



MOTION SHEET

CITY COUNCIL *of* SALT LAKE CITY

TO: City Council Members

FROM: Brian Fullmer
Policy Analyst

DATE: November 10, 2020

**RE: 833 South 800 East Rezone and Master Plan Amendment
PLNPCM2019-01111**

MOTION 1 (adopt with development agreement)

I move that the Council adopt the ordinance subject to the administration entering into a development agreement with the applicant which includes the following conditions:

- Provide three two-bedroom townhome rental units at 80% area median income for a period of not less than five years from the issuance of a certificate of occupancy.
- Height of the townhome building will not exceed thirty feet.

MOTION 2 (adopt without development agreement)

I move that the Council adopt the ordinance

MOTION 3 (defer action)

I move that the Council defer action to a future Council meeting.

MOTION 4 (reject)

I move that the Council reject the ordinance.





COUNCIL STAFF REPORT

CITY COUNCIL of SALT LAKE CITY

TO: City Council Members

FROM: Brian Fullmer
Policy Analyst

DATE: November 10, 2020

**RE: 833 South 800 East Rezone and Master Plan Amendment
PLNPCM2019-01111**

Item Schedule:

Briefing: September 15, 2020

Set Date: September 15, 2020

Public Hearing #1: October 6, 2020

Public Hearing #2: October 20, 2020

Potential Action: November 10, 2020

PUBLIC HEARING #2 SUMMARY

Twelve people spoke at the October 20 public hearing; seven opposed to the proposal and five in support. Comments opposed to the rezone and master plan amendment were primarily about incompatibility with and changing the neighborhood character. Loss of the affordable housing units in two homes on the property was also mentioned. An area downzone several years ago was mentioned by some opposed to the proposal. It was stated the current proposal overrides work residents did to preserve their neighborhood.

Those who spoke in favor of the proposal expressed balancing the need for growth while preserving history and stated this project strikes that balance. The applicant stated current zoning would allow a total of 18 housing units on the two parcels. He hopes to return to the previous zoning on the subject parcel which would allow for a total of 23 units on the parcels.

The City Council voted to close the public hearing and defer action to a future Council meeting.

The following information was provided for the October 20 public hearing. It is provided again for background purposes.

PUBLIC HEARING #1 SUMMARY

Six people spoke at the October 6 public hearing; three opposed to the proposal and three in support. Those opposed to the rezone and master plan amendment cited a neighborhood rezone approximately six



years ago and not wanting to make additional changes. Incompatibility with the neighborhood and a lack of less expensive housing units were also mentioned.

Those who support the project noted a need for additional density to support businesses in the 9th & 9th neighborhood. The applicant spoke in support of his project and stated some comments opposing the proposal are factually inaccurate. He stated he is trying to get back to seven housing units that would have been allowed on the subject parcel before the neighborhood downzone.

The Council closed the public hearing and noted a second public hearing scheduled for October 20, 2020.

The following information was provided for the October 6 public hearing. It is provided again for background purposes.

WORK SESSION SUMMARY

Council Member questions were focused on the number of units in the project, the price point for units, and parking. The applicant noted there are 23 market rate rental units in the proposed development. Plans call for 47 total parking places on the property. Each townhome is designed with a two-car garage that is accessed from alleys within the project. The garages will not be visible from 800 East. Vehicle access to the property will be from driveways on 800 East and on Chase Avenue. Since Chase Avenue is a private street, the applicant stated he obtained consent from all property owners on the street to provide access to the project.

A question about trees in the landscape buffer was raised and if they are too large for the space. The applicant stated his intent is to provide a robust buffer at installation and the landscape architect recommended the proposed trees.

The applicant provided his presentation to Council staff and it was emailed to Council Members for reference.


The following information was provided for the September 15 work session. It is provided again for background purposes.

The Council will be briefed about an ordinance to amend the zoning map and future land use map for the property located at 833 South 800 East from its current R-2 (Single & Two-Family Residential) zoning designation to RMF-45 (Moderate/High-Density Multi-family Residential). Currently the future land use map designates this property as “Low-Density Residential.” The applicant, Micah Peters of Clearwater Homes, would like to develop the site for multi-family housing.

The applicant also owns the adjacent property at 847 East 800 South where the Telegraph Exchange Building is located. Under the proposal, the two properties would be consolidated into one parcel for the development. A total of 23 residential units are planned, six in the Telegraph Exchange Building which would be renovated, and 17 on the subject property. Two existing homes on the subject property, built in 1891 and 1896 would be demolished under the proposal. Neither dwelling is designated as historic or protected so the property could be redeveloped by right for a duplex or twin-home under the current zoning designation. A detailed description of the project including revisions to the original proposal following the Planning Commission’s May 27, 2020 meeting are included on pages 19-24 of the Administration’s transmittal.

Nearby properties are a mixture of zoning designations including R-2 (Single & Two-Family Residential), RMF-45 (Moderate/High-Density Multi-family Residential), CB (Community Business), and SR-3 (Special Development Pattern Residential District) as shown on the zoning map below.

Planning staff recommended and the Planning Commission voted to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for the proposed zoning map and future land use map amendments for the subject property. It should be noted the Planning Commission approved a planned development for the property conditioned upon City Council approval of the zoning map and future land use map amendments. If the Council does not approve the proposed amendments, the planned development will be null and void.



Goal of the briefing: Review the proposed zoning map amendment, determine if the Council supports moving forward with the proposal.

POLICY QUESTIONS

1. The Council may wish to ask what changes, if any, were made as a result of the public process since the May 27, 2020 Planning Commission meeting.
2. Does the Council support the Planning Commission's recommendation to adopt the proposed changes?

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

From 2012-2014 the City worked on a general rezoning of the 9th and 9th area aimed at preserving the single-family homes and character of the area. There was concern from residents the existing nature of the area was threatened by commercial growth, particularly on properties near existing commercial areas. Many area parcels were zoned RMF-30, RMF-35 or RMF-45, but included single-family or duplex

dwellings. These were rezoned R-2 to match zoning with then-current area development. The subject property at 833 South 800 East is one of the parcels rezoned from RMF-30 to R-2 in this process.

KEY CONSIDERATIONS

Six key considerations were identified through Planning's analysis of the proposed project and during the Planning Commission public hearing held May 27, 2020. A summary of each is below. See pages 25-34 of the Administration's transmittal for the complete analysis.

Consideration 1: City goals and policies

As noted in the summary of relevant City master plans below, policies and statements can be found that support and conflict with proposed changes to the subject property. Planning staff noted these changes should be weighed against existing policies in terms of what is in the City's best interest and priorities.

Central Community Master Plan (2005)

The *Central Community Master Plan* notes the neighborhood where the subject property is located includes a mixture of architectural styles and building types, but the majority are single-family detached residential structures. The future land use map identifies the subject properties as Low Density Residential (1-15 dwelling units/acre). Total acreage of the two parcels is 0.79 acres which equals 29 units/acre with the proposed 23 units.

The *Central Community Master Plan* includes policies and statements both in support of and in conflict with the proposal. These are identified on pages 25-26 of the Administration's transmittal.

East Central Community Small Area Master Plan (1993)

The *East Central Community Small Area Master Plan* includes several scenarios on land use and policy options. The Telegraph Building was discussed as "warehouse space" which was its function at the time as it was used as storage space for The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. Another scenario included the building being used for residential space with up to 10 dwelling units and a different scenario was to convert the building to office space. Among the several options for the warehouse, preferred uses included multi-family residential.

Plan Salt Lake (2015)

Plan Salt Lake, the citywide master plan, emphasizes the need for a variety of housing options. Nearly half of housing units in Salt Lake City are single-family detached dwellings. While preserving existing housing stock will continue to be a priority for the City, over the next 25 years a variety of new housing options and types will be needed to accommodate the City's growing population and changing housing needs.

Planning staff noted the proposed development is supported by the general principles and initiatives found in *Plan Salt Lake*. They stated it would preserve an architecturally distinct and historically significant building while providing additional housing options within a walkable neighborhood that includes commercial services served by convenient transit opportunities.

Growing SLC: A Five-Year Housing Plan – 2018-2022 (2017)

Growing SLC cites density limitations as a local barrier exacerbating the city's housing crisis. The plan encourages enhanced flexibility of the land-use code to increase a diversity of housing types. This plan also references guiding policies and housing initiatives included in *Plan Salt Lake* as noted above. By reference, these policies are incorporated into the housing plan.

It is Planning staff's opinion the proposed development is in line with these strategies because it provides flexibility in existing code requirements while providing more housing units and housing variety in the neighborhood.

Consideration 2: Rezoning of the Property from R-2 to RMF-45

Through Planning's outreach process, some objections were raised about the requested zoning change of 833 South 800 East from R-2 to multi-family. Reference was made to the 2012-2014 downzoning of the area which included the subject property. Planning staff stated consideration must be given to the proposed change in terms of how the proposal meets the City's master plans and policies and whether the City's needs and proprieties have changed since the previous action took place.

Consideration 3: Central Community Master Plan Future Land Use Map Amendments

The applicant is requesting a change to the future land use map in the Central Community Master Plan from low-density residential to medium/high density residential. Planning staff noted the future land use map applies the low-density residential designation to both the property zoned R-2 and the adjacent property, also owned by the applicant, zoned RMF-45. The applicant included the following statement in his narrative:

The need for this application stems from a conflict in the Masterplan adopted in 2005. The conflict in the master plan is due to the master plan land use language to be low density throughout the neighborhood (10 - 20 units per acre), even on parcels zoned RMF-45 which is a moderate to high density multi-family residential zoning. Our application seeks simply to correct the noted Master plan conflict and utilize the density's associated with our current zoning.

Consideration 4: Preservation of the Structure vs. Allowed Development on the Subject Properties

As stated above, the Telegraph Exchange Building is located on a property currently zoned RMF-45. Although the building is iconic and distinctive in the 9th and 9th neighborhood, it is not located within a local historic district nor is it designated as a City Landmark site. Because of this it does not have protection from demolition and redevelopment of the property. A developer could demolish the building and redevelop the property with the current RMF-45 zoning.

Under current zoning for both parcels a total of 18 units could be built if all setbacks were met. The applicant stated the cost of renovating the Telegraph Exchange Building with seismic upgrades, fire access and safety considerations, and bringing it up to current building code standards would be prohibitively expensive. It is often more cost effective to demolish and old building and build a new one than to restore and reuse the old one.

To offset the cost of renovating the existing building, the applicant would like to add additional density with a total of 5 residential units more than would be permitted "by right" under the current zoning designation.

Consideration 5: Zoning Modifications Requested through the Planned Development

The Planning Commission approved a Planned Development with reduced setbacks and landscape buffers than typically required under the zoning. As noted above, the Planned Development is conditioned on the City Council approval of the zoning map and future land use map amendments.

Consideration 6: Impacts to Neighboring Properties and Compatibility

The proposed development includes both historic and modern architecture with the Telegraph Exchange Building representing historic aspects and the new townhome units more modern design. Renderings of the development can be seen in Attachment C (pages 46-84) of the Administration's transmittal.

A total of 46 parking spaces are proposed for the 23 units. Two spaces for each townhome provided in individual garages, and 12 covered parking spaces for the six loft units within the Telegraph Exchange Building. An additional four on-street parking stalls are located along the 800 East frontage. Providing two parking stalls for each dwelling unit meets the requirement for this type of development.

Planning staff received a comment from the adjacent property owner to the north objecting to a driveway next to his property. That concern along with a proposed elimination of a landscape buffer extending to an area where a trash and recycling enclosure were proposed were addressed in changes to the design. These changes include a 4-foot buffer heavily landscaped with trees and elimination of the trash and recycling enclosure. Each housing unit will be served by individual cans.

Several other public comments were submitted to Planning and are included in Attachment F (pages 97-134 of the Administration's transmittal). Comments included concerns about "spot zoning" of the subject parcel, nullification of the relatively recent zoning changes in the area that downzoned the parcel to R-2, preservation of neighborhood character, out of scale multi-family development, and the precedence a zoning change would set. Other concerns were focused on increased neighborhood traffic and parking impacts due to insufficient on-site parking and guests parking on the street.

Planning staff also received comments supportive of the development citing preservation of the historic building and providing additional housing options in the area.

It is Planning staff's opinion a 4-foot landscape buffer combined with placing the driveway and townhomes approximately 24.5 feet from the property line would adequately mitigate potential impacts to the property owner to the north. In addition, Planning staff believes placing the 30-foot tall townhomes between the 58-foot tall Telegraph Exchange Building and lower scale residential property to the north helps create a logical transition and step-down in scale to the surrounding neighborhood.

Based on the above six key considerations, Planning staff recommended, and the Planning Commission forwarded a positive recommendation for the rezone to the City Council.

ANALYSIS OF STANDARDS

Attachment E of the Planning Commission staff report (pages 88-96 of the Administration's transmittal) outlines Master Plan Amendment and Planned Development standards that should be considered as the Council reviews this proposal. Planning staff found this proposal generally complies with applicable standards. Please see the Planning Commission staff report for full details.

PUBLIC PROCESS

- Notice of the project and a formal letter requesting comments was sent to the Chairs of the East Liberty Park Community Organization and East Central Community Council on December 12, 2019.
- Planning Staff sent an early notification announcement of the project to all residents and property owners located within 300 feet of the project site on December 20, 2019 providing notice about the project and information on how to give public input on the project.
- Planning Staff hosted an Open House at the Tenth East Senior Center on January 9, 2020 to provide an opportunity for public comment and to have the applicant present to answer questions.
- Planning Staff attended the East Liberty Park Community Organization meeting held on January 23, 2020 to answer questions about the project.

- The East Central Community Council (ECCC) provided a formal letter dated January 20, 2020 expressing opposition to the project. The letter is included on 99-100 of the Administration's transmittal.
 - The 45-day recognized organization comment period expired January 30, 2020.
 - The Planning Commission held a Public Hearing on May 27, 2020. By unanimous vote, the Planning Commission voted to table all applications for the applicant and staff to address some unresolved issues. Minutes from the Planning Commission meeting of May 27, 2020 are included on pages 136-140 of the Administration's transmittal.
 - A Planning Commission Public Hearing was scheduled for July 8, 2020.
 - Public hearing notice mailed: June 25, 2020
 - Public hearing notice sign posted on property: June 25, 2020
 - Public notice posted on City and State websites & Planning Division list serve June 25, 2020
- The Planning Commission reviewed the petition again at its July 8, 2020 meeting. The Commission voted 8-1 to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council. Minutes of that meeting are found on pages 147-149 of the Administration's transmittal.



CITY COUNCIL TRANSMITTAL

Lisa Shaffer 
Lisa Shaffer, Chief Administrative Officer

Date Received: August 4, 2020
Date sent to Council: August 4, 2020

TO: Salt Lake City Council
Chris Wharton, Chair

DATE: 07/30/2020

FROM: Jennifer McGrath, Interim Director Department of Community & Neighborhoods


Jennifer McGrath (Jul 30, 2020 15:11 MDT)

SUBJECT: PLNPCM2019-01110 and PLNPCM2019-01111 – Rezone and Master Plan
Amendment at 833 South 800 East

STAFF CONTACT: David J. Gellner, AICP, Principal Planner, david.gellner@slcgov.com
(801) 535-6107

DOCUMENT TYPE: Ordinance

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council follow the recommendation of the Planning Commission to change the future land use map in the Central Community Master Plan from “Low-Density Residential” to “Medium/High Density Residential” for the subject property and change the zoning map to RMF-45 (Moderate/High Density Multi-Family Residential) from the current designation of R-2 (Single & Two-Family Residential) for the property located at 833 South 800 East.


BUDGET IMPACT: None

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION: Micah Peters of Clearwater Homes, the property owner is requesting that the City amend the zoning map and associated future land use map for the property located at 833 South 800 East in order to allow development of the site for multi-family housing. This project requires both Zoning Map and Master Plan Amendments that were filed in conjunction with Planned Development application for the Telegraph Exchange Lofts project. The following petitions are associated with this request:

- a. Master Plan Amendment - The associated future land use map in the Central Community Master Plan currently designates the property as "Low-Density Residential". The petitioner is requesting to amend the future land use map for the parcel to "Medium/High Density Residential". Case number PLNPCM2019-01110
- b. Zoning Map Amendment - The property is currently zoned R-2 – Single & Two-Family Residential district. The petitioner is requesting to amend the zoning map designation of the property to the RMF-45 – Moderate/High Density Multi-Family Residential district. Case number PLNPCM2019-01111
- c. Planned Development - Planned Development approval is needed to address various yard setbacks to property lines for the proposed multi-family development, modification of landscaping requirements and to allow more than one principle structure on the property. Case number PLNSUB2019-01112

Note: The Planned Development for the Telegraph Exchange Lofts was approved by the Salt Lake City Planning Commission on July 8, 2020. The Planned Development is conditioned upon approval of the new zoning. Thus, should the City Council not approve the zoning map amendment requested, any approval by the Planning Commission of the Planned Development will become null and void.

For specific information regarding the proposal, and Planning Staff's analysis and recommendation please refer to the Planning Commission Staff Reports found in Exhibit 3.b. (for July 8, 2020) and Exhibit 3.e. (for May 27, 2020)



PUBLIC PROCESS:

- Notice of the project and request for comments sent to the Chairs of the East Liberty Park Community Organization (ELPCO) and East Central Community Council (ECCC) on December 12, 2019
- Staff sent an early notification announcement of the project to all residents and property owners located within 300 feet of the project site on December 20, 2019 providing notice about the proposal and information on how to give public input on the project.
- Staff hosted an Open House at the Tenth East Senior Center on January 9, 2020 to provide an opportunity for public comment and to have the applicant present to answer questions.
- Staff attended the East Liberty Park Community Organization meeting held on January 23, 2020 to answer questions about the project.
- A Planning Commission Public Hearing was held on May 27, 2020. Numerous public comments were provided in advance of and at the Public Hearing. Those comments are included in the Planning Commission Staff Report and Minutes for May 27, 2020 (Exhibits 3.e and 3.f)
- The Planning Commission closed the Public Hearing and by unanimous vote, the Commission voted to table all three (3) applications in order for the applicant and staff to

address some unresolved issues with the proposed design and Fire Department access requirements.

- A Planning Commission Meeting was held on July 8, 2020. No additional public comments were taken on the proposal as the Commission closed the Public Hearing at the May 27, 2020 meeting. Comments received up to May 27, 2020 are included in the Planning Commission Staff Report and Minutes for May 27, 2020 (Exhibits 3.e and 3.f) and in the Planning Commission Staff Report for July 8, 2020 (Exhibit 3.b).
- Additional public comments received after the Public Hearing on May 27, 2020 are included in Exhibit 4.
- There were numerous comments received both in support and opposed to the proposed zoning and master plan changes and planned development. Staff considered these comments in their analysis included in Staff Reports. The Planning Commission also considered these comments in their analysis and recommendation on the petitions.
- At the Planning Commission Meeting on July 8, 2020, the Commission voted unanimously (8-1) to forward a Positive recommendation to City Council for both the proposed Master Plan and Zoning Map amendments. The Commission also voted unanimously (8-1) to Approve the Planned Development for the Telegraph Exchange Lofts subject to the approval of the zoning change by City Council.

EXHIBITS:

1. Project Chronology
2. Notice of City Council Hearing
3. Planning Commission (PC) Records

July 8, 2020

- a) Original Notice and Postmark for July 8, 2020
- b) Planning Commission Staff Report of July 8, 2020
- c) PC Agenda and Minutes of July 8, 2020

May 27, 2020

- d) Original Notice and Postmark for May 27, 2020
- e) Planning Commission Staff Report of May 27, 2020
- f) PC Agenda and Minutes of May 27, 2020

4. Additional Public Comments Received after the May 27, 2020 Planning Commission Public Hearing.
5. Original Petition
6. Mailing List

SALT LAKE CITY ORDINANCE

No. _____ of 2020

(Amending the zoning map pertaining to a parcel of property located at 833 South 800 East Street to rezone the parcel from **R-2 Single- and Two-Family Residential** to **RMF-45 Moderate/High Density Multi-Family Residential** and amending the Central Community Master Plan Future Land Use Map)

An ordinance amending the zoning map pertaining to a parcel of property located at 833 South 800 East Street to rezone the parcel from **R-2 Single- and Two-Family Residential** to **RMF-45 Moderate/High Density Multi-Family Residential** pursuant to petition number PLNPCM2019-01111 and amending the Central Community Master Plan Future Land Use Map pursuant to petition number PLNCPM2019-01110.

WHEREAS, Micah Peters of Clearwater Homes submitted an application to rezone the parcel of property located at 833 South 800 East Street to rezone the parcel from **R-2 Single- and Two-Family Residential** to **RMF-45 Moderate/High Density Multi-Family Residential** pursuant to petition number PLNPCM2019-01111 and amending the Central Community Master Plan Future Land Use Map with respect to the that property from Low-Density Residential to Medium/High Density Residential pursuant to petition number PLNCPM2019-01110; and

WHEREAS, at its July 8, 2020 meeting, the Salt Lake City Planning Commission held a public hearing and voted in favor of forwarding a positive recommendation to the Salt Lake City Council on said applications; and

WHEREAS, after a public hearing on this matter, the city council has determined that adopting this ordinance is in the city's best interests.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it ordained by the City Council of Salt Lake City, Utah:

SECTION 1. Amending the Zoning Map. The Salt Lake City zoning map, as adopted by the *Salt Lake City Code*, relating to the fixing of boundaries and zoning districts, shall be and hereby is amended to reflect that the parcel located at 833 South 800 East Street (Tax ID No. 08-25-376-018-0000) more particularly described on Exhibit "A" attached hereto, is rezoned from **R-2 Single- and Two-Family Residential to RMF-45 Moderate/High Density Multi-Family Residential.**

SECTION 2. Amending the Central Community Master Plan. The Future Land Use Map of the Central Community Master Plan shall be and hereby is amended to change the future land use designation of the property identified in Exhibit "A" from Low-Density Residential to Medium/High Density Residential.

SECTION 3. Effective Date. This Ordinance shall become effective on the date of its first publication.

Passed by the City Council of Salt Lake City, Utah, this ____ day of _____, 20__.

CHAIRPERSON

ATTEST AND COUNTERSIGN:

CITY RECORDER

Transmitted to Mayor on _____.

Mayor's Action: _____Approved. _____Vetoed.

MAYOR

CITY RECORDER
(SEAL)

Bill No. _____ of 20__
Published: _____.

APPROVED AS TO FORM
Salt Lake City Attorney's Office
Date: <u>July 29, 2020</u>
By: <u>Paul Nielson</u>
<i>Paul Nielson, Senior City Attorney</i>

Exhibit “A”

Legal description of the property parcel:

Tax ID No. **16-08-176-026-0000**

1114 BEG SW COR LOT 4, BLK 2, PLAT B, SLC SUR; N 5 RDS; E 9 RDS; S 5 RDS; W 9 RDS TO BEG. ALSO BEG E 148.5 FT FR SW COR SD LOT 4, N 82.5 FT; E 2.8 FT; S 82.5 FT; W 2.8 FT TO BEG. 7461-0*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1. Project Chronology**
- 2. Notice of City Council Hearing**
- 3. Planning Commission (PC) Records**
 - July 8, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting**
 - a) Original Notice & Postmark for July 8, 2020**
 - b) Planning Commission Staff Report of July 8, 2020**
 - c) PC Agenda and Minutes of July 8, 2020**
 - May 27, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting**
 - d) Original Notice & Postmark for May 27, 2020**
 - e) Planning Commission Staff Report of May 27, 2020**
 - f) PC Agenda and Minutes of May 27, 2020**
- 4. Additional Public Comments Received after the May 27, 2020 Planning Commission Public Hearing**
- 5. Original Petitions**
- 6. Mailing List**

1. Project Chronology

PROJECT CHRONOLOGY

PETITION:

**PLNPCM2019-01110 and PLNPCM2019-01111
Telegraph Exchanges Lofts - Zoning Map & Master Plan
Amendments and Planned Development – 833 & 847 South 800
East**

November 22, 2019	Petitions for the zoning map and master plan amendments and planned development received by the Salt Lake City Planning Division
December 4, 2019	Petitions assigned to David Gellner, Principal Planner, for staff analysis and processing.
December 12, 2019	Information about the proposal was sent to the Chairs of the East Liberty Park Community Organization (ELPCO) and East Central Community Council (ECCC) in order to solicit public comments and start the 45-day Recognized Organization input and comment period.
December 20, 2019	Staff sent an early notification announcement of the project to all residents and property owners living within 300 feet of the project site providing information about the proposal and how to give public input on the project.
January 9, 2020	Staff hosted an Open House at the Tenth East Senior Center on January 9, 2020 to provide an opportunity for public comment and to have the applicant present to answer questions.
January 20, 2020	The East Central Community Council (ECCC) provided a formal letter dated January 20, 2020 in relation to the project.
January 23, 2020	Staff attended the East Liberty Park Community Organization meeting held on January 23, 2020 to answer questions about the project.
January 30, 2020	The 45-day public comment period for Recognized Organizations ended. No formal comments were submitted to staff by the recognized organizations to date related to this proposal.
May 14, 2020	Public notice posted on City and State websites and sent via the Planning list serve for the Planning Commission meeting of May 27, 2020. Public hearing notice mailed.
May 15, 2020	Public hearing notice sign with project information and notice of the Planning Commission public hearing physically posted on the property.

May 26, 2020	The East Liberty Park Community Organization (ELPCO) provided a formal letter dated May 26, 2020 in relation to the project.
May 27, 2020	The Planning Commission held a Public Hearing on May 27, 2020. By unanimous vote, the Planning Commission voted to table all applications in order for the applicant and staff to address some unresolved issues.
June 25, 2020	Public notice posted on City and State websites and sent via the Planning list serve for the Planning Commission meeting of July 8, 2020. Public meeting notice mailed. Public meeting notice sign with project information and notice of the Planning Commission meeting physically posted on the property.
July 8, 2020	At the Planning Commission Meeting on July 8, 2020, the Commission voted unanimously to forward a Positive recommendation to City Council for both the proposed Master Plan and Zoning Map amendments. The Commission also voted unanimously to Approve the Planned Development for the Telegraph Exchange Lofts subject to the approval of the zoning change by City Council.

2. Notice of City Council Hearing

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

The Salt Lake City Council is considering Petitions **PLNPCM2019-01110 and PLNPCM2019-01111 – 833 South 800 East - Rezone and Master Plan Amendment** – Micah Peters of Clearwater Homes, the property owner is requesting that the City amend the zoning map and associated future land use map for the property located at 833 South 800 East. The property is currently zone R-2 – Single & Two-Family Residential. The petitioner is requesting to amend the zoning map designation of the property to RMF-45 – Moderate/High Density Residential. The associated future land use map in the Central Community Master Plan currently designates the property as "Low Density Residential". The petitioner is requesting to amend the future land use map for the parcel to "Medium/High Density Residential". The zoning and master plan amendment requests were filed in conjunction with Planned Development application (PLNSUB2019-01112) for the Telegraph Exchange Lofts that was approved by the Planning Commission subject to the zone change being approved by City Council. The property is located within Council District 5, represented by Darin Mano (Staff contact: David J. Gellner at (801-535-6107 or david.gellner@slcgov.com)

As part of their study, the City Council is holding an advertised public hearing to receive comments regarding the petition. During this hearing, anyone desiring to address the City Council concerning this issue will be given an opportunity to speak. The hearing will be held electronically:

DATE:

TIME: 7:00 p.m.

PLACE: This will be an electronic meeting pursuant to Salt Lake City Emergency Proclamation No.2 of 2020(2)(b). Please visit <https://www.slc.gov/council/news/featured-news/virtually-attend-city-council-meetings/> to learn how you can share your comments live during electronic City Council meetings. If you would like to provide feedback or comment, via email or phone, please contact us at: 801-535-7654 (24-Hour comment line) or by email at: council.comments@slcgov.com .

If you have any questions relating to this proposal or would like to review the file, please call David Gellner at 801-535-6107 between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday or via e-mail at david.gellner@slcgov.com

People with disabilities may make requests for reasonable accommodation, which may include alternate formats, interpreters, and other auxiliary aids and services. Please make requests at least two business days in advance. To make a request, please contact the City Council Office at council.comments@slcgov.com, 801-535-7600, or relay service 711.(P 19-19)

3a. Planning Commission - Original Notice and Postmark – July 8, 2020



SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING DIVISION
 451 S State Street - Room 406
 Salt Lake City, UT 84114 - 5480
 PO BOX 145480

STATE MAIL 06/23/2020
 Salt Lake City Planning Division David Gellner
 PO BOX 145480
 Salt Lake City UT 84114

FIRST CLASS



U.S. POSTAGE PINNEY BOWES
 ZIP 84116 \$ 000.50
 02 1W
 0001403442 JUN 26 2020



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

July 8, 2020, at 5:30 p.m.

*This meeting will be an electronic meeting pursuant to Salt Lake City
 Emergency Proclamation No. 2 of 2020 (2)(b)*

Unfinished Business - No Public Comments will be taken

Telegraph Exchange Lofts Rezoning, Master Plan Amendment & Planned Development at approximately 833 & 847 South 800 East - Micah Peter of Clearwater Homes, the property owner, is requesting a Master Plan Amendment, Zoning Map Amendment, and Planned Development approval to construct a twenty-three (23) unit residential development called the Telegraph Exchange Lofts at 833 & 847 South 800 East. The proposal involves two (2) properties, one of which would be rezoned. A total of six (6) residential lofts would be developed within the existing Telegraph Exchange Building and an additional seventeen (17) new 3-story townhouse units would be added to the site. A total of 47 parking spaces will be provided. The proposed project is subject to the following petitions:

- **Master Plan Amendment** - The petitioner is requesting to amend the future land use map in the Central Community Master Plan from low-density residential to medium/high density residential for the parcel at 833 South 800n East. **Case number PLNPCM2019-01110**
- **Zoning Map Amendment** - The petitioner is requesting to amend the zoning map designation of the property at 833 South 800 East from R-2 Single and Two-Family Residential to the RMF-45 - Moderate/High Density Residential District. **Case number PLNPCM2019-01111**
- **Planned Development** - Planned Development approval is needed to address various yard setbacks to property lines for the proposed multi-family development. **Case number PLNSUB2019-01112**

The project site is located within Council District 5, represented by Darin Mano (Staff contact: David Gellner at (801) 535-6107 or david.gellner@slcgov.com)

This Meeting will not have an anchor location at the City and County Building.
 Commission Members will connect remotely.

The Planning Commission meeting will be available on the following platforms:

- **YouTube:** www.youtube.com/slclivemeetings
- **SLCtv Channel 17 Live:** www.slctv.com/livestream/SLCtv-Live/2

Providing Comments:

If you are interested in participating during the Public Hearing portion of the meeting or provide general comments, email: planning.comments@slcgov.com or connect with us on WebEx at:

- <http://tiny.cc/slc-pc-07082020>

For instructions on how to use WebEx visit: www.slc.gov/planning/public-meetings

For Planning Commission agendas, staff reports, and minutes, visit the Planning Division's website at slc.gov/planning/public-meetings. Staff Reports will be posted the Friday prior to the meeting and minutes will be posted two days after they are ratified, which usually occurs at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission.

PLANNING DIVISION



3b. Planning Commission Staff Report – July 8, 2020



Staff Report

PLANNING DIVISION
DEPARTMENT of COMMUNITY and NEIGHBORHOODS

To: Salt Lake City Planning Commission

From: David J. Gellner, AICP, Principal Planner - 801-535-6107 - david.gellner@slcgov.com

Date: July 8, 2020

Re: PLNPCM2019-01110 – Master Plan Amendment
PLNPCM2019-01111 – Zoning Map Amendment
PLNSUB2019-01112 – Telegraph Exchange Lofts Planned Development

Master Plan Amendment, Zoning Map Amendment & Planned Development

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 833 & 847 South 800 East

PARCEL ID: 16-08-176-015 -0000 (Zoned RMF-45)

16-08-176-026-0000 (Zoned R-2)

MASTER PLAN: Central Community Master Plan

ZONING DISTRICT: RMF-45 Moderate/High Density Multi-Family Residential District and R-2
– Single- and Two-Family Residential District

REQUEST: Micah Peter of Clearwater Homes, the property owner, is requesting approval from the City to construct a twenty-three (23) unit residential development at the addresses listed above. Under the proposal, a total of six (6) residential lofts would be developed within the existing Telegraph Exchange Building, which would be renovated. An additional seventeen (17) new three-story townhouse units would be added to the combined site. The proposed project requires the following applications:

1. **Master Plan Amendment (PLNPCM2019-01110)** - The associated future land use map in the Central Community Master Plan currently designates the subject properties as low-density residential. The petitioner is requesting to amend the future land use map to medium/high density residential for both subject properties.
2. **Zoning Map Amendment (PLNPCM2019-01111)** - The subject property at 833 S 800 E is currently zoned R-2 – Single and Two-Family Residential. The petitioner is requesting to amend the zoning map designation of the property to the RMF-45 – Moderate/High Density Residential District.
3. **Planned Development (PLNSUB2019-01112)** –Planned Development approval is needed to address various yard setbacks to property lines for the proposed multi-family development, modification of landscaping requirements and to allow more than one principle structure on the property

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Based on the information presented in this staff report, Planning Staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for the proposed master plan amendment and zoning map amendments.

Based on the findings and information in this staff report, it is the Planning Staff's opinion that the Planned Development generally meets the standards of approval and therefore recommends the Planning Commission approve the Planned Development request.

In order to comply with the applicable standards, the following conditions of approval shall apply to the Planned Development:

- 1. Final approval of the details for site lighting, any signage, and landscaping to be delegated to Planning Staff to ensure compliance with the standards for Planned Developments and other Zoning Ordinance requirements.*
- 2. A notarized statement from the property owners along Chase Avenue agreeing to the balcony encroachments over Chase Avenue must be provided or the proposed balcony encroachments will have to be eliminated from the design.*
- 3. Approval is for the specific zoning modifications discussed and identified in the staff report. All other base zoning regulations continue to apply.*
- 4. Compliance with all other City department conditions (as noted in [Attachment H](#)).*

The Planned Development is conditioned upon approval of the new zoning. Thus, should the City Council not approve the zoning map amendment requested, any approval by the Planning Commission of the Planned Development will become null and void.

ATTACHMENTS:

- A.** [Vicinity/Zoning Map & Future Land Use Map](#)
- B.** [Site Photographs & Existing Conditions](#)
- C.** [Applicant's Narrative, Plans, Renderings & Historical Photographs](#)
- D.** [Development Standards](#)
- E.** [Analysis of Standards](#)
- F.** [Public Process and Comments](#)
- G.** [Planning Commission Minutes from 05/27/2020](#)
- H.** [Department Review Comments](#)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Includes Revisions Made Since the May 27, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting

Micah Peter of Clearwater Homes, the property owner, is requesting a Master Plan Amendment, Zoning Map Amendment (Rezone), and Planned Development approval to construct a twenty-three (23) unit residential development called the Telegraph Exchange Lofts at 833 & 847 South 800 East. The proposal involves two (2) properties, the smaller of which is currently zoned R-2 – Single and Two-Family residential. The larger parcel is zoned RMF-45 – Moderate/High Density Multi-Family and contains the existing Telegraph Exchange Building. The properties will be consolidated into one parcel for the development. The total size of the two parcels combined is approximately 0.79 acres (34,400 square feet).



Project Quick Facts

Number of Residential Units:

Telegraph Building – 6 loft units
Townhome – 17 units

Height: Telegraph Building – 58-feet
Townhomes – 30 feet proposed

Exterior Materials: Telegraph – red brick
Townhomes - durable materials including brick veneer, cement board, metal and wood

Parking: 46 on-site spaces. 34 in attached garages for the townhomes and 12 surface parking spaces for the loft units in the Telegraph Exchange Building.

Properties:

833 S 800 E – Zoned R-2 – 0.29 acres
847 S 800 E – Zoned RMF-45 – 0.50 acres

Existing Building Factsoids:

16,000 square feet
Built in 1911 as a telephone & telegraph facility
Functioned as a warehouse for many years
Currently vacant

- 5 units facing Chase Avenue directly adjacent to the private street – Shown as Units 19-23 on the site plan
- 4 units behind those facing Chase in the location where a garage/storage structure currently exists – Shown as Units 15-18 on the site plan
- An in-ground pool and hot tub has been proposed between the Telegraph Exchange building and Units 7-10 that front onto 800 E. This area will be appropriately screened for safety and privacy for the users but will also provide some visual interest from the street.
- Site and fire access will be provided via a driveway on the northern edge of the combined properties that circulates into the site and to the garages under each unit.
- A smaller access gate geared toward pedestrians is located on Chase Avenue between the Telegraph Building and Units 19-23 that face Chase Avenue.
- An access gate between the eastern edge of the development and the Smith's store will be installed to enhance walkability between the development and the 9th and 9th business district. (Note: This was added after the 05/27/2020 Planning Commission meeting.)

Planned development approval is necessary because the proposed development does not comply with some of the required setbacks and landscape buffers based on the proposed site design. The following requirements are proposed to be modified through the Planned Development request - only item #6 has been modified from the original request reviewed by the Planning Commission on May 27, 2020 as explained in the note below that item:

1. Reduction of the front yard setback for the townhouse units facing 800 E (Units from 25-feet to approximately 12feet.
2. Reduction of interior side yard setbacks for townhouse units: from 8-feet to 4-feet.
3. Reduction of the rear yard setback for the townhouse units off Chase Avenue: from 20-feet to 5-feet.
4. Elimination of the 7-foot landscaping buffer between some of the units and the CB zoned Smith's property.
5. Elimination of the 7-foot landscaping buffer between the parking carport and the CB zoned Smith's property.
6. Proposed reduction of the required landscaping buffer along the north edge of the property between the development and the single-family property to the north from 10-feet to 4-feet.

