kim Hills
3/24/2026 14:19	Max Tok	Funding for CDCIP	Dear Council, Spy Hop's Phase 2 Productions Advanced Apprenticeship is awesome! I have had many work experiences that were created through them. I received my certification in Filmmaking from UVU because of the Spy Hop programs. I run a YT channel which is only possible because of all that Spy Hop and the Phase 2 Production Advances Apprentice has thought me. That being hands on training with industry standard equipment or what steps to take to pursue my goals. This program provides real workforce pathways for young adults in Salt Lake City while also supporting local businesses and nonprofits through creative work. You should support programs like Phase 2 that expand economic opportunity and invest in the next generation of Utah's creative workforce. Thank you, Max Tokhtuev

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/24/2026 15:01	Kara Pettit	Closure of N Temple from March to October 2027 and Alternatives	<p>I recently learned of this proposal to close N. Temple, S. Temple and W. Temple for 7 months, so I listened to the Council meeting from February at which City Staff made their presentation. I appreciate the advocacy for your constituents that both of you demonstrated at the February meeting. Chris knows me and I live in his District. Ms. Petro, I've copied you on this email as well because I thought your comments, questions and concerns were spot on. After listening to the Staff presentation, I was left with the following questions: 1. What is the basis for the estimate there will be 22K-29K visitors each day for 6 entire months? Does the City have an understanding of the correctness of that estimate, and the extent the Church is using the Conference Center for visitors in addition to Temple Square? 2. I did not hear any data on traffic or pedestrian counts for any of the streets that were proposed to be closed. I suspect the traffic count on N. Temple far exceeds the counts on either S. Temple or W. Temple. Because, as you both pointed out, N. Temple is the primary east-west arterial for anyone coming from north of S. Temple. Thus, the impact of closing that street is tremendous, and for 7 months! It was a disaster when they closed it for much shorter periods for the construction contractors. 3. Has the City evaluated alternatives to closing N. Temple? Could temporary pedestrian bridges be built? Please ensure alternatives are explored. 4. Please also ensure the analysis of this proposal includes a comprehensive assessment of other temporary road closures that may occur during these 7 months. The work on the 600 North bridge is impacting east/west traffic now, and I am uncertain of the timeline for that project. Ms. Petro also mentioned 400 S may be partially closed for construction at some point. 200 West is likely to be closed at some level during this time for construction of the new school. Closures for events at the Delta Center, etc. etc. 5. Someone at the February hearing phrased this a closure during summer months, implying it would not have as much effect on students traveling east/west. The proposal includes the last 3.5 months of the 2026-27 school year and the first 2 months of the 2027-28 year. It will have a significant impact on students and families. 6. Why does the Church need to use private buses to shuttle people from an area near the Fairpark to Temple Square, instead of utilizing Trax? I thought Councilman Puy's comment on the impact on air quality was well-taken. The buses will also add to the traffic congestion caused by the closure of N. Temple. Is there something the City, in conjunction with UTA, can do to minimize additional traffic from buses and encourage the use of Trax or existing transit? Thanks for your consideration and service.</p> <p>Sincerely, Kara Pettit</p>
3/24/2026 15:05	Carol Betts	Sugarhouse	<p>I'd like to comment on the idea of a 7-9 story building in sugarhouse. Can't we leave some part of our valley as a quaint comfortable place without placing buildings so overpowering there? Put the big building closer to the downtown area where it ascetically fits.</p>