(Note: Item #6 was modified in response to Planning Commission comments from the 05/27/2020 meeting. The original proposal sought to completely eliminate the 10-foot landscape barrier in this location. The applicant is now proposing a reduced-width landscape barrier for consideration. All other requested modifications are the same.)

The proposed modifications requested through the planned development approval are outlined in more detail in the Key Considerations section of this report under Consideration 5: Zoning Modifications through the Planned Development, and on the site plan and applicant's narratives included in [Attachment C](#) of this report.

Materials and design of the townhome units:

The proposed 3-story townhomes are modern in design. The materials would be brick, metal panels, cement board, wood and stucco. The applicant states that the materials are contextual to the neighborhood and that the units facing 800 E are designed to provide interaction with the sidewalk to honor the character of the neighborhood. The applicant also provided this statement:

“Infill modern townhomes like the ones proposed, are being built throughout the city in existing neighborhoods with existing housing. The newly constructed house contiguous to the north of the 833 lot is starkly modern and represents the eclectic and transitional architectural nature of the existing housing stock. In the last few years, numerous modern homes of a similar vernacular have recently been built in the 9th and 9th neighborhood.”

Additional details in relation to the design were provided in response to Planning Commission and staff comments from the May 27th meeting. The materials and design of the townhomes are more fully described in the revised narrative included in [Attachment C](#) of this report.

PROJECT BACKGROUND:

The applicant presented the proposal to the Planning Commission at a Public Hearing held on May 27, 2020. By unanimous vote, the Commission voted to Table all 3 applications associated with the request in order to allow the applicant an opportunity to work on design questions and issues with the proposed development and to ensure that Fire Department and other requirements were fully satisfied. The following provides a brief summary of the issues raised by the Planning Commission at the May 27th meeting and points of discussion. An excerpt from the Planning Commission Minutes from May 27, 2020 is also included in [Attachment G](#) of this report.

Planning Commission Comments, Questions and Direction from the 05-27-2020 Meeting

1. **Change in layout and driveway location** – Was consideration given to a site design that would route traffic into the development from Chase Avenue instead of from the driveway on the north in order to not impact adjacent properties and provide better circulation throughout the site? What alternatives were considered?
2. **Front setback for 800 E townhouse units** – Was consideration given to increasing the front setback for the 800 E facing units? This would make the setback closer to that of the existing homes up the block rather than matching the Telegraph Building. This could make the development feel more connected to the neighborhood and also highlight the Telegraph Building as the centerpiece of the development.
3. **Fire department access issues and questions.** – Has Fire Department approval been issued based on the size of access drives and proposed design?
4. **Setback issues and concerns** – Elimination of the required 10-foot landscape buffer on the north and trash enclosure location on the property line are concerning and make the development incompatible with the neighboring single-family property. The design should be changed to address these concerns.
5. **Design elements of the townhomes** – How will the materials and colors of townhomes transition to the adjacent neighborhood?

6. **Balcony encroachments** – Has permission for the balcony encroachment proposed over Chase Avenue on the south side of the Telegraph Building been granted by owners of that private right-of-way?

Revisions to the Proposal and Responses to Planning Commission Comments & Direction of 05/27/2020

In response to feedback, direction and comments from the May 27th Planning Commission hearing, the applicant provided updated plans and a narrative to further address the specific issues and questions raised. The revised plans and narrative are included in [Attachment C](#) of this report. The following is a summary of the changes made to the initial proposal by the applicant or the response provided by the applicant where changes to the proposal have not been made:

1. The applicant has stated that the proposed layout was based upon Fire Department approval which has been granted for the layout as proposed. Planning Staff has met with the applicant in the past and reviewed alternate layouts outside of an official application being submitted for review. The currently proposed design is the one chosen by the applicant for consideration by the Planning Commission. (No changes to the layout other than a landscaping buffer have been made by the applicant after the May 27, 2020 Planning Commission meeting.)
2. The applicant states that it is their intent to create a walkable development to better engage the public sidewalk. The applicant states that given the width of 800 E which also includes a center island, pushing the units back would be counterproductive to the concept of achieving street activation. (No changes to the front setback have been made by the applicant after the May 27, 2020 Planning Commission meeting.)
3. The Fire Department has reviewed and approved the proposed layout of the development. Their updated comments can be found in [Attachment H](#) of this report. (The Fire Department has indicated that the proposed design complies with Fire requirements in response the issues raised at the May 27, 2020 PC meeting)
4. The northern edge of the development now includes a 4-foot landscaping buffer along the proposed driveway between the proposed development and the adjacent R-2 property. This landscape buffer will be planted with trees as described in the applicant's revised narrative. In conjunction with the proposed 20-foot driveway, this would provide a total setback of approximately 24-feet and 4-inches from the townhomes to the north property line. The trash enclosure and dumpster proposed along the north property line has now been eliminated in lieu of individual private cans which will be provided for each of the residences. (Changes to the landscaping buffer and trash enclosure were made by the applicant after the May 27, 2020 Planning Commission meeting.)
5. The materials and design elements of the proposed townhomes and how they will transition into the neighborhood are more fully described in the applicant's revised narrative found in [Attachment C](#) and in the Project Description section of this report found above. (No changes to the materials have been made by the applicant after the May 27, 2020 Planning Commission meeting but additional information has been provided in relation to the materials being used.)

6. The balcony encroachments match the existing roof overhang of the Telegraph Building which is already established. The approval of the homeowner's on Chase was not specifically mentioned but will be sought. The applicant is asking that approval of these balcony encroachments be conditioned upon receiving this approval from the homeowners along Chase Avenue. If not granted, the decks can be pulled back or the encroachment over Chase Avenue will be eliminated. (Staff is recommending this as a condition of approval.)
7. Gates to Smith's and 9th and 9th business district are being provided on the south-east portion of the development to enhance walkability. This community access gate will be located between the unit blocks 19-23 and 15-18 at the end of the drive aisle. (This addition was made by the applicant after the May 27, 2020 Planning Commission meeting.)

BUILDING & PROPERTY HISTORY:

Existing Telegraph Exchange Building

The Telegraph Exchange Building was constructed in 1911 as the Mountain States Telephone and Telegraph Building. It served as one of the first Utah operator stations for telephone technology which was new at the time. It later served as a warehouse for the LDS Church and is currently vacant. The building is roughly 16,000 square feet in size and constructed of unreinforced masonry. The outer facades of the building are covered in a distinctive red brick. At a height of approximately 58-feet tall, the building is the tallest structure and a distinct landmark in the 9th and 9th area. The term "landmark" in this context is being used in reference to the prominence of the structure and not in terms of a legal historic designation. The Telegraph Building is not located within a designated local historic district nor is it a City Landmark Site. As such, it does not have a protected status in terms of demolition of the structure and redevelopment of the property under the current RMF-45 zoning. No review by the Historic Landmark Commission is required.

Zoning of the Subject Property at 833 South 800 East

From 2012 - 2014, the City pursued a general rezoning in the 9th and 9th area aimed at preserving the single-family homes and character of the area. Many residents at the time were concerned that the residential nature of the area was being threatened by commercial growth, especially in those properties located near the existing commercial areas (the 900 South 900 East intersection, and Smith's market). Many of the parcels in the area that were zoned RMF-30, RMF-35 or RMF-45 but only contained a single-family dwelling or duplex were rezoned to R-2 – Single and Two Family residential through this initiative. This was an attempt to make the zoning reflect the existing development of the area.

The subject property located at 833 S 800 E was rezoned from RMF-35 to R-2 through this action with the adoption of Ordinance 1 of 2014. The property currently contains two individual single-family dwellings. County Assessor records show that one dwelling was constructed in 1891 while the other was constructed in 1896. Neither of the dwellings are designated as historic or protected structures so the property could be redeveloped by right for a duplex or twin-home under the current zoning designation.

The applicant proposes to change the zoning of this property to RMF-45 which would match the zoning on the abutting Telegraph Exchange property. The two parcels would be consolidated to accommodate the proposed Planned Development across the combined parcel.

KEY CONSIDERATIONS:

The key considerations listed below were identified through the analysis of the project, and discussion during the initial Public Hearing held on May 27, 2020:

Consideration 1: City goals and policies

Central Community Master Plan (2005)

The subject properties are located within the East Central North neighborhood planning area identified in the Central Community Master Plan. More specifically, it is located in the Bennion Neighborhood which was once named the “Ward of Industry” related to some of the historic light industrial uses that were present. The Plan notes that the neighborhood includes a mixture of many architectural styles and building types but that the majority are residential structures, predominantly single-family detached dwellings.

The subject properties are designated in the future land use map as Low Density Residential (1-15 dwelling units/acre). Total acreage of the two parcels is 0.79 acres. With 23 units the applicant proposes a density of 29 dwelling units per acre. It should be noted that the property at 847 S 800 E is already zoned RMF-45 which would be more in line with a designation of Medium-High Density Residential based on the current zoning and dwelling unit density possible. This discrepancy between the future land use map and the zoning of the Telegraph Exchange parcel are discussed in more detail in the Key Considerations section.

The Central Community Master Plan contains policies and statements that both support the proposed rezoning of the property and the overall Planned Development and statements that conflict with the proposed changes. These policies are outlined in more detail below.

The applicant provided this statement in support of the rezone application:

The project consists of 2 parcels: 847 S 800 E is .50 Acres and currently zoned RMF-45, while 833 S 800 E is .29 acres and currently zoned R-2. When we purchased the properties back in 2011, the 847 S 800 E has its current RMF-45 zoning, and 833 S 800 E had an RMF-35 zoning. Utilizing the density afforded by both of the original zones would afford us the total 23 units we are currently requesting. Because 833 S 800 E was rezoned to R-2 in 2013, we will be submitting a rezone request. While we are asking for a single zone for the consolidated lot of RMF-45, (which would afford substantial density), we are capping the development density at the proposed 23 total units.

Support for the Changes found in the Central Community Master Plan

The proposal is supported by these Central Community Master Plan policies:

RLU-1.0 Based on the Future Land Use map, use residential zoning to establish and maintain a variety of housing opportunities that meet social needs and income levels of a diverse population.

RLU-1.2 Provide opportunities for medium-density housing in areas between the Central Business District and lower-density neighborhoods and in areas where small multi-family dwellings are compatible.

RLU-1.6 Encourage coordination between the Future Land Use map, zoning ordinances, and the Salt Lake City Community Housing Plan.

RLU-3.1 Encourage residential land developers to build housing that provides residential opportunities for a range of income levels, age groups, and family size.

RLU-3.3 Use the planned development process to encourage design flexibility for residential housing while maintaining compatibility with the neighborhood.

The Central Community Master Plan also contains the following goals that are relevant to this project:

- *Encourage the creation and maintenance of a variety of housing opportunities that meet social needs and income levels of a diverse population.*

The Master Plan recognizes that the City is a living organism, subject to growth, decay, and renewal. Its intent is to ensure that change occurs in response to the needs of, and in the best interests of, the residents of the Central Community as well as the City as a whole.

The Future Land Use map represents a balance of existing and future residential development patterns and identifies land use locations and designations. Future land use designations will be implemented through zoning changes that regulate density, permitted land uses, and minimum site design requirements.

Conflicts with the Proposed Changes found in the Central Community Master Plan

The proposal is in conflict with these Central Community Master Plan policies:

RLU-1.1 Preserve low-density residential areas and keep them from being replaced by higher density residential and commercial uses.

RLU-2.0 Preserve and protect existing single- and multi-family residential dwellings within the Central Community through codes, regulations and design review.

The Master Plan also includes the following statements that are inconsistent with the proposed changes in zoning:

Higher density housing replacing characteristic lower density structures – The community does not support the demolition of lower-density residences in order to build multi-family structures. Residents prefer to protect the existing residential character and prevent the construction of multiple family dwellings in low density neighborhoods especially those exceeding 14 dwelling units per acre. (page 9)

East Central Community Small Area Master Plan (1993)

The East Central Community Small Area Master Plan came about in response to increased development pressures, both commercial and residential, in the 9th & 9th neighborhood during the early 1990's. This included an effort by the Smith's Food and Drug to expand their existing store in the area. A big focus of the Plan was traffic and safety in the area and concerns about the Smith's loading dock area that faces 900 S. Concerns about the loading dock related to aesthetics and safety concerns with the layout that allowed hidden activities to occur.

The Plan contains an Alternatives Evaluation with several scenarios on Land Use and Policy Options. Under the scenarios outlined in the Plan the Telegraph Building is discussed as "warehouse space" which was its function at the time as it was storage space for the LDS Church. One scenario included the building becoming a residential space with up to 10 dwelling units inside. Another saw the conversion of the building to office space.

It was noted that there were several options for the LDS Warehouse depending on market conditions, economic feasibility and zoning compliance. Among others, the preferred uses included multi-family residential uses.

Chase Avenue is discussed in the Plan with a recommendation that it be reduced in scale and serve as a driveway for the remaining houses along that private right-of-way.

Plan Salt Lake (2015)

The citywide master plan, Plan Salt Lake, emphasizes the need for a variety of housing options. This is expressed in the following Guiding Principle:

Access to a wide variety of housing types for all income levels throughout the city, providing the basic human need for safety and responding to changing demographics.

Almost half of the total housing units in Salt Lake City are single-family detached dwellings. While preserving the existing housing stock will continue to be priority for the City, over the next 25 years, it will be critical for us to encourage and support a diversity of new housing options and types with a range of densities throughout the City in order to best accommodate the changing population.

In recent years, we have seen a renewed interest in walkable neighborhoods, increased residential development downtown, and transit-oriented development. There is a growing demand for urban living, primarily driven by Baby Boomers and Millennials, paired with changing demographics on a national and local level that include an aging population, growing minority communities, and an increase in single-parent households and households without children. These changing households require changes to our housing policies and housing stock to provide choices on how best to meet their needs.

The following guiding principles and related initiatives under each guiding principle are relevant to this proposal:

- ***Growing responsibly while providing people with choices about where they live, how they live, and how they get around.***
 - *Locate new development in areas with existing infrastructure and amenities, such as transit and transportation corridors.*
 - *Promote infill and redevelopment of underutilized land.*

- ***Access to a wide variety of housing types for all income levels throughout the City, providing the basic human need for safety and responding to changing demographics.***
 - *Increase the number of medium density housing types and options.*
 - *Direct new growth toward areas with existing infrastructure and services that have the potential to be people oriented.*
 - *Enable moderate density increases within existing neighborhoods where appropriate.*
 - *Promote energy efficient housing and rehabilitation of existing housing stock.*
 - *Promote high density residential in areas served by transit.*
- ***Maintaining places that provide a foundation for the City to affirm our past.***
 - *Preserve and enhance neighborhood and district character.*
 - *Encourage the incorporation of historic elements into buildings, landscapes, public spaces, streetscapes, neighborhoods, and districts where appropriate.*
 - *Retain areas and structures of historic and architectural value.*
 - *Balance flexibility for change and growth.*

The proposed development is supported by the general principles and initiatives found in Plan Salt Lake. It would preserve an architecturally distinct and historically significant building while providing additional housing options within a walkable neighborhood with commercial services that is served by convenient transit opportunities.

Growing SLC: A Five-Year Housing Plan – 2018-2022 (2017)

Additionally, the city's housing plan, Growing SLC, reinforces the growing demand for housing. The plan cites density limitations as a local barrier, which has been exacerbating the city's housing crisis. The following goal and objective are relevant to this proposal:

- ***Increase housing options: Reform City practices to promote a responsive, affordable, high-opportunity housing market.***
 - *Review and modify land-use and zoning regulations to reflect the affordability needs of a growing, pioneering city.*
 - 1.1.1 *Develop flexible zoning tools and regulations, with a focus along significant transportation routes.*
 - 1.1.2 *Develop in-fill ordinances that promote a diverse housing stock, increase housing options, create redevelopment opportunities, and allow additional units within existing structures, while minimizing neighborhood impacts.*

The plan encourages an *enhanced flexibility of the land-use code* in order to increase a diversity of housing types. The plan also references the guiding policies and housing initiatives included in Plan Salt Lake as noted above. By reference, these policies are incorporated into the Housing Plan.

The proposal is in line with these strategies because it provides flexibility in existing code requirements while providing more housing units and housing variety in the neighborhood.

As noted in the information above, the Central Community Master Plan and other City plans and documents contains policies and statements that both support the proposed rezoning of the property

and the overall Planned Development and statements that conflict with the proposed changes. The proposed changes must be weighed against the existing policies in terms of what is in the City's best interest and priorities.

Consideration 2: Rezoning of the Property from R-2 to RMF-45

Through the public outreach process, some objections have been raised about the request to change the zoning of the property at 833 S from R-2 to multi-family. Some of these comments have pointed out that the property was included in a general but deliberate downzoning of the area that started in 2012 and concluded in 2014. The history of that action is discussed in the Background History section of this report. Despite how relatively recently that action took place, the property owner has the right to request the zoning change and the current request to rezone the property must be evaluated on its own merits. Due consideration must be given to the proposed change in terms of how the proposal meets the City's master plans and policies and if the City's needs and priorities have or have not changed since that previous action took place. The City's goals and policies and the issues of preservation of the structure versus allowed development are discussed further within the Key Considerations section of this report in Consideration #4.

Consideration 3: Central Community MP Future Land Use Map Amendments

The applicant is requesting to change the future land use map in the Central Community Master Plan from low-density residential to medium/high density residential. It should be noted that the future land use map applies that designation to both the property zoned RMF-45 and the property zoned R-2. The applicant notes in his narrative the following:

The need for this application stems from a conflict in the Masterplan adopted in 2005. The conflict in the master plan is due to the master plan land use language to be low density throughout the neighborhood (10 - 20 units per acre), even on parcels zoned RMF-45 which is a moderate to high density multi-family residential zoning. Our application seeks simply to correct the noted Master plan conflict and utilize the density's associated with our current zoning.

Whether or not the proposal to rezone the property at 833 S along with the corresponding master plan amendment are approved or not, consideration should be given to amending the future land use map for the property at 847 South to accurately reflect the current RMF-45 zoning designation of the property.

Consideration 4: Preservation of the Structure vs. Allowed Development on the Subject Properties

As mentioned above, the Telegraph Exchange building is located on a property currently zoned RMF-45. While the building is iconic and considered a distinctive structure in the 9th and 9th area, the structure is not located within a local historic district nor is it a designated City Landmark site. As such, it does not have protection in terms of demolition of the structure and redevelopment of the property under the current zoning designation. A developer could demolish the structure and re-develop the property under the allowances of the current RMF-45 zoning. Therefore, it is important to consider what could potentially be built on the subject properties by right when weighed against the goal of preserving the structure and what is being proposed in terms of the overall project.

The Telegraph site is approximately 21,800 square feet (0.5 acres) in size. The RMF-45 zone requires 21,000 square feet for 15 units, plus 800 square feet for each additional dwelling unit up to 1 acre.

Under the current zoning, the existing building could be demolished, and 16 units could be built on the property in a multi-family building configuration as a permitted use if all setbacks were met. The smaller property is zoned R-2 and is approximately 12,600 square feet (0.29 acres) in size. The zoning would support the demolition of the existing dwellings and building of two (2) units in twin home or two-family dwelling configuration as a permitted use if all setbacks were met. Under the current zoning, a total of eighteen (18) new units could be built between the two subject properties in total.

The applicant is proposing a total of twenty-three (23) residential units on the combined properties under a single zoning designation of RMF-45. Six (6) residential lofts would be developed within the existing Telegraph Exchange Building. Seventeen (17) new 3-story townhouse units would also be added to the combined site.

According to the applicant, the cost of renovating the existing Telegraph Exchange building for an adaptive reuse to residential dwellings is prohibitively expensive in terms of seismic upgrades, fire access and safety considerations and meeting current building code standards. In starkest terms, it is often more cost effective for a developer to demolish an old building and build new than to restore and reuse a building. The applicant is seeking to off-set the cost of renovating the existing building by adding additional density to the site, a total of 5 residential units over what would be permitted by right under the current property zoning.

While not a Landmark Site, the Telegraph Exchange Building is a building of historical significance in the 9th & 9th area in terms of the distinctive architecture, its history and role in the community, and its prominence based on the size of the building. The applicant has stated that “Restoration of the structure will it the crown jewel of 9th and 9th and a source of pride for the immediate 800 East community.”

The applicant’s proposal would preserve this iconic structure and adapt it for a residential use while at the same time providing additional housing in the area. In order to do so under the proposed layout, the property at 833 S would need to be rezoned and consolidated into the project. Both the preservation of historic structures and the provision of additional housing are goals supported by City policies and plans. At the same time, some of the policies related to the preservation of existing neighborhoods would conflict with the site expansion onto the parcel that is currently zoned R-2.

Another consideration of preserving the building through an adaptive reuse versus demolition relates to the City’s sustainability goals and preservation goals. The adaptive reuse of the building preserves its unique features and is reflective of period in which it was built and helps to “tell the story” of the City’s development. Preservation and reuse of the building is in itself “sustainable and green” through the retention of embodied energy. *The concept of embodied energy—that is, all of the material and human energy consumed by the initial building process—is important to understand. When the embodied energy of an existing building is considered, demolition and reconstruction is almost never the most environmentally beneficial option.* Through a reuse, the energy that went into making the original building is not lost through the demolition and disposal of the materials that went into making it. The “embodied energy” is retained. The adaptive reuse of the building is supported by City sustainability goals.

Consideration 5: Zoning Modifications Requested through the Planned Development

The applicant is proposing a number of modifications through the Planned Development approval. Those modifications are outlined below in more detail below and shown on the annotated site plan included in [Attachment C](#) of this report as well as being mentioned in the applicant’s narrative.

1. **Front yard setback** – the existing Telegraph Exchange building has a front yard setback of approximately 12-feet. The four (4) proposed units facing 800 E (Units 7-10) would have same setback. The required front yard setback is 25-feet. The 13-foot reduction is sought to match the existing Telegraph Exchange building.
2. **Interior side yard setbacks** – The RMF-45 zone requires an 8-foot interior side yard setback for multi-family dwellings. This would apply to the units that face Chase (Units 19-23) and the units behind them noted as Units 15-18. The applicant is proposing an interior side yard setback of 4-feet for these units.
3. **Rear yard setback** – The RMF-45 zone requires a setback of “twenty five percent (25%) of the lot depth but need not exceed thirty feet (230’).” With a lot depth of approximately 225 feet, the required rear yard setback is 20 feet. The applicant is proposing a rear yard setback of 5-feet for Units 18 and 19 that abut the Smith’s grocery store property.
4. **Landscaping buffer on the interior side yard by units and carports** - Between properties in the CB zoning district and those in a residential district, a 7-foot wide landscape buffer is required in addition to an 8-foot interior side yard setback. By Units 15-18 that run east-west on the north-east corner of the site, the applicant is proposing the elimination of the landscape barrier in the proposed 4-foot interior side yard setback. Adjacent to the carport structures, the applicant is proposing elimination of the 1-foot setback from the property line for accessory structures and elimination of the required 7-foot landscape buffer.
5. **Landscape buffer along the north edge of the property** - Between the RMF-45 zone and R-2 zone (this is assuming the current R-2 parcel is successfully rezoned to RMF-45), a 10-foot landscape buffer is required between the proposed development and the single-family property immediately to the north. The applicant is requesting to reduce this landscaping buffer to one that is 4-feet in width. A 20-foot wide driveway is proposed between the new townhomes and the landscape buffer.
(Note: The proposed buffer was changed after the May 27, 2020 Planning Commission meeting. The original proposal was for the elimination of the landscaping buffer. The request has been modified to propose a reduced width buffer of 4-feet.)

The applicant’s requested reductions and modifications through the Planned Development are based on the proposed site layout. This is partially driven by constraints on the site related to the historic establishment of the Telegraph Exchange building on the south part of the site immediately adjacent to Chase Avenue. Since the building footprint and location are established and the applicant’s goal is to preserve the building and incorporate it into the design as an adaptive reuse, the flexibility to design the layout of the site as a “blank canvas” is more limited than if the building was being demolished.

The intent of the Planned Development process is to provide some design flexibility to the zoning standards in order to *encourage the efficient use of land and resources, promoting greater efficiency in public and utility services and encouraging innovation in the planning and building of all types of development*. The purpose of allowing such flexibility is to obtain a *more enhanced product than would be achievable through strict application of land use regulations, while enabling the development to be compatible with adjacent and nearby land developments*.

The reduced front yard setback proposed (**Item #1**) for Units 7-10 along 800 E would promote harmony with the existing building and the building immediately to the south of Chase Avenue and help to maintain the harmony of the development pattern. At the same time, an argument could be made that setting the units farther back from the street than the Telegraph Exchange building and

maintaining the required front-yard setback would help to maintain the prominence of the Telegraph building on the block and highlight it as the centerpiece of the project. This setback would also provide additional transitional space between the public sidewalk and the units on 800 E. This could be used to provide additional privacy or could accommodate individual porches, patios or garden space. The applicant contends that given the width of 800 E, setting the units back further from the street would be counter-productive to achieving street activation along 800 E. There is no evidence that street activation could not be achieved with an increased front yard setback, a common design element in many parts of the City.

The proposed reduced rear and interior side yard setbacks (**Items #2 & #3**) abut the Smith's property. These abutments generally occur in the rear service areas of the Smith's grocery store. A reduction in the setbacks would not negatively impact the Smith's property but may lead to additional impacts to future residents of the Telegraph Exchange site, particularly in the units closest to this area. The existing brick wall separating the two should remain in place to mitigate these potential impacts. No additional mitigation measures are being recommended by staff.

The reduced landscaping buffers in the interior side yards by the units and carports (**Item #4**) are part of the Planned Development modifications requested. A 7-foot wide landscape buffer is required between properties in the CB zoning district and those in a residential district. The applicant is proposing the elimination of the landscape barrier in the proposed 4-foot interior side yard setback adjacent to Units 15-18 that run east-west on the north-east corner of the site. Adjacent to the carport structures, the applicant is proposing elimination of the 1-foot setback from the property line for accessory structures and elimination of the required 7-foot landscape buffer. As this would be the interface of the surface parking with the existing wall that surrounds the Smith's grocery store property, no additional impacts are anticipated though the elimination of this buffer.

The proposed reduction of the 10-foot landscaping buffer to 4-feet to the north between the proposed development and the single-family home immediately north (**Item #5**) must be considered in the context of neighborhood compatibility. The applicant is proposing a reduction of this landscaping buffer between the driveway and the single-family home to the north based on the proposed location of Unit 10 and Unit 11 approximately 20.5 feet from the property line. This driveway would also serve as the approved Fire Department access to the development. The neighboring property owner has expressed a concern about the loss of privacy and traffic/noise impacts from site traffic being concentrated and directed to that portion of the site via the driveway. The applicant contends that the driveway in conjunction with the reduced landscaping buffer would provide more separation between the townhomes and neighboring property than a landscaping buffer on its own would so this would mitigate the impact of the proposed driveway location on the neighboring property. This is also discussed in more detail in Consideration 6 below.

Consideration 6: Impacts to Neighboring Properties and Compatibility

The proposed development includes a mix of historic and modern architecture. The Telegraph Exchange building represents the historic aspect of the project while the new townhome units would be modern in their architecture. This is shown in the renderings submitted by the applicant which can be found in [Attachment C](#) of this report.

The proposed development includes 46 onsite parking stalls for the proposed 23 units. This includes the two (2) parking spaces for each townhome unit that will be provided within individual garages and Twelve (12) covered surface parking stalls being provided for the 6 loft units contained within the Telegraph Building. An additional four (4) on-street parking stalls are located along the frontage of

800 E. The provision of 2 parking stalls per each dwelling unit meets the requirements of Chapter 21.44 in terms of required parking for the types of residential development being proposed.

Planning Staff received a public comment from the property owner to the north objecting to the placement of the driveway into and out of the site along the north perimeter of the site (assuming approval of the rezoning and the current configuration). The letter from Janelle Bauer on behalf of property owner Cody Derrick is included in [Attachment F](#) of this report. The property owner argues that the placement of the driveway along the north edge of the property adjacent to his property would create a negative impact in terms of noise and property enjoyment. This would be further exacerbated by the proposed elimination of the required 10-foot landscaping buffer between the Telegraph Exchange and this property. The elimination of this landscape barrier extends to the area where the trash and recycling enclosure would abut the adjacent property in the side of the rear yard.

Since that letter was received by staff, the applicant has revised the design based on both public input and direction from the Planning Commission at the May 27th meeting. The elimination of the landscape buffer as originally proposed has been modified to include a 4-foot buffer that will be heavily landscaped with trees. In addition, the originally proposed trash and recycling enclosure along the property line has been eliminated and each unit will be served by individual cans. The letter is still included but the proposal has since changed in terms of those details.

The applicant argues that the location of the townhomes puts it approximately 20.5 feet from the property line in conjunction with a reduced width landscaping buffer of 4-feet would provide better separation from the residential property than the 10-foot landscaping buffer with the townhomes built within 10 feet of the neighboring property as would be allowed for a multi-family development in the RMF-45 zoning district. The applicant also notes the existing 8-foot tall side yard fence on the adjacent property. The 8-foot side yard fence was permitted by Special Exception in 2018 under PLNPCM2018-00911 at the request of property owner Cody Derrick. Documents submitted to the City indicate the fence exception was requested in anticipation of future construction on the property at 833 S in conjunction with multi-family uses or amenities. The narrative submitted by Mark Haslam on behalf of the property owner indicated that it was their understanding that there would be a landscaping installed on the south side of the fence on the 833 S property, but the size or details of the landscaping were not specified.

Several other comments were submitted in relation to the project expressing a concern about compatibility of the project with the neighborhood and in particular the rezoning of the R-2 parcel as part of the development. Comments received by staff are included in [Attachment F](#) of this report. Comments and concerns related to “spot zoning” of the parcel, the nullification of recent zone changes in the area that changed this parcel to R-2, the impact on the existing community fabric, preservation of neighborhood character, out of scale multi-family development, and the precedence this action would set were all concerns submitted by neighboring property owners. There were comments expressing concern about the amount of on-site parking being provided and that at 2 spaces per unit proposed, it would not be enough. They also expressed about the negative impacts of guest parking occurring on the street and the impacts of increased traffic within the surrounding neighborhood.

There were also positive comments received by staff in relation to the development and the preservation of the historic building while also providing additional housing options in the area.

In terms of potential negative impacts to neighboring properties, Staff's opinion is that a reduced width landscaping buffer of 4-feet in conjunction with the placement of the driveway and townhomes approximately 24.5 feet from the property line would adequately mitigate potential impacts to the neighboring property to the north. In terms of compatibility, Staff finds that the placement of the proposed townhomes measuring 30-feet tall between the taller Telegraph Exchange Building (58-feet

tall) and the lower scale residential property to the north would help to create a logical transition and step-down in scale to the surrounding neighborhood.

DISCUSSION:

If the applicant chose to, they could build an 18-unit development by-right on the subject properties. Medium/high density residential uses are already permitted on the subject property zoned RMF-45 and a multifamily development could be built by right. The R-2 zone would allow the existing houses on the property at 833 S to be demolished and replaced with a new single or two-family dwelling by right. This would be a one-to-one replacement if two units were built. Using the current allowances, the applicant could potentially build 18 units on the property by right if the existing building and houses were demolished *and would not require a planning process*. If the applicant chose to, a new multi-family development would be possible on the RMF-45 parcels by-right and would not be subject to design standards to ensure compatibility with the neighborhood.

The proposal expands the multi-family zoning onto a parcel currently zoned R-2 and increases the total density of the project by 5 units. At the same time, the project provides an avenue to preserve the iconic Telegraph Exchange Building and adapt it for a residential use while at the same time providing additional housing in the area. The goals and positives of preserving the historic building and approval of the overall development plan for the site must be weighed against the potential impacts on the surrounding neighborhood and the City's policies and goals articulated in its policies and plans.

Based on the Key Considerations, it is Staff's recommendation that the Planning commission forward a positive recommendation to City Council for approval of the zoning map amendment and master plan amendments. The applicant's argument that the preservation and adaptive reuse of the Telegraph Exchange structure and the proposed housing outweighs the possible negative impacts of the zoning changes. As such, staff is recommending a positive recommendation from the Planning Commission on both items.

In regard to the Planned Development, it is Planning Staff' opinion that in conjunction with the provision of a reduced width landscaping buffer to the north, removal of the dumpster and recycling enclosure on the property line, demonstration of compliance with all Fire Department access requirements and additional information provided by the applicant in terms of design considerations that included alternate driveway locations, circulation and the front setback on 800 E that the proposal meets the standards of review for a Planned Development. As such, Planning Staff is recommending that the Planning Commission approve the Planned Development as proposed subject to conditions.

NEXT STEPS:

The Planning Commission may approve, approve with conditions, deny, or table the proposed Planned Development. The Planning Commission's recommendation for the proposed map and master plan amendments, whether negative or positive, will be forwarded to the City Council for their consideration as part of the final decision on this proposal.


If all the requests are approved, the applicant will be able to proceed with the proposed development after meeting the conditions of approval and will be required to obtain all necessary permits.


If the zoning and master plan amendments are denied, the subject property will maintain its R-2 zoning designation and could be developed accordingly. The RMF-45 property could also be developed independently under the allowances of the zoning in place. In that case, any approval of the Planned Development will become null and void.

If the Planned Development is denied and the amendments are approved, the proposed development may be altered to comply with the standards of the new zoning district.

If the Planned Development is tabled, the Planning Commission should provide additional direction to the applicant and Staff in terms of the site design and other elements that are suggested for modification to meet the Planned Development standards and to mitigate negative neighborhood impacts.

ATTACHMENT A: Vicinity/Zoning Map & Future Land Use Map





Future Land Use

- Low Density Residential (1-15 dwelling units/acre)
- Low Medium Density Residential (10-20 dwelling units/acre) *
- Medium Density Residential (15-30 dwelling units/acre) *
- Medium High Density Residential (30-50 dwelling units/acre)
- High Density Residential (50 or more dwelling units/acre)
- Low Residential/Mixed Use (5-10 dwelling units/acre)
- Medium Residential/Mixed Use (10-50 dwelling units/acre)
- Residential/Office Mixed Use (10-50 dwelling units/acre)
- High Mixed Use (50 or more dwelling units/acre)
- Neighborhood Commercial
- Community Commercial
- Central Business District
- Central Business District Support

- Regional Commercial/Industrial
- Low Density Transit Oriented Development (1-20 dwelling units/acre)
- Medium Density Transit Oriented Development (10-50 dwelling units/acre)
- High Density Transit Oriented Development (50 or more dwelling units/acre)
- Open Space
- Institutional
- Gateway Master Plan
- Non-conforming properties to be evaluated for appropriate land use designation. (Interim land use policy would be adjacent land use classifications)

*** NOTE:** The Low-Medium and Medium Density Land Use designations may include multiple zoning designations (e.g.; a single land use designation and map color may represent RMF-35 or SR-3 classifications)

ATTACHMENT B: Site Photographs & Existing Conditions



Telegraph Exchange Building viewed from NW



Building interface with Chase Avenue, a private street.



Front of building – looking north on 800 E



Looking south on 800 E – house at 833 S (R-2 property) shown



Chase Avenue at 800 E



End of Chase Avenue at Smith's Property – behind store



Back of Telegraph Building – houses on R-2 parcel visible



Development to the south of the subject property



Neighborhood development on the west side of 800 E



Single-family dwelling to the north - dark colored house in center



Telegraph Exchange building



Telegraph Exchange building



Existing access gate to Smith's property at the end of Chase Avenue

Existing Zoning and Land Uses in the Immediate Vicinity:

The subject properties located 833 South 800 East and 847 South 800 East in the R-2 (Single and Two-Family Residential) and RMF-45 (Moderate/High Density Multi-Family Residential) zoning districts respectively.

North: To the north of the subject properties are low scale residential structures. The zoning is R-2 which extends to the corner of 800 S.


South: To the south of the subject properties is a low-scaled commercial use and a church on properties zoned RMF-45. The RMF-45 zoning continues to 900 S.

East: To the east of the subject properties the zoning is CB – Community Business. The property to the east has been developed for a larger scale commercial use, the Smith’s grocery store. The rear of the subject properties backs the Smith’s property, mainly in the rear of the store where support functions such as the loading dock are located.

West: To the west of the subject properties are zoned R-2 and the development consists largely of small-scale residential structures. There is some small scaled multi-family “cottage court” development across from the end of Chase Avenue on property that is zoned RMF-35.

ATTACHMENT C: Applicant's Narrative, Plans, Project Renderings & Historical Phototographs

Note: Based on feedback from the Planning Commission at the meeting of 05/27/2020, the applicant submitted a narrative addressing the design concerns as well as updated plans with a 4-foot landscaping buffer included in the design. The updated documents are included in this attachment.



REFERENCE NOTES

1. EXISTING FIRE HYDRANT
2. EXISTING POWER POLE
3. EXISTING LANDSCAPE
4. EXISTING SIDEWALK
5. EXISTING CURB
6. NEW BIKE RACK
7. NOT USED
8. NEW APPROACH TO TOWNHOUSE ENTRY
9. NEW 4'-0" LANDSCAPE BUFFER--KINDRED SPIRIT COLUMNAR OAK TO BE PLANTED EVERY 6'-0"
10. NEW DRIVE AISLE
11. NEW LANDSCAPE
12. NOT USED
13. NEW 90 DEGREE PARKING AS PER S.L.C. DIVISION OF TRANSPORTATION STANDARD, 12 PARKING SPOTS TOTAL.
14. CARPORT OVERHANG
15. CARPORT SUPPORT COLUMN BELOW
16. SHIPPING CONTAINER, RESTROOM AND KITCHEN
17. NEW FIREPLACE
18. NEW IN-GROUND POOL & HOT TUB
19. NEW STAIRS TO ENTER BUILDING
20. NOT USED
21. NEW LIGHTING FOR IMPROVED SECURITY
22. NEW LIGHT WELL
23. TRAFFIC CALMING LANDSCAPE BULB-OUT AROUND EXISTING POWER POLES
24. EXISTING FIRE TRUCK CRASH GATE
25. EXISTING BRICK WALL TO REMAIN
26. PATH FOR BUILDING EXITING
27. NEW SIDEWALK
28. COMMUNITY ACCESS GATE TO SMITHS & 900 EAST BUSINESS DISTRICT

CITY APPLICATIONS

TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE
847 SOUTH 800 EAST
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84102

255 WEST 700 SOUTH SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84101
TELEPHONE 801.364.5161

ARCHITECTURE □ INTERIOR DESIGN

MJSA

REVISIONS:

THESE DRAWINGS ARE INSTRUMENTS OF SERVICE AND SHALL REMAIN THE PROPERTY OF THE ARCHITECT. NO USE OR RE-USE OF THESE DOCUMENTS SHALL BE PERMITTED UNLESS AUTHORIZED IN WRITING BY MUSA ARCHITECTS WITH APPROPRIATE COMPENSATION.

PROJECT NO.: 14033

DATE:
JUNE 4, 2020

SHEET:
AS0-00

STAMP

**UPDATES & CLARIFICATIONS
PER 05.27.2020 PLANNING
COMMISSION MEETING**

SITE DIAGRAM
SCALE: 1/16" = 1'-0"

N:\6033 - A & B Telegraph Exchange\CAD\2020\650-05.dwg - Thu, 04 Jun 2020 - 4:57 pm

A5 SITE DIAGRAM
AS0-00 SCALE: 1/16"=1'-0"



RE: PLANNED DEVELOPMENT Memo-Updated June 17, 2020 in response to Planning and Zoning commission comments from the 5/27/2020 meeting.

Specifics updates to the project resulting from the comments received at the 5/27/2020 Planning and Zoning meeting. The items below brought forth in the may Planning and Zoning meeting have been addressed as follow.

1-Fire Approval: We have been working with the City fire representatives for over 2 years on this project and have designed the land plan in accordance with the standards set forth. At this time, we have full fire approval of the plan presented in this updated submittal. Mr. Steven Collett and Mr. Ted Itchon have been very helpful, and we appreciate the assistance.

2-North Landscape Buffer: In an effort to enhance the transition from the town homes to the single-family residences on the North of the project, we have incorporated a 4' landscape buffer. The said Buffer will be in addition to the 20' setback, creating an overall side yard setback on the north of the project at 24'4". Our landscape plan for this 149' long, by 4' wide buffer includes, a count of twenty-four (24) "Kindred Spirit" columnar oak trees, to be planted every 6'. These trees will be 1-3/4" to 2" caliper, 10'-14' tall at installation. Growth pattern for this tree species is 3 feet per year in height, with a 35'-40' mature height, and 6'-8' wide. We believe this planting plan and the 24'4" setback will provide a generous transition to the single-family residential homes.

3- Removal of Northeast dumpster location: We have opted for all residences to have 39 Gallon private recycling and trash containers.

4- Gates to Smiths and the 9th&9th business district. See location on south east portion of the campus.

5- 800 East permanent fire pad has been removed: The approved fire plan does not require this infrastructure. 2 large historic trees in the park strip will now be able to stay and not be impacted by the development.

6-Member of the P&Z request that we look at options with layout and driveway location: specifically, to consider putting more traffic into the development from Chase and less from the driveway on the north in order to not impact adjacent properties and provide better circulation throughout the site. There have been numerous land plan iterations developed throughout the design process for this site. Knowing the importance of fire access, we worked closely with Ted Itchon, SLC Fire Department. After a 2-year process, the current layout has been accepted by the fire department. Loading up Chase Avenue with additional cars impacts the existing users. Vehicular traffic on Chase Avenue (private street) in the current land plan, has been approved by all Chase owners. The planned traffic will consist of 10 cars from the Telegraph site, two existing residences, and two existing duplexes. Adding cars and creating an additional egress onto Chase does not comport with agreement with the owners and the approval from the Fire department. Additionally, each existing lot in the proposed PUD, currently has its own existing curb cut. With the lot consolidation we are eliminating one of the two existing curb-cuts so that the development as a whole has one curb-cut/access to 800 E that is driven by our agreement with fire.

7-Front setback for 800 E townhouse units – the PC wanted us to look at having the front setback be closer to the homes up the block rather than matching the Telegraph Building so that the development would be more connected to the neighborhood and also highlight the Telegraph Building. This application is based on the approval of the Lot Consolidation to RMF-45. IN RMF-45 the setback is 25 feet or because the historic Telegraph Exchange building (referred to hereafter as TEX) is a legally existing building built before April 12, 1995, the required front yard shall be no greater than the existing yard established by the existing building (TEX). The language for establishing front yard setbacks in R-2 also includes text indicating that if there is a legally existing structure on the property built before April 12, 1995, the required front yard shall be no greater than the existing yard. The common factor for both R-2 & RMF-45 zones is the inclusion of the existing April 12, 1995 building, which we have acknowledged this in our current land plan. Finally,



according to the current SLC Planning department goals, we are promoting a walking community. The closer proximity to the sidewalk engages the street activity better than if we were to push the townhomes farther the street. At this location, with 800 East being so wide with a center island, 25 feet setback would be counter to street activation. The historic TEX building is currently 18'-10" off of the sidewalk. Additionally, moving the 800 E townhomes back from the street would void our fire approval and force a loss of density that would compromise our ability save/re-use the historic TEX building. This is a unique neighborhood with a vital neighborhood commercial zone.

8-Design elements of the Townhomes – materials and colors of townhomes and how they transition to neighborhood.

The materials of the townhomes would be brick, metal panels, cementitious siding, natural wood, and stucco. These materials are contextual to the neighborhood. Infill modern townhomes like the ones proposed, are being built throughout the city in existing neighborhoods with existing housing. The newly constructed house contiguous to the north of the 833 lot is starkly modern and represents the eclectic and transitional architectural nature of the existing housing stock. In the last few years, numerous modern homes of a similar vernacular have recently been built in the 9th and 9th neighborhood. Of the stock of east side townhomes in SLC have been recently approved and built, I would contend that our proposed architecture is of high quality, compelling, and an enhancement to the community.

9-Balcony encroachments – over Chase – permission from other property owners.

The roof and cornice overhang of the existing TEX building is 2' over the property line. While our project approval from the Chase owners doesn't specifically contemplate the overhang of the decks matching the existing roof overhang, the roof overhang is already established. We can go back to the Chase Ave owners for approval of this detail but prefer a conditioned approval from the PC that states the required Chase owner's approval. If the approval on this item is not achieved from the Chase owners, we can simply pull those 2 south facing decks back the 2 feet. That being said, we firmly believe that the protruding decks are a nice detail on the south face of the TEX building, which serves to create an interesting depth and dimension to an otherwise long, flat section.

10-Summary: It is important to reiterate that the current plan allows us to justify the expense of saving the historic TEX building. Any loss of units/density associated with the approval process will jeopardize our ability to complete the adaptive re-use of the TEX building and will likely result in demolition of the historic structure. The plan presented is thoughtful and ready to proceed. This project would be an enhancement to the residential community, while also supporting local businesses and economic development.

PARCEL 16-08-176-015
847 South 800 East
Salt Lake City, UT 84102

PARCEL 16-08-176-026
833 South 800 East
Salt Lake City, UT 84102



The proposed project consists of consolidating two parcels, both owned by Micah Peters (Clearwater Homes): Parcel 16-08-176-015 located at 847 S 800 E is 0.50 Acres and Parcel 16-08-176-026 located at 833 S 800 E is 0.29 acres. The combined parcels will consist of 23 future residential units.

In addition to the adaptive re-use efforts to place 6 residential lofts in the existing historic building, the project will have 17 3-story modern townhomes tactically placed in a manner that activates and completes the 800 east and Chase avenue street fronts.

Total # of Units 23

The 23 units include:

- 6 unique loft floor plans in the Historic building
- 8 1,750 SF, 3 bed, 4 bath town home unit types
- 9 1,350 SF, 2 bed, 3 bath town home unit types

Parcel 16-08-176-015 located at 847 South 800 East has been an unimproved warehouse for over 20 years, however the building has historical significance. The added density as noted is essential to our efforts to preserve and restore the historic building. It goes without saying the adaptive reuse of the historic building costs 2.5 times more per square foot to complete compared to traditional new construction. As stated, the added density of 5 more residential units associated with our applications will afford us the economic capability to preserve the 16,000 square foot historic building. In the event we are not successful in gaining the added density, it may be necessary to demolish the historic building and simply use the existing density of 18 new structures (RMF-45 zone for 847 S allows for 16 units as survey of parcel is over 21,800 SF, and 833 S has 2 units available with current R-2 zone).

In order to restore/re-use the historic building and achieve the 23 total unit density on the site, SLC planning department has directed us to submit the following applications simultaneously with this Planned Development application.

- 1- Lot consolidation application.
- 2- Rezone application.
- 3- Master Plan Amendment application.

Lot consolidation application- This requirement is derived from the fact that the proposed project is comprised of 2 separate parcels. The consolidation of the two parcels will simplify the land plan and clarify setback requirements throughout the project. Additionally, buildings and utilities will not end up bridging or straddling lot lines.

Rezone Application- As noted above, the project consists of 2 parcels: 847 S 800 E is .50 Acres and currently zoned RM-45, while 833 S 800 E is .29 acres and currently zoned R-2. When we purchased the properties back in 2011, the 847 S 800 E has its current RM-45 zoning, and 833 S 800 E had a RM35 zoning. Utilizing the density afforded by both of the original zones would afford us the total 23 units we are currently requesting. Because 833 S 800E was rezoned to R-2 in 2013, we will be submitting a rezone request. While we are asking for a single zone for the consolidated lot of RM-45, (which would afford substantial density), we are capping the development density at the proposed 23 total units.

Master Plan Amendment- The need for this application stems from a conflict in the Masterplan adopted in 2005. The conflict in the master plan is due to the master plan land use language to be low density



throughout the neighborhood (10 - 20 units per acre), even on parcels zoned RMF-45 which is a moderate to high density multi-family residential zoning. Our application seeks simply to correct the noted Master plan conflict and utilize the density's associated with our current zoning.

Planned Development.

Specific areas of application compliance with 2018 published Planned Development Objectives detailed in 21A.55.010
objectives: B, D, E

B. Historic Preservation: Preservation, restoration, or adaptive reuse of buildings or structures that contribute to the character of the City either architecturally and/or historically, and that contribute to the general welfare of the residents of the City.

Clearwater Homes has been through a rigorous design process focused on preserving the existing 3-story, unreinforced masonry, 16,000 square foot historic Telephone & Telegraph building. The said structure was built in 1911 by the Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Company and served as one of the first Utah operator stations for the new telephone technology.

The proposed project will carefully contrast historic reverence with modernism. Adaptive re-use and preservation construction methodology will be important and central to the project. In addition to typical adaptive reuse criteria such as structural/seismic, HVAC, electrical, and roofing, we also have special focus on: (a) the brick exterior massing of the Telegraph building will be tuckered, pointed, and sealed by a professional mason with historic restoration credentials, (b) the notable historic plaster mold cornice, soffit, and fascia located on the west facing 3 story roof transition will be preserved, sealed and painted, (c) historically appropriate high quality wood clad/steel divided light windows will be installed.

We have provided pictures (see exhibit A) of the original historic porch circa 1920. The LDS Church demolished this porch due to security problems in the 1980's. As part of our adaptive re-use efforts, we will reconstruct a precise replica of the original front porch. As the tallest building in the 9th & 9th neighborhood, the Telegraph building is visible on the skyline for several blocks. We firmly believe that restoration and preservation of this iconic building will secure an important and contributing asset to the fabric of the 9th and 9th community for generations.

D. Mobility: Enhances accessibility and mobility:

Improvements that encourage transportation options other than just the automobile.

The proposed Telegraph Exchange Lofts benefits from a location and land plan that encourages "walkability", "Bike-ability", and "skate-ability" (or pick your form of alternative transportation). As noted above, 46 onsite parking stalls will be EV stalls. Residents will be encouraged to use onsite bike racks, or extra garages space to safely



store bikes. Pedestrians, riders, and skaters, can elect to walk north, south, east, or West to find restaurants, parks, entertainment, and shopping at their fingertips. Local (obvious) attractions include the Ninth & Ninth business district, Trolley Square, and Liberty Park.

E. Sustainability: Creation of a project that achieves exceptional performance with regards to resource consumption and impact on natural systems:

- . Energy Use and Generation: Design of the building, its systems, and/or site that allow for a significant reduction in energy usage as compared with other buildings of similar type and/or the generation of energy from an on-site renewable resource.

Zero emissions residential community

Residential emissions accounts for 38% of all carbon dioxide contributions into the Wasatch Front local airshed. In addition to general climate change problems, local air quality is dramatically impacted by the widespread burning of natural gas as a residential furnace and hot water heating source. Clearwater Homes believes that development should not contribute to high frequency asthma for the developing lungs of Utah children. As such, the Telegraph Exchange lofts will work to eliminate residential gas meters by utilizing all electric furnaces and hot water heaters powered 100% by offsite renewable energy solar farms.

1A.55.050: STANDARDS FOR PLANNED DEVELOPMENTS:



The Planning Commission may approve, approve with conditions, or deny a planned development based upon written findings of fact according to each of the following standards. It is the responsibility of the applicant to provide written and graphic evidence demonstrating compliance with the following standards:

A. Planned Development Objectives: The planned development shall meet the purpose statement for a planned development (section 21A.55.010 of this chapter) and will achieve at least one of the objectives stated in said section. To determine if a planned development objective has been achieved, the applicant shall demonstrate that at least one of the strategies associated with the objective are included in the proposed planned development. The applicant shall also demonstrate why modifications to the zoning regulations are necessary to meet the purpose statement for a planned development. The Planning Commission should consider the relationship between the proposed modifications to the zoning regulations and the purpose of a planned development, and determine if the project will result in a more enhanced product than would be achievable through strict application of the land use regulations. **Answer- As noted above, the project consists of 2 parcels: 847 S 800 E is .50 Acres and currently zoned RM-45, while 833 S 800 E is .29 acres and currently zoned R-2. When we purchased the properties back in 2011, the 847 S 800 E has its current RM-45 zoning, and 833 S 800 E had a RM35 zoning. Utilizing the density afforded by both of the original zones would afford us the total 23 units we are currently requesting. Because 833 S 800E was rezoned to R-2 in 2015, we will be submitting a rezone request. While we are asking for a single zone for the consolidated lot of RM-45, (which would afford substantial density), we are seeking an**



approval, capping the development density at the proposed 23 total units. The economics of the additional 5 units requested, will support the extensive costs associated with the adaptive reuse effort on the historic building. Thus, the thrust of our proposal is an economic request to assist in saving the historic building. Furthermore, the added density as noted is essential to our efforts to preserve and restore the historic building. It goes without saying the adaptive reuse of the historic building costs 2.5 times more per square foot to complete compared to traditional new construction. The added density of 5 more residential units associated with our applications will afford us the economic capability to preserve the 16,000 square foot historic building. In the event we are not successful in gaining the added density, it may be necessary to demolish the historic building and simply use the existing density of 18 new structures (RMF-45 zone for 847 S allows for 16 units as survey of parcel is over 21,800 SF, and 833 S has 2 units available with current R-2 zone). We firmly believe that approval of our proposal as stated will result in a substantially enhanced community and preservation of an iconic local treasure.

B. Master Plan Compatibility: The proposed planned development is generally consistent with adopted policies set forth in the Citywide, community, and/or small area Master Plan that is applicable to the site where the planned development will be located.

Answer- See Master Plan Amendment language above

C. Design And Compatibility: The proposed planned development is compatible with the area the planned development will be located and is designed to achieve a more enhanced product than would be achievable through strict application of land use regulations. In determining design and compatibility, the Planning Commission should consider:

- . Whether the scale, mass, and intensity of the proposed planned development is compatible with the neighborhood where the planned development will be located and/or the policies stated in an applicable Master Plan related to building and site design; **Answer- The existing historic building is 58' tall and represent and iconic landmark in the neighborhood. Restoration of this structure will make it the crown jewel of 9th and 9th, and source of pride for the immediate 800 east community.**
- . Whether the building orientation and building materials in the proposed planned development are compatible with the neighborhood where the planned development will be located and/or the policies stated in an applicable Master Plan related to building and site design;
- . Whether building setbacks along the perimeter of the development: **Answer- See setbacks identified on site plan and described in narrative below.**



- . Maintain the visual character of the neighborhood or the character described in the applicable Master Plan. **Yes, the project provides. See site plan and renderings. The project philosophy is "Historic reverence with modern contrast". We believe this project will fit in nicely with the "Eclectic, Bohemian 9th and 9th character.**

- . Provide sufficient space for private amenities. **Yes, the project provides. See site plan and renderings.**

- . Provide sufficient open space buffering between the proposed development and neighboring properties to minimize impacts related to privacy and noise. **Answer-See setbacks noted on site plan and narrated below. Also note :20'4" setback to residential house located on the North side of the project. We wanted to be particularly sensitive to this neighborhood housing transition.**

- . Provide adequate sight lines to streets, driveways and sidewalks. **Yes, the project provides.**

- . Provide sufficient space for maintenance. **Yes, the project provides.**

- . Whether building facades offer ground floor transparency, access, and architectural detailing to facilitate pedestrian interest and interaction; **Answer- Yes, the front porches to all 800 east oriented Townhomes, as well as the existing historic building provide notable pedestrian interest. See attached renderings.**

- . Whether lighting is designed for safety and visual interest while minimizing impacts on surrounding property; **Answer-Lighting package and orientation will be sensitive to the residential neighborhood. Soft lite LED bulbs and down light fixtures will be tactically used.**

- . Whether dumpsters, loading docks and/or service areas are appropriately screened; and

- . Whether parking areas are appropriately buffered from adjacent uses. **Answer- 46 parking stalls provided are 100% screened from the street. 34 stalls will be in garage's, while the final 12 stalls are in the northeast corner (see site plan for reference)**

- D. Landscaping: The proposed planned development preserves, maintains or provides native landscaping where appropriate. In determining the landscaping for the proposed planned development, the Planning Commission should consider:
 - . Whether mature native trees located along the periphery of the property and along the street are preserved and maintained; **Answer- All Mature street trees will be preserved with the exception of one. Two trees will to be removed due to its location in the drive**

lane. The said tree will be replanted in accordance with Salt Lake Urban forestry requirements.

- . Whether existing landscaping that provides additional buffering to the abutting properties is maintained and preserved; **NA**
- . Whether proposed landscaping is designed to lessen potential impacts created by the proposed planned development; and

4. Whether proposed landscaping is appropriate for the scale of the development.

Answer- The project design, landscape architecture, and planting schedule has been thoughtfully curated by the LOCI design group. The site plan was designed to place front porches in the manner that activates the street frontages of 800 east and Chase avenue. In addition to numerous raised planter beds, hundreds of trees, perennial grasses & flowers, the project amenities include a 10'X60' lap pool and a heavily forested roof top deck. See attached landscape plan and water wise species/planting schedule.

The planting scheme will feature a variety of hardy native and/or climate adapted trees, shrubs, and grasses. Areas will be designed with a focus on minimizing water use, enhancing the urban forest, and creating comfortable use areas through shading and screening. Additionally, the design will draw inspiration from the natural conditions of the Valley and surrounding mountains. Trees will be small to medium varieties that strive to provide year-round interest while also meeting aforementioned design goals. Shrubs will be low to medium height and ideally provide year-round interest.

Potential Tree Varieties include Kindred Spirit Oak, Serviceberry, Tatarian Maple, and Paperbark Maple

Potential Shrub Varieties include Creeping Oregon Grape, Gro Low Sumac, St. John's Wort

Potential Grass Varieties include Feather Reed Grass, Fountain Grass.

E. Mobility: The proposed planned development supports Citywide transportation goals and promotes safe and efficient circulation within the site and surrounding neighborhood. In determining mobility, the Planning Commission should consider:

- . Whether drive access to local streets will negatively impact the safety, purpose and character of the street; **Answer-36 of our parking stalls will enter and discharge on a 20'drive aisle on 800 E, while 10 additional garage stalls will utilize Chase Avenue**
- . Whether the site design considers safe circulation for a range of transportation options including: **Answer- See locations and narrative for bike storage above in Objectives section D**



. Safe and accommodating pedestrian environment and pedestrian oriented design;

Answer-Bikers and pedestrians have multiple paths to street and sidewalk that don't conflict with vehicle drive aisle.

. Bicycle facilities and connections where appropriate, and orientation to transit where available; and **Answer- See locations and narrative for bike storage above in Objectives section D**

. Minimizing conflicts between different transportation modes; **Answer-Bikers and pedestrians have multiple paths to street and sidewalk that don't conflict with vehicle drive aisle.**

Whether the site design of the proposed development promotes or enables access to adjacent uses and amenities; **NA**

Whether the proposed design provides adequate emergency vehicle access; and

Answer-The Fire department has reviewed and approved the proposed plan

Whether loading access and service areas are adequate for the site and minimize impacts to the surrounding area and public rights-of-way.

Answer- The site and the land plan provide excess parking and adequate loading areas for residents.

F. Existing Site Features: The proposed planned development preserves natural and built features that significantly contribute to the character of the neighborhood and/or environment.

Answer- Please refer to our narrative above in section B of Objectives: Preservation of the historic building

G. Utilities: Existing and/or planned utilities will adequately serve the development and not have a detrimental effect on the surrounding area. (Ord. 8-18, 2018)

Answer- We have conducted 2 DRT meetings for this project with all related Salt Lake City departments in preparation for this project. Public utilities may require that we upsize a pressurized water line from 900 South to the frontage of the subject property. All other needed utilities and capacities are present in the street frontage.



As part of this Planned Unit development application, we are seeking approval for the following setbacks and conditions (the statements below assume our rezone application is approved) (see setbacks on site plan attached as well as 2nd story overhang notes):

West- setbacks -800 East

The West side of the existing historic building currently sits 11'9" back from the property line. To maintain an inline street front, we are proposing the 4 new townhome structures fronting 800 E maintain the same setback as the historic building. The stated orientation of the buildings is designed to activate the 800 east street front

East- Setbacks

East Section "A", This is clearly a rear lot line, but is defined by the code as an interior side yard with an 8' setback requirement and/or a 10' landscape buffer requirement, and a 1' accessory dwelling requirement. Our structures in **Section A- East** are setback 37'6" and thus far exceed the 8' setback requirement. We are requesting a waiver to 0' on the landscape buffer (existing Landscape buffer on adjacent property is approximately 18'), and a waiver of the 1' accessory dwelling setback to 0'. This side of the property is contiguous to the Smiths commercial parking lot. Section "B" east is defined by the RM-45 code as a rear lot line. **Section B-East** is proposed as 5' setback. The formula in the RM45 zone would require a 30' setback in this direction. We are requesting to waive the 30' setback requirement in exchange for the proposed 5' setback.

It is important to note that the entire east reach of the project backs the massive 2 plus acre Smiths commercial parking lot, and thus, the proposed, will not negatively impact any adjacent party. Additionally, the Smiths parking lot already includes a landscape buffer of approximately 18'.

North- Setbacks

North section A-The RM-45 zone requires an 8' interior side yard setback or a 10' landscape buffer. This North side of the project represents the direct transition from our development to a single-family residential zone. Buildings on this side of the property will have a 24'4" setback from the property line of the contiguous residential lot. We felt that providing the said 24'4" setback was a more respectful transition than a 10' landscape buffer. We will not need a setback waiver as we have substantially exceeded the requirement. We are requesting to waive the 10' landscape buffer requirement in exchange for a 4' landscape buffer. It's also important to note that the homeowner to the north asked for our consent last year



for a city height variance on his side yard fence. The request was granted, and the neighbor now has an 8' high quality custom fence on the property line.

North Section B- The RM45 zone requires an 8' setback in this location, and we are requesting to waive the 8' setback in exchange for our proposed 4' setback. We are also seeking a waiver of the landscape buffer requirement. As with the East setback, it is important to note that this North reach of the project backs the massive 2 plus acre Smiths commercial parking lot, and thus will not negatively impact any party. As stated, the Smiths parking lot already includes a landscape buffer of approximately 15' as well

South- Setbacks

Chase Avenue- The south side of the existing historic building currently sits on the property line, while the new structures fronting Chase Avenue (private street) will have a 4' setback from the right of way. The RM45 zone requires an 8' setback in this location, and we are requesting to waive the 8' setback in exchange for our proposed 4' setback. All Chase Avenue owners have formally consented to the proposed 4' setback and development plan. The Chase Avenue owner's consents have been executed and notarized.

Height

The historic building height is 58'. This height will be maintained as part of the roof top deck area and restoration of the building. All new residential structures on the site will be capped at 30' or less.

Fire Safety

We anticipate and have budgeted the installation of fire sprinklers for all interior space in the historic building and new residential structures.

Sincerely,
Micah Wells Peters
Clearwater Homes

RE: MASTER PLAN AMENDMENT

PARCEL 16-08-176-015
847 South 800 East
Salt Lake City, UT 84102

PARCEL 16-08-176-026
833 South 800 East
Salt Lake City, UT 84102

The proposed project consists of consolidating two parcels, both owned by Micah Peters (Clearwater Homes): Parcel 16-08-176-015 located at 847 S 800 E is 0.50 Acres and Parcel 16-08-176-026 located at 833 S 800 E is 0.29 acres. The combined parcels will consist of 23 future residential units.

Clearwater Homes has been through a rigorous design process focused on preserving the existing 3-story, unreinforced masonry, 16,000 square foot historic Telephone & Telegraph building. The said structure was built in 1911 by the Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Company and served as one of the first Utah operator stations for the new telephone technology. In addition to the adaptive re-use efforts to place 6 residential lofts in the existing historic building, the project will have 17 3-story modern townhomes tactically placed in a manner that activates and completes the 800 east and Chase avenue street fronts.

Total # of Units 23

The 23 units include:

- 6 unique loft floor plans in the Historic building
- 8 1,750 SF, 3 bed, 4 bath town home unit types
- 9 1,350 SF, 2 bed, 3 bath town home unit types

Parcel 16-08-176-015 located at 847 South 800 East has been an unimproved warehouse for over 20 years, however the building has some historical significance. The added density as noted is essential to our efforts to preserve and restore the historic building. It goes without saying the adaptive reuse of the historic building costs 2.5 times more per square foot to complete compared to traditional new construction. As stated, the added density of 5 residential units associated with our 4 applications will afford us the economic capability to preserve the 16,000 square foot historic building. In the event we are not successful in gaining the added density, it may be necessary to demolish the historic building and simply use the existing density of 18 new structures (RMF-45 zone for 847 S allows for 16 units as survey of parcel is over 21,800 SF, and 833 S has 2 units available with current R-2 zone).

In order to restore/re-use the historic building and achieve the 23 total unit density on the site, SLC planning department has directed us to submit the following applications simultaneously with this Planned Development application.

- 1- Lot consolidation application.
- 2- Rezone application.
- 3- Planned Development Amendment application.

Lot consolidation application- This requirement is derived from the fact that the proposed project is comprised of 2 separate parcels. The consolidation of the two parcels will simplify the land plan and



clarify setback requirements throughout the project. Additionally, buildings and utilities will not end up bridging or straddling lot lines.

Rezone Application-As noted above, the project consists of 2 parcels: 847 S 800 E is .50 Acres and currently zoned RM-45, while 833 S 800 E is .29 acres and currently zoned R-2. When we purchased the properties back in 2011, the 847 S 800 E has its current RM-45 zoning, and 833 S 800 E had a RM35 zoning. Utilizing the density afforded by both of the original zones would afford us the total 23 units we are currently requesting. Because 833 S 800E was rezoned to R-2 in 2013, we will be submitting a rezone request. While we are asking for a single zone for the consolidated lot of RM-45, (which would afford substantial density), we are capping the development density at the proposed 23 total units.

Planned Development. This application simply details the land plan for the development, setbacks on the newly consolidated lot, as well as establishing the 30' height on the new residential structures.

Master Plan Amendment- The need for this application stems from a conflict in the Masterplan adopted in 2005. The conflict in the master plan is due to the master plan land use language to be low density throughout the neighborhood (10 - 20 units per acre), even on parcels zoned RMF-45 which is a moderate to high density multi-family residential zoning. Our application seeks simply to correct the noted Master plan conflict and utilize the density's associated with our current zoning.

City Masterplan References;

- *Central Community Master Plan, adopted 11/01/2005*
- *East Central Community Small Area Master Plan, adopted 12/1992: revised 01/1993*
- *9 Line Corridor Master Plan, adopted 03/03/15*

Central Community MP Bullet Points in support of the MP change;

- Conflicts with Zoning Ordinance and Master Plan. The MP indicates the Land use to be Low Density Residential (10-20 units per acre). The current zone is RMF – 45 Moderate/High Multi-Family Residential (31 units possible total units if zoning change is approved)
- Application is proposing 23 units, max.
- Promoting "intent" of the MP through the following;
 1. Preservation of the community's architectural heritage
 2. Protect and improve the quality of life
 3. Improve and support community involvement
 4. Capital improvement in the neighborhood
 5. Provide smarter and more creative development practices
 6. Overall project is a low dense project below the zoned maximum
 7. Preserving the historic structure and maintaining the residential neighborhood integrity
 8. Promote walkable development
 9. The increase of density will support neighborhood business uses and expand their use of common public facilities.
 10. With future expansion of the 9-Line system the project will maintain the integrity of the transit-oriented opportunities
 11. Promote quality of excellence to maintain and enhance the quality of living
 12. Modern townhouses offer the neighborhood a variety of housing types



13. All parking is contained on site

East Central Comm. Small Area MP Bullet Points in support of the MP change;

- Promoting “intent” of the MP through the following;
 1. Maintains and preserve residential neighborhood integrity and a sense of security with additional eyes on the street
 2. Maintain and preserves a viable commercial business district within the neighborhood.
 3. All parking is contained on site.
 4. Chase Avenue is will be upgraded. The Avenue is a private street and will be developed & enhanced with a plan that facilitates parking and currently signed off and supported by all property owners.

9-Line Corridor MP Bullet Points in support of the MP change;

- Promoting “intent” of the MP through the following;
 1. Residential density to support the future extension of the 9-line

The submittal of the Master Plan Amendment benefits from the supporting summary of the Planned Development Application, therefore, the summary overlay is included below:

Zero emissions residential community

Residential emissions accounts for 38% of all carbon dioxide contributions into the Wasatch Front local airshed. In addition to general climate change problems, local air quality is dramatically impacted by the widespread burning of natural gas as a residential furnace and hot water heating source. Clearwater Homes believes that development should not contribute to high frequency asthma for the developing lungs of Utah children. As such, the Telegraph Exchange lofts will work to eliminate residential gas meters by utilizing all electric furnaces and hot water heaters powered 100% by offsite renewable energy solar farms. Additionally, we plan to have 100% of our 47 onsite parking stalls include EV stations for electric vehicles (this parking stall count does not include the 4 parallel street parking stalls on 800 E).

Planned Development Information. Description of how your project meets one or more of the following objectives

- A. Combination and coordination of architectural styles, building forms, building materials, and building relationships;**
- B. Preservation and enhancement of desirable site characteristics such as natural topography, vegetation and geologic features, and the prevention of soil erosion;**
- C. Preservation of buildings which are architecturally or historically significant or contribute to the character of the city;**
- D. Use of design, landscape, or architectural features to create a pleasing environment;**
- E. Inclusion of special development amenities that are in the interest of the general public;**



- F. Elimination of blighted structures or incompatible uses through redevelopment or rehabilitation;**
- G. Inclusion of affordable housing with market rate housing; or**
- H. Utilization of "green" building techniques in development**

The Telegraph Exchange Lofts will meet objectives a, c, d, & h above, per the following:

A. Combination and coordination of architectural styles, building forms, building materials, and building relationships; The proposed project will carefully contrast historic reverence with modernism. Massing and exterior materials will include restored historic brick, cementitious/fiber cement panels, lap siding, smooth finished EIFS material, and architectural metals.

C. Preservation of buildings which are architecturally or historically significant or contribute to the character of the city; The proposed project will carefully contrast historic reverence with modernism. Adaptive re-use and preservation construction methodology will be important and central to the project. As noted above, the site houses a 1911, 3 story, 16,000 SF, historic building originally known as the Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph building. The brick exterior massing of the Telegraph building will be tucked, pointed, and sealed by a professional mason with historic restoration credentials. The notable plaster mold cornice, soffit, and fascia located on the west facing 3 story roof transition will be preserved, sealed and painted. High quality wood clad/steel divided light windows that meet the demands for historic tax credits will be installed.

We have provided pictures (see exhibit A) of the original historic porch circa 1920. The LDS Church demolished this porch due to security problems in the 1980's. As part of our adaptive re-use efforts, we will reconstruct a precise replica of the original front porch. As the tallest building in the 9th & 9th neighborhood, the Telegraph building is visible on the skyline for several blocks. We firmly believe that restoration and preservation of this iconic building will secure an important and contributing asset to the fabric of the 9th and 9th community for generations.

D. Use of design, landscape, or architectural features to create a pleasing environment; The project design, landscape architecture, and planting schedule has been thoughtfully curated by the LOCI design group. The site plan was designed to place front porches in the manner that activates the street frontages of 800 east and Chase avenue. In addition to numerous raised planter beds, hundreds of trees, perennial grasses & flowers, the project amenities include a 10'X60' lap pool and a heavily forested roof top deck. See attached landscape plan and water wise species/planting schedule.

The planting scheme will feature a variety of hardy native and/or climate adapted trees, shrubs, and grasses. Areas will be designed with a focus on minimizing water use, enhancing the urban forest, and creating comfortable use areas through shading and screening. Additionally, the design will draw inspiration from the natural conditions of the Valley and surrounding mountains. Trees will be small to medium varieties that strive to



provide year-round interest while also meeting aforementioned design goals. Shrubs will be low to medium height and ideally provide year-round interest.

Potential Tree Varieties include Serviceberry, Tatarian Maple, and Paperbark Maple

Potential Shrub Varieties include Creeping Oregon Grape, Gro Low Sumac, St. John's Wort

Potential Grass Varieties include Feather Reed Grass, Fountain Grass.

H. Utilization of "green" building techniques in development. The Telegraph Exchange Loft project falls within Clearwater Homes new "Subculture Loft" series. This represents a philosophy of Green Building and zero emissions residential construction. As such, all residences will be constructed with highly efficient electric furnaces and water heaters. With the absence of gas meters, the project will not contribute emissions to the local air shed. It is commonly known that residential natural gas comprises make significant contributions to pollution that negatively impact the air quality on the WASTACH FRONT. In addition to the "Zero Emissions "strategy, we will employ a number of other green building techniques and sustainable material applications.

As part of this Planned Unit development application, we have designed the land plan and are seeking approval for the following setbacks (see site plan attached):

West-800 East

The West side of the existing historic building currently sits 11'9"" back from the property line. To maintain an inline street front, we are proposing the 4 new townhome structures fronting 800 E maintain the same setback as the historic building.

East

This side of the property is contiguous to the Smiths commercial parking lot. Our new structures will be located at a section A-37'6", and Section B-5' setback from the property line.

North

Building on this side of the property will have a 20'4" setback from the property line of the contiguous residential lot. Landscape buffer between RMF-45 and R-2 will be completed on R-2 property. An agreement has been made between parties.

South

Chase Avenue- The south side of the existing historic building currently sits on the property line, while the new structures fronting Chase Avenue (private street) will have a 4' setback from the right of way. All Chase avenue owners have formally consented to the setback and development plan. The consents have been documented and notarized.

Height



The historic building height is 58'. This height will be maintained as part of the roof top deck area and restoration of the building. All new residential structures on the site will be capped at 30' or less.

Fire Safety

We anticipate and have budgeted the installation of fire sprinklers for all interior space in the historic building and new residential structures.

Additional purpose and Objective Bullet Points

- Encouraging efficient use of land and resources
- Encouraging innovative planning and development
- Reinforcing the character of the surrounding neighborhood
- Development will result in a more enhanced product than would be achievable through strict application of land use regulations through the Historic Preservation of the Telegraph Exchange building. The Telegraph Exchange building is a large contributor to the character of shaping the city and contributing to the general welfare of the city's residents.
- The development will be another contributor to the future extension of the 9-Line Corridor with the addition of residences to the area.