3/24/2026 15:06	Rachel Broadbent	Sugar House Hotel Rezone	<p>Hello Council, I live in sugarhouse, within easy walking and bicycle distance from the commercial area. I believe the current zone of MU-3 is sufficient, we do NOT need buildings up to 90ft. tall nor more hotels, nor more commercial buildings creeping eastward. There are sooooo many new and tall residential buildings being built that infrastructure will have more and more demands upon it already. I think that before we approve more hotels a study of occupancy of all surrounding hotels and airbnb should be made. I suspect we are not at capacity, and hotel development and 90' tall buildings would NOT benefit the residential landowners in the area, only make distant developers richer without enriching our community. Thank you for considering your constituent's comments. -- Rachel Broadbent</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/24/2026 15:10	Christine Pomeroy	Concerns with the N Temple Closure and Direct Effects	Dear Mr. Wharton, I am writing this email to urge you to vote against the proposed road closures for the Temple reopening celebration. As you know, the proposed road closures will essentially cut off east-west traffic in the northern part of downtown. This is unacceptable and must be avoided. It already takes 15-20 minutes to drive from the avenues to the west side, or vice versa. This closure will further distance the connection between these two communities. Have you closely considered the direct implications to commuters who use this corridor to go to work and school? The paltry payment of \$2.2 million to the city will provide zero compensation to the many commuters this closure will affect. Wasted time due to extended commute times impacts families. Longer commutes for the road closures will mean parents have less time to spend with their children, less time to take care of life's demands. And for some parents, less time to work to support their families. My family will be personally affected by this closure, as my 14-year old will attend West High or SLCSE next school year. The UTA bus ride to SLCSE is already 40 minutes. I expect the alternate route will add 15-20 minutes more to this ride, with similar increases in commute time to West High. The people will come to the Temple reopening regardless of the road closures. The revenue to the city will be there, whether or not a total E-W barricade is implemented. I hope you will put the needs of your constituents above a buyout from the Church. Regards, Christine Pomeroy
3/24/2026 15:34	Anonymous Constituent	Sugarhouse Hotel	I'm 10000000% sure that I am against the Sugarhouse hotel!!!! It's just a bad idea.
3/24/2026 15:45	Dan Lollar	ICE Detention Center	Councillors, I'm writing today to ask that you please do what is in your power to keep ICE out of Salt Lake City. If that means bringing a lawsuit against them or against this current administration, please do so. Everywhere ICE goes, they bring along fear, violence, and chaos. They do not belong in our city, especially in such an outsized capacity as they are currently planning. Thank you very much for your time. Best, Dan Lollar
3/24/2026 15:45	Beth Thomas	Phone call to City Council	Sugar Houser resident for nearly 40 years and is in opposition for allowing a building of such great height on the property of 2100 S and 1300 E. A building of that magnitude will effect create more traffic in the area and make it more difficult to get around thatn it already is.
3/24/2026 15:48	Laura Livnat	ICE Detention Center	City council, I'm writing to you today to ask you to represent your community by suing DHS for not respecting local Control of our local Authorities. ICE detention centers in the country have shown themselves to be abusers of basic human rights and dignity and do NOT belong in Utah, full stop. We have law enforcement and it's dangerous to citizens when a federal government group grants themselves control in our state. DHS has lied to us all and bought a warehouse in secret on the west side of SLC. If allowed to be used as a detention center, you will be showing yourselves to be supporters of rape, unchecked violence and locking up US citizens who get caught up in ICE's illegal detention of citizens as well as non Citizens. Please vote against this center and sue DHS to force it to adhere to Utah's laws and local control. Laura Livnat 84106
3/24/2026 15:51	Martha Farney	Voicemail to City Council	Hi, my name is Martha Farney. I am very opposed to a big building on that piece of property. It is such a lovely piece of property. A reception center or something a little more elegant than a tall building would be wonderful there. I hope they are not able to put in a big building there. Thank you.