Sincerely,
Micah Wells Peters
Clearwater Homes

RE: ZONING AMENDMENT

PARCEL 16-08-176-015
847 South 800 East
Salt Lake City, UT 84102

PARCEL 16-08-176-026
833 South 800 East
Salt Lake City, UT 84102

This application is accompanied with three other applications associated with the proposed development. The three other applications are: PUD, Lot Consolidation, and Master Plan Amendment.

The project consists of consolidating two parcels that are both owned by Micah Peters: Parcel 16-08-176-015 located at 847 S 800 E is 0.50 acres and currently zoned RMF-45; and Parcel 16-08-176-026 located at 833 S 800 E is 0.29 acres, which was historically zoned RMF-35 until 2013, at which time the parcel was rezoned R-2. The Zoning Application is requesting that the new consolidated parcel adopt the existing zoning of Parcel 16-08-176-015 of RMF-45. The consolidated parcel with the new zoning of RMF-45 will provide enough land area and density to create a balanced residential project that will allow the owner to preserve the historical structure while providing additional housing for the area.

The combined parcels will consist of 23 residential units. Clearwater Homes has been through a rigorous design process focused on preserving the existing 3-story, unreinforced masonry, 16,000 square foot historic Telephone & Telegraph building. The said structure was built in 1911 by the Mountain States Telephone company and served as one of the first Utah operator stations for the new telephone technology. In addition to the adaptive re-use efforts to place 6 residential lofts in the existing historic building, the project will have 17 3-story modern townhomes tactically placed in a manner that activates and completes the 800 east and Chase avenue street fronts.

Total # of Units 23

The 23 units include:

- 6 unique loft floor plans in the Historic building
- 8 1,750 SF, 3 bed, 4 bath town home unit types
- 9 1,350 SF, 2 bed, 3 bath town home unit types

When Micah Peters purchased the properties back in 2011, the 847 S 800 E has its current RMF-45 zoning, and 833 S 800 E had a RM35 zoning. Utilizing the density afforded by both of the original zones would afford the total 23 units we are currently requesting. Because 833 S 800 E was rezoned to R-2 in 2013, we are requesting this zoning amendment. The properties immediately to the south of our parcels along 800 East are also zoned RMF-45, and so our parcels are simply a continuation of that zoning designation. While we are asking for a single zone for the consolidated lot of RMF-45, which would afford a higher density, we are asking that our approvals are conditioned on a cap of 23 total residential units; 6 residential units in the 3-story historic building, and 17 new residential units on the surrounding combined parcel.

Parcel 16-08-176-015 located at 847 South 800 East has been an unimproved warehouse for over 20 years, however the building has historical significance. The added density, as noted, is essential to our efforts to preserve and restore the historic building. It goes without saying the adaptive reuse of the



historic building costs 2.5 times more per square foot to complete compared to traditional new construction. As stated, the added density of 5 more residential units associated with our applications will afford us the economic capability to preserve the 16,000 square foot historic building. In the event we are not successful in gaining the added density, it may be necessary to demolish the historic building and simply use the existing density of 18 new structures.

In order to restore/re-use the historic building and achieve the 23 total unit density on the site, SLC planning department has directed us to submit the following applications simultaneously with this Planned Development application.

- 1- Lot consolidation application.
- 2- Planned Development application.
- 3-Master Plan Amendment application.

Lot consolidation application- This requirement is derived from the fact that the proposed project is comprised of 2 separate parcels. The consolidation of the two parcels will simplify the land plan and clarify setback requirements throughout the project. Additionally, buildings and utilities will not end up bridging or straddling lot lines.

Rezone Application- As noted above, the project consists of 2 parcels: 847 S 800 E is .50 Acres and currently zoned RM-45, while 833 S 800 E is .29 acres and currently zoned R-2. When we purchased the properties back in 2011, the 847 S 800 E has its current RM-45 zoning, and 833 S 800 E had a RM35 zoning. Utilizing the density afforded by both of the original zones would afford us the total 23 units we are currently requesting. Because 833 S 800E was rezoned to R-2 in 2013, we will be submitting a rezone request. While we are asking for a single zone for the consolidated lot of RM-45, (which would afford substantial density), we are capping the development density at the proposed 23 total units.


Planned Development. This application simply details the land plan for the development, setbacks on the newly consolidated lot, as well as establishing the 30' height on the new residential structures.

Master Plan Amendment- The need for this application stems from a conflict in the Masterplan adopted in 2005. The conflict in the master plan is due to the master plan land use language to be low density throughout the neighborhood (10 - 20 units per acre), even on parcels zoned RMF-45 which is a moderate to high density multi-family residential zoning. Our application seeks simply to correct the noted Master plan conflict and utilize the density's associated with our current zoning.

Sincerely,
Micah Wells Peters
Clearwater Homes

HISTORICAL TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE IMAGES





TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE LOFTS



TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE LOFTS

VIEW A



TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE LOFTS
VIEW B



TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE LOFTS
VIEW C



TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE LOFTS

VIEW D



TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE LOFTS

VIEW E



TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE LOFTS
VIEW F



TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE LOFTS

VIEW G



TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE LOFTS

AERIAL VIEW



TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE LOFTS

VIEW H



TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE LOFTS

AERIAL VIEW



TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE LOFTS

VIEW I

CITY APPLICATIONS



847 SOUTH 800 EAST
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84102

ARCHITECTURE ▢ INTERIOR DESIGN

IVISA

5


DRAWINGS ARE
MENTS OF
AND SHALL
HE PROPERTY
RCHITECT. NO
USE OF THESE
INTS SHALL BE
ED UNLESS
ED IN WRITING
ARCHITECTS
PROPRIATE
NSATION.

033

4, 2020

00-00

[illegible]




ZONING KEY MAP

YARD DESIGNATION	SETBACK FROM PROPERTY LINE
1. FRONT YARD	8'-0" with building overhang, 11'-10" at foundation in line with historic building
2. CORNER SIDE YARD	0'-0"
3. INTERIOR SIDE YARD A	11'-3" at Carport, 24'-4" from nearest building
4. INTERIOR SIDE YARD B	0'-0" with building overhang, 4'-0" at building foundation
5. REAR YARD A	0'-0" with carport, 37'-6" from nearest building
6. REAR YARD B	5'-0"

ZONING CODE ANALYSIS

Analysis based on combining an R-2 lot with an RMF-45 lot & rezoning the R-2 lot to RMF-45				
Zoning District:	RMF 45			
Minimum Lot Area & Width:	Multi family dwelling (15+) 21,000 sqft + 800 sqft for each additional unit up to 1 acre 34,111 (763 acre)			
Actual Lot Area:				
Minimum Lot Width:	80'-0"			
Actual Lot Width:	181'-7"			
Allowable Units Calculation:	34,111-21,000 = 13,111/800 = 16 15+16 = 31 UNITS ALLOWED 23 UNITS PROVIDED			
Maximum Bldg. Height:	45'-0" (Existing historic building exceeds 45'-0")			
Building Height Provided:	Historic Building: 50'-0" Townhome Units: 30'-0"			
Minimum Yard Req:				
Setbacks:	Front	Corner S.Y.	Interior S.Y.	Rear Yard
Required Setbacks:	No greater than ext. yard for bldg. built before 1995	20'-0"	8'-0"	25% of lot depth, not to exceed 30'
Provided Setbacks:	In-line with historic bldg.	See Zoning Key Map	See Zoning Key Map	See Zoning Key Map
Parking Restrictions in Yards:	Not Permitted(NP)	NP	NP within 10' if abutting res. zone	NP within 10' if abutting res. zone
Provided:	None	None	None	Abutting a commercial zone
Req. Landscape Yards:	The front yard & corner side yard will be maintained as landscaped			
Maximum Bldg. Coverage:	The surface coverage of all principal & accessory buildings shall not exceed 60% of the lot area			
Required:	13,961 sqft/34,111 = 41% lot Coverage			
Provided:				
Landscape Buffers:	Landscape buffer between RMF-45 and R-2 will be completed on R-2 property. An agreement has been made between parties.			
Parking Requirements:	Historic Building: 1 stall for 1 bedroom, 2 stalls for 2 or more bedrooms Townhomes: 2 stalls per unit			
Parking Provided:	Historic Building: 6 total units, 13 stalls provided onsite, 4 additional steel parking stalls provided for guests Townhomes: 2 garage spaces provided per unit.			



- ## REFERENCE NOTES
1. EXISTING FIRE HYDRANT
 2. EXISTING POWER POLE
 3. EXISTING LANDSCAPE
 4. EXISTING SIDEWALK
 5. EXISTING CURB
 6. NEW BIKE RACK
 7. NOT USED
 8. NEW APPROACH TO TOWNHOUSE ENTRY
 9. NEW 4'-0" LANDSCAPE BUFFER--KINDRED SPIRIT COLUMNAR OAK TO BE PLANTED EVERY 6'-0"
 10. NEW DRIVE AISLE
 11. NEW LANDSCAPE
 12. NOT USED
 13. NEW 90 DEGREE PARKING AS PER S.L.C. DIVISION OF TRANSPORTATION STANDARD, 12 PARKING SPOTS TOTAL.
 14. CARPORT OVERHANG
 15. CARPORT SUPPORT COLUMN BELOW
 16. SHIPPING CONTAINER, RESTROOM AND KITCHEN
 17. NEW FIREPLACE
 18. NEW IN-GROUND POOL & HOT TUB
 19. NEW STAIRS TO ENTER BUILDING
 20. NOT USED
 21. NEW LIGHTING FOR IMPROVED SECURITY
 22. NEW LIGHT WELL
 23. TRAFFIC CALMING LANDSCAPE BULB-OUT AROUND EXISTING POWER POLES
 24. EXISTING FIRE TRUCK CRASH GATE
 25. EXISTING BRICK WALL TO REMAIN
 26. PATH FOR BUILDING EXITING
 27. NEW SIDEWALK
 28. COMMUNITY ACCESS GATE TO SMITHS & 900 EAST BUSINESS DISTRICT

CITY APPLICATIONS

TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE
847 SOUTH 800 EAST
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84102

255 WEST 700 SOUTH SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84101
TELEPHONE 801.364.5161

ARCHITECTURE □ INTERIOR DESIGN

MJSA

REVISIONS:

STAMP

**UPDATES & CLARIFICATIONS
PER 05.27.2020 PLANNING
COMMISSION MEETING**


16033

DATE:
JUNE 4, 2020


SHEET:
AS0-00

SITE DIAGRAM
SCALE: 1/16" = 1'-0"


A5 SITE DIAGRAM
AS0-00 SCALE: 1/16"=1'-0"



1/4"=1'-0" A & B: 1/4"=1'-0" C: 1/4"=1'-0" D: 1/4"=1'-0" E: 1/4"=1'-0" F: 1/4"=1'-0" G: 1/4"=1'-0" H: 1/4"=1'-0" I: 1/4"=1'-0" J: 1/4"=1'-0" K: 1/4"=1'-0" L: 1/4"=1'-0" M: 1/4"=1'-0" N: 1/4"=1'-0" O: 1/4"=1'-0" P: 1/4"=1'-0" Q: 1/4"=1'-0" R: 1/4"=1'-0" S: 1/4"=1'-0" T: 1/4"=1'-0" U: 1/4"=1'-0" V: 1/4"=1'-0" W: 1/4"=1'-0" X: 1/4"=1'-0" Y: 1/4"=1'-0" Z: 1/4"=1'-0" AA: 1/4"=1'-0" AB: 1/4"=1'-0" AC: 1/4"=1'-0" AD: 1/4"=1'-0" AE: 1/4"=1'-0" AF: 1/4"=1'-0" AG: 1/4"=1'-0" AH: 1/4"=1'-0" AI: 1/4"=1'-0" AJ: 1/4"=1'-0" AK: 1/4"=1'-0" AL: 1/4"=1'-0" AM: 1/4"=1'-0" AN: 1/4"=1'-0" AO: 1/4"=1'-0" AP: 1/4"=1'-0" AQ: 1/4"=1'-0" AR: 1/4"=1'-0" AS: 1/4"=1'-0" AT: 1/4"=1'-0" AU: 1/4"=1'-0" AV: 1/4"=1'-0" AW: 1/4"=1'-0" AX: 1/4"=1'-0" AY: 1/4"=1'-0" AZ: 1/4"=1'-0" BA: 1/4"=1'-0" BB: 1/4"=1'-0" BC: 1/4"=1'-0" BD: 1/4"=1'-0" BE: 1/4"=1'-0" BF: 1/4"=1'-0" BG: 1/4"=1'-0" BH: 1/4"=1'-0" BI: 1/4"=1'-0" BJ: 1/4"=1'-0" BK: 1/4"=1'-0" BL: 1/4"=1'-0" BM: 1/4"=1'-0" BN: 1/4"=1'-0" BO: 1/4"=1'-0" BP: 1/4"=1'-0" BQ: 1/4"=1'-0" BR: 1/4"=1'-0" BS: 1/4"=1'-0" BT: 1/4"=1'-0" BU: 1/4"=1'-0" BV: 1/4"=1'-0" BW: 1/4"=1'-0" BX: 1/4"=1'-0" BY: 1/4"=1'-0" BZ: 1/4"=1'-0" CA: 1/4"=1'-0" CB: 1/4"=1'-0" CC: 1/4"=1'-0" CD: 1/4"=1'-0" CE: 1/4"=1'-0" CF: 1/4"=1'-0" CG: 1/4"=1'-0" CH: 1/4"=1'-0" CI: 1/4"=1'-0" CJ: 1/4"=1'-0" CK: 1/4"=1'-0" CL: 1/4"=1'-0" CM: 1/4"=1'-0" CN: 1/4"=1'-0" CO: 1/4"=1'-0" CP: 1/4"=1'-0" CQ: 1/4"=1'-0" CR: 1/4"=1'-0" CS: 1/4"=1'-0" CT: 1/4"=1'-0" CU: 1/4"=1'-0" CV: 1/4"=1'-0" CW: 1/4"=1'-0" CX: 1/4"=1'-0" CY: 1/4"=1'-0" CZ: 1/4"=1'-0" DA: 1/4"=1'-0" DB: 1/4"=1'-0" DC: 1/4"=1'-0" DD: 1/4"=1'-0" DE: 1/4"=1'-0" DF: 1/4"=1'-0" DG: 1/4"=1'-0" DH: 1/4"=1'-0" DI: 1/4"=1'-0" DJ: 1/4"=1'-0" DK: 1/4"=1'-0" DL: 1/4"=1'-0" DM: 1/4"=1'-0" DN: 1/4"=1'-0" DO: 1/4"=1'-0" DP: 1/4"=1'-0" DQ: 1/4"=1'-0" DR: 1/4"=1'-0" DS: 1/4"=1'-0" DT: 1/4"=1'-0" DU: 1/4"=1'-0" DV: 1/4"=1'-0" DW: 1/4"=1'-0" DX: 1/4"=1'-0" DY: 1/4"=1'-0" DZ: 1/4"=1'-0" EA: 1/4"=1'-0" EB: 1/4"=1'-0" EC: 1/4"=1'-0" ED: 1/4"=1'-0" EE: 1/4"=1'-0" EF: 1/4"=1'-0" EG: 1/4"=1'-0" EH: 1/4"=1'-0" EI: 1/4"=1'-0" EJ: 1/4"=1'-0" EK: 1/4"=1'-0" EL: 1/4"=1'-0" EM: 1/4"=1'-0" EN: 1/4"=1'-0" EO: 1/4"=1'-0" EP: 1/4"=1'-0" EQ: 1/4"=1'-0" ER: 1/4"=1'-0" ES: 1/4"=1'-0" ET: 1/4"=1'-0" EU: 1/4"=1'-0" EV: 1/4"=1'-0" EW: 1/4"=1'-0" EX: 1/4"=1'-0" EY: 1/4"=1'-0" EZ: 1/4"=1'-0" FA: 1/4"=1'-0" FB: 1/4"=1'-0" FC: 1/4"=1'-0" FD: 1/4"=1'-0" FE: 1/4"=1'-0" FF: 1/4"=1'-0" FG: 1/4"=1'-0" FH: 1/4"=1'-0" FI: 1/4"=1'-0" FJ: 1/4"=1'-0" FK: 1/4"=1'-0" FL: 1/4"=1'-0" FM: 1/4"=1'-0" FN: 1/4"=1'-0" FO: 1/4"=1'-0" FP: 1/4"=1'-0" FQ: 1/4"=1'-0" FR: 1/4"=1'-0" FS: 1/4"=1'-0" FT: 1/4"=1'-0" FU: 1/4"=1'-0" FV: 1/4"=1'-0" FW: 1/4"=1'-0" FX: 1/4"=1'-0" FY: 1/4"=1'-0" FZ: 1/4"=1'-0" GA: 1/4"=1'-0" GB: 1/4"=1'-0" GC: 1/4"=1'-0" GD: 1/4"=1'-0" GE: 1/4"=1'-0" GF: 1/4"=1'-0" GG: 1/4"=1'-0" GH: 1/4"=1'-0" GI: 1/4"=1'-0" GJ: 1/4"=1'-0" GK: 1/4"=1'-0" GL: 1/4"=1'-0" GM: 1/4"=1'-0" GN: 1/4"=1'-0" GO: 1/4"=1'-0" GP: 1/4"=1'-0" GQ: 1/4"=1'-0" GR: 1/4"=1'-0" GS: 1/4"=1'-0" GT: 1/4"=1'-0" GU: 1/4"=1'-0" GV: 1/4"=1'-0" GW: 1/4"=1'-0" GX: 1/4"=1'-0" GY: 1/4"=1'-0" GZ: 1/4"=1'-0" HA: 1/4"=1'-0" HB: 1/4"=1'-0" HC: 1/4"=1'-0" HD: 1/4"=1'-0" HE: 1/4"=1'-0" HF: 1/4"=1'-0" HG: 1/4"=1'-0" HH: 1/4"=1'-0" HI: 1/4"=1'-0" HJ: 1/4"=1'-0" HK: 1/4"=1'-0" HL: 1/4"=1'-0" HM: 1/4"=1'-0" HN: 1/4"=1'-0" HO: 1/4"=1'-0" HP: 1/4"=1'-0" HQ: 1/4"=1'-0" HR: 1/4"=1'-0" HS: 1/4"=1'-0" HT: 1/4"=1'-0" HU: 1/4"=1'-0" HV: 1/4"=1'-0" HW: 1/4"=1'-0" HX: 1/4"=1'-0" HY: 1/4"=1'-0" HZ: 1/4"=1'-0" IA: 1/4"=1'-0" IB: 1/4"=1'-0" IC: 1/4"=1'-0" ID: 1/4"=1'-0" IE: 1/4"=1'-0" IF: 1/4"=1'-0" IG: 1/4"=1'-0" IH: 1/4"=1'-0" II: 1/4"=1'-0" IJ: 1/4"=1'-0" IK: 1/4"=1'-0" IL: 1/4"=1'-0" IM: 1/4"=1'-0" IN: 1/4"=1'-0" IO: 1/4"=1'-0" IP: 1/4"=1'-0" IQ: 1/4"=1'-0" IR: 1/4"=1'-0" IS: 1/4"=1'-0" IT: 1/4"=1'-0" IU: 1/4"=1'-0" IV: 1/4"=1'-0" IW: 1/4"=1'-0" IX: 1/4"=1'-0" IY: 1/4"=1'-0" IZ: 1/4"=1'-0" JA: 1/4"=1'-0" JB: 1/4"=1'-0" JC: 1/4"=1'-0" JD: 1/4"=1'-0" JE: 1/4"=1'-0" JF: 1/4"=1'-0" JG: 1/4"=1'-0" JH: 1/4"=1'-0" JI: 1/4"=1'-0" JJ: 1/4"=1'-0" JK: 1/4"=1'-0" JL: 1/4"=1'-0" JM: 1/4"=1'-0" JN: 1/4"=1'-0" JO: 1/4"=1'-0" JP: 1/4"=1'-0" JQ: 1/4"=1'-0" JR: 1/4"=1'-0" JS: 1/4"=1'-0" JT: 1/4"=1'-0" JU: 1/4"=1'-0" JV: 1/4"=1'-0" JW: 1/4"=1'-0" JX: 1/4"=1'-0" JY: 1/4"=1'-0" JZ: 1/4"=1'-0" KA: 1/4"=1'-0" KB: 1/4"=1'-0" KC: 1/4"=1'-0" KD: 1/4"=1'-0" KE: 1/4"=1'-0" KF: 1/4"=1'-0" KG: 1/4"=1'-0" KH: 1/4"=1'-0" KI: 1/4"=1'-0" KJ: 1/4"=1'-0" KK: 1/4"=1'-0" KL: 1/4"=1'-0" KM: 1/4"=1'-0" KN: 1/4"=1'-0" KO: 1/4"=1'-0" KP: 1/4"=1'-0" KQ: 1/4"=1'-0" KR: 1/4"=1'-0" KS: 1/4"=1'-0" KT: 1/4"=1'-0" KU: 1/4"=1'-0" KV: 1/4"=1'-0" KW: 1/4"=1'-0" KX: 1/4"=1'-0" KY: 1/4"=1'-0" KZ: 1/4"=1'-0" LA: 1/4"=1'-0" LB: 1/4"=1'-0" LC: 1/4"=1'-0" LD: 1/4"=1'-0" LE: 1/4"=1'-0" LF: 1/4"=1'-0" LG: 1/4"=1'-0" LH: 1/4"=1'-0" LI: 1/4"=1'-0" LJ: 1/4"=1'-0" LK: 1/4"=1'-0" LL: 1/4"=1'-0" LM: 1/4"=1'-0" LN: 1/4"=1'-0" LO: 1/4"=1'-0" LP: 1/4"=1'-0" LQ: 1/4"=1'-0" LR: 1/4"=1'-0" LS: 1/4"=1'-0" LT: 1/4"=1'-0" LU: 1/4"=1'-0" LV: 1/4"=1'-0" LW: 1/4"=1'-0" LX: 1/4"=1'-0" LY: 1/4"=1'-0" LZ: 1/4"=1'-0" MA: 1/4"=1'-0" MB: 1/4"=1'-0" MC: 1/4"=1'-0" MD: 1/4"=1'-0" ME: 1/4"=1'-0" MF: 1/4"=1'-0" MG: 1/4"=1'-0" MH: 1/4"=1'-0" MI: 1/4"=1'-0" MJ: 1/4"=1'-0" MK: 1/4"=1'-0" ML: 1/4"=1'-0" MM: 1/4"=1'-0" MN: 1/4"=1'-0" MO: 1/4"=1'-0" MP: 1/4"=1'-0" MQ: 1/4"=1'-0" MR: 1/4"=1'-0" MS: 1/4"=1'-0" MT: 1/4"=1'-0" MU: 1/4"=1'-0" MV: 1/4"=1'-0" MW: 1/4"=1'-0" MX: 1/4"=1'-0" MY: 1/4"=1'-0" MZ: 1/4"=1'-0" NA: 1/4"=1'-0" NB: 1/4"=1'-0" NC: 1/4"=1'-0" ND: 1/4"=1'-0" NE: 1/4"=1'-0" NF: 1/4"=1'-0" NG: 1/4"=1'-0" NH: 1/4"=1'-0" NI: 1/4"=1'-0" NJ: 1/4"=1'-0" NK: 1/4"=1'-0" NL: 1/4"=1'-0" NM: 1/4"=1'-0" NO: 1/4"=1'-0" NP: 1/4"=1'-0" NQ: 1/4"=1'-0" NR: 1/4"=1'-0" NS: 1/4"=1'-0" NT: 1/4"=1'-0" NU: 1/4"=1'-0" NV: 1/4"=1'-0" NW: 1/4"=1'-0" NX: 1/4"=1'-0" NY: 1/4"=1'-0" NZ: 1/4"=1'-0" OA: 1/4"=1'-0" OB: 1/4"=1'-0" OC: 1/4"=1'-0" OD: 1/4"=1'-0" OE: 1/4"=1'-0" OF: 1/4"=1'-0" OG: 1/4"=1'-0" OH: 1/4"=1'-0" OI: 1/4"=1'-0" OJ: 1/4"=1'-0" OK: 1/4"=1'-0" OL: 1/4"=1'-0" OM: 1/4"=1'-0" ON: 1/4"=1'-0" OO: 1/4"=1'-0" OP: 1/4"=1'-0" OQ: 1/4"=1'-0" OR: 1/4"=1'-0" OS: 1/4"=1'-0" OT: 1/4"=1'-0" OU: 1/4"=1'-0" OV: 1/4"=1'-0" OW: 1/4"=1'-0" OX: 1/4"=1'-0" OY: 1/4"=1'-0" OZ: 1/4"=1'-0" PA: 1/4"=1'-0" PB: 1/4"=1'-0" PC: 1/4"=1'-0" PD: 1/4"=1'-0" PE: 1/4"=1'-0" PF: 1/4"=1'-0" PG: 1/4"=1'-0" PH: 1/4"=1'-0" PI: 1/4"=1'-0" PJ: 1/4"=1'-0" PK: 1/4"=1'-0" PL: 1/4"=1'-0" PM: 1/4"=1'-0" PN: 1/4"=1'-0" PO: 1/4"=1'-0" PP: 1/4"=1'-0" PQ: 1/4"=1'-0" PR: 1/4"=1'-0" PS: 1/4"=1'-0" PT: 1/4"=1'-0" PU: 1/4"=1'-0" PV: 1/4"=1'-0" PW: 1/4"=1'-0" PX: 1/4"=1'-0" PY: 1/4"=1'-0" PZ: 1/4"=1'-0" QA: 1/4"=1'-0" QB: 1/4"=1'-0" QC: 1/4"=1'-0" QD: 1/4"=1'-0" QE: 1/4"=1'-0" QF: 1/4"=1'-0" QG: 1/4"=1'-0" QH: 1/4"=1'-0" QI: 1/4"=1'-0" QJ: 1/4"=1'-0" QK: 1/4"=1'-0" QL: 1/4"=1'-0" QM: 1/4"=1'-0" QN: 1/4"=1'-0" QO: 1/4"=1'-0" QP: 1/4"=1'-0" QQ: 1/4"=1'-0" QR: 1/4"=1'-0" QS: 1/4"=1'-0" QT: 1/4"=1'-0" QU: 1/4"=1'-0" QV: 1/4"=1'-0" QW: 1/4"=1'-0" QX: 1/4"=1'-0" QY: 1/4"=1'-0" QZ: 1/4"=1'-0" RA: 1/4"=1'-0" RB: 1/4"=1'-0" RC: 1/4"=1'-0" RD: 1/4"=1'-0" RE: 1/4"=1'-0" RF: 1/4"=1'-0" RG: 1/4"=1'-0" RH: 1/4"=1'-0" RI: 1/4"=1'-0" RJ: 1/4"=1'-0" RK: 1/4"=1'-0" RL: 1/4"=1'-0" RM: 1/4"=1'-0" RN: 1/4"=1'-0" RO: 1/4"=1'-0" RP: 1/4"=1'-0" RQ: 1/4"=1'-0" RR: 1/4"=1'-0" RS: 1/4"=1'-0" RT: 1/4"=1'-0" RU: 1/4"=1'-0" RV: 1/4"=1'-0" RW: 1/4"=1'-0" RX: 1/4"=1'-0" RY: 1/4"=1'-0" RZ: 1/4"=1'-0" SA: 1/4"=1'-0" SB: 1/4"=1'-0" SC: 1/4"=1'-0" SD: 1/4"=1'-0" SE: 1/4"=1'-0" SF: 1/4"=1'-0" SG: 1/4"=1'-0" SH: 1/4"=1'-0" SI: 1/4"=1'-0" SJ: 1/4"=1'-0" SK: 1/4"=1'-0" SL: 1/4"=1'-0" SM: 1/4"=1'-0" SN: 1/4"=1'-0" SO: 1/4"=1'-0" SP: 1/4"=1'-0" SQ: 1/4"=1'-0" SR: 1/4"=1'-0" SS: 1/4"=1'-0" ST: 1/4"=1'-0" SU: 1/4"=1'-0" SV: 1/4"=1'-0" SW: 1/4"=1'-0" SX: 1/4"=1'-0" SY: 1/4"=1'-0" SZ: 1/4"=1'-0" TA: 1/4"=1'-0" TB: 1/4"=1'-0" TC: 1/4"=1'-0" TD: 1/4"=1'-0" TE: 1/4"=1'-0" TF: 1/4"=1'-0" TG: 1/4"=1'-0" TH: 1/4"=1'-0" TI: 1/4"=1'-0" TJ: 1/4"=1'-0" TK: 1/4"=1'-0" TL: 1/4"=1'-0" TM: 1/4"=1'-0" TN: 1/4"=1'-0" TO: 1/4"=1'-0" TP: 1/4"=1'-0" TQ: 1/4"=1'-0" TR: 1/4"=1'-0" TS: 1/4"=1'-0" TU: 1/4"=1'-0" TV: 1/4"=1'-0" TW: 1/4"=1'-0" TX: 1/4"=1'-0" TY: 1/4"=1'-0" TZ: 1/4"=1'-0" UA: 1/4"=1'-0" UB: 1/4"=1'-0" UC: 1/4"=1'-0" UD: 1/4"=1'-0" UE: 1/4"=1'-0" UF: 1/4"=1'-0" UG: 1/4"=1'-0" UH: 1/4"=1'-0" UI: 1/4"=1'-0" UJ: 1/4"=1'-0" UK: 1/4"=1'-0" UL: 1/4"=1'-0" UM: 1/4"=1'-0" UN: 1/4"=1'-0" UO: 1/4"=1'-0" UP: 1/4"=1'-0" UQ: 1/4"=1'-0" UR: 1/4"=1'-0" US: 1/4"=1'-0" UT: 1/4"=1'-0" UU: 1/4"=1'-0" UV: 1/4"=1'-0" UW: 1/4"=1'-0" UX: 1/4"=1'-0" UY: 1/4"=1'-0" UZ: 1/4"=1'-0" VA: 1/4"=1'-0" VB: 1/4"=1'-0" VC: 1/4"=1'-0" VD: 1/4"=1'-0" VE: 1/4"=1'-0" VF: 1/4"=1'-0" VG: 1/4"=1'-0" VH: 1/4"=1'-0" VI: 1/4"=1'-0" VJ: 1/4"=1'-0" VK: 1/4"=1'-0" VL: 1/4"=1'-0" VM: 1/4"=1'-0" VN: 1/4"=1'-0" VO: 1/4"=1'-0" VP: 1/4"=1'-0" VQ: 1/4"=1'-0" VR: 1/4"=1'-0" VS: 1/4"=1'-0" VT: 1/4"=1'-0" VU: 1/4"=1'-0" VV: 1/4"=1'-0" VW: 1/4"=1'-0" VX: 1/4"=1'-0" VY: 1/4"=1'-0" VZ: 1/4"=1'-0" WA: 1/4"=1'-0" WB: 1/4"=1'-0" WC: 1/4"=1'-0" WD: 1/4"=1'-0" WE: 1/4"=1'-0" WF: 1/4"=1'-0" WG: 1/4"=1'-0" WH: 1/4"=1'-0" WI: 1/4"=1'-0" WJ: 1/4"=1'-0" WK: 1/4"=1'-0" WL: 1/4"=1'-0" WM: 1/4"=1'-0" WN: 1/4"=1'-0" WO: 1/4"=1'-0" WP: 1/4"=1'-0" WQ: 1/4"=1'-0" WR: 1/4"=1'-0" WS: 1/4"=1'-0" WT: 1/4"=1'-0" WU: 1/4"=1'-0" WV: 1/4"=1'-0" WW: 1/4"=1'-0" WX: 1/4"=1'-0" WY: 1/4"=1'-0" WZ: 1/4"=1'-0" XA: 1/4"=1'-0" XB: 1/4"=1'-0" XC: 1/4"=1'-0" XD: 1/4"=1'-0" XE: 1/4"=1'-0" XF: 1/4"=1'-0" XG: 1/4"=1'-0" XH: 1/4"=1'-0" XI: 1/4"=1'-0" XJ: 1/4"=1'-0" XK: 1/4"=1'-0" XL: 1/4"=1'-0" XM: 1/4"=1'-0" XN: 1/4"=1'-0" XO: 1/4"=1'-0" XP: 1/4"=1'-0" XQ: 1/4"=1'-0" XR: 1/4"=1'-0" XS: 1/4"=1'-0" XT: 1/4"=1'-0" XU: 1/4"=1'-0" XV: 1/4"=1'-0" XW: 1/4"=1'-0" XX: 1/4"=1'-0" XY: 1/4"=1'-0" XZ: 1/4"=1'-0" YA: 1/4"=1'-0" YB: 1/4"=1'-0" YC: 1/4"=1'-0" YD: 1/4"=1'-0" YE: 1/4"=1'-0" YF: 1/4"=1'-0" YG: 1/4"=1'-0" YH: 1/4"=1'-0" YI: 1/4"=1'-0" YJ: 1/4"=1'-0" YK: 1/4"=1'-0" YL: 1/4"=1'-0" YM: 1/4"=1'-0" YN: 1/4"=1'-0" YO: 1/4"=1'-0" YP: 1/4"=1'-0" YQ: 1/4"=1'-0" YR: 1/4"=1'-0" YS: 1/4"=1'-0" YT: 1/4"=1'-0" YU: 1/4"=1'-0" YV: 1/4"=1'-0" YW: 1/4"=1'-0" YX: 1/4"=1'-0" YZ: 1/4"=1'-0" ZA: 1/4"=1'-0" ZB: 1/4"=1'-0" ZC: 1/4"=1'-0" ZD: 1/4"=1'-0" ZE: 1/4"=1'-0" ZF: 1/4"=1'-0" ZG: 1/4"=1'-0" ZH: 1/4"=1'-0" ZI: 1/4"=1'-0" ZJ: 1/4"=1'-0" ZK: 1/4"=1'-0" ZL: 1/4"=1'-0" ZM: 1/4"=1'-0" ZN: 1/4"=1'-0" ZO: 1/4"=1'-0" ZP: 1/4"=1'-0" ZQ: 1/4"=1'-0" ZR: 1/4"=1'-0" ZS: 1/4"=1'-0" ZT: 1/4"=1'-0" ZU: 1/4"=1'-0" ZV: 1/4"=1'-0" ZW: 1/4"=1'-0" ZX: 1/4"=1'-0" ZY: 1/4"=1'-0" ZZ: 1/4"=1'-0"



REFERENCE NOTES		CITY APPLICATIONS
<div>1. EXISTING FIRE HYDRANT</div> <div>2. EXISTING POWER POLE</div> <div>3. EXISTING LANDSCAPE</div> <div>4. EXISTING SIDEWALK</div> <div>5. EXISTING CURB</div> <div>6. NEW BIKE RACK</div> <div>7. NOT USED</div> <div>8. NEW APPROACH TO TOWNHOUSE ENTRY</div> <div>9. NEW 4'-0" LANDSCAPE BUFFER-KINDRED SPIRIT COLUMNAR OAK TO BE PLANTED EVERY 6'-0"</div> <div>10. NEW DRIVE AISLE</div> <div>11. NEW LANDSCAPE</div> <div>12. NOT USED</div> <div>13. NEW 90 DEGREE PARKING AS PER S.L.C. DIVISION OF TRANSPORTATION STANDARD, 12 PARKING SPOTS TOTAL</div> <div>14. CARPORT OVERHANG</div> <div>15. CARPORT SUPPORT COLUMN BELOW</div> <div>16. SHIPPING CONTAINER, RESTROOM AND KITCHEN</div> <div>17. NEW FIREPLACE</div> <div>18. NEW IN-GROUND POOL & HOT TUB</div> <div>19. NEW STAIRS TO ENTER BUILDING</div> <div>20. NOT USED</div> <div>21. NEW LIGHTING FOR IMPROVED SECURITY</div> <div>22. NEW LIGHT WELL</div> <div>23. TRAFFIC CALMING LANDSCAPE BULB-OUT AROUND EXISTING POWER POLES</div> <div>24. EXISTING FIRE TRUCK CRASH GATE</div> <div>25. EXISTING BRICK WALL TO REMAIN</div> <div>26. PATH FOR BUILDING EXITING</div> <div>27. NEW SIDEWALK</div> <div>28. COMMUNITY ACCESS GATE TO SMITHS & 900 EAST BUSINESS DISTRICT</div>		
TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE 847 SOUTH 800 EAST SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84102		THE STATE OF UTAH ARCHITECTURE - INTERIOR DESIGN
MJS		
STAMP		REVISION:
		THESE DRAWINGS ARE INSTRUMENTS OF SERVICE AND SHALL REMAIN THE PROPERTY OF THE ARCHITECT. NO USE OR RE-USE OF THESE DOCUMENTS OR DRAWINGS IS PERMITTED UNLESS AUTHORIZED IN WRITING BY MESA ARCHITECTS WITH AN APPROPRIATE COMPENSATION.
		PROJECT NO: 16033
		DATE: JUNE 4, 2020
SITE PLAN AT FOUNDATION SCALE: 1/16" = 1'-0"		DATE: AS1-01



REFERENCE NOTES			
1. CARPORT, STANDING SEAM METAL ROOF 2. ROOFTOP PATIO			
CITY APPLICATIONS		TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE 847 SOUTH 800 EAST SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84102	
MJSA		THE WEST FOR SOUTH SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84102 ARCHITECTURE INTERIOR DESIGN	
STAMP		REVISIONS:	
		THESE DRAWINGS ARE INSTRUMENTS OF SERVICE AND SHALL REMAIN THE PROPERTY OF THE ARCHITECT. NO USE OR REUSE OF THESE DOCUMENTS SHALL BE PERMITTED UNLESS AUTHORIZED IN WRITING BY THE ARCHITECT. WITH APPROPRIATE COMPENSATION.	
		PROJECT NO: 16033	
		DATE: JUNE 4, 2020	
		SHEET: AS1-02	

A5 SITE PLAN AT ROOF
 SCALE: 1/16" = 1'-0"
 NORTH

SITE PLAN AT ROOF
 SCALE: 1/16" = 1'-0"

ATTACHMENT D: Development Standards

The subject property at 833 S 800 E is zoned R-2 – Single and Two-Family Residential District. The purpose of the R-2 zoning district follows:

The purpose of the R-2 Single- and Two-Family Residential District is to preserve and protect for single-family dwellings the character of existing neighborhoods which exhibit a mix of single- and two-family dwellings by controlling the concentration of two-family dwelling units. Uses are intended to be compatible with the existing scale and intensity of the neighborhood. The standards for the district are intended to provide for safe and comfortable places to live and play and to promote sustainable and compatible development patterns.

The applicant has requested that the property be changed to the RMF-45 – Low Density Residential Multi-Family zoning district. The purpose of the RMF-45 zoning district follows:

The purpose of the RMF-45 Moderate/High Density Multi-Family Residential District is to provide an environment suitable for multi-family dwellings of a moderate/high density with a maximum building height of forty-five feet (45'). This district is appropriate in areas where the applicable Master Plan policies recommend a density of less than forty-three (43) dwelling units per acre. This district includes other uses that are typically found in a multi-family residential neighborhood of this density for the purpose of serving the neighborhood. Such uses are designed to be compatible with the existing scale and intensity of the neighborhood. The standards for the district are intended to provide for safe and comfortable places to live and play, promote sustainable and compatible development patterns and to preserve the existing character of the neighborhood.

The main differences between the R-2 and RMF-45 zoning districts are:

- The RMF-45 zone allows single-family attached and detached dwellings as well as multi-family dwellings. Twin-home or two-family dwellings are not allowed.
- The R-2 zoning district allows single-family and two-family uses but prohibits multi-family uses.
- Both zones prohibit
- Height and massing – the height and massing for the RMF-45 zone is substantially greater than for the R-2 zone. This is illustrated in the table below.

ZONING DISTRICT BULK AND LOT CONTROL COMPARISONS

	R-2– Single and Two-Family Residential– (Existing Zoning)	RMF-45 –Medium-High Density Multi-Family Residential (Proposed Zoning)
Maximum Building Height	Pitched roof: 28-feet to the ridge or average of other principle buildings on block face Flat roof: 20-feet	45-feet
Front Yard	Average of the existing buildings on the block face. Where no buildings exist, a minimum of 20-feet.	20% of lot depth, but need not exceed 25-feet
Corner Side Yard Setback	10-feet	Single-family attached: 10-ft Multi-family: 20-feet
Interior Side Yard Setback	For twin homes: No side yard along one lot line. A 10-foot side yard along the other. Other uses: 4-feet provided that on interior lots one yard must be at least 10-feet.	Single-family attached: No yard is required but if one is provided it can't be less than 4-feet. Multi-family: 8-feet Other permitted and Conditional uses: 10-feet on each side
Rear Yard Setback	25% of the lot depth but not less than 15-feet and need not exceed 25-feet.	25% of the lot depth but not less than 20-feet – need not exceed 30-feet
LOT AREA REQUIRED		
Single-family detached dwellings	5,000 square feet	5,000 square feet
Single-family attached dwellings	Not allowed	3,000 square feet per unit
Twin-home dwelling	4,000 feet per dwelling	Not allowed
Two-family dwelling	8,000 square feet	Not allowed
Multi-family dwellings	Not allowed	9,000 square feet – for 3 to 14 units, then 1,000 SF for each additional unit up to and including 14 units. 21,000 square feet for 15 units, plus 800 square feet

		<p>for each additional dwelling unit up to 1 acre.</p> <p>For developments greater than 1 acre, 1,000 square feet for each dwelling unit is required.</p>
--	--	---

ATTACHMENT E: Analysis of Standards

MASTER PLAN AMENDMENTS

State Law, Utah Code Annotated, Title 10 Chapter 9a, requires that all municipalities have a master plan. However, there is no specific criteria relating to master plan amendments. The City does not have specific criteria relating to master plan amendments. However, City Code Section 21A.02.040 – Effect of Adopted Master Plans or General Plans addresses this issue in the following way:

All master plans or general plans adopted by the planning commission and city council for the city, or for an area of the city, shall serve as an advisory guide for land use decisions. Amendments to the text of this title or zoning map should be consistent with the purposes, goals, objectives and policies of the applicable adopted master plan or general plan of Salt Lake City. (Ord. 26-95 § 2(1-4), 1995)

In this case, the master plan is being amended in order to provide consistency between the Central Community Master Plan and the proposed zoning designation of the subject property. This request facilitates a rezoning of the property to a district that will allow different uses on the property. State Law does include a required process in relation to a public hearing and recommendation from the Planning Commission in relation to a master plan amendment. The required process and noticing requirements have been met.

As noted in the Key Considerations section of this report, Consideration 3, the future land use map in the Central Community Master Plan applies the low-density residential designation to the property at 847 S 800 E that is currently zoned RMF-45. The applicant has requested to change this to medium/high density residential to accurately reflect the current zoning. Whether or not the master plan amendment for 833 S is approved or not, consideration should be given to amending the future land use map for the property at 847 South to accurately reflect the current RMF-45 zoning.

ZONING MAP AMENDMENTS

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

Factor	Finding	Rationale
1. Whether a proposed map amendment is consistent with the purposes, goals, objectives, and policies of the city as stated through its various adopted planning documents;	Complies	The applicant is seeking a master plan amendment because the proposed zoning amendment is not consistent with the future land use map in the Central Community Master Plan. However, as discussed in the Key Considerations section of this report, the proposed amendments are in line with some of the goals and policies in the Central Community Master Plan and in conflict with other. The proposed zoning map amendment would expand the Telegraph Exchange site and tie into a project aimed at preserving and adaptively reusing the historic and iconic building. The

		<p>proposed zoning amendment is also in line with growth and housing goals outlined in the citywide master plan, Plan Salt Lake, and the city's 5-year housing plan, Growing SLC. These goals include increasing medium density housing and providing more housing types and options in terms of unit size and price while directing growth to areas with existing infrastructure. At the same time, the proposal conflicts with policies aimed at the preservation of existing neighborhoods and discourages the expansion of multi-family uses in areas that are predominantly low-density or single-family in nature.</p>
<p>2. Whether a proposed map amendment furthers the specific purpose statements of the zoning ordinance.</p>	<p>Complies</p>	<p>The proposal helps to foster the city's residential development by allowing additional housing options to be established. The proposal would help to preserve a historic building so helps to promote the convenience, order, prosperity and welfare of the present and future inhabitants. The proposal helps to implement aspects of the City's adopted plans and policies as discussed above.</p>
<p>3. The extent to which a proposed map amendment will affect adjacent properties;</p>	<p>Complies</p>	<p>Concerns have been raised through the public outreach process in relation to the impact of the zone change on adjacent properties and the changing of a low-density zoning to multi-family and if this would set a precedent. There was also concern about changing the property designation in light of a change to R-2 that occurred in 2014. This is discussed further in the Key Considerations section of this report under Consideration 2.</p> <p>While staff finds that while the proposed zoning change could lead to additional impacts on neighboring properties, it is not substantially more than what could be experienced if the property was re-developed under the current zoning allowances in place.</p> <p>Staff is recommending the Planning Commission table the Planned Development to address potential impacts on neighboring properties associated with the specific site design</p>

		proposed under the development but support the zoning and master plan changes.
4. Whether a proposed map amendment is consistent with the purposes and provisions of any applicable overlay zoning districts which may impose additional standards;	Complies	The property is not located within an overlay district. This standard is not applicable.
5. The adequacy of public facilities and services intended to serve the subject property, including, but not limited to, roadways, parks and recreational facilities, police and fire protection, schools, stormwater drainage systems, water supplies, and wastewater and refuse collection.	Complies	No objections were received from other City departments regarding this amendment or the proposed development. Public Utilities did note that infrastructure in Chase is private and that other connections may need to be upsized for this development. Prior to obtaining a building permit, the development will need to comply with all city regulations. Other city departments and divisions provided preliminary comments, which are included in Attachment H .

PLANNED DEVELOPMENTS

21A.55.050: Standards for Planned Developments: The Planning Commission may approve, approve with conditions, or deny a planned development based upon written findings of fact according to each of the following standards. It is the responsibility of the applicant to provide written and graphic evidence demonstrating compliance with the following standards:

Standard	Findings	Rationale
A. Planned Development Objectives The planned development shall meet the purpose statement for a planned development and will achieve at least one of the objectives stated in said section. To determine if a planned development objective has been achieved, the applicant shall demonstrate that at least one of the strategies associated with the objective are included in the proposed planned development. The applicant shall also demonstrate why modifications to the zoning regulations are necessary to meet the purpose statement for a planned	Complies	The applicant argues that the proposed development complies with Planned Development objective B.1 – <i>Historic Preservation: Preservation, restoration, or adaptive reuse of buildings or structures that contribute to the character of the City either architecturally and/or historically, and that contribute to the general welfare of the residents of the City.</i> <i>The applicant’s narrative includes the following: The proposed project will carefully contrast historic reverence with modernism. Adaptive re-use and preservation construction methodology will be important and</i>

<p>development. The Planning Commission should consider the relationship between the proposed modifications to the zoning regulations and the purpose of a planned development and determine if the project will result in a more enhanced product than would be achievable through strict applicable of the land use regulations.</p>		<p><i>central to the project. In addition to typical adaptive reuse criteria such as structural/seismic, HVAC, electrical, and roofing, we also have special focus on: (a) the brick exterior massing of the Telegraph building will be tucked, pointed, and sealed by a professional mason with historic restoration credentials, (b) the notable historic plaster mold cornice, soffit, and facia located on the west facing 3 story roof transition will be preserved, sealed and painted, (c)historically appropriate high quality wood clad/steel divided light windows will be installed.</i></p> <p>The applicant also argues that the proposal meets Objective D related to mobility and Objective E related to sustainability. Further explanation of these is included in the applicant's narrative in Attachment C of this report.</p> <p>Staff agrees with this analysis. The proposed development meets at least one of the planned development objectives and the purpose statement for a planned development. This standard has been satisfied.</p>
<p>B. Master Plan Compatibility The proposed planned development is generally consistent with adopted policies set forth in the Citywide, community, and/or small area Master Plan that is applicable to the site where the planned development will be located.</p>	<p>Complies with Some Statements & Conflicts with Others</p>	<p>The proposed development is consistent with some of the goals and policies related to housing and historic preservation in the Central Community Master Plan. It is in conflict with others as they relate to neighborhood preservation.</p> <p>The proposal is consistent with the growth and housing goals outlined in the citywide master plan, Plan Salt Lake, and the city's 5-year housing plan, Growing SLC.</p> <p>The proposed development is compatible with the neighborhood in terms of the master plan and will contain a mix of units that creates more housing variety.</p>
<p>C. Design and Compatibility The proposed planned development is compatible with the area the planned development will be</p>	<p>Complies (Based on modifications made after the</p>	<p>The proposed planned development incorporates an historic building that is generally somewhat out of scale for the neighborhood, but it is well-regarded by</p>

<p>located and is designed to achieve a more enhanced product than would be achievable through strict application of land use regulations. In determining design and compatibility, the Planning Commission should consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whether the scale, mass, and intensity of the proposed planned development is compatible with the area the planned development will be located and/or policies stated in an applicable Master Plan related to building and site design; 2. Whether the building orientation and building materials in the proposed planned development are compatible with the neighborhood where the planned development will be located and/or the policies stated in an applicable Master Plan related to building and site design; 3. Whether building setbacks along the perimeter of the development: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Maintain the visual character of the neighborhood or the character described in the applicable Master Plan. b. Provide sufficient space for private amenities. c. Provide sufficient open space buffering between the proposed development and neighboring properties to minimize impacts related to privacy and noise. d. Provide adequate sight lines to street, driveways and sidewalks. e. Provide sufficient space for maintenance. 4. Whether building facades offer ground floor 	<p>05/27/2020 PC meeting)</p>	<p>many and iconic in the area. The development also includes 17 more modern townhome dwellings that are generally conform with the development pattern of the neighborhood which includes an eclectic mix of dwellings. The townhomes will be more modern than many of the existing structures but will not be alone in that regard in the general area. The house to the immediate north is of a more modern design that does not emulate the typical development style in the neighborhood. That dwelling would be the transition point between new and old on the block face. In addition, the placement of the 30-foot tall townhomes between the Telegraph Building and neighboring residential uses will help to create a compatible transition in scale to the neighborhood.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The scale, mass and general intensity of the proposed development is generally compatible with the area. The applicant is proposing an increase of 5 units above what the combined properties would support by right under the current zoning. Policies in the Master Plan and other City documents both support and conflict with the proposal. 2. The proposed development incorporates brick and other durable materials in the façade, which is a material commonly found in the area. It also uses a fiber cement board which would reflect the wood siding that many of the adjacent homes have. The Master Plan notes the eclectic architecture that can be found in the neighborhood. Details of how the architecture will be compatible with the neighborhood are articulated in the applicant's revised narrative. 3. As discussed in Consideration #5 and #6, the reduced front
--	--------------------------------------	--

<p>transparency, access, and architectural detailing to facilitate pedestrian interest and interaction;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Whether lighting is designed for safety and visual interest while minimizing impacts on surrounding property; 6. Whether dumpsters, loading docks and/or service areas are appropriately screened; and 7. Whether parking areas are appropriately buffered from adjacent uses. 		<p>yard setback would promote harmony between new construction on the site and the existing Telegraph Building. The smaller front yard setback would also help to promote engagement with the street. The setbacks provide space for the driveways and utilities. All of the setbacks provide enough space for maintenance and adequate sight lines. The north setback along the property line has been modified to include a reduced width landscaping buffer that is 4-feet in width. A landscaping buffer was recommended by both Staff and the Planning Commission in order to mitigate potential impacts to the neighboring property to the north. The applicant is asking for a reduction in the required width of the buffer.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. The units facing 800 E (Units 7-10) are designed to engage the street and promote interaction at the street level. A pool will be located between the Telegraph Building and the units on 800 E. 5. A lighting plan has not been provided. Compliance will be verified at the building permit stage. 6. The originally proposed dumpsters on the property line between the development and the R-2 property to the north have been eliminated. These have been replaced with individual cans for each unit. This item is no longer a concern for staff. 7. Parking is located in the attached garages or in a surface area under a carport. The carport backs up to a large
---	--	--

		commercial use. Elimination of the landscape buffer adjacent to the carport has been requested. The parking areas will be adequately buffered from adjacent uses thought the proposed design and site conditions.
<p>D. Landscaping: The proposed planned development preserves, maintains or provides native landscaping where appropriate. In determining the landscaping for the proposed planned development, the Planning Commission should consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whether mature native trees located long the periphery of the property and along the street are preserved and maintained; 2. Whether existing landscaping that provides additional buffering to the abutting properties is maintained and preserved; 3. Whether proposed landscaping is designed to lessen potential impacts created by the proposed planned development; and 4. Whether proposed landscaping is appropriate for the scale of the development. 	<p>Complies (Based on modifications made after the 05/27/2020 PC Meeting)</p>	<p>The applicant is proposing some modifications to the required landscaping buffers within the project. A reduction to required 10-foot landscape buffer on the north side of the development between the Telegraph Lofts project and the single-family dwelling is being requested. The proposed buffer would be 4-feet in width and heavily landscaped. It is staff's opinion that the reduced width landscaping buffer in conjunction with the placement of the driveway and the townhome units away from the property line would meet the intent of this standard.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The mature street trees will be preserved. Initial plans showed removal of some trees but this has been modified on subsequent in accordance with fire department access issues that will not necessitate removal of the trees. 2. There is landscaping on the property associated with the R-2 property that will be removed. The landscaping did not appear to provide any additional buffering between the properties. 3. The applicant is proposing street trees as required by the zoning ordinance and drought tolerant plants throughout the development. Staff is recommending that final plans, including the landscape plan, shall be provided to staff to ensure compliance with zoning standards. A condition of approval is recommended in

		<p>relation to the landscaping buffers</p> <p>4. The proposed landscaping is appropriate for the scale of the development. The reduction of the required north side landscaping buffer will not create additional impacts on the adjacent property that the buffer is intended to mitigate given the placement of the driveway which will provide additional separation between the uses on the site and neighboring property.</p>
<p>E. Mobility: The proposed planned development supports City wide transportation goals and promotes safe and efficient circulation within the site and surrounding neighborhood. In determining mobility, the Planning Commission should consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Whether drive access to local streets will negatively impact the safety, purpose and character of the street; Whether the site design considers safe circulation for a range of transportation options including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Safe and accommodating pedestrian environment and pedestrian oriented design; Bicycle facilities and connections where appropriate, and orientation to transit where available; and Minimizing conflicts between different transportation modes; Whether the site design of the proposed development promotes or enables access to adjacent uses and amenities; Whether the proposed design provides adequate 	<p>Complies (Based on modifications made after the 05/27/2020 PC Meeting)</p>	<p>The proposed development supports City goals and promotes safe and efficient circulation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Only one drive access is proposed onto 800 E, limiting curb cuts. Directing vehicular egress and ingress to the single driveway on the north side of the site helps limiting the width of curb cuts and reduces the traffic impact on 800 E but create negative impacts on the abutting residential property to the north. Units 19-23 which face Chase Avenue will be accessed via that private street. The access to the site via Chase is already established and used. However, Chase is a private street and balconies on the south side of the Telegraph Building would encroach over the street. It is unclear whether that would be allowed by all parties that own the street. This issue is discussed elsewhere, and resolution will be recommended as a condition of approval. The development includes pedestrian walkways from 800 E to Units 7-10 and within the site as well as a pedestrian walkway to Chase Avenue. A community access gate has been added between the development and the Smith's

<p>emergency vehicle access; and</p> <p>5. Whether loading access and service areas are adequate for the site and minimize impacts to the surrounding area and public rights-of-way.</p>		<p>site in order to facilitate access to the 9th and 9th business district and enhance walkability. Bicycle parking will be provided as required by Chapter 21A.44. There are no anticipated or foreseen conflicts between different transportation modes.</p> <p>3. The development is largely self-contained within the site and units will have access to their unit via the driveway or Chase Avenue. There has been concern expressed by the neighboring property owner to the north about the location of the driveway on the north side of the site. The applicant has incorporated a reduced width landscaping buffer into the design in order to mitigate the impacts on the neighboring property.</p> <p>4. The proposal will be required to comply with all fire code requirements before obtaining a building permit. The Fire Department has indicated that the proposed design meets all Fire Department access requirements. Updated comments from the Fire Department can be found in Attachment H of this report.</p> <p>5. The loading and service areas are adequate for the site. The originally proposed dumpster on the property line has been eliminated and replaced with individual cans. The proposal meets this criterion.</p>
--	--	---

ATTACHMENT F: Public Process and Comments

The following is a list of public meetings that have been held, and other public input opportunities, related to this project:

Public Notices:

- Notice of the project and a formal letter requesting comments was sent to the Chairs of the East Liberty Park Community Organization and East Central Community Council on December 12, 2019.
- Staff sent an early notification announcement of the project to all residents and property owners located within 300 feet of the project site on December 20, 2019 providing notice about the project and information on how to give public input on the project.
- Staff hosted an Open House at the Tenth East Senior Center on January 9, 2020 to provide an opportunity for public comment and to have the applicant present to answer questions.
- Staff attended the East Liberty Park Community Organization meeting held on January 23, 2020 to answer questions about the project.
- The East Central Community Council (ECCC) provided a formal letter dated January 20, 2020 in relation to the project. The letter is included on the following pages.
- Several public comments were received about the project. Those comments have been included on the following pages.
- The 45-day recognized organization comment period expired on January 30, 2020.
- The Planning Commission held a Public Hearing on May 27, 2020. By unanimous vote, the Planning Commission voted to table all applications in order for the applicant and staff to address some unresolved issues. Minutes from the Planning Commission meeting of May 27, 2020 are included in [Attachment G](#).
- A Planning Commission Public Hearing was scheduled for July 8, 2020.

Public Hearing Notice:

- Public hearing notice mailed: June 25, 2020
- Public hearing notice sign posted on property: June 25, 2020
- Public notice posted on City and State websites & Planning Division list serve: June 25, 2020

Public Comments:

Numerous public comments were received in relation to the proposed development, both in opposition and support of the proposal. The following is a listing of the comments received as of the date of publication of this staff report. Comments received in writing are included on the following pages of this attachment.

Letters:

1. Letter from the East Central Community Council – 01-20-2020
2. Letter from Jones-Waldo on behalf of Cody Derrick – 01-30-2020
3. Letter from the East Liberty Park Community Organization (ELPCO) – 05/26/2020

Email Comments Received (as of July 1, 2020)

1. Email from Marian & Nathan Florence – 01/01/2020
2. Email from Tracy Albers – 01/02/2020

3. Email from Angela Carlson – 01/04/2020
4. Email from Etherington – 01/09/2020
5. Email from Greg Joy – 01/09/2020
6. Email from Blattenberger – 01/12/2020
7. Email from McCloy – 01/12/2020
8. Email from Barnum – 01/13/2020
9. Email from Kathy – 01/14/2020
10. Email from Henri Prater – 01/22/2020
11. Email from Angela Carlson – 01/29/2020
12. Email from Marian & Nathan Florence – 01/30/2020
13. Email from Scott Nak – 01/30/2020
14. Email from Joshua Stewart – 05/15/2020
15. Email from Marian & Nathan Florence – 05/19/2020
16. Email from Angela Carlson – 05/26/2020
17. Email from Julie Bjornstad – 05/27/2020
18. Email from Sebastian Hock – 05/27/2020
19. Email from Missy Greis – 05/27/2020
20. Email from Marian & Nathan Florence – 06/29/2020



January 20, 2020

David J. Gellner, AICP, Principal Planner
Salt Lake City Planning Division
Sent via Email: david.gellner@slcgov.com

Regarding: PLNPCM2019-01110 & 01111 and PLNSUB2019-01112
Telegraph Exchange Lofts- 833 South 800 East and 847 South 800 East

Dear David;

The East Central Community Council, Executive Board and ECC Land Use Committee do not support a spot zone of the R2 parcel. The ECC supports the development and preservation of the historic building.

In order to come to this conclusion, the ECC held numerous committee meetings (including site visits), held discussions at the general membership meeting, board meetings and this application and associated information was also distributed via the ECC proprietary email system and posted on the ECC social media platforms in order to gather community based feedback. Many neighbors have written independent letters documenting their concerns to you directly.

Both the board vote (12) and email vote of the community at large (164 responses) was **unanimous in opposition** of the rezone of the R2 parcel. The six residential lofts in the Telegraph Exchange Building were supported.

The right development in the right locations.

While the ECC does support appropriate development, redevelopment and the 5 year City Housing Plan of the City (especially owner occupied workforce housing), we support this effort on the appropriate parcels **already zoned** or positioned for this type of density of which there are hundreds of parcels available in the ECC alone and multitude of opportunities on the fixed transit routes.

Spot zoning is rarely smart planning.

The community dedicated more than three years of weekly work by dozens of community members to correctly identify the zoning that should be in place for the ECC area. This work was completed with our City Council Representative after the 2005 master plan was adopted to better address the patchwork quilt zoning issues we were left with and to lessen impacts and work load to all involved. By correctly targeting where development should take place and where it should not would allow a lessened work load and stress on the community and City alike, as well as better informing the development community. This was a block by block effort. The first down zone application was then sponsored with this 800 East block included. The majority of properties were down zoned to R2 to protect the residential character and compatibility of this existing neighborhood from new inappropriately scaled multi-family housing.



Spot zoning this parcel to higher density is in direct conflict with the extensive work completed by this previous painstaking community wide effort/petition. Instead this parcel could be infilled with appropriately scaled work force housing that is so desperately needed.

A master plan and existing zoning map helps inform people as they make significant investment decisions of where to live and thrive. The impact of this spot zone and development as proposed is significant to every home owner who has invested in this area and to their quality of life. The ECC and neighbors cite negative impacts such as scale of the proposed development, increase in traffic patterns, lack of setback, loss of mature trees that provide better air/shade/visual improvements, etc., buffers to adjacent neighbors, size and locations of trash/recycling impacts, density, loss of privacy, light, visual impact of height, design, property values, block face pattern disruption and lack of design compatibility to historic and other features.

The ECC is fragile. Each block face matters.

The ECC is a unique gem within not only Salt Lake City but unique in the US for its walkability and historic features. It includes all types of housing such as student, families, workforce, senior and assisted living with all types of buildings from cottages to historic mansions and multifamily dwellings. It has unique wide park strips, gardens and old growth trees. All types of resources are a stroll or short transit ride away from coffee shops to medical facilities; from the University of Utah to shopping Downtown or at 9th and 9th.

This is a community where you can truly age in place.

Due to its location the ECC continues to be an area highly sought after for development as it is seen as a significant profit generator. Rather than utilize parcels already zoned for higher density, many developers seek to spot zone lower cost properties with little regard for the impacts they bring. Developers cite financial hardship and that they need to bring extra density to make the project “pencil”, yet the day to day financial hardship brought to existing property owners who have a loss of quality of life and property value must be considered.

We suggest that it is especially important that all rezoning and development be carefully considered to not destroy the fabric of the existing neighborhood. **The ECC cannot possibly accommodate the scope of all growth needed without losing the very essence of what makes the ECC unique.** We cannot continue to sacrifice the ECC with already the highest density in the City.

We urge you to submit a negative recommendation for this proposal as it is currently outlined.

With best regards,

Esther Hunter, Chair East Central Community Council

In behalf of the East Central Executive Board and the Community Council at large

eastcentralcommunity@gmail.com

Maps of parcels zoned for higher density within the ECC area available on our web site eastcentralcc.org.



T: 801.521.3200
F: 801.328.0537

170 South Main Street
Suite 1500
Salt Lake City, UT 84101

www.joneswaldo.com

January 30, 2020

Via Email

elpscslc@gmail.com

jason.stevenson@gmail.com

darryl.high@comcast.net

estherehunter@gmail.com

darin.mano@slcgov.com

david.gellner@slcgov.com

RE: Telegraph Exchange Lofts

To Whom It May Concern:


Cody Derrick wishes to submit the following preliminary comments on the Clearwater Homes development called "Telegraph Exchange Lofts" located at 833 and 847 South, 800 East (the "Proposed Development"). Mr. Derrick owns the neighboring property located at 829 South 800 East which is directly to the north of the proposed development. Of major concern to Mr. Derrick is the density of the Proposed Development and negative impact to his home. The Proposed Development includes a lot (833 S. 800 E.) that was very recently rezoned in 2013 from a high-density zoning to R-2 to comply with the City's Central Community Master Plan for the area (which designates the property as low density residential). It is now slated to have 17 residences and the total density for both lots in the Proposed Development is 23 residences. This is a dramatic change from the current zoning and not something Mr. Derrick anticipated when purchasing his home. In addition, the 2013 rezone was initiated over the neighborhood's concerns regarding several other high-density developments slated for the area and an intent to preserve the single-family residential feel of the neighborhood. Under Salt Lake City Ordinance 21A.50.050(B), the goals, objectives, and policies of the City must be considered by the City Council in approving an amendment to the zoning map. The zoning map amendment must also comply with the Central Community Master Plan. *Id.* Here, it seems clear the City intended to preserve the single-family residential character of the lot at issue and the current proposal violates not only the Master Plan but also the objectives and policies for the neighborhood as evidenced in the 2013 rezone.

In addition, the City is required to consider the affect this application will have on adjacent properties for the zoning map amendment application as well as for approval of the planned unit development application. *Id.* See also SLC Ordinance 21A.55.050. Planned unit developments are also required to provide mechanisms to reduce negative impacts to privacy and noise on neighboring properties. *Id.* From the documents Mr. Derrick has obtained through a public records request, it appears the Proposed Development will violate several requirements of the R-45 zoning designation including setbacks and landscaping buffers, which will negatively impact Mr. Derrick's property as well as other surrounding properties in violation of the zoning

map amendment standards as well as the planned unit development ordinance. Specifically, a 10-foot landscaping buffer is required under City ordinance's on the North side of the property, but the plans submitted to the City at this time do not include a much smaller buffer. Adequate buffering between properties is required under SLC Ordinance 21A.55.050 (C)(3)(c). In addition, the Proposed Development includes only one access, a driveway, that will funnel all of the traffic entering and exiting the development right next to Mr. Derrick's home. Having all of the traffic enter and exit directly adjacent to Mr. Derrick's property will unquestionably negatively impact the quiet enjoyment of his home in violation of SLC Ordinance 21A.55.050(E) among other provisions. The Developer also indicated that all guest parking for the development will be street parking, which will add a large amount of traffic congestion to the surrounding neighborhood in violation of SLC Ordinance 21A.55.050(E). Mr. Derrick is also concerned about the rooftop decks and height of the buildings that will overlook his property and infringe upon his privacy in violation of 21A.55.050(C)(3). Mr. Derrick is also concerned about the removal of existing landscaping and trees at the Proposed Development and the impact of the removal of the same on his property, in violation of SLC Ordinance 21A.55.050(D).

Mr. Derrick intends to submit more detailed comments to the Planning Commission outlining his concerns regarding the Proposed Development as the applications move through the City's administrative approval process. In the meantime, please add Mr. Derrick and myself to any notice lists or electronic mailing updates for the Proposed Development.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "J. Bauer". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first letter of the first name being a large, stylized "J".

Janelle Eurick Bauer



May 26, 2020

Dear Salt Lake City Planning Commissioners:

The following is a review of the Telegraph Exchange Lofts project (833 and 847 South 800 East) by ELPCO, the East Liberty Park Community Organization. This project is located within ELPCO's shared boundary zone with the East Central Community Council.

This project requests amendments to both the Central Community Master Plan (changing from low-density residential to medium/high density residential), as well as changes to the Zoning Map (from R-2 Single and Two-Family Residential to RMF-45 Moderate/High Density Residential District). The petitioner also seeks Planned Development approval to allow several changes to setbacks and street access.

Initial Contact

ELPCO has been following the potential development of this property for several years. We were first contacted about the current proposal in November 2019 by the property owner and developer, Micah Peters from Clearwater Homes. Mr. Peters said he would be willing to attend community meetings to describe his project and answer questions.

Public Engagement

One of ELPCO's primary goals is to engage residents in local decision-making. As a result, ELPCO distributed flyers (flyer [PDF](#)) to 800 East and 900 South residents to advertise the January 9, 2020 Open House organized by SLC Planning which several ELPCO board members attended. ELPCO asked Mr. Peters to introduce his project at the January 23, 2020 ELPCO Community Meeting (agenda [PDF](#)). Mr. Peters attended the meeting and spoke to the audience of 35 residents for more than 30 minutes ([video link](#)). ELPCO appreciates the outreach and availability by Mr. Peters to introduce this project to the community. In preparation for these events and meetings, ELPCO made the project documents (overview [PDF](#)) available via social media posts, e-newsletters, and QR codes on the flyers.

Public Comments

ELPCO monitored the discussions at the events mentioned above and received eight letters or emails from residents of 800 East after encouraging the public to submit comments. While some people who spoke at the January 23 ELPCO meeting supported the project, several of them appeared to be local property owners who did not reside in the neighborhood. Statements by Mr. Peters that he had secured the support of many homeowners on 800 East were disputed by several residents at the public meetings and in their submitted comments.

In general, the written and spoken comments received by ELPCO from residents of 800 East and nearby streets are in opposition to the proposed zoning and master plan changes and scale of the project. Residents are especially concerned about the re-zone from R-2 to RMF-45 for the property (833 S 800 E) north of the Telegraph building because it reverses the neighborhood's effort (circa 2013-14) to down-zone the area to R-2. Residents voiced other concerns about the height of the townhomes, requests for reduced setbacks, the psychological effect of a gated development, impacts on traffic, density, and the reduction of mature trees. Residents also cited the height and density of this project to claim it violates the master plan goals of supporting multi-family developments that conserve a neighborhood's residential character. Residents praised the developer's goal and projected expense of preserving the



Telegraph Exchange building and the environmental amenities incorporated into the project. They also appreciated the designation of two off-street parking stalls per unit in the project.

ELPCO Opinion

Few residents want a large, multi-family development to drop on their block. So, opposition to this project by residents of 800 East is both understandable and expected. But this project also touches on other aspects of neighborhood self-determination, cohesiveness, and housing diversity that make it different—and raise important concerns for ELPCO.

First, ELPCO, is concerned about the project's reversal of the resident-led down-zone of 833 S 800 E to R-2 Single and Two-Family Residential. If the city aims to empower residents to engage in local decision-making and develop a shared sense of community, then reversing this 2013 decision to allow higher density would set a negative precedent and likely discourage future zoning reform in other neighborhoods. Currently, the housing mix on this block of 800 East consists of single-family and duplex residential units, as well as the unique apartment rows at Noble Place. A triplex at the north end of the street has been converted into small business space. The current R-2 zoning of 833 S 800 E is consistent with the rest of the street. The re-zone requested by this project risks undermining the existing small-scale and low-density status deliberately created by residents, many of whom have lived on the street for several decades.

Second, the public engagement by Mr. Peters was commendable for this large-scale project. Mr. Peters also stated that he studied and learned from the design disputes over the nearby Mutual Beauty/Nexus on 9th condo project, especially about parking. However, the public meetings and submitted statements make it clear to ELPCO that many residents of 800 East oppose key aspects of the project and believe that Mr. Peters has over-stated the support from local homeowners in his presentations.

Third, ELPCO has experience evaluating and supporting planned developments (PD), including East Liberty Commons on 1100 East in October 2019. However, the current proposal for this project appears to isolate it physically and psychologically from the rest of the street. We believe the project's reduced setbacks, gated access drive and fenced-off interior courtyard (not evident in the plans, but required for the swimming pool) will create a long strip of highly-visible, barrier frontage that contrasts with the uniform, deeper setbacks of the single-family and duplex homes that line the rest of the street. The project's intent to match the setbacks for the proposed condo buildings to the Telegraph building's setbacks follows the anomaly instead of the neighborhood standard. Residents have also expressed concerns about the psychological impact of adding a gated community of 17 units (potentially 40+ residents) on their street who could exceed the number of existing residents.

Fourth, because many of the community complaints we receive relate to visual and auditory impacts of driveways and utilities, we believe landscape buffers should be required in PUDs and other projects to reduce potential conflicts between properties. In this proposal, we believe landscape buffers should be required along the north boundary/access drive of the 833 S 800 E property if it is rezoned to RMF 45. If it is not rezoned, then a landscape buffer should be required along the current north boundary of 847 S 800 E.

Lastly, residents have been told that any alternative proposal for this site could demolish the historic Telegraph Exchange building and construct a new multi-family complex that maximizes the parcel's



existing RMF-45 zoning without any public engagement process. This is accurate. Mr. Peters has explained to residents that the additional condo buildings at 833 S 800 E are required to generate the revenue to rehabilitate the Telegraph Exchange building. However, asking residents to compare a current proposal to a hypothetical plan is not helpful for evaluating the impacts of the existing plans--especially as the current proposal involves zoning changes to increase density and height at the 833 S 800 E property.

Conclusion

Based on these determinations, ELPCO opposes the proposed changes to the Community Master Plan and the Zoning Map requested by this project. We also recommend the SLC Planning Commission table the Planned Development to give Mr. Peters the opportunity to develop a new design that adheres to the current zoning and integrates the setbacks with the existing streetscape.

Signed:

Jason Stevenson, ELPCO co-chair

Darryl High, ELPCO co-chair

Dave Richards, ELPCO Land Use Advisor

Judi Short, ELPCO Land Use Advisor

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 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. and re-broadcasts its meetings on our Facebook page at www.facebook.com/ELPCO

Gellner, David

From: Nathan Florence <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, January 1, 2020 12:01 PM
To: Gellner, David
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Telegraph Exchange Lofts project Case numbers PLNPCM2019-01110 through 01112

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Gellner,

I am writing to you in opposition to the proposed Telegraph Exchange Loft project by Clearwater Homes.

We are homeowners at [REDACTED] and have been engaged with the community council and planning commission on several projects for the 18 years that we have lived here. We were first involved in the gas station construction at the Smith's grocery store behind our home and then worked with our City Council representative at the time on a neighborhood-wide project to rezone the blocks from 700 E-900 E and 700 S-900 S as R-2. This was in an effort to preserve existing homes and buildings, while allowing for new construction of homes if necessary. As a neighborhood we also wanted to prevent land owners from consolidating multiple properties with homes on them and demolishing these buildings to build larger complexes of apartments or condominiums. The Telegraph Exchange project is in direct conflict with this effort.

I would like to hold up an example of the positive results of our efforts by using the group of homes and buildings on the Southeast and west corners of 8th S and 8th E which now host Vis optical, Vantage clothing and several small homes with cottage businesses. These properties were ALL owned by a single individual with the intention of consolidating them, demolishing existing structures and building large apartment complexes. If we had not worked together as a community council, Planning Commission, City Council and neighborhood, in harmony with the existing area master plan, we would not have these beautifully restored and highly useful and productive neighbors. We have worked together to preserve the character and history of the neighborhood, while at the same time making huge improvements to those same characteristics that make this such a desirable place to live.