3/24/2026 15:53	Pat McGill	FTR CDBG	As a former client and current board member of FTR I would like to let you know what a positive impact Fit To Recover has had on me and my family. The community does not have many convenient low cost options for people in recovery. A variety of programs are supported that help individuals achieve goals beyond sobriety and provide a positive impact on all those we are involved with. Best Regards, Patrick McGill

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/24/2026 15:55	Dawnita Hugie	NO ICE DETENTION CENTER	I am writing to implore you to sue DHS along with Salt Lake County and help take a united front against DHS and ICE shoving an immoral detention camp down the throats of those of us residing in Salt Lake County. Thank you for listening to my concern. Please vote to sue! Sincerely, Dawnita Hugie Taylorsville, UT 84129
3/24/2026 15:56	Carole Murnin	Stop ICE	Please file a lawsuit against ICE. We dont want a detention centers in Utah. No mask allowed on ICE NO ICE serving as TSA agents No ICE at elections Sorry for brief comments but I had cataract surgery this morning & can't see well. Regards, Carole Murnin
3/24/2026 15:58	Jane Bowman	Keep ICE out of SL County	We don't need that kind of trouble..... Respectfully, Jane Bowman SL CO resident
3/24/2026 15:59	Sharon Ellsworth-Nielson	ICE Warehouse	Hello SLC City Council, I live in Salt Lake, am a retired teacher and member of MWEG. I'm writing to ask you to fight against an ICE detention facility here in Salt Lake. I strongly disagree with Gov. Spencer Cox's public comments and tactic support of ICE acquiring a warehouse to convert it to what is essentially an internment camp, a place where people from across our state and the west, including citizens and lawful residents, will be detained without due process. We know what will happen here; we've seen this play out in other cities. And we've seen in play out here in Utah two generations ago at Topaz, Utah. My children's grandfather, a 3rd generation Japanese-American, was unlawfully detained along with his entire family at Heart Mountain because of the same fear and ultimately racism that fuels the creation of these huge detention centers now. We have been here before. Our state, county, and cities leaders must ask themselves this question: "Will I want history to remember my part in something that was recognized as shameful in 1942 and is equally shameful today? Will I be proud of my actions or regretful?" I appreciate your work as Salt Lake City leaders. I appreciate Erin Mendenhall's work. That's why I'm reaching out. Please fight to stop the unlawful detainment of people without due process through suing DHS or by any possible means. Sincerely, Sharon Ellsworth-Nielson

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/24/2026 16:00	Betty Williams	Sugar House Hotel - I oppose the zoning change and related construction	<p>To Whom It May Concern I currently reside in the Sugarhouse/Millcreek area and have attended some of the prior meetings related to the proposed Zoning change and construction of the Sugarhouse Hotel at the site of the old Sizzler restaurant at 21st South and 13th East. I would like to again express my vehement opposition to the hotel project and any change in zoning. This location is not a good site for a hotel that will mar the beauty of the neighborhood and have major negative impacts on the traffic and atmosphere of this area. Property owners within the neighboring area who currently can enjoy the beauty of the mountains from their homes would only be able to see an ugly, multi-story building blocking their views if this zoning request and related construction is allowed to proceed forward. The site is not appropriate for anything more than a one-story building and is well suited for a restaurant, coffee shop or other small retail establishment --- certainly NOT for a hotel!! I regularly frequented that Sizzler as a customer over my 35+ years of working nearby. I would LOVE for there to be another small restaurant in that location! (but not one within a hotel setting) There will undoubtedly be environmental impacts to the adjacent Sugarhouse Park area, with potential effects to the substrate and water table from construction activities and subsequent operations or activities. That corner is not suited to the significant traffic flow increases that would arise with a hotel offering guest suites numbering in the hundreds. The hotel will only be accessible if heading north (on 13th E) or if heading east (on 21st S), so guests leaving the hotel with a goal of heading west or south will need to make U-turns, often accessing neighborhood streets, to proceed to their destinations. The results of the traffic study that were published do not at all reflect what we, as long-time Salt Lake residents, know to be a reality for locations similar to this within the valley. PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE ---- DO NOT APPROVE A CHANGE IN ZONING OR ALLOW THE PROPOSED SUGARHOUSE HOTEL MONSTROSITY TO MAR THE BEAUTY OF THIS NEIGHBORHOOD! Thank you for the opportunity to express my thoughts on this matter. Betty Williams</p>