We believe that an equally vital and viable option could exist for the Telegraph Exchange project without having to demolish existing structures and set a precedent for rezoning R-2 properties whenever it suits the needs of a developer. In conversation with other developers they have expressed a confidence that there are multiple viable and sustainable options for preserving and using that structure without the need for such large expansion. We understand and support the need for increased density of residential properties, but with multiple projects in this area and limiting the Telegraph project to the existing single property where it sits, we are doing this already.

To sum up:

We support the need for density while preserving neighborhood character.

Objections are spot rezoning to suit large developers, demolition of existing homes, old growth tree loss (home to nesting owls, by the way)

We are unable to attend the open house scheduled for this project as we have a previous obligation. We will be involved as much as we can in the process and welcome a conversation.

Nathan and Marian Florence

[REDACTED]

Gellner, David

From: Tracy Albers <T [REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, January 2, 2020 6:47 PM
To: Gellner, David
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Telegraph Exchange Lofts project Case numbers PLNPCM2019-01110 through 01112

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Gellner,

I am writing to you in opposition to the proposed Telegraph Exchange Loft project by Clearwater Homes.

I have been the homeowner at [REDACTED] for fifteen years. Several years ago, I was involved in the neighborhood-wide project to rezone the blocks from 700 E - 900 E and 700 S - 900 S as R-2. Our persistent efforts were successful and we have preserved existing homes and buildings in the neighborhood, while allowing for new construction of homes as necessary.

While I support the development of the existing Telegraph Exchange site, I am opposed to over-expansion of the site to include the R-2 property that has been acquired by Micah Peters of Clearwater homes. The rezoning and demolition of this R-2 property will clearly benefit Micah Peters' agenda, allowing him unjustified special treatment while undermining the pre-existing rights and uses of adjacent property owners.

Sincerely,

T
[REDACTED]

Gellner, David

From: angela carlson <[REDACTED]> on behalf of angela carlson
<[REDACTED]>
Sent: Saturday, January 4, 2020 1:34 PM
To: Gellner, David; [REDACTED]
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Fw: Telegraph Exchange Lofts project Case numbers PLNPCM2019-01110 through 01112

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

To whom it may concern,
I'm writing in opposition to the proposed Telegraph exchange Loft project by Clearwater Homes, 833 & 847 South 800 East.

I am a homeowner at [REDACTED] and longtime resident of this neighborhood. I have included a copy of our neighbor's letter they sent to you on January 1st of this year because I am in agreement with their statements and concerns. I've worked with the Florences in the past in support of preserving the residential character in the neighborhood.

It's my understanding that Salt Lake City's Planning Division is considering amendments to update the City's four Multi-Family Residential (RMF) zoning districts, starting with the RMF-30: Low-Density Multi-Family Residential district, with the intent of implementing the recently adopted Growing SLC: A Five Year Housing Plan (2018-2022). This would discourage the collection or "banking" of multiple parcels of land to accommodate large developments, a lot width maximum has been proposed that would limit the width of new lots to 100 feet wide or less. Based on average lots widths in the RMF-30 district, this would typically prevent the consolidation of more than 2 or 3 parcels. This concern is not isolated to one type of zoning in residential neighborhoods and especially applies to this proposed development.

The proposed drawings show the destruction of mature city trees on the parking strip. These trees contribute to the property values and overall health of our urban landscape, their removal is unnecessary and unacceptable. The plans I was shown for this project feature a swimming pool placed where effective ingress and egress currently exists. Those plans arbitrarily create an ingress and egress where decades old healthy, habitat providing trees stand on the city owned parking strip (not to mention the old growth pines, home to owls on the private property parcel).

I understand the need for housing density, and support the preservation of neighborhood character. Objections are spot rezoning to suit large developers, demolition of existing homes and our city's urban forest.

Angela Carlson Licensed Realtor @ Urban Utah Homes & Estates

[REDACTED]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Nathan Florence** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Wed, Jan 1, 2020 at 12:00 PM

Subject: Telegraph Exchange Lofts project Case numbers PLNPCM2019-01110 through 01112

To: <David.Gellner@slcgov.com>

Dear Mr. Gellner,

I am writing to you in opposition to the proposed Telegraph Exchange Loft project by Clearwater Homes.

We are homeowners at [REDACTED] and have been engaged with the community council and planning commission on several projects for the 18 years that we have lived here. We were first involved in the gas station construction at the Smith's grocery store behind our home and then worked with our City Council representative at the time on a neighborhood-wide project to rezone the blocks from 700 E-900 E and 700 S-900 S as R-2. This was in an effort to preserve existing homes and buildings, while allowing for new construction of homes if necessary. As a neighborhood we also wanted to prevent land owners from consolidating multiple properties with homes on them and demolishing these buildings to build larger complexes of apartments or condominiums. The Telegraph Exchange project is in direct conflict with this effort.

I would like to hold up an example of the positive results of our efforts by using the group of homes and buildings on the Southeast and west corners of 8th S and 8th E which now host Vis optical, Vantage clothing and several small homes with cottage businesses. These properties were ALL owned by a single individual with the intention of consolidating them, demolishing existing structures and building large apartment complexes. If we had not worked together as a community council, Planning Commission, City Council and neighborhood, in harmony with the existing area master plan, we would not have these beautifully restored and highly useful and productive neighbors. We have worked together to preserve the character and history of the neighborhood, while at the same time making huge improvements to those same characteristics that make this such a desirable place to live.

We believe that an equally vital and viable option could exist for the Telegraph Exchange project without having to demolish existing structures and set a precedent for rezoning R-2 properties whenever it suits the needs of a developer. In conversation with other developers they have expressed a confidence that there are multiple viable and sustainable options for preserving and using that structure without the need for such large expansion. We understand and support the need for increased density of residential properties, but with multiple projects in this area and limiting the Telegraph project to the existing single property where it sits, we are doing this already.

To sum up:

We support the need for density while preserving neighborhood character.

Objections are spot rezoning to suit large developers, demolition of existing homes, old growth tree loss (home to nesting owls, by the way)

We are unable to attend the open house scheduled for this project as we have a previous obligation. We will be involved as much as we can in the process and welcome a conversation.

Nathan and Marian Florence

[REDACTED]

Gellner, David

From: Nick Etherington <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, January 9, 2020 10:22 AM
To: Gellner, David
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Telegraph Exchange Lofts

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

David,

I wanted to send you this email representing my complete support of the Telegraph Exchange Lofts project. I love the old Telegraph Exchange building and am quite please to hear that it will not be demolish, but revitalized into an active part of the community. I have spent much of my life in the 9th and 9th area. My parents have owned and operated a store in the area for 35+ years and I grew up on Douglas Street several blocks East of the project. I continue to frequent the area for dining and shopping, as I lived on Laird and now on 9th South (East of the 9th and 9th area). We love the 9th and 9th area and once again, think the subject project does nothing, but enhance and maintain the look and feel of the area. Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

NICK ETHERINGTON
TAYLOR DERRICK CAPITAL



This message, including all attachments, is confidential and intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. The contents of this message must not be disclosed to another person without the sender's authority. If you are not the intended recipient, you are not authorized to, and must not, disclose, copy, distribute, or retain this message or any part of it. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify the sender and delete this message, together with any attachments, from your computer. Thank you.

Gellner, David

From: Greg Joy <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, January 9, 2020 2:21 PM
To: Gellner, David
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Telegraph Exchange Lofts Project

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

David,

I own two properties within a couple of blocks of the proposed development at 833 & 847 South 800 East by Micah Peters. (My homes are [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]).

I am writing in support of the project. I have met with Micah and was impressed by his goal to keep the character of the area while revitalizing an impressive older building. I appreciate his goal to be energy neutral and support electric vehicles in every off-street space.

It is this thinking towards the future which separates Micah from many other builders in SLC. It is my belief the project will enhance 800 East and the 9th and 9th area in general.

I would be happy to discuss at any time.

Regards,

Greg Joy
[REDACTED]

Gellner, David

From: Beth Blattenberger <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, January 12, 2020 1:18 PM
To: Gellner, David
Subject: (EXTERNAL) historic 9th and 9th

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

As a resident of 9th and 9th [REDACTED], I love the old architecture, including the Telegraph Building. I also understand the need for more housing as our population grows, and I support density rather than sprawl. If there is a way to keep the historic character of the Telegraph Building while incorporating additional housing, I would applaud that, and hope creative ways can be found and approved by city planning officials.

Sincerely,
Beth Blattenberger

Gellner, David

From: Marjorie McCloy <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, January 12, 2020 2:35 PM
To: Gellner, David
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Telegraph Exchange building

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Happy to hear that this beautiful and mysterious building will get a new life. We live just down the street ([REDACTED]) and have long admired its architecture and wondered at its providence.

I hear it is to be reimagined in a sustainable way. I hope that means good insulation, rooftop solar, and other earth-friendly considerations.

Thank you!

Best,
Margie McCloy

Sent from my iPad

Gellner, David

From: Wally Barnum Gmail <w[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, January 13, 2020 12:02 PM
To: Gellner, David
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Old Telegraph Building

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hello David, I saw a post on Next Door about the Telegraph Building.
[Keep The Old Telegraph Exchange Building Standing](#)

I want to let you know that I support Micah's request to ask for more units in the building. I'd like to see the building refurbished and given new life.
I have known Micah for 25 years and have a lot of confidence in him as a developer and faith in his good intent for our city.
My family lives nearby in the neighborhood ([REDACTED]). I like the direction 9th and 9th and Sugarhouse is heading. We need more density for a ton of reasons.

BTW, I like the new traffic circle at 9th and 11th if you had anything to do with that...

Best Regards,

Wally Barnum
[REDACTED]

Gellner, David

From: Kathy <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2020 9:47 PM
To: Gellner, David
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Old telegraph bldg

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I am in support of not destroying the old telegraph building. I hope you take the neighborhood requests into consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

Gellner, David

From: Henri Prater <h[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, January 22, 2020 5:40 PM
To: Gellner, David
Subject: (EXTERNAL) rezoning

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Gellner,

I live in the neighborhood where a proposed rezoning (PARCEL 16-08-176-026) is requested by Clearwater Homes.

They want to rezone to increase the density of their parcels. This is not the nature of our neighborhood. (10 to 20 units per acre.)
Also, the high-density units are NOT reflective of the architecture in our community. Large Flat-roofed buildings? You just couldn't get any more basic than Clearwater did with their design. There is nothing attractive about it. Creative? They can't claim that in these designs.

This will not improve the neighborhood's quality of life. Quite the opposite.
While it would be advantageous to our community to have the historic building next to this parcel turned into 6 dwelling units, it is not worth it. And I'm one who almost always desires historic preservation.

Clearwater Homes is claiming a "conflict" in our Masterplan. **Our neighborhood** does not have a conflict with our Masterplan. We all worked VERY HARD to get our neighborhood zoned for R-2. We are invested in our neighborhood. I've lived here for 29 years. And don't start thinking that I'm just this old person who doesn't want things to change. Not true. I know they need to change but please, not in this way.

Our neighborhood lost our challenge to the Nexus apartments on 900 S. The planning dept. overrode what our neighborhood wanted.
I'm losing hope that our neighborhood has any say in what happens to us.

So, mark me down for being against this. But I suspect that it won't make any difference.

H. Prater
[REDACTED]

Gellner, David

From: angela carlson <[REDACTED]> on behalf of angela carlson
<[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, January 29, 2020 2:01 PM
To: Marian Florence; Gellner, David
Cc: jason.stevenson@gmail.com; East Liberty Park 1 CC Chair; estherehunter@gmail.com; Mano, Darin
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Re: Telegraph Exchange: Community Council feedback due tomorrow(!)
Attachments: 20-01-Telegraph-comments.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I agree that the developer inaccurately indicated that the property owners who live on the street approve of the development, the majority of us do not. There was one property owner who owns the home at [REDACTED] (where no one lives but a daycare is run out of) and a vacant commercial property to the south of the proposed development voicing his support yet he does not live in this particular neighborhood.

I'm all for historically sensitive and creative reuse of the Telegraph Building. I know it's possible to do some of what the developer wants to do and do it well. Arbitrarily designing the project to destroy city trees is unacceptable. I'm in agreement on the main points that Marion Florence states on the prior email.

Homeowner at [REDACTED] since 1992

Angela Carlson
Licensed Realtor
Urban Utah Homes & Estates
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: Marian Florence <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, January 29, 2020 1:34 PM
Cc: jason.stevenson@gmail.com; Darryl High; estherehunter@gmail.com; darin.mano@slcgov.com
Subject: Telegraph Exchange: Community Council feedback due tomorrow(!)

Hey neighbors -

At the ELPCO Community Council meeting, there was some lively debate about Micah's project, but clearly (I thought) a misrepresentation of enthusiastic neighbor support. Micah had brought several vocal sycophants, so I'm writing to get your input to share with ELPCO and ECCC in an official way.

ELPCO and ECCC's deadline is **JANUARY 30 (tomorrow)** to present their comments to the City. Can you please look at this tonight? Thanks!

Jason and Darryl, who run ELPCO, have written to us to say that in order to properly report on their community's stand on the project they need our concerns documented. He wrote: *While approval of these proposals does not operate on a majority rule basis, community interest and support matters. If you believe that the 800 East community does not support the proposal to the extent that has been represented, or that support is nuanced or more complex (i.e. split between different aspects of the project), I would encourage you to **document that somehow**.*

Can you please write to Jason/Darryl/Esther (all copied here) with **your suggestions/comments** (of course you are under no obligation to agree with us! I just want to make sure all voices are heard) with a note stating that you are an 800 E neighbor? I have attached the ELPCO comment cards if you would like to use them and their email addresses are copied above.

Our main points:

1. we support the preservation of the historic building but would like to see it fit in the neighborhood in terms of scale and design

2. we have concerns with

- the reworking of the Master Plan - this project does not meet the aims of the Master Plan which is to "conserve the neighborhood's residential character" and "ensure new multi-family development is carefully sited, well designed and **compatible in scale**"
- the rezoning of an R2 plot to RMF45 (we only just got this downzoned to R2 a few years ago to protect the neighborhood)
- the setbacks he is requesting (11'9" when the zoning requires 25' on the front; the rear and side setbacks are also much reduced from what is required by RMF45)
- the loss of mature trees (owl habitat and urban forest)
- the absence of a suitable (10ft) landscape buffer on the north side
- the placement of trash/recycling for all 23 units along the neighbor's lot, rather than on the east side
- the density of 17 townhomes on the property
- the height of the proposed townhomes
- the ensuing traffic from the property
- the exclusive feel of a gated "campus" on the street

We would welcome a project that was similar but with fewer townhomes, that complemented the neighborhood without dwarfing it.

The next step for this project is to go to Planning Commission. I would urge you to share your comments with David Gellner of the City Planning Department (david.gellner@slcgov.com).

Thanks for reading and for adding your comments - if you want more information I can get you the site plans and city correspondence.

Marian and Nathan

[REDACTED]

Gellner, David

From: Marian Florence <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, January 30, 2020 1:09 PM
To: Gellner, David
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Telegraph Exchange

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Mr. Gellner,

At the ELPCO Community Council meeting, there was some lively debate about Micah's project, but clearly (I thought) a misrepresentation of enthusiastic neighbor support. Micah had brought several vocal sycophants, so I'm writing to add my reasons for hoping for a continued process.

1. I support the preservation of the historic building but would like to see it fit in the neighborhood in terms of scale and design
2. I have concerns with
 - the reworking of the Master Plan - this project does not meet the aims of the Master Plan which is to "conserve the neighborhood's residential character" and "ensure new multi-family development is carefully sited, well designed and **compatible in scale**"
 - the rezoning of an R2 plot to RMF45 (we only just got this downzoned to R2 a few years ago to protect the neighborhood)
 - the setbacks he is requesting (11'9" when the zoning requires 25' on the front; the rear and side setbacks are also much reduced from what is required by RMF45)
 - the loss of mature trees (owl habitat and urban forest)
 - the absence of a suitable (10ft) landscape buffer on the north side
 - the placement of trash/recycling for all 23 units along the neighbor's lot, rather than on the east side
 - the density of 17 townhomes on the property
 - the height of the proposed townhomes
 - the ensuing traffic from the property
 - the exclusive feel of a gated "campus" on the street

I would welcome a project that was similar but with fewer townhomes, that complemented the neighborhood without dwarfing it.

Marian Florence
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Gellner, David

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 30, 2020 8:23 AM
To: Gellner, David
Subject: (EXTERNAL) RE: Telegraph Exchange: Community Council feedback due tomorrow(!)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

To all concerned, my name is Scott Nak I live just a few houses north of said proposed project I have lived at [REDACTED] [REDACTED] for 61 years my wife has lived with me for thirty of those years. we are in complete agreement with all of Nathan & Marian Florence comments, We were never approached by Micah to discuss this project and in no way do we approve of it as it was submitted. The said town houses are thirty feet tall which would be completely out of caricature with the neiborhood. The code as it stands for my side of the street is 20' I know this because my neighbor on the south at 829 south built a home which is 20' high and I had the city come out and measure it and they told me it is to the inch of being in code, I can no longer even see the sky out of my kitchen window all I see is a black wall, so to be even 10' taller on these townhouses is in total disrespect for are neiborhood. I have watched smithfood king take complete advantage of our neiborhood by being allowed expand several times and demolish most of our neiborhood and now Micah wants to take the rest. This is a beautiful neiborhood and I personally would like to see it preserved as such.

From: SCOTT MARIE NAK [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 30, 2020 6:03 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: [EXT] FW: Telegraph Exchange: Community Council feedback due tomorrow(!)

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, January 29, 2020 2:46 PM
To: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Community Council feedback due tomorrow(!)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Marian Florence <[REDACTED]>
Date: Wed, Jan 29, 2020 at 1:33 PM
Subject: Telegraph Exchange: Community Council feedback due tomorrow(!)
To:
Cc: <jason.stevenson@gmail.com>, Darryl High <darryl.high@comcast.net>, <estherehunter@gmail.com>, <darin.mano@slcgov.com>

Hey neighbors -

Gellner, David

From: Joshua Stewart <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, May 15, 2020 3:56 PM
To: Gellner, David
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Telegraph Exchange Lofts Rezoning, Master Plan Amendment & Planned Development at approximately 833 & 847 South 800 East

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

David and Planning Commission,

If the intent is to build 3 story townhouses R-35 should be high enough density to fit 3 story townhouses. R-45 would allow the developer to go 4 story or perhaps more and this would be out of scale with the other residential properties on the street. Please limit the height of development at this location to 3 stories and units should have front doors at grade level facing the street- half buried parking structures facing the street.

I would suggest also making a condition that the architectural style and materials of the development be historically compatible with the neighboring homes that face it. Otherwise this massive development will overwhelm the charming character of this street.

Josh Stewart

[REDACTED]
Salt Lake City

Gellner, David

From: Marian Florence <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, May 19, 2020 7:57 AM
To: Gellner, David
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Re: Telegraph Exchange

David,

Here, again, are my thoughts on this project. I really hope the City will not capitulate to a rezone and such an intense use of this space (especially given that his plans require amendments to the desired rezone). Let's look for more sustainable ways to preserve the historic building and the neighborhood.

Thanks,
Marian

On Thu, Jan 30, 2020 at 1:09 PM Marian Florence <marianflorence@gmail.com> wrote:
Mr. Gellner,

At the ELPCO Community Council meeting, there was some lively debate about Micah's project, but clearly (I thought) a misrepresentation of enthusiastic neighbor support. Micah had brought several vocal sycophants, so I'm writing to add my reasons for hoping for a continued process.

1. I support the preservation of the historic building but would like to see it fit in the neighborhood in terms of scale and design
2. I have concerns with

- the reworking of the Master Plan - this project does not meet the aims of the Master Plan which is to "conserve the neighborhood's residential character" and "ensure new multi-family development is carefully sited, well designed and **compatible in scale**"
- the rezoning of an R2 plot to RMF45 (we only just got this downzoned to R2 a few years ago to protect the neighborhood)
- the setbacks he is requesting (11'9" when the zoning requires 25' on the front; the rear and side setbacks are also much reduced from what is required by RMF45)
- the loss of mature trees (owl habitat and urban forest)
- the absence of a suitable (10ft) landscape buffer on the north side
- the placement of trash/recycling for all 23 units along the neighbor's lot, rather than on the east side
- the density of 17 townhomes on the property
- the height of the proposed townhomes
- the ensuing traffic from the property
- the exclusive feel of a gated "campus" on the street

I would welcome a project that was similar but with fewer townhomes, that complemented the neighborhood without dwarfing it.

Marian Florence
817 S 800 E
[REDACTED]

Gellner, David

From: angela carlson <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, May 26, 2020 11:20 AM
To: Gellner, David; Mano, Darin
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Fw: Telegraph Exchange Lofts
Attachments: Final 847 Planned Development Narrative 11.21.2019.pdf; AS1-01 Site Plan for Comm Councils copy.pdf; TX#10.jpg; TX#9.jpg; TX#8.jpg; TX#5.jpg; TX #1.jpg; TX#6.jpg; TX#7 east View.jpg

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Hello,

I am emailing in regard to the upcoming Planning Commission meeting for the proposed development at 833 & 847 South 800 East, the street I live on and have lived on for the 28 years. As you can see from the developer's renderings they fully expect to be able to remove our city trees on the city owned park strip. We stood face to face with Micah as he told us he would never take down the tree directly in front of the Telegraph building due to his love of the shade it provides. I met with Mayor Mendenhall and she indicated that some protective ordinance is in place to not allow developers to do so. The Telegraph building has, right now, the ingress and egress that allows for any and all access needed without negatively impacting city trees. The ill conceived swimming pool component of this development undoubtedly is putting pressure on the site to perform in ways that are not necessary.

When the city bows to the whim of every developer's wants our neighborhood's unique character suffers. Unfortunately zoning changes that encourage the disposal of neighborhood friendly single family homes with their 20 foot height restriction in favor of 35 foot tall buildings only benefit the ROI of a developer.

Thank you

Angela Carlson
Licensed Realtor
Urban Utah Homes & Estates

[REDACTED]

From: Micah Peters <micah@clearwaterhomesutah.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 17, 2019 12:02 PM
To: [REDACTED]; Angela Carlson <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Fw: Telegraph Exchange Lofts

Angela-Shaun,

Thanks so very much for spending time with me yesterday.

See attached info on the project.

See the attached project overview submitted to the city, land plan and few renderings, as well as a link to more images (did not want to drop too many MB's on you)

Renewing Link-

<https://www.dropbox.com/sh/md1ksgg3b5v0d6p/AAB1cCCQ1JJXrjTuoUuJELqga?dl=0>

I will update you on the schedule for the community council meeting and open house as soon as it's set.

Feel free to reach out with any questions/concerns.
Best

Micah W. Peters
CEO
Clearwater Homes Utah
336 W. Broadway #110
SLC, UT 84101
Micah@clearwaterhomesutah.com
[\(801\) 599-1839](tel:(801)599-1839)

Gellner, David

From: Julie Bjornstad <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, May 27, 2020 4:43 PM
To: Planning Public Comments; Gellner, David
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Telegraph Exchange Lofts Rezoning, Master Plan Amendment & Planned Development at approximately 833 & 847 South 800 East

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Hi David,

I'm writing you in regards to the proposed Telegraph Exchange Loft application, I live a few houses up the street from the proposed development. While I support the reuse of the existing warehouse building, I have significant concerns with the proposed application that would require amendments to or variances of all defining planning documents - the Citywide Master Plan, zoning, and development ordinances. I also believe the City should more holistically consider the impacts of this development on the local street and community.

One of the main concerns of the project is the rezone from R-2 to RMF-45. As you are aware, the neighborhood was rezoned recently to preserve the character and history of the neighborhood. This was a significant neighborhood effort, including involvement by the Community Councils, which has already been harnessed to preserve structures around the intersection of 800 East and 800 South from consolidation of lots and demolition. These homes and buildings, including Vantage Vintage, Vis Optical, three cottage businesses, and a residential duplex, are examples of how communities can be strengthened when the City makes decisions based on adopted master plan documents and existing zoning.

Existing master plan documents call for conservation of neighborhood residential character and compatibility with the existing neighborhood for any new multi-family housing. Fortunately, this block of 800 East already has a number of multi-family housing units that provide excellent examples of neighborhood compatibility. These examples include duplexes, a triplex, a quadplex, and trolley apartments, all of which are compatible with the existing neighborhood in design and scale. Unfortunately, the Telegraph Exchange project seems to heed no lessons from the existing form, scale, or design of other properties on this block - including the fact that the proposed development is at least ten feet taller than any other structure on the block save the existing warehouse building. In addition, our street is a community - we actively use our porches, we host neighborhood BBQs, we pass down children's clothing and toys, and we mow each other's lawns when someone is in the hospital. The proposed gate around the project is in direct conflict with the community of our street and the beauty of living in an urban neighborhood.

The proposed rezone from R-2 to RMF-45 is rather extreme and incompatible with the neighborhood. The proposed development does not comply with setback or landscaping requirements for either R-2 or RMF-45. Further, there should be concern about the precedent the City is setting ignoring existing planning documents to accommodate spot rezoning without a more holistic conversation about the future of local neighborhoods considering growth pressures and how to successfully integrate additional multi-family housing into established residential neighborhoods.

I also question the notion that the only way to save the existing warehouse building is to construct as many housing units (including townhomes) as is included in the application. The number of new units on the two properties in question is roughly equivalent to all existing units on the block. Further, I think there is legitimate concern that if the rezone is approved, the developer will substantially change the density of the site after the rezone is approved.

As a urban planner by profession, I understand the need for additional density throughout the Region and support sustainable efforts to accommodate the additional growth the Region is facing. The City contributed to the development

of the locally driven regional blueprint for transportation and land use, Wasatch Choice 2050 Vision, and Mayor Mendenhall is an active member of the Wasatch Front Regional Council. This Vision calls for linking housing and transportation and providing access to open space. Clearly, 800 East provides excellent access to transit, bike facilities, trails, and Liberty Park - which all reasons we fell in love with the house we currently own and why there is virtually no other area in the City that can provide the same convenience. However, one of the other key aspects of the Vision is reducing housing and transportation costs and improving access to opportunities. The townhomes proposed range between 1,300 and 1,800 square feet and will rent for \$200 or more a square foot. It is unacceptable that this development includes no moderate-income housing units, considering local, regional, and state efforts to address housing affordability, and also because this location, with direct transit access to the University, close proximity to two frequent bus lines, and close proximity to multiple grocery stores (providing access to fresh food and eliminating the food desert that typically surrounds affordable housing options) is ripe to accommodate housing units that can truly help the City address affordability and lower housing and transportation costs. The proposed project seems like density for density's sake without addressing any of the issues the City is facing now or in the near future.

The applicant has also proposed to remove numerous trees - at least three street trees and one very large mature evergreen, which currently has nesting owls residing. At least one of these trees is being removed for a new driveway, although each property on the application has at least one existing driveway on 800 East and the warehouse property has an existing driveway on Chase Lane, all of which could be used without impact to existing trees. 800 East has a beautiful canopy of mature trees and this proposal will have a detrimental effect on that canopy and the character of the street. City trees have been shown over and over to contribute to a lower heat island effect and better health outcomes for nearby residents. Mayor Mendenhall, during her campaigning for mayor, pledged to plant more trees throughout the City acknowledging their impact in combating climate change and improving health. So why is it acceptable to remove any of the mature trees on these properties when it can easily be avoided?

Ultimately, while I think this is an appropriate location for additional housing, any proposed development should better fit guidelines the City has already adopted - master plans, zoning, and development ordinances - and preserve the existing neighborhood character. Any proposed development should fit the character of the street, in scale and form. Any rezone should be contingent on a site plan and design that is compatible with the neighborhood, including in scale and in unit count.

Sincerely,

Julie Bjornstad

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.

Gellner, David

From: Sebastian Hoch <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, May 27, 2020 4:44 PM
To: Gellner, David; Planning Public Comments
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Telegraph Exchange Lofts Rezoning, Master Plan Amendment & Planned Development at approximately 833 & 847 South 800 East

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I'm writing now to share my thoughts about the plans for the Telegraph Exchange Lofts.

While I support the redevelopment of the historic Telegraph Exchange building, the only really positive aspect of the presented plans is that the historic front facade would be preserved.

The rest is, in my opinion, an order of magnitude overreach of what our neighborhood should evolve to following the Salt Lake City master plan. The development as proposed does neither conserve the neighborhood's residential character nor does it ensure that new multi-family development is carefully sited, well designed, and compatible in scale.

While some denser development would be positive, the scale of the proposed project is more a "down-town scale" development than a development fitting in our neighborhood. The jump from R2 to RMF45 - especially after zoning it to R2 a few years back in order to protect the existing neighborhood character - is too much of a leap.

The plans to remove so many trees, the requested setbacks that do not meet zoning requirements, the extreme height, and the fact that the development is "gated" from the street are just some of the examples of features of the plan that highlight its incompatibility with our existing neighborhood.

A more modest increase in density, a compatible height of the town homes, protection of the existing urban forest, and plans respecting the zoning requirements while preserving the historic facade would be welcome change. However, the sheer number and size of proposed town homes (with the smallest having a square footage larger than some of the other homes in our neighborhood) does not allow for a such compatible development and indicates that the developer does not care about preserving the neighborhood character.

The plans do clearly not conserve the neighborhood's character and the development is not compatible with the neighborhood in its proposed scale. Therefore, I strongly oppose the development presented, including the Mast Plan Amendment, the Zoning Map Amendment, and the Planned Development.

Thank you,

-Sebastian Hoch ([REDACTED])

Gellner, David

From: missy greis <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, May 27, 2020 6:54 PM
To: Gellner, David; [REDACTED]
Subject: (EXTERNAL) 847 S. 8th East : Telegraph Exchange Lofts

David and Darin,

I am unable to join tonight's virtual meeting and wanted to provide my quick + favorable comment for the project noted above as I fear that there will be comments dissenting from many of us who live/work in the neighborhood who may not attend tonight's meeting.

For reference, I am the owner of the Publik restaurants and have owned the property at 931 E. 900 S. since 1997, which has housed Publik Kitchen since 2016. Until last year I resided at 931 S. 900 East, but I still consider 9th/9th my home and my neighborhood. For 23 years I have watched this special neighborhood expand and grow. I have watched City Hall navigate builders and developers and residents who have made investments in the improvement of our cool, little 'hood.

I have watched the progression of the referenced project and I feel strongly that the proposed development of the Telegraph Exchange Lofts is a "win" for our neighborhood due to several factors, but here are three that I feel, as a third party, are important to note:

1. The developer has a proven track record in SLC of building with responsible + sustainable practices. He is local. He understands the sensibility of our unique neighborhood. He and his family plan to live in the building.
2. The size and scale are an investment being made by the developer that not only make the project financially feasible but also

create a tasteful + superior design (one that another out of state, or out of touch, developer couldn't capture).

3. The project meets the ordinances, specifically parking, which is the one issue that has always been a concern with our property owners.

All my best to you both and thank you for your time.

missy greis



Community over corporate. Quality over quantity. Planet over profit.



Gellner, David

From: Marian Florence <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, June 29, 2020 11:19 AM
To: Gellner, David
Cc: Nathan Florence
Subject: Re: (EXTERNAL) Telegraph Exchange Project: July 8

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Thanks, David.

I notice that the revisions don't address some of our main concerns -

- the landscape buffer on the north side is required to be 10' - not 4'
- the Master Plan amendment is not warranted, especially when ensuring that the proposal is "compatible in scale"
- setbacks are still not addressed
- loss of mature trees is still not addressed
- density, height, traffic, neighborhood compatibility not addressed

We would welcome a discussion of a compatible project that did not propose such unsuitable/unsustainable density onto this block. We support the preservation of the historic building, but question the developer's insistence (and threats) that this plan is the only way to preserve the building.

What can we do to continue this conversation and ensure that developers meet the requirements of the City Master Plan and zoning laws? We rely on the Planning Department and Planning Commission to hold developers to these requirements.

Thanks,

Marian

[REDACTED]

On Mon, Jun 29, 2020 at 9:00 AM Gellner, David <David.Gellner@slcgov.com> wrote:

Marian and Nathan,

Your comments and concerns will be considered by the Planning Commission and they are included in the staff report attachment for public comments via the emails you sent to me on 01/01/2020, 01/30/2020 and 05/19/2020.

In terms of plan changes, the applicant has changed the following things since the last Planning Commission meeting:

1. A landscaping buffer has been added along the north side of the driveway adjacent to the single-family property to the north. The landscaping buffer is 4-feet wide and will be planted with trees.
2. The proposed trash and recycling dumpster on the north property line has been removed. Each of the units will be served by individual cans per unit.
3. A pedestrian gate between the property and the Smith's site will be added on the east side of the development to allow residents to more easily access Smith's and the 9th and 9th business district.

Those are the extent of the changes since the last PC meeting. If you have any additional questions, please let me know. D.

Regards,

DAVID J. GELLNER, MAG, AICP

Principal Planner

Salt Lake City Planning Division

Desk: **801-535-6107**

From: Marian Florence <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, June 28, 2020 9:05 AM
To: Gellner, David <David.Gellner@slcgov.com>
Cc: Nathan Florence <[REDACTED]>
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Telegraph Exchange Project: July 8

Mr. Gellner,

We notice that the project proposal is on the July 8th agenda for the Planning Commission - can you please ensure that all of our comments and concerns are still in consideration, and let us know if the plans have been amended at all prior to this meeting? Micah has been unresponsive to us as neighbors, and our concerns about the amendment to the Master Plan and high density zoning changes remain.

I am happy to reiterate them if necessary.

Thanks,

Marian Florence

817 S 800 E



LEAVE A COMMENT!



SALT LAKE CITY
PLANNING

PROJECT NAME: TELEGRAPH BUILDING

DATE: 1/9/2020

NAME: CINDY CROMER

EMAIL: [REDACTED]

ADDRESS:

COMMENTS: THIS AREA WAS IN A COMPREHENSIVE REZONE ADOPTED IN 2014. THE PROJECT WAS ONE OF THE LARGEST SINCE 1995. IT EXTENDED FROM 700 E TO 900 E AND 700 S TO 900 S. THE CITY NEEDS TO EVALUATE WHETHER THIS REZONING HAS HAD ITS INTENDED EFFECT.
SECONDLY THE EDGES OF THE 9TH AND 9TH AREA ARE CLEARLY DEFINED IN TERMS OF INTENSITY OF USE. THIS PROPOSAL CHANGES THE EDGE ON 800 E, AND SIMILAR PROPOSALS TO EXPAND THE AREA OF MORE INTENSE USE WILL FOLLOW.

STAY INFORMED // Please provide your contact information to be notified of future information and other meetings on this project. You can submit this sheet before the end of the Open House, or provide your comments via email or mail.

DAVID GELLNER // david.gellner@slcgov.com

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING DIVISION

451 S. State Street // Salt Lake City, UT 84114-5480 // P.O. Box 145480

LEAVE A COMMENT!



SALT LAKE CITY
PLANNING

PROJECT NAME: *Telegraph Exchange*

DATE: *1/9/2020*

NAME: *Robert Creedman*

EMAIL: [REDACTED]

ADDRESS:

COMMENTS: *I appreciate the adaptive reuse!*

Personally, I feel that parking and housing is a zero sum game; please build more housing, not more parking. As someone looking for low income housing previously, I was upset when I saw so many cars, and so much parking prioritized over ~~my~~ housing. Also, I hope this project is mixed use! that'd be exciting

STAY INFORMED // Please provide your contact information to be notified of future information and other meetings on this project. You can submit this sheet before the end of the Open House, or provide your comments via email or mail.

DAVID GELLNER // david.gellner@slcgov.com

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING DIVISION

451 S. State Street // Salt Lake City, UT 84114-5480 // P.O. Box 145480

ATTACHMENT G: Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
- Excerpt from 05/27/2020

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

This meeting was held electronically pursuant to Salt Lake City Emergency Proclamation No. 2 of 2020 (2)(b)

Wednesday, May 27, 2020

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:30:26 PM](#). Audio recordings of the Planning Commission meetings are retained for a period of time.

Present for the Planning Commission meeting were: Chairperson Adrienne Bell; Vice Chairperson Brenda Scheer; Commissioners Maurine Bachman, Amy Barry,Carolynn Hoskins, Jon Lee, Matt Lyon, Andres Paredes, Sara Urquhart, Crystal Young-Otterstrom.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Michaela Oktay, Planning Deputy Director; Nick Norris, Planning Director; Paul Nielson, Attorney; Wayne Mills, Planning Manager; Chris Earl, Principal Planner; Mayara Lima, Principal Planner; David Gellner, Principal Planner, and Marlene Rankins, Administrative Secretary.

Michaela Oktay, Planning Deputy Director, provided participation information.

APPROVAL OF THE MAY 13, 2020, MEETING MINUTES. [5:32:20 PM](#)

MOTION [5:32:33 PM](#)

Commissioner Lyon moved to approve the May 13, 2020, meeting minutes. Commissioner Scheer seconded the motion. Commissioners Bachman, Lyon, Paredes, Scheer, Urquhart, and Young-Otterstrom voted “Aye”. Commissioner Barry abstained from voting. The motion passed 6-1.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR [5:34:44 PM](#)

Chairperson Bell stated she had nothing to report.

Vice Chairperson Scheer stated she had nothing to report.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR [5:34:54 PM](#)

Michaela Oktay, Planning Deputy Director stated she had nothing to report.

[5:35:08 PM](#)

ADU Conditional Use at approximately 2174 South 1900 East - Antonio Padilla, property owner, is requesting Conditional Use approval for a 750 square foot accessory dwelling unit (ADU) to be located in the basement of a new home proposed at approximately 2174 S 1900 E. The property is zoned R-1/7,000 Single-Family Residential, where ADUs must be processed as a conditional use. The property is located within Council District 7, represented by Amy Fowler. (Staff contact: Chris Earl at (801) 535-7932 or christopher.earl@slcgov.com) **Case number PLNPCM2020-00064**

Chris Earl, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff recommended that the Planning Commission approve the Conditional Use request with the conditions listed in the staff report.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- Clarification on differences between an ADU and duplex

Antonio Padilla, applicant, was available for questions.

Commissioner Lee seconded the motion. Bachman, Barry, Hoskins, Lee, Urquhart, and Young-Otterstrom voted “Aye”. Commissioners Lyon, Paredes, and Scheer voted “Nay”. The motion passed 6-3.

Commissioner Andres Paredes was excused from the meeting.

[8:25:17 PM](#)

Telegraph Exchange Lofts Rezoning, Master Plan Amendment & Planned Development at approximately 833 & 847 South 800 East - Micah Peter of Clearwater Homes, the property owner, is requesting a Master Plan Amendment, Zoning Map Amendment, and Planned Development approval to construct a twenty-three (23) unit residential development called the Telegraph Exchange Lofts at 833 & 847 South 800 East. The proposal involves two (2) properties, one of which would be rezoned. A total of six (6) residential lofts would be developed within the existing Telegraph Exchange Building and an additional seventeen (17) new 3-story townhouse units would be added to the site. A total of 47 parking spaces will be provided. The proposed project is subject to the following petitions:

- I. **Master Plan Amendment** - The petitioner is requesting to amend the future land use map in the Central Community Master Plan from low-density residential to medium/high density residential for the parcel at 833 South 800 East. **Case number PLNPCM2019-01110**
- II. **Zoning Map Amendment** - The petitioner is requesting to amend the zoning map designation of the property at 833 South 800 East from R-2 Single and Two-Family Residential to the RMF-45 – Moderate/High Density Residential Zoning district. **Case number PLNPCM2019-01111**
- III. **Planned Development** –Planned Development approval is needed to address various yard setbacks to property lines for the proposed multi-family development. **Case number PLNSUB2019-01112**

The property is located within Council District 5, represented by Darin Mano. (Staff contact: David Gellner at (801) 535-6107 or david.gellner@slcgov.com)

David Gellner, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff recommended that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to approve the Master Plan Amendment and Zoning Map Amendment. He also stated Staff recommended that the Planning Commission table the Planned Development.

Micah Peters, applicant, provided a presentation along with further details including plans for a roof-top deck complete with outdoor kitchen, a possible art piece on the building, outdoor elevator and roof-top landscaping.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- Clarification on the existing building being 16,000 square feet
- Number of units proposed
- Whether the units are rentals or for purchase
- Clarification on individual unit sizes

PUBLIC HEARING [8:55:26 PM](#)

Chairperson Bell opened the Public Hearing;

Judi Short – Stated she in favor of the restoration of the building but is not in favor of the rezone and doesn't like the design of the Planned Development. She referenced the previous downzoning of the area in 2013, felt the setback should match the rest of the street, said the planned development would have a "gated community feel". She also suggested eliminating the pool to provide more space to neighboring properties.

Jason Stevenson, Co-Chair of East Liberty Park Community Organization – Stated the community submitted a letter that covered the community outreach. He raised concern with the impact that reversing the previous downzoning would have on other Community Councils and neighborhoods across the City as the effort was a good example of a neighborhood self-determination effort.

Zachary Dussault – Spoke in favor of the application for all 3 parts of the request. Stated that having vehicles enter from Chase Avenue would be a better design. The townhomes would provide a step-down from the taller building to the rest of the neighborhood.

Janelle Bauer – Representing Cody Derek, property owner to the North of the project, raised concern regarding the lack of separation between his him and the neighboring townhomes. She stated that her client relied on the previous rezone from RMF-35 to R-2 to buffer him from the Telegraph property when he built his house.

Julie Bjornstad – Provided an email comment stating her opposition of the request. This was read into the record by staff.

Sebastian Hoch – Provided an email comment stating his opposition of the request. This was read into the record by staff.

Missy Greis – Provided an email comment stated her support of the request. This was read into the record by staff.

Numerous other emails and letters, both in support and opposed to the project were provided in the staff report packet and the Planning Commission Dropbox.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- What the plans are for the existing trees
- Location of the new curb cut
- Clarification on whether there is a protected status on the property
- Whether it's appropriate in the process to wait on making a zoning decision until the concerns regarding the Planned Development are addressed

Cindy Cromer – Stated she disagrees with staff and evaluation of the Master Planning documents because the most important one is the most recent one. She said that rezoning should be a comprehensive effort and not piecemeal and that people should be able to expect the zoning in an area to not change. A new effort was overdue for the area.

Seeing no one else wished to speak; Chairperson Bell closed the Public Hearing.

The applicant addressed the public's concerns.

The Commission and Applicant further discussed the following:

- Clarification on zoning choice the applicant is requesting

- Whether the applicant explored other options for access and parking
- Concerns with the fire access requirements and resolution of those issues
- Tabling the whole thing would be better so that the PC could learn more about the planned development
- The neighborhood self-determination issue it is heading
- Need to balance public concerns but also acknowledge that there are positive comments
- The scale generally works
- The area is walkable with Smith's nearby

The applicant should explore the following items:

- Driveway location
- Fire access requirements
- Setback issues

MOTION [9:46:13 PM](#)

Commissioner Scheer stated, I move that we table all 3 pending applications until the applicant can resolve the issues identified in the staff report with the Planned Development.

Commissioner Urquhart seconded the motion. Commissioners Young-Otterstrom, Urquhart, Scheer, Lyon, Lee, Hoskins, Barry, and Bachman voted "Aye". The motion passed unanimously.

The following is a list of Q&A's that were received during the meeting:

Q&A Session for Planning Commission Meeting May 27, 2020

Session number: 969768690

Date: Wednesday, May 27, 2020

Starting time: 8:04 PM

Zachary Dussault (zacharytdussault@gmail.com) - 6:55 PM

Q: nothing to do with the roads

Priority: N/A

Zachary Dussault (zacharytdussault@gmail.com) - 5:44 PM

Q: I would like to speak but I cant raise my hand

Priority: N/A-

-Nick Norris - 5:44 PM

A: Thanks, we will call on you.

Zachary Dussault (zacharytdussault@gmail.com) - 8:20 PM

Q: still has to go before the city council, will take weeks

Priority: N/A

Zachary Dussault (zacharytdussault@gmail.com) - 8:41 PM

Q: Dont see the presentation

Priority: N/A

Jason Stevenson (jstevenson51@hotmail.com) - 8:59 PM

Q: I would like to speak, too

Priority: N/A

Jason Stevenson (jstevenson51@hotmail.com) - 8:59 PM

Q: I would like to speak, too

Priority: N/A

Zachary Dussault (zacharytdussault@gmail.com) - 9:24 PM

Q: Bad echo

Priority: N/A

Zachary Dussault (zacharytdussault@gmail.com) - 9:49 PM

Q: Staff suggested the setback be greater. it was originally planned closer to the street for the townhomes.

Priority: N/A

Zachary Dussault (zacharytdussault@gmail.com) - 9:50 PM

Q: goodnight yall!

Priority: N/A

Zachary Dussault (zacharytdussault@gmail.com) - 9:50 PM

Q: oh boy its just gonna be all me complaining.

Priority: N/A

The meeting adjourned at [9:48:59 PM](#)

ATTACHMENT H: Department Review Comments

Note: Updated Fire Department review comments have been included in this attachment.

The following comments were received from other City divisions/departments with regards to the proposed development:

Zoning Review

The following criteria apply to the RMF-45 zone.

The maximum allowed height in the RMF-45 zone is forty-five feet (45').

The front yard setback is twenty percent (20%) of lot depth but need not exceed twenty-five feet (25'). For buildings legally existing on April 12, 1995, the required front yard shall be no greater than the existing yard.

The minimum side yard is eight feet (8'); provided, that no principal building is erected within ten feet (10') of a building on an adjacent lot.

The rear yard requirement is twenty five percent (25%) of the lot depth but need not exceed thirty feet (30').

The maximum the surface coverage of all principal and accessory buildings is sixty percent (60%) of the lot area.

Landscape yard requirements will apply to the front and one interior side yard.

A landscape buffers will be required along the north property line: Where a lot abuts a lot in a single-family or two-family residential district, a landscape buffer shall be provided in accordance with chapter 21A.48, "Landscaping And Buffers", of this title. (Ord. 46-17, 2017: Ord. 66-13, 2013: Ord. 12-11, 2011: Ord. 62-09 § 7, 2009: Ord. 26-95 § 2(12-13), 1995)

Any deviation from these requirements will need to be approved through the planned development process.

Engineering – Scott Weiler

The Architectural Site Plan, sheet AS1-01, shows new sidewalk to be installed on the south side of Chase Avenue. SLC Engineering has no objection to this but since Chase Avenue is a private street, consent of the property owners who have rights to Chase Avenue must be obtained prior to installation of the sidewalk.

Prior to performing work in the public way of 800 East, a Permit to Work in the Public Way must be obtained from SLC Engineering by a licensed contractor who has a bond and insurance on file with SLC Engineering.

Public Utilities - Jason Draper

SLCPU does not maintain the 2" private main in Chase Ave. It is the responsibility of the properties connected to it to maintain that line.

No objections to the proposed amendments or setback for the planned development.

Conditions and comments on the proposed project:

Water and sewer service are available in 800 East.

The sewer main is in the park strip and new trees will need to be coordinated to be at least 5 feet from this main.

The existing 6" water main in 800 East is likely insufficient to provide culinary and fire flows for this project and the main may need to be upsized. This must include reconnection of existing services.

One water meter may be reused for irrigation service.

Unused water and sewer service will need to be capped at the main.

Plans must meet SLCDPU standards, policies, ordinance and practices.

Plans must be submitted for review.

Building Code – Steven Collett

The International Existing Building Code (IEBC) is the applicable code for existing buildings.

The International Existing Building Code (IEBC) is a model code in the International Code family of codes intended to provide requirements for repair and alternative approaches for alterations and additions to existing buildings. This code allows for options for controlled departure from full compliance with the International Codes dealing with new construction, while maintaining basic levels for fire prevention, structural and life safety features of the rehabilitated building.

Drawings do not clearly identify interior circulation, or layout of the units.

This project could fall under the provisions of the IRC which regulates the following: The construction, alteration, movement, enlargement, replacement, repair, equipment, use and occupancy, location, removal and demolition of townhouses not more than three stories above grade plane in height with each unit having a separate means of egress.

STORY ABOVE GRADE PLANE. Any story having its finished floor surface entirely above grade plane, or in which the finished surface of the floor next above is either of the following:

1. More than 6 feet (1829 mm) above grade plane.
2. More than 12 feet (3658 mm) above the finished ground level at any point.

MEANS OF EGRESS. A continuous and unobstructed path of vertical and horizontal egress travel from any occupied portion of a building or structure to a public way. A means of egress consists of three separate and distinct parts: the exit access, the exit and the exit discharge.

Transportation – Michael Barry

The minimum parking requirements are listed in 21A.44. The parking layout must conform to 21A.44.020.

Fire – Steven Collett

(Note: Comments in grey are general and do not apply to the proposed development. Modification through an Alternate Means and Methods – AM&M can be granted by the Fire Department on a case-by-case basis.)

- Fire department access roads shall be a minimum of 26-foot clear width and 13 foot 6 inches clear height for which measured from the lowest fire department access road to the highest occupied floor is 30 foot and greater.
- Aerial apparatus access roads shall be located within a minimum of 15 feet and a maximum of 30 feet from the building and shall be positioned parallel to one entire side of the building(s).
- Fire Department access roads that are dead ends greater than 150 feet shall be provide with a turn-around.
- Fire hydrants shall be within 400 feet of all exterior walls of the structure.
- The turning radius of fire department access roads are 45 foot outside and 20 foot inside.
- Fire department access roads are measured from the inside edge of the waterway of the curb and gutter to the inside edge of the curb and gutter.
- Fire Department Connection(s) FDC shall be located on the address side of the structure.
- Fire Department Connections(s) FDC shall be within 100 feet of a fire hydrant.

Updated Fire Department Comments provided 06/02/2020:

On Chase Avenue, there is an existing fire department crash gate and easement at the end of the street for emergency use that alleviates the dead-end concern.

There is walkway between the existing Telegraph building and the townhomes off Chase Avenue and also 5 feet to rear of the townhomes and these can be used for access.

The townhomes are less than 30' in elevation so aerial access in not needed and the proposed 20'-4" width drive access on the north is compliant. The townhomes are fully sprinklered as well.

With all these items in place, the fire department access is satisfied.

3c. Planning Commission Agenda and Minutes for July 8, 2020

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA
This meeting will be an electronic meeting pursuant to Salt Lake City Emergency
Proclamation No. 2 of 2020 (2)(b)
July 8, 2020, at 5:30 p.m.
(The order of the items may change at the Commission's discretion)

This Meeting will **not** have an anchor location at the City and County Building. Commission Members will connect remotely. We want to make sure everyone interested in the Planning Commission meetings can still access the meetings how they feel most comfortable. If you are interested in watching the Planning Commission meetings, they are available on the following platforms:

- YouTube: www.youtube.com/slclivemeetings
- SLCTV Channel 17 Live: www.slctv.com/livestream/SLCtv-Live/2

If you are interested in participating during the Public Hearing portion of the meeting or provide general comments, email: planning.comments@slcgov.com or connect with us on Webex at:

- <http://tiny.cc/slc-pc-07082020>

Instructions for using Webex will be provided on our website at SLC.GOV/Planning

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING WILL BEGIN AT 5:30 PM
APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR JUNE 24, 2020
REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR
REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Telegraph Exchange Lofts Rezoning, Master Plan Amendment & Planned Development at approximately 833 & 847 South 800 East - Micah Peter of Clearwater Homes, the property owner, is requesting a Master Plan Amendment, Zoning Map Amendment, and Planned Development approval to construct a twenty-three (23) unit residential development called the Telegraph Exchange Lofts at 833 & 847 South 800 East. The proposal involves two (2) properties, one of which would be rezoned. A total of six (6) residential lofts would be developed within the existing Telegraph Exchange Building and an additional seventeen (17) new 3-story townhouse units would be added to the site. A total of 47 parking spaces will be provided. The proposed project is subject to the following petitions:

- a. **Master Plan Amendment** - The petitioner is requesting to amend the future land use map in the Central Community Master Plan from low-density residential to medium/high density residential for the parcel at 833 South 800n East. **Case number PLNPCM2019-01110**
- b. **Zoning Map Amendment** - The petitioner is requesting to amend the zoning map designation of the property at 833 South 800 East from R-2 Single and Two-Family Residential to the RMF-45 – Moderate/High Density Residential District. **Case number PLNPCM2019-01111**
- c. **Planned Development** – Planned Development approval is needed to address various yard setbacks to property lines for the proposed multi-family development. **Case number PLNSUB2019-01112**

The project site is located within Council District 5, represented by Darin Mano (Staff contact: David Gellner at (801) 535-6107 or david.gellner@slcgov.com)

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **RYE Bar Conditional Use at approximately 239 South 500 East** - Lance Saunders, representing the property owner, is requesting a Conditional Use approval to allow a bar establishment at the above-listed address. The applicant is proposing to change the license of the existing restaurant at this location to bar establishment in order to expand its bar program. The property is zoned R-MU Residential/Mixed-Use and is located within Council District 4, represented by Ana Valdemoros. (Staff contact: Mayara Lima at (801) 535-7118 or mayara.lima@slcgov.com) **Case number PLNPCM2020-00321**
2. **Azure Place Planned Development & Preliminary Subdivision at approximately 637 North 300 West, 641 North 300 West & 642 N Pugsley Street** - Paul Garbett of Garbett Homes, the property owner, is requesting approval for a new residential development at 637 N 300 West, 641 N 300 West and 642 N Pugsley Street. The request is to consolidate the three parcels and subdivide the property to create 29 residential three-story townhomes. The proposed project is subject to the following applications:
 - a. **Planned Development** – The Planned Development approval is needed to address the lack of street frontage and any modifications to the MU (Mixed Use) zoning regulations. Case number **PLNSUB2020-00074**
 - b. **Preliminary Subdivision** - A preliminary plat is necessary to consolidate the existing three parcels and create individual new lots. Case number **PLNSUB2020-00073**

The project site is located within Council District 3, represented by Chris Wharton (Staff contact: Katia Pace at (801) 535-6354 or katia.pace@slcgov.com)

WORK SESSION

1. **Twenty Ones Design Review at approximately 2105 East 2100 South** - Salt Lake City has received a request from Tom Henriod, with Rockworth Companies, for Design Review and Special Exception approval to construct a mixed-use development at approximately 2105 East and 2100 South. The proposed project consists of two buildings, a north and a south building. The proposed north building is a 3-story residential structure totaling 77- units. The south building is a 2-story mixed-use commercial and residential structure with 31 residential units. The ground floor contains approximately 21,000 SF of commercial space. This project is required to go through Design Review due to building size limits in the CB: Community Business zoning district. Buildings in excess of seven thousand five hundred (7,500) gross square feet of floor area for a first-floor footprint are allowed only through the design review process. Special Exception approval is required due to the requested additional height of 3 feet on the north building. The project site is located in the CB (Community Business) zoning district and is located within Council District 6, represented by Dan Dugan (Staff Contact: Krissy Gilmore at (801) 535-7780 or Kristina.gilmore@slcgov.com) **PLNPCM2019-01170 & PLNPCM2020-00200**

For Planning Commission agendas, staff reports, and minutes, visit the Planning Division's website at slc.gov/planning/public-meetings. Staff Reports will be posted the Friday prior to the meeting and minutes will be posted two days after they are ratified, which usually occurs at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission.

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

This meeting was held electronically pursuant to Salt Lake City Emergency Proclamation No. 2 of 2020 (2)(b)
July 8, 2020, at 5:30 p.m.

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:30:31 PM](#). Audio recordings of the Planning Commission meetings are retained for a period of time.

Present for the Planning Commission meeting were: Chairperson Adrienne Bell; Vice Chairperson, Brenda Scheer; Commissioners; Maurine Bachman, Amy Barry, Carolyn Hoskins, Jon Lee, Matt Lyon, Andres Paredes, Sara Urquhart, and Crystal Young-Otterstrom.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Molly Robinson, Planning Manager; Nick Norris, Planning Director; Paul Nielson, Attorney; David Gellner, Principal Planner; Mayara Lima, Principal Planner; Kristina Gilmore, Principal Planner; and Marlene Rankins, Administrative Secretary.

[5:31:07 PM](#) Vice Chairperson, Brenda Scheer read the Salt Lake City Emergency Declaration.

Chairperson, Adrienne Bell stated that the approval of the minutes for June 24, 2020 will be postponed until July 22, 2020.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR [5:35:55 PM](#)

Chairperson Bell stated she had nothing to report

Vice Chairperson Scheer stated she had nothing to report.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR [5:36:05 PM](#)

Molly Robinson, Planning Manager, provided Commissioners Paredes and Urquhart regarding the need for re-applying to continue on to second terms.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

[5:38:02 PM](#)

Telegraph Exchange Lofts Rezoning, Master Plan Amendment & Planned Development at approximately 833 & 847 South 800 East - Micah Peter of Clearwater Homes, the property owner, is requesting a Master Plan Amendment, Zoning Map Amendment, and Planned Development approval to construct a twenty-three (23) unit residential development called the Telegraph Exchange Lofts at 833 & 847 South 800 East. The proposal involves two (2) properties, one of which would be rezoned. A total of six (6) residential lofts would be developed within the existing Telegraph Exchange Building and an additional seventeen (17) new 3-story townhouse units would be added to the site. A total of 47 parking spaces will be provided. The proposed project is subject to the following petitions:

- a. **Master Plan Amendment** - The petitioner is requesting to amend the future land use map in the Central Community Master Plan from low-density residential to medium/high density residential for the parcel at 833 South 800n East. **Case number PLNPCM2019-01110**
- b. **Zoning Map Amendment** - The petitioner is requesting to amend the zoning map designation of the property at 833 South 800 East from R-2 Single and Two-Family Residential to the RMF-45 – Moderate/High Density Residential District. **Case number PLNPCM2019-01111**

- c. Planned Development** – Planned Development approval is needed to address various yard setbacks to property lines for the proposed multi-family development. **Case number PLNSUB2019-01112**

The project site is located within Council District 5, represented by Darin Mano (Staff contact: David Gellner at (801) 535-6107 or david.gellner@slcgov.com)

David Gellner, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff recommended that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for the Master Plan Amendment and Zoning Map Amendments. He also stated Staff recommended the Planning Commission approve the Planned Development as proposed with the conditions listed in the staff report.

Note: No Public Hearing was held, and no additional public comments were taken as the Public Hearing was previously closed at the May 27, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting when all (3) applications were tabled.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- Clarification of access considerations from Chase Ave

Micah Peters, applicant, and Juliann Hanson, and Ralph Nagasawa, project architects, provided a presentation with further design details and further information.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- Landscaping buffer on the North and mitigation measures
- Number of parking stalls being provided and where parking would be located
- Total size of the North side setback with buildings and driveway
- Encroachment of balconies over Chase Avenue
- Clarification on how waste management pick up would occur
- Clarification on whether the Smith's entrance would be accessible to the residents. Applicant also stated that the pedestrian gate to Smith's was not yet finalized and that they would continue to work on getting that approved.
- Discussion was made regarding the compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood, the proposed style and the general eclectic style of the neighborhood being common
- Discussion with street interaction on 800 East
- Clarification on the number of properties can be built by right within the current zoning designations
- Further discussion on the Master Plan and zone change
- Clarification on the required parking

MOTION [6:24:13 PM](#)

Commissioner Scheer stated, based on the information in the staff report, the information presented and the input received during the public hearing, I move that the Planning Commission forward a POSITIVE recommendation to City Council for the proposed Master Plan and Zoning Map Amendment for the property located at 833 S 800 E. as requested through the following applications:

- 1. Master Plan Amendment –PLNPCM2019-01110 –proposed change to the future land use map from low-density residential to medium/high density residential.**

2. Zoning Map Amendment PLNPCM2019-01111 - proposed change from R-2 – Single & Two-Family Residential to RMF-45 – Moderate/High Density Residential.

Commissioner Lee seconded the motion. Commissioners Barry, Scheer, Urquhart, Lyon, Bachman, Hoskins, Lee, and Paredes voted “Aye”. Commission Young-Otterstrom voted “Nay”. The motion passed 8-1.

Discussion was made regarding the number of units allowed.

SECOND MOTION [6:28:45 PM](#)

Commissioner Scheer stated, based on the information in the staff report, the information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, I move that the Planning Commission vote to Approve the Planned Development, petition PLNSUB2019-01112 with the following conditions of approval listed in the staff report.

Commissioner Lee seconded the motion. Commissioners Paredes, Lee, Hoskins, Bachman, Lyon, Urquhart, Scheer, Barry voted “Aye”. Commissioner Young-Otterstrom voted “Nay”. The motion passed 8-1.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

[6:31:06 PM](#)

RYE Bar Conditional Use at approximately 239 South 500 East - Lance Saunders, representing the property owner, is requesting a Conditional Use approval to allow a bar establishment at the above-listed address. The applicant is proposing to change the license of the existing restaurant at this location to bar establishment in order to expand its bar program. The property is zoned R-MU Residential/Mixed-Use and is located within Council District 4, represented by Ana Valdemoros. (Staff contact: Mayara Lima at (801) 535-7118 or mayara.lima@slcgov.com) **Case number PLNPCM2020-00321**

Mayara Lima, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff recommended that the Planning Commission approve the request with the conditions listed in the staff report.

Will Sartain and Lance Saunders, applicants, provided further information and were available for questions.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- Clarification on the use of the property behind the proposal

PUBLIC HEARING [6:37:44 PM](#)

Chairperson Bell opened the Public Hearing;

Zachary Dussault – Stated he’s in favor of the application.

Seeing no one else wished to speak; Chairperson Bell closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION [6:39:31 PM](#)

Commissioner Barry stated, based on the information listed in the staff report, the information presented, and the input received during the public hearing, I move that the Commission approve the request for Conditional Use for a Bar Establishment at 239 S 500 E, as presented in petition PLNPCM2020-00321, with the condition listed in the staff report.

Commissioner Lee seconded the motion. Commissioners Barry, Scheer, Urquhart, Young-Otterstrom, Lyon, Bachman, Hoskins, Lee, and Paredes voted "Aye". The motion passed unanimously.

WORK SESSION

Commissioner Sara Urquhart excused herself for the remainder of the meeting.

[6:41:01 PM](#)

Twenty Ones Design Review at approximately 2105 East 2100 South - Salt Lake City has received a request from Tom Henriod, with Rockworth Companies, for Design Review and Special Exception approval to construct a mixed-use development at approximately 2105 East and 2100 South. The proposed project consists of two buildings, a north and a south building. The proposed north building is a 3-story residential structure totaling 77- units. The south building is a 2-story mixed-use commercial and residential structure with 31 residential units. The ground floor contains approximately 21,000 SF of commercial space. This project is required to go through Design Review due to building size limits in the CB: Community Business zoning district. Buildings in excess of seven thousand five hundred (7,500) gross square feet of floor area for a first-floor footprint are allowed only through the design review process. Special Exception approval is required due to the requested additional height of 3 feet on the north building. The project site is located in the CB (Community Business) zoning district and is located within Council District 6, represented by Dan Dugan (Staff Contact: Krissy Gilmore at (801) 535-7780 or Kristina.gilmore@slcgov.com) **PLNPCM2019-01170 & PLNPCM2020-00200**

Krissy Gilmore, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as outlined in the Memorandum.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- Clarification on the length of the 2100 South facing building
- Property to the North of the property
- Clarification on the small area plan
- Whether there is a break on the 2100 South facing building

Thomas Henriod, and Ryan Mackowiak applicants, provided a presentation along with further details.

The discussion and comments were primarily focused on the South Building which fronts 2100 South.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- Clarification on height of the underpass
- Width of the underpass
- Amenities that are being brought forth on the public standpoint
- Clarification on sidewalk width
- Retail frontage and if the main entrances would front 2100 South or be internal to the site
- Clarification on why the two buildings need to be connected
- Pedestrian access
- Clarification on the length of the building on both sides of the break

- Clarification on the on-level parking and why there's so many spaces
- Angle parking that is currently available
- Creating a signage incentive for the tenants
- Clarification on height changes by right or additional height through Design Review
- Pedestrian engagement
- Contamination study results
- Clarification on the landscape setback buffer and if the parking ramp can encroach within that buffer

The following is a list of Q&A's that were received during the meeting:

Q&A Session for Planning Commission Meeting July 8, 2020

Session number: 1468881775

Date: Wednesday, July 8, 2020

Starting time: 5:06 PM

-Zachary Dussault (zacharytdussault@gmail.com) - 6:14 PM

Q: Is the public hearing closed on this matter? I thought tabled applications have the public comment left open?

Priority: N/A-

-Nick Norris - 6:25 PM

A: Yes, the Planning Commission closed the public hearing at the last meeting on the matter. Sorry for the delay in response, I kept losing my connection to the meeting.-

-Zachary Dussault (zacharytdussault@gmail.com) - 6:20 PM

Q: 2 per DU

Priority: N/A-

-Zachary Dussault (zacharytdussault@gmail.com) - 6:21 PM

Q: Multi family parking mins would be based on bedrooms per DU

Priority: N/A-

-Zachary Dussault (zacharytdussault@gmail.com) - 6:21 PM

Q: 2 per 2 bedroom or more

Priority: N/A-

-Zachary Dussault (zacharytdussault@gmail.com) - 6:22 PM

Q: 1 per 1 bedroom

Priority: N/A-

-Zachary Dussault (zacharytdussault@gmail.com) - 7:15 PM

Q: It really is amazing how much of this development is devoted to cars.

Priority: N/A-

-Zachary Dussault (zacharydussault@gmail.com) - 7:21 PM
Q: Because its all require by the parking ordinance.
Priority: N/A-

-Ryan Mackowiak (mackowiak80@hotmail.com) - 7:38 PM
Q: I'm here, but it won't let me unmute myself
Priority: N/A-
-Nick Norris - 7:42 PM
A: Ryan, are you with the applicant team?-

The meeting adjourned at [7:52:16 PM](#)

3d. Planning Commission - Original Notice and Postmark – May 27, 2020



SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING DIVISION
 451 S State Street - Room 406
 Salt Lake City, UT 84114 - 5480
 PO BOX 145480

Salt Lake City Planning Division David Gellner
 PO BOX 145480
 Salt Lake City UT 84114

STATE MAIL 05/16/2020

FIRST CLASS



U.S. POSTAGE PITNEY BOWES
 ZIP 84116 \$000.50⁰
 02 1W
 0001403373 MAY 15 2020



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

May 27, 2020, at 5:30 p.m.

*This meeting will be an electronic meeting pursuant to Salt Lake City
 Emergency Proclamation No. 2 of 2020 (2)(b)*

A public hearing will be held on the following matter.

Telegraph Exchange Lofts Rezoning, Master Plan Amendment & Planned Development at approximately 833 & 847 South 800 East - Micah Peter of Clearwater Homes, the property owner, is requesting a Master Plan Amendment, Zoning Map Amendment, and Planned Development approval to construct a twenty-three (23) unit residential development called the Telegraph Exchange Lofts at 833 & 847 South 800 East. The proposal involves two (2) properties, one of which would be rezoned. A total of six (6) residential lofts would be developed within the existing Telegraph Exchange Building and an additional seventeen (17) new 3-story townhouse units would be added to the site. A total of 47 parking spaces will be provided. The proposed project is subject to the following petitions:

- I. **Master Plan Amendment** - The petitioner is requesting to amend the future land use map in the Central Community Master Plan from low-density residential to medium/high density residential for the parcel at 833 South 800 East. **Case number PLNPCM2019-01110**
- II. **Zoning Map Amendment** - The petitioner is requesting to amend the zoning map designation of the property at 833 South 800 East from R-2 Single and Two-Family Residential to the RMF-45 - Moderate/High Density Residential Zoning district. **Case number PLNPCM2019-01111**
- III. **Planned Development** - Planned Development approval is needed to address various yard setbacks to property lines for the proposed multi-family development. **Case number PLNSUB2019-01112**

The property is located within Council District 5, represented by Darin Mano. (Staff contact: David Gellner at (801) 535-6107 or david.gellner@slcgov.com)

This Meeting will not have an anchor location at the City and County Building. Commission Members will connect remotely.

The Planning Commission meeting will be available on the following platforms:

- YouTube: www.youtube.com/slclivemeetings
- SLCTv Channel 17 Live: www.slctv.com/livestream/SLCtv-Live/2

Providing Comments:


If you are interested in participating during the Public Hearing portion of the meeting or provide general comments, email: planning.comments@slcgov.com or connect with us on WebEx at:

- <http://tiny.cc/slc-pc-05272020>

For instructions on how to use WebEx visit: www.slc.gov/planning/public-meetings

For Planning Commission agendas, staff reports, and minutes, visit the Planning Division's website at slc.gov/planning/public-meetings. Staff Reports will be posted the Friday prior to the meeting and minutes will be posted two days after they are ratified, which usually occurs at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission.

0411455480 6800



3e. Planning Commission Staff Report – May 27, 2020



Staff Report

PLANNING DIVISION
DEPARTMENT of COMMUNITY and NEIGHBORHOODS

To: Salt Lake City Planning Commission

From: David J. Gellner, AICP, Principal Planner - 801-535-6107 - david.gellner@slcgov.com

Date: May 27, 2020

Re: PLNPCM2019-01110 – Master Plan Amendment
PLNPCM2019-01111 – Zoning Map Amendment
PLNSUB2019-01112 – Telegraph Exchange Lofts Planned Development

Master Plan Amendment, Zoning Map Amendment & Planned Development

PROPERTY ADDRESS: 833 & 847 South 800 East

PARCEL ID: 16-08-176-015 -0000 (Zoned RMF-45)

16-08-176-026-0000 (Zoned R-2)

MASTER PLAN: Central Community Master Plan

ZONING DISTRICT: RMF-45 Moderate/High Density Multi-Family Residential District and R-2
– Single and Two Family Residential District

REQUEST: Micah Peter of Clearwater Homes, the property owner, is requesting approval from the City to construct a twenty-three (23) unit residential development at the addresses listed above. Under the proposal, a total of six (6) residential lofts would be developed within the existing Telegraph Exchange Building, which would be renovated. An additional seventeen (17) new three-story townhouse units would be added to the combined site. The proposed project requires the following applications:

1. **Master Plan Amendment (PLNPCM2019-01110)** - The associated future land use map in the Central Community Master Plan currently designates the subject properties as low-density residential. The petitioner is requesting to amend the future land use map to medium/high density residential for both subject properties.
2. **Zoning Map Amendment (PLNPCM2019-01111)** - The subject property at 833 S 800 E is currently zoned R-2 – Single and Two-Family Residential. The petitioner is requesting to amend the zoning map designation of the property to the RMF-45 – Moderate/High Density Residential District.
3. **Planned Development (PLNSUB2019-01112)** –Planned Development approval is needed to address various yard setbacks to property lines for the proposed multi-family development, modification of landscaping requirements and to allow more than one principle structure on the property

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Based on the information presented in the staff report, Planning Staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for the proposed master plan amendment and zoning map amendments.

Based on the information presented in the staff report, Planning Staff recommends that the Planning Commission vote to table the Planned Development request for the following reasons:

1. As configured, the proposal does not meet the standards of approval for a Planned Development.
2. The proposed design would introduce negative impacts to the surrounding neighborhood that are not mitigated.

Specifically, the Planning Commission and Staff would like the applicant to address the following items:

1. Incorporation of a landscaping buffer along the north edge of the property to mitigate impacts from the proposed driveway and development on the adjacent single-family residential use.
2. Incorporation of a landscape buffer to separate the proposed trash enclosure located along the north property line from the adjacent single-family residential property in order to mitigate impacts.
3. Demonstration that all Fire Department access requirements have been met.
4. Provide additional information on the materials and design elements of the townhomes and how the design is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.
5. Demonstrate that the proposed balcony encroachments over Chase Avenue are allowed by all parties with an ownership in the private street.

The Planned Development is conditioned upon approval of the new zoning. Thus, should the City Council not approve the amendments requested, any approval by the Planning Commission of the Planned Development will become null and void.

ATTACHMENTS:

- A. [Vicinity/Zoning Map & Future Land Use Map](#)
- B. [Site Photographs & Existing Conditions](#)
- C. [Applicant's Narrative, Plans, Renderings & Historical Photographs](#)
- D. [Development Standards](#)
- E. [Analysis of Standards](#)
- F. [Public Process and Comments](#)
- G. [Department Review Comments](#)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Micah Peter of Clearwater Homes, the property owner, is requesting a Master Plan Amendment, Zoning Map Amendment (Rezone), and Planned Development approval to construct a twenty-three (23) unit residential development called the Telegraph Exchange Lofts at 833 & 847 South 800 East. The proposal involves two (2) properties, the smaller of which is currently zoned R-2 – Single and Two-Family residential. The larger parcel is zoned RMF-45 – Moderate/High Density Multi-Family and contains the existing Telegraph Exchange Building. The properties will be consolidated into one parcel for the development. The total size of the two parcels combined is approximately 0.79 acres (34,400 square feet).



Project Quick Facts

Number of Residential Units:

Telegraph Building – 6 loft units

Townhome – 17 units

Height: Telegraph Building – 58-feet

Townhomes – 30 feet proposed

Exterior Materials: Telegraph – red brick

Townhomes - durable materials including brick veneer, cement board, metal and wood

Parking: 46 on-site spaces. 34 in attached garages for the townhomes and 12 surface parking spaces for the loft units.

Properties:

833 S 800 E – Zoned R-2 – 0.29 acres

847 S 800 E – Zoned RMF-45 – 0.50 acres


Existing Building Factoids:

16,000 square feet

Built in 1911 as a telephone & telegraph facility

Functioned as a warehouse for many years

Currently vacant



The site will be configured as described below:

- Six (6) residential lofts would be developed within the existing Telegraph Exchange Building. The building would be renovated in order to make it meet building code and seismic standards. The building would include fire sprinklers.
 - Balconies will be added to the units in the Telegraph Building that face Chase Avenue.
 - A raised deck structure would be added to the Telegraph Building on the north side. This deck would face into the development.
- Seventeen (17) new 3-story townhouse units would be added to the combined site. The configuration of these is in 4 building clusters or “pods” – divided as follows:
 - 4 units facing 800 East on the front of the current R-2 parcel – these extend onto the RMF-45 parcel
 - 4 units behind the 800 East facing units (also onto RMF-45 parcel)
 - 5 units facing Chase Avenue directly adjacent to the private street
 - 4 units behind those facing Chase in the location where a garage/storage structure currently exists.