3/24/2026 16:03	Karen HORNE	Please DENY zoning change to permit hotel on Sugarhouse park	<p>Dear City Council, I'm a business owner and resident of the Sugarhouse area (south liberty) since 1996. I also grew up in Utah in the 1970s. I loved working next to Granite Furniture on 21st south in the late 1990s, early 2000s. I frequented 1300 E., 1100 E and 2100 south area for years, but have since been disappointed by the level of vertical construction in recent years, and try to avoid the area. I STRENUOUSLY OBJECT to the proposal the council is considering to relax zoning protections to introduce yet another high rise into the neighborhood - a hotel bordering a public park no less. 1. BLOCKS OUR MOUNTAIN VIEWS - This will change the experience of the park, as well as anyone looking towards the mountains from below. We'll see a looming building, instead of our beloved mountain range. One of the things I enjoy most about SLC are the vistas, and being able to look up towards our Wasatch mountains, and down towards the Oquirrh. 2. TRAFFIC IS ALREADY HIGHLY CONGESTED THERE. 1300 east is heavily used, and 2100 South even more so. What a Terrible idea to create more traffic at that intersection. I have a friend whose grandchild was almost mortally injured crossing 1300 south at 2100 s. and had to have intensive years long treatment to begin recovery. 3. INTRODUCES BIGGER COMMERCIAL ENTITY IMPINGING ON OUR PARK - Keep parks for the public! And this parcel less intensive so it doesn't interfere with the public good.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of these concerns Karen Horne</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/24/2026 16:04	Sarah Foran	DHS lawsuit	<p>Hello, My name is Sarah Foran, I am unable to make the council meeting tonight but I would like to voice my support for the Alliance for a Better Utah's proposal to issue a lawsuit against DHS and the ICE facility. While I understand that a lawsuit is a costly and time intensive investment, the costs of a local detention center will be a longterm higher cost to taxpayers than the lawsuit. The current profit projections have neither been explained nor verified and do not pass an initial sniff test. Based on news articles, these centers often end up costing the tax payer more to operate. Additionally the environmental impacts are not something that the city and county are prepared to incur. In our lowest snowpack year on record and the worsening of our drought status (plus the Olympics on the horizon) this facility is moving us away from addressing these issues and creating a greater impact that we cannot afford or sustain. I would be remiss to leave out the moral implications of allowing this plan to move forward. There is no maximum monetary value for the cost of doing what's right. It is a cost we should be willing to pay. The current data is not indicating that retained individuals are 100% criminals. The abduction of our neighbors and community members violates all of our justice systems we so proudly tout as a country. As a state that is blacken with the history of Topaz, it would be wise to use our history to prevent the execution of the same mistakes. It is also insulting to our future Olympic visitors and tourist to allow this facility and all it stands for into our county. I am sure the fallout will be greater than imagined if we do not fight against this atrocity. Morally, financially, environmentally, sustainably there is no justifiable reason to allow this detention center into our community, our county, or our state. Thank you for your consideration, Sarah Foran</p>
3/24/2026 16:23	Nicole Salazar	Voicemail to City Council	<p>Hi, my name is Nicole Salazar. I am a resident of District 7. I'm calling to give a comment about the proposed building at the old Sizzler location on the corner of 21st South and 13th East near Sugar House Park. I oppose the building being approved as planned. The traffic in that area is already absolutely atrocious and untenable with the amount of business that's already there. Adding a hotel or apartment building of that magnitude will only make it far worse and will make Sugar House just not a fun place to go. I will avoid it at all costs if we can, which will only hurt the small businesses that call that Sugar House area home like spoons and spice. I don't want that to happen. I don't think this is a good use of that property. I would prefer something that is more community-oriented and less oriented towards big business. You're welcome to give me a call if you have any questions, 1-718-1210.</p> <p>Again, my name is Nicole Salazar, and I'm a resident of District 7. Thank you so much.</p>
3/24/2026 16:25	Anonymous Constituent	Voicemail to City Council	<p>I would like to register my opposition to the multi-story being planned at the corner of 21st and 13th where the old Sizzler used to be. To me, it would change the nature of our community, and we would be really sad to have that sort of a thing go there. Thank you. I'm a 50-year resident of Sugar House.</p>
3/24/2026 16:26	Bob Farney	Voicemail to City Council	<p>My name is Bob Farney, and I am calling to register my opposition to the new building that's being proposed at the old Sizzler site on 21st South and 13th East. I think a very large building at that site is completely out of character for the environment. It obscures that beautiful sugar house view, and it's going to increase congestion to an incredibly congested corner area. I think the traffic flow at that point is already very terrible, and adding a very large building would only enhance the traffic congestion. My name is Bob Farney, F-A-R-N-E-Y. Thank you.</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/24/2026 16:52	Sharon Peters	In Opposition of ICE	ICE detention centers put a huge strain on the local infrastructure. With the small snowpack this winter adding a large ice detention facility in this valley cannot be supported. It would put a further strain on water resources and the Great Salt Lake which we cannot handle. Where is the environmental impact statement for this facility? What are the water and sewer requirements for this facility? Stop this facility! Sharon Peters
3/24/2026 16:57	Ryan Houk	ICE Detention Center	We are asking the Salt Lake City Council to protect our civil liberties and human rights by bringing a lawsuit to the Department of Homeland Security. DHS is infringing on the local control of municipalities and counties. There is precedent for this type of legal action as we've seen from lawsuits like the one in Maryland. DHS has not conducted proper environmental assessments on the impact to the Great Salt Lake, asked for public comment, or considered viable alternatives. The immigration detention centers in other states have been rife with physical and sexual abuse, food shortages, and unsafe conditions and citizens, lawful residents, and non-citizens across the US have been taken and held without due process. Citizens, lawful residents, and non-citizens across the US have been taken and held without due process. Over 130 American citizens have been physically harmed, illegally detained, and racially profiled by ICE agents in other communities. Thanks for standing up for your community! Warmly, Ryan & Miranda Houk
3/24/2026 17:00	Kassie Wahlstrom Ford	ICE Detention Center	Dear Ms. Petro, As my Salt Lake City Council representative I am calling upon you to protect our civil liberties and human rights by bringing a lawsuit against the Department of Homeland Security for the proposed immigration center on Salt Lake's west side. DHS is infringing on the local control of municipalities and counties. DHS has not conducted proper environmental assessments on the impact to the Great Salt Lake, asked for public comment, or considered viable alternatives. The immigration detention centers in other states have been rife with physical and sexual abuse, food shortages, and unsafe conditions and citizens, lawful residents, and non-citizens across the US have been taken and held without due process. Over 130 American citizens have been physically harmed, illegally detained, and racially profiled by ICE agents in other communities. Thanks for standing up for your community! Best, Kassie Wahlstrom Ford
3/24/2026 17:05	Mia Crisostomo	ICE Detention Center	Dear Councilmember Petro, I am unable to attend the City Council meeting that is occurring this evening due to having to work, but I wanted to contact you as a constituent of Salt Lake City to let you know that I strongly oppose the purchase of the warehouse by DHS to create an inhumane detention center in our city. Not only is ICE grossly inhumane and part of what I believe to be a fake police force terrorizing peaceful members of our community, but the location of the building will also put wetlands that we depend on directly for water purification at risk. It is against the best interest of Salt Lake City residents on so many levels. The proposed benefits don't make any sense, and quite frankly I'm tired of hearing that possible profits are worth the degradation of human life, and the lake that is our city's namesake. Thank you for your consideration. Mia Crisostomo Resident of the Sugarhouse Neighborhood