- An in-ground pool and hot tub has been proposed between the Telegraph Exchange building and the units that front onto 800 E. This will be appropriately screened from the street to provide some visual interest from the street but also privacy for the users.
- Site and fire access will be provided via a driveway on the northern edge of the combined properties that circulates into the site and to the garages under each unit.
- A smaller access gate geared toward pedestrians is located on Chase Avenue between the Telegraph Building and the 5 units that face Chase Avenue.

Planned development approval is necessary because the proposed development does not comply with some of the required setbacks and buffers based on the proposed site design. The following requirements are proposed to be modified through the planned development:

- Reduction of the front yard setback for the townhouse units facing 800 E: from 25-feet to approximately 12feet.
- Reduction of interior side yard setbacks for townhouse units: from 8-feet to 4-feet.
- Reduction of the rear yard setback for the townhouse units off Chase Avenue: from 20-feet to 5-feet.
- Elimination of the 10-foot landscaping buffer required along the north edge of the property between the development and the single-family property to the north.
- Elimination of the 7-foot landscaping buffer between some of the units and the CB zoned Smith's property.
- Elimination of the 7-foot landscaping buffer between the parking carport and the CB zoned Smith's property.

The proposed modifications requested through the planned development approval are outlined in more detail in the Key Considerations section of this report under Consideration 5: Zoning Modifications through the Planned Development, and on the site plan and applicant's narrative included in [Attachment C](#) of this report.

Materials and design of the townhome units:

The proposed 3-story townhomes are modern in design. A detailed material and color palette has not been provided but the elevations and renderings show them to be made of durable materials including brick veneer, cement board, metal and wood. The units that face 800 E are designed to provide interaction with the sidewalk to honor the character of the neighborhood. Additional information on the materials and colors must be provided for approval. This is recommended as a condition of approval to be delegated to Staff by the Planning Commission.

BACKGROUND HISTORY:

Existing Telegraph Exchange Building

The Telegraph Exchange Building was constructed in 1911 as the Mountain States Telephone and Telegraph Building. It served as one of the first Utah operator stations for telephone technology which was new at the time. It later served as a warehouse for the LDS Church and is currently vacant. The building is roughly 16,000 square feet in size and constructed of unreinforced masonry. The outer facades of the building are covered in a distinctive red brick. At a height of approximately 58-feet tall, the building is the tallest structure and a distinct landmark in the 9th and 9th area. The term "landmark"

in this context is being used in reference to the prominence of the structure and not in terms of a legal historic designation. The Telegraph Building is not located within a designated local historic district nor is it a City Landmark Site. As such, it does not have a protected status in terms of demolition of the structure and redevelopment of the property under the current RMF-45 zoning. No review by the Historic Landmark Commission is required.

Zoning of the Subject Property at 833 South 800 East

From 2012 - 2014, the City pursued a general rezoning in the 9th and 9th area aimed at preserving the single-family homes and character of the area. Many residents at the time were concerned that the residential nature of the area was being threatened by commercial growth, especially in those properties located near the existing commercial areas (the 900 South 900 East intersection, and Smith's market). Many of the parcels in the area that were zoned RMF-30, RMF-35 or RMF-45 but only contained a single-family dwelling or duplex were rezoned to R-2 – Single and Two Family residential through this initiative. This was an attempt to make the zoning reflect the existing development of the area.

The subject property located at 833 S 800 E was rezoned from RMF-35 to R-2 through this action with the adoption of Ordinance 1 of 2014. The property currently contains two individual single-family dwellings. County Assessor records show that one dwelling was constructed in 1891 while the other was constructed in 1896. Neither of the dwellings are designated as historic or protected structures so the property could be redeveloped by right for a duplex or twin-home under the current zoning designation.

The applicant proposes to change the zoning of this property to RMF-45 which would match the zoning on the abutting Telegraph Exchange property. The two parcels would be consolidated to accommodate the proposed Planned Development across the combined parcel.

KEY CONSIDERATIONS:

Consideration 1: City goals and policies

Central Community Master Plan (2005)

The subject properties are located within the East Central North neighborhood planning area identified in the Central Community Master Plan. More specifically, it is located in the Bennion Neighborhood which was once named the "Ward of Industry" related to some of the historic light industrial uses that were present. The Plan notes that the neighborhood includes a mixture of many architectural styles and building types but that the majority are residential structures, predominantly single-family detached dwellings.

The subject properties are designated in the future land use map as Low Density Residential (1-15 dwelling units/acre). Total acreage of the two parcels is 0.79 acres. With 23 units the applicant proposes a density of 29 dwelling units per acre. It should be noted that the property at 847 S 800 E is already zoned RMF-45 which would be more in line with a designation of Medium-High Density Residential based on the current zoning and dwelling unit density possible. This discrepancy between the future land use map and the zoning of the Telegraph Exchange parcel are discussed in more detail in the Key Considerations section.

The Central Community Master Plan contains policies and statements that both support the proposed rezoning of the property and the overall Planned Development and statements that conflict with the proposed changes. These policies are outlined in more detail below.

The applicant provided this statement in support of the rezone application:

The project consists of 2 parcels: 847 S 800 E is .50 Acres and currently zoned RMF-45, while 833 S 800 E is .29 acres and currently zoned R-2. When we purchased the properties back in 2011, the 847 S 800 E has its current RMF-45 zoning, and 833 S 800 E had an RMF-35 zoning. Utilizing the density afforded by both of the original zones would afford us the total 23 units we are currently requesting. Because 833 S 800E was rezoned to R-2 in 2013, we will be submitting a rezone request. While we are asking for a single zone for the consolidated lot of RMF-45, (which would afford substantial density), we are capping the development density at the proposed 23 total units.

Support for the Changes found in the Central Community Master Plan

The proposal is supported by these Central Community Master Plan policies:

RLU-1.0 Based on the Future Land Use map, use residential zoning to establish and maintain a variety of housing opportunities that meet social needs and income levels of a diverse population.

RLU-1.2 Provide opportunities for medium-density housing in areas between the Central Business District and lower-density neighborhoods and in areas where small multi-family dwellings are compatible.

RLU-1.6 Encourage coordination between the Future Land Use map, zoning ordinances, and the Salt Lake City Community Housing Plan.

RLU-3.1 Encourage residential land developers to build housing that provides residential opportunities for a range of income levels, age groups, and family size.

RLU-3.3 Use the planned development process to encourage design flexibility for residential housing while maintaining compatibility with the neighborhood.

The Central Community Master Plan also contains the following goals that are relevant to this project:

- *Encourage the creation and maintenance of a variety of housing opportunities that meet social needs and income levels of a diverse population.*

The Master Plan recognizes that the City is a living organism, subject to growth, decay, and renewal. Its intent is to ensure that change occurs in response to the needs of, and in the best interests of, the residents of the Central Community as well as the City as a whole.

The Future Land Use map represents a balance of existing and future residential development patterns and identifies land use locations and designations. Future land use designations will be implemented through zoning changes that regulate density, permitted land uses, and minimum site design requirements.

Conflicts with the Proposed Changes found in the Central Community Master Plan

The proposal is in conflict with these Central Community Master Plan policies:

RLU-1.1 Preserve low-density residential areas and keep them from being replaced by higher density residential and commercial uses.

RLU-2.0 Preserve and protect existing single- and multi-family residential dwellings within the Central Community through codes, regulations and design review.

The Master Plan also includes the following statements that are inconsistent with the proposed changes in zoning:

Higher density housing replacing characteristic lower density structures – The community does not support the demolition of lower-density residences in order to build multi-family structures. Residents prefer to protect the existing residential character and prevent the construction of multiple family dwellings in low density neighborhoods especially those exceeding 14 dwelling units per acre. (page 9)

East Central Community Small Area Master Plan (1993)

The East Central Community Small Area Master Plan came about in response to increased development pressures, both commercial and residential, in the 9th & 9th neighborhood during the early 1990's. This included an effort by the Smith's Food and Drug to expand their existing store in the area. A big focus of the Plan was traffic and safety in the area and concerns about the Smith's loading dock area that faces 900 S. Concerns about the loading dock related to aesthetics and safety concerns with the layout that allowed hidden activities to occur.

The Plan contains an Alternatives Evaluation with several scenarios on Land Use and Policy Options. Under the scenarios outlined in the Plan the Telegraph Building is discussed as "warehouse space" which was its function at the time as it was storage space for the LDS Church. One scenario included the building becoming a residential space with up to 10 dwelling units inside. Another saw the conversion of the building to office space.

It was noted that there were several options for the LDS Warehouse depending on market conditions, economic feasibility and zoning compliance. Among others, the preferred uses included multi-family residential uses.

Chase Avenue is discussed in the Plan with a recommendation that it be reduced in scale and serve as a driveway for the remaining houses.

Plan Salt Lake (2015)

The citywide master plan, Plan Salt Lake, emphasizes the need for a variety of housing options. This is expressed in the following Guiding Principle:

Access to a wide variety of housing types for all income levels throughout the city, providing the basic human need for safety and responding to changing demographics.

Almost half of the total housing units in Salt Lake City are single-family detached dwellings. While preserving the existing housing stock will continue to be priority for the City, over the next 25 years, it will be critical for us to encourage and support a diversity of new housing options and types with a range of densities throughout the City in order to best accommodate the changing population.

In recent years, we have seen a renewed interest in walkable neighborhoods, increased residential development downtown, and transit-oriented development. There is a growing demand for urban living, primarily driven by Baby Boomers and Millennials, paired with changing demographics on a national and local level that include an aging population, growing minority communities, and an increase in single-parent households and households without children. These changing households require changes to our housing policies and housing stock to provide choices on how best to meet their needs.

The following guiding principles and related initiatives under each guiding principle are relevant to this proposal:

- ***Growing responsibly while providing people with choices about where they live, how they live, and how they get around.***
 - *Locate new development in areas with existing infrastructure and amenities, such as transit and transportation corridors.*
 - *Promote infill and redevelopment of underutilized land.*
- ***Access to a wide variety of housing types for all income levels throughout the City, providing the basic human need for safety and responding to changing demographics.***
 - *Increase the number of medium density housing types and options.*
 - *Direct new growth toward areas with existing infrastructure and services that have the potential to be people oriented.*
 - *Enable moderate density increases within existing neighborhoods where appropriate.*
 - *Promote energy efficient housing and rehabilitation of existing housing stock.*
 - *Promote high density residential in areas served by transit.*
- ***Maintaining places that provide a foundation for the City to affirm our past.***
 - *Preserve and enhance neighborhood and district character.*
 - *Encourage the incorporation of historic elements into buildings, landscapes, public spaces, streetscapes, neighborhoods, and districts where appropriate.*
 - *Retain areas and structures of historic and architectural value.*
 - *Balance flexibility for change and growth.*

The proposed development is supported by the general principles and initiatives found in Plan Salt Lake. It would preserve an architecturally distinct and historically significant building while providing additional housing options within a walkable neighborhood with commercial services that is served by convenient transit opportunities.

Growing SLC: A Five Year Housing Plan – 2018-2022 (2017)

Additionally, the city's housing plan, Growing SLC, reinforces the growing demand for housing. The plan cites density limitations as a local barrier, which has been exacerbating the city's housing crisis. The following goal and objective are relevant to this proposal:

- *Increase housing options: Reform City practices to promote a responsive, affordable, high-opportunity housing market.*
 - *Review and modify land-use and zoning regulations to reflect the affordability needs of a growing, pioneering city.*
 - 1.1.1 *Develop flexible zoning tools and regulations, with a focus along significant transportation routes.*
 - 1.1.2 *Develop in-fill ordinances that promote a diverse housing stock, increase housing options, create redevelopment opportunities, and allow additional units within existing structures, while minimizing neighborhood impacts.*

The plan encourages an *enhanced flexibility of the land-use code* in order to increase a diversity of housing types. The plan also references the guiding policies and housing initiatives included in Plan Salt Lake as noted above. By reference, these policies are incorporated into the Housing Plan.

The proposal is in line with these strategies because it provides flexibility in existing code requirements while providing more housing units and housing variety in the neighborhood.

As noted in the information above, the Central Community Master Plan and other City plans and documents contains policies and statements that both support the proposed rezoning of the property and the overall Planned Development and statements that conflict with the proposed changes. The proposed changes must be weighed against the existing policies in terms of what is in the City's best interest and priorities.

Consideration 2: Rezoning of the Property from R-2 to RMF-45

Through the public outreach process, some objections have been raised about the request to change the zoning of the property at 833 S from R-2 to multi-family. Some of these comments have pointed out that the property was included in a general but deliberate downzoning of the area that started in 2012 and concluded in 2014. The history of that action is discussed in the Background History section of this report. Despite how relatively recently that action took place, the property owner has the right to request the zoning change and the current request to rezone the property must be evaluated on its own merits. Due consideration must be given to the proposed change in terms of how the proposal meets the City's master plans and policies and if the City's needs and priorities have (or have not) changed since that action took place. The City's goals and policies and the issues of preservation of the structure versus allowed development are discussed further within the Key Considerations section of this report.

Consideration 3: Central Community MP Future Land Use Map Amendments

The applicant is requesting to change the future land use map in the Central Community Master Plan from low-density residential to medium/high density residential. It should be noted that the future land use map applies that designation to both the property zoned RMF-45 and the property zoned R-2. The applicant notes in his narrative the following:

The need for this application stems from a conflict in the Masterplan adopted in 2005. The conflict in the master plan is due to the master plan land use language to be low density

throughout the neighborhood (10 - 20 units per acre), even on parcels zoned RMF-45 which is a moderate to high density multi-family residential zoning. Our application seeks simply to correct the noted Master plan conflict and utilize the density's associated with our current zoning.

Whether or not the proposal to rezone the property at 833 S along with the corresponding master plan amendment are approved or not, consideration should be given to amending the future land use map for the property at 847 South to accurately reflect the current RMF-45 zoning designation of the property.

Consideration 4: Preservation of the Structure vs. Allowed Development on the Subject Properties

As mentioned above, the Telegraph Exchange building is located on a property currently zoned RMF-45. While the building is iconic and considered a distinctive structure in the 9th and 9th area, the structure is not located within a local historic district nor is it a designated City Landmark site. As such, it does not have protection in terms of demolition of the structure and redevelopment of the property under the current zoning. A developer could demolish the structure and re-develop the property under the allowances of the RMF-45 zoning. Therefore, it is important to consider what could potentially be built on the subject properties by right when weighed against the goal of preserving the structure and what is being proposed in the overall project.

The Telegraph site is approximately 21,800 square feet (0.5 acres) in size. The RMF-45 zone requires 21,000 square feet for 15 units, plus 800 square feet for each additional dwelling unit up to 1 acre. Under the current zoning, the existing building could be demolished, and 16 units could be built on the property in a multi-family building configuration as a permitted use if all setbacks were met. The smaller property is zoned R-2 and is approximately 12,600 square feet (0.29 acres) in size. The zoning would support the demolition of the existing dwellings and building of two (2) units in twin home or two-family dwelling configuration as a permitted use if all setbacks were met. Under the current zoning, a total of eighteen (18) units could be built between the two subject properties in total.

The applicant is proposing a total of twenty-three (23) residential units on the combined properties under a single zoning designation of RMF-45. Six (6) residential lofts would be developed within the existing Telegraph Exchange Building. Seventeen (17) new 3-story townhouse units would also be added to the combined site.

According to the applicant, the cost of renovating the existing Telegraph Exchange building for an adaptive reuse to residential dwellings is prohibitively expensive in terms of seismic upgrades, fire access and safety considerations and meeting current building code standards. In starkest terms, it is often more cost effective for a developer to demolish an old building and build new than to restore and reuse a building. The applicant is seeking to off-set the cost of renovating the existing building by adding additional density to the site, a total of 5 residential units over what would be permitted under the current zoning.

While not a Landmark Site, the Telegraph Exchange Building is a building of historical significance in the 9th & 9th area in terms of the distinctive architecture, its history and role in the community, and its prominence based on the size of the building. The applicant has stated that "Restoration of the structure will it the crown jewel of 9th and 9th and a source of pride for the immediate 800 East community."

The applicant's proposal would preserve this iconic structure and adapt it for a residential use while at the same time providing additional housing in the area. In order to do so under the proposed layout,

the property at 833 S would need to be rezoned and consolidated into the project. Both the preservation of historic structures and the provision of additional housing are goals supported by City policies and plans. At the same time, some of the policies related to the preservation of existing neighborhoods would conflict with the site expansion onto the parcel that is currently zoned R-2.

Another consideration of preserving the building through an adaptive reuse versus demolition relates to the City's sustainability goals and preservation goals. The adaptive reuse of the building preserves its unique features and is reflective of period in which it was built and helps to "tell the story" of the City's development. Preservation and reuse of the building is in itself "sustainable and green" through the retention of embodied energy. *The concept of embodied energy—that is, all of the material and human energy consumed by the initial building process—is important to understand. When the embodied energy of an existing building is considered, demolition and reconstruction is almost never the most environmentally beneficial option.* Through a reuse, the energy that went into making the original building is not lost through the demolition and disposal of the materials that went into making it. The "embodied energy" is retained. The adaptive reuse of the building is supported by City sustainability goals.

Consideration 5: Zoning Modifications Requested through the Planned Development

The applicant is proposing a number of modifications through the Planned Development approval. Those modifications are outlined below in more detail below and shown on the annotated site plan included in Attachment C of this report as well as being mentioned in the applicant's narrative.

Note: The applicant's site plan did not provide a number or other designation for each building. The descriptions below are based on the approximate building positioning.

1. **Front yard setback** – the existing Telegraph Exchange building has a front yard setback of approximately 12-feet. The four (4) proposed units facing 800 E would have same setback. The required front yard setback is 25-feet. The 13-foot reduction is sought to match the existing Telegraph Exchange building.
2. **Interior side yard setbacks** – The RMF-45 zone requires an 8-foot interior side yard setback for multi-family dwellings. This would apply to the units that run east/west on both Chase and in the back (north-east corner). The applicant is proposing an interior side yard setback of 4-feet for these units.
3. **Rear yard setback** – The RMF-45 zone requires a setback of "twenty five percent (25%) of the lot depth but need not exceed thirty feet (230')." With a lot depth of approximately 225 feet, the required rear yard setback is 20 feet. The applicant is proposing a rear yard setback of 5-feet for the most eastern units that abut the Smith's grocery store property.
4. **Landscaping buffer on the interior side yard by units and carports** - Between properties in the CB zoning district and those in a residential district, a 7-foot wide landscape buffer is required in addition to an 8-foot interior side yard setback. By the 4 interior units that run east-west on the north-east corner of the site, the applicant is proposing the elimination of the landscape barrier in the proposed 4-foot interior side yard setback. Adjacent to the carport structures, the applicant is proposing elimination of the 1-foot setback from the property line for accessory structures and elimination of the required 7-foot landscape buffer.
5. **Landscape buffer along the north edge of the property** - Between the RMF-45 zone and R-2 zone (this is assuming the current R-2 parcel is successfully rezoned to RMF-45), a 10-foot landscape buffer is required between the proposed development and the single-family property immediately to the north. The applicant is proposing the

elimination of this landscaping buffer. A 20-foot wide driveway is proposed between the new townhomes and the property line. No landscape is proposed in this area.

The applicant's requested reductions and modifications through the Planned Development are based on the proposed site layout. This is partially driven by constraints on the site related to the historic establishment of the Telegraph Exchange building on the south part of the site immediately adjacent to Chase Avenue. Since the building footprint and location are established and the applicant's goal is to preserve the building and incorporate it into the design as an adaptive reuse, the flexibility to design the layout of the site as a "blank canvas" is more limited than if the building was being demolished.

The intent of the Planned Development process is to provide some design flexibility to the zoning standards in order to *encourage the efficient use of land and resources, promoting greater efficiency in public and utility services and encouraging innovation in the planning and building of all types of development*. The purpose of allowing such flexibility is to obtain a *more enhanced product than would be achievable through strict application of land use regulations, while enabling the development to be compatible with adjacent and nearby land developments*.

The reduced front yard setback proposed (**Item #1**) for the units along 800 E would promote harmony with the existing building and the building immediately to the south of Chase Avenue and help to maintain the harmony of the development pattern. At the same time, an argument could be made that setting the units farther back from the street than the Telegraph Exchange building and maintaining the required front-yard setback would help to maintain the prominence of the Telegraph building on the block and highlight it as the centerpiece of the project. This setback would also provide additional transitional space between the public sidewalk and the units on 800 E. This could be used to provide additional privacy or could accommodate individual porches, patios or garden space.

The proposed reduced rear and interior side yard setbacks (**Items #2 & #3**) abut the Smith's property. These abutments generally occur in the rear service areas of the Smith's grocery store. A reduction in the setbacks would not negatively impact the Smith's property but may lead to additional impacts to future residents of the Telegraph Exchange site, particularly in the units closest to this area. The existing brick wall separating the two should remain in place to mitigate these potential impacts. No additional mitigation measures are being recommended by staff.

The reduced landscaping buffers in the interior side yards by the units and carports (**Item #4**) are part of the Planned Development modifications requested. A 7-foot wide landscape buffer is required between properties in the CB zoning district and those in a residential district. The applicant is proposing the elimination of the landscape barrier in the proposed 4-foot interior side yard setback adjacent to the 4 interior units that run east-west on the north-east corner of the site. Adjacent to the carport structures, the applicant is proposing elimination of the 1-foot setback from the property line for accessory structures and elimination of the required 7-foot landscape buffer. As this would be the interface of the surface parking with the existing wall that surrounds the Smith's grocery store property, no additional impacts are anticipated though the elimination of this buffer.

The proposed elimination of the 10-foot landscaping buffer to the north between the proposed development and the single-family home immediately north (**Item #5**) must be considered in the context of neighborhood compatibility. The applicant is proposing the elimination of this landscaping buffer between the driveway and the single-family home to the north based on the establish location of the Telegraph Building on the site which is located approximately 20.5 feet from the property line. This driveway would also serve as fire department access to the development. The neighboring property owner has expressed a concern about the loss of privacy and traffic/noise impacts from site traffic being concentrated and directed to that portion of the site via the driveway. In addition, the

dumpsters and recycling containers have been placed at the property line where the most eastern part of the landscape buffer would be required. This would negatively impact the neighboring property and the expected privacy in the rear yard both through noise when the containers are serviced as well as the possibility of odors. The elimination of this proposed landscape barrier creates numerous concerns in terms of compatibility. This is discussed in more detail in Consideration 6 below.

Consideration 6: Impacts to Neighboring Properties and Compatibility

The proposed development includes a mix of historic and modern architecture. The Telegraph Exchange building represents the historic aspect of the project while the new townhome units would be modern in their architecture. This is shown in the renderings submitted by the applicant which can be found in [Attachment C](#) of this report.

The proposed development includes 46 onsite parking stalls for the proposed 23 units. This includes the two (2) parking spaces for each townhome unit that will be provided within individual garages and Twelve (12) covered surface parking stalls being provided for the 6 loft units contained within the Telegraph Building. An additional four (4) on-street parking stalls are located along the frontage of 800 E. The provision of 2 parking stalls per each dwelling unit meets the requirements of Chapter 21.44 in terms of required parking for the types of residential development being proposed.

Planning Staff received a public comment from the property owner to the north objecting to the placement of the driveway into and out of the site along the north perimeter of the site (assuming approval of the rezoning and the current configuration). The letter from Janelle Bauer on behalf of property owner Cody Derrick is included in [Attachment F](#) of this report. The property owner argues that the placement of the driveway along the north edge of the property adjacent to his property would create a negative impact in terms of noise and property enjoyment. This would be further exacerbated by the proposed elimination of the required 10-foot landscaping buffer between the Telegraph Exchange and this property. The elimination of this landscape barrier extends to the area where the trash and recycling enclosure would abut the adjacent property in the side of the rear yard. The applicant argues that the location of the Telegraph Building puts it approximately 20-feet from the property line and would provide better separation than the 10-foot landscaping buffer. The applicant further argues that in conjunction with an existing 8-foot tall side yard fence on the adjacent property that the 10-foot landscaping buffer is not needed. Note: The 8-foot side yard fence was permitted by Special Exception in 2018 under PLNPCM2018-00911 at the request of property owner Cody Derrick. Documents submitted to the City indicate the fence exception was requested in anticipation of future construction on the property at 833 S in conjunction with multi-family uses or amenities. The narrative submitted by Mark Haslam on behalf of the property owner indicated that it was their understanding that there would be landscaping installed on the south side of the fence on the 833 S property.

Several other comments were submitted in relation to the project expressing a concern about compatibility of the project with the neighborhood and in particular the rezoning of the R-2 parcel as part of the development. Comments received by staff are included in [Attachment F](#) of this report. Comments and concerns related to “spot zoning” of the parcel, the nullification of recent zone changes in the area that changed this parcel to R-2, the impact on the existing community fabric, preservation of neighborhood character, out of scale multi-family development, and the precedence this action would set were all concerns submitted by neighboring property owners. There were comments expressing concern about the amount of on-site parking being provided and that at 2 spaces per unit proposed, it would not be enough. They also expressed about the negative impacts of guest parking occurring on the street and the impacts of increased traffic within the surrounding neighborhood.

There were also positive comments received by staff in relation to the development and the preservation of the historic building while also providing additional housing options in the area.

In terms of potential negative impacts to neighboring properties, staff has concerns about elimination of this landscaping buffer in terms of potential impacts to the neighboring property owner to the north. While the placement of the Telegraph Building is set, a reduction in the size of some of the townhome units or a repositioning of the driveway could be considered in order to accommodate a landscaping buffer along the property edge in order to mitigate impacts between the proposed development and property to the north.

DISCUSSION:

If the applicant chose to, they could build an 18-unit development by-right on the subject properties. Medium/high density residential uses are already permitted on the subject property zoned RMF-45 and a multifamily development could be built by right. The R-2 zone would allow the existing houses on the property at 833 S to be demolished and replaced with a new single or two-family dwelling by right. This would be a one-to-one replacement if two units were built. Using the current allowances, the applicant could potentially build 18 units on the property by right if the existing building and houses were demolished *and would not require a planning process*. If the applicant chose to, a new multi-family development would be possible on the RMF-45 parcels by-right and would not be subject to design standards to ensure compatibility with the neighborhood.

The proposal expands the multi-family zoning onto a parcel currently zoned R-2 and increases the total density of the project by 5 units. At the same time, the project provides an avenue to preserve the iconic Telegraph Exchange Building and adapt it for a residential use while at the same time providing additional housing in the area. The goals and positives of preserving the historic building and approval of the overall development plan for the site must be weighed against the potential impacts on the surrounding neighborhood and the City's policies and goals articulated in its policies and plans.

Based on the Key Considerations, it is Staff's recommendation that the Planning commission forward a positive recommendation to City Council for approval of the zoning map amendment and master plan amendments. The applicant's argument that the preservation and adaptive reuse of the Telegraph Exchange structure and the proposed housing outweighs the possible negative impacts of the zoning changes. As such, staff is recommending a positive recommendation from the Planning Commission on both items.

In regard to the Planned Development, Planning Staff has reservations about the site layout, potential impacts on neighboring properties and how the proposal meets the standards of approval for a Planned Development. Planning Staff recommends the Planning Commission table a decision on the Planned Development in order to allow the applicant an opportunity to mitigate the potential impacts between the development and the existing neighborhood and to ensure that the proposal meets the standards of review for a Planned Development.

NEXT STEPS:

The Planning Commission may approve, approve with conditions, deny, or table the proposed Planned Development. The Planning Commission's recommendation for the proposed map and master plan amendments will be forwarded to the City Council for their consideration as part of the final decision on this proposal.


If all the requests are approved, the applicant will be able to proceed with the proposed development after meeting the conditions of approval and will be required to obtain all necessary permits.

If the amendments are denied, the subject property will maintain its R-2 zoning designation and could be developed accordingly. The RMF-45 property could also be developed independently under the allowances of the zoning in place. In that case, any approval of the Planned Development will become null and void.

If the Planned Development is denied and the amendments are approved, the proposed development may be altered to comply with the standards of the new zoning district.

If the Planned Development is tabled, the Planning Commission should provide direction to the applicant and Staff in terms of the site design and other elements that are suggested for modification to meet the Planned Development standards and to mitigate negative neighborhood impacts.

ATTACHMENT A: Vicinity/Zoning Map & Future Land Use Map





Future Land Use

- Low Density Residential (1-15 dwelling units/acre)
- Low Medium Density Residential (10-20 dwelling units/acre) *
- Medium Density Residential (15-30 dwelling units/acre) *
- Medium High Density Residential (30-50 dwelling units/acre)
- High Density Residential (50 or more dwelling units/acre)
- Low Residential/Mixed Use (5-10 dwelling units/acre)
- Medium Residential/Mixed Use (10-50 dwelling units/acre)
- Residential/Office Mixed Use (10-50 dwelling units/acre)
- High Mixed Use (50 or more dwelling units/acre)
- Neighborhood Commercial
- Community Commercial
- Central Business District
- Central Business District Support

- Regional Commercial/Industrial
- Low Density Transit Oriented Development (1-20 dwelling units/acre)
- Medium Density Transit Oriented Development (10-50 dwelling units/acre)
- High Density Transit Oriented Development (50 or more dwelling units/acre)
- Open Space
- Institutional
- Gateway Master Plan
- Non-conforming properties to be evaluated for appropriate land use designation. (Interim land use policy would be adjacent land use classifications)

*** NOTE:** The Low-Medium and Medium Density Land Use designations may include multiple zoning designations (e.g.; a single land use designation and map color may represent RMF-35 or SR-3 classifications)

ATTACHMENT B: Site Photographs & Existing Conditions



Telegraph Exchange Building viewed from NW



Building interface with Chase Avenue, a private street.



Front of building – looking north on 800 E



Looking south on 800 E – house at 833 S (R-2 property) shown



Chase Avenue at 800 E



End of Chase Avenue at Smith's Property – behind store



Back of Telegraph Building – houses on R-2 parcel visible



Development to the south of the subject property



Neighborhood development on the west side of 800 E



Single-family dwelling to the north - dark colored house in center



Telegraph Exchange building



Telegraph Exchange building

Existing Zoning and Land Uses in the Immediate Vicinity:

The subject properties located 833 South 800 East and 847 South 800 East in the R-2 (Single and Two-Family Residential) and RMF-45 (Moderate/High Density Multi-Family Residential) zoning districts respectively.

North: To the north of the subject properties are low scale residential structures. The zoning is R-2 which extends to the corner of 800 S.

South: To the south of the subject properties is a low-scaled commercial use and a church on properties zoned RMF-45. The RMF-45 zoning continues to 900 S.

East: To the east of the subject properties the zoning is CB – Community Business. The property to the east has been developed for a larger scale commercial use, the Smith’s grocery store. The rear of the subject properties backs the Smith’s property, mainly in the rear of the store where support functions such as the loading dock are located.

West: To the west of the subject properties are zoned R-2 and the development consists largely of small-scale residential structures. There is some small scaled multi-family “cottage court” development across from the end of Chase Avenue on property that is zoned RMF-35.

ATTACHMENT C: Applicant's Narrative, Plans, Project Renderings & Historical Phototographs

**RE: PLANNED DEVELOPMENT AMENDMENT
(UPDATED: 03-13-2020)**

PARCEL 16-08-176-015
847 South 800 East
Salt Lake City, UT 84102

PARCEL 16-08-176-026
833 South 800 East
Salt Lake City, UT 84102

The proposed project consists of consolidating two parcels, both owned by Micah Peters (Clearwater Homes): Parcel 16-08-176-015 located at 847 S 800 E is 0.50 Acres and Parcel 16-08-176-026 located at 833 S 800 E is 0.29 acres. The combined parcels will consist of 23 future residential units.

In addition to the adaptive re-use efforts to place 6 residential lofts in the existing historic building, the project will have 17 3-story modern townhomes tactically placed in a manner that activates and completes the 800 east and Chase avenue street fronts.

Total # of Units 23

The 23 units include:

- 6 unique loft floor plans in the Historic building
- 8 1,750 SF, 3 bed, 4 bath town home unit types
- 9 1,350 SF, 2 bed, 3 bath town home unit types

Parcel 16-08-176-015 located at 847 South 800 East has been an unimproved warehouse for over 20 years, however the building has historical significance. The added density as noted is essential to our efforts to preserve and restore the historic building. It goes without saying the adaptive reuse of the historic building costs 2.5 times more per square foot to complete compared to traditional new construction. As stated, the added density of 5 more residential units associated with our applications will afford us the economic capability to preserve the 16,000 square foot historic building. In the event we are not successful in gaining the added density, it may be necessary to demolish the historic building and simply use the existing density of 18 new structures (RMF-45 zone for 847 S allows for 16 units as survey of parcel is over 21,800 SF, and 833 S has 2 units available with current R-2 zone).

In order to restore/re-use the historic building and achieve the 23 total unit density on the site, SLC planning department has directed us to submit the following applications simultaneously with this Planned Development application.

- 1- Lot consolidation application.
- 2- Rezone application.
- 3- Master Plan Amendment application.

Lot consolidation application- This requirement is derived from the fact that the proposed project is comprised of 2 separate parcels. The consolidation of the two parcels will simplify the land plan and clarify setback requirements throughout the project. Additionally, buildings and utilities will not end up bridging or straddling lot lines.

Rezone Application- As noted above, the project consists of 2 parcels: 847 S 800 E is .50 Acres and currently zoned RM-45, while 833 S 800 E is .29 acres and currently zoned R-2. When we purchased the properties back in 2011, the 847 S 800 E has its current RM-45 zoning, and 833 S 800 E had a RM35 zoning. Utilizing the density afforded by both of the original zones would afford us the total 23 units we are currently requesting. Because 833 S 800E was rezoned to R-2 in 2013, we will be submitting a rezone request. While we are asking for a single zone for the consolidated lot of RM-45, (which would afford substantial density), we are capping the development density at the proposed 23 total units.

Master Plan Amendment- The need for this application stems from a conflict in the Masterplan adopted in 2005. The conflict in the master plan is due to the master plan land use language to be low density throughout the neighborhood (10 - 20 units per acre), even on parcels zoned RMF-45 which is a moderate to high density multi-family residential zoning. Our application seeks simply to correct the noted Master plan conflict and utilize the density's associated with our current zoning.

Planned Development.

Specific areas of application compliance with 2018 published Planned Development Objectives detailed in 21A.55.010
objectives: B, D, E

B. Historic Preservation: Preservation, restoration, or adaptive reuse of buildings or structures that contribute to the character of the City either architecturally and/or historically, and that contribute to the general welfare of the residents of the City.

Clearwater Homes has been through a rigorous design process focused on preserving the existing 3-story, unreinforced masonry, 16,000 square foot historic Telephone & Telegraph building. The said structure was built in 1911 by the Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Company and served as one of the first Utah operator stations for the new telephone technology.

The proposed project will carefully contrast historic reverence with modernism. Adaptive re-use and preservation construction methodology will be important and central to the project. In addition to typical adaptive reuse criteria such as structural/seismic, HVAC, electrical, and roofing, we also have special focus on: (a) the brick exterior massing of the Telegraph building will be tuckered, pointed, and sealed by a professional mason with historic restoration credentials, (b) the notable historic plaster mold cornice, soffit, and fascia located on the west facing 3 story roof transition will be preserved, sealed and painted, (c) historically appropriate high quality wood clad/steel divided light windows will be installed.

We have provided pictures (see exhibit A) of the original historic porch circa 1920. The LDS Church demolished this porch due to security problems in the 1980's. As part of our adaptive re-use efforts, we will reconstruct a precise replica of the original front porch. As the tallest building in the 9th & 9th neighborhood, the Telegraph building is visible on the skyline for several blocks. We firmly believe that restoration and preservation of this iconic building will secure an important and contributing asset to the fabric of the 9th and 9th community for generations.

D. Mobility: Enhances accessibility and mobility:

Improvements that encourage transportation options other than just the automobile.

The proposed Telegraph Exchange Lofts benefits from a location and land plan that encourages “walkability”, “Bike-ability”, and “skate-ability” (or pick your form of alternative transportation). As noted above, 46 onsite parking stalls will be EV stalls. Residents will be encouraged to use onsite bike racks, or extra garages space to safely store bikes. Pedestrians, riders, and skaters, can elect to walk north, south, east, or West to find restaurants, parks, entertainment, and shopping at their fingertips. Local (obvious) attractions include the Ninth & Ninth business district, Trolley Square, and Liberty Park.

E. Sustainability: Creation of a project that achieves exceptional performance with regards to resource consumption and impact on natural systems:

. Energy Use and Generation: Design of the building, its systems, and/or site that allow for a significant reduction in energy usage as compared with other buildings of similar type and/or the generation of energy from an on-site renewable resource.

Zero emissions residential community

Residential emissions accounts for 38% of all carbon dioxide contributions into the Wasatch Front local airshed. In addition to general climate change problems, local air quality is dramatically impacted by the widespread burning of natural gas as a residential furnace and hot water heating source. Clearwater Homes believes that development should not contribute to high frequency asthma for the developing lungs of Utah children. As such, the Telegraph Exchange lofts will work to eliminate residential gas meters by utilizing all electric furnaces and hot water heaters powered 100% by offsite renewable energy solar farms.

1A.55.050: STANDARDS FOR PLANNED DEVELOPMENTS:



The Planning Commission may approve, approve with conditions, or deny a planned development based upon written findings of fact according to each of the following standards. It is the responsibility of the applicant to provide written and graphic evidence demonstrating compliance with the following standards:

A. Planned Development Objectives: The planned development shall meet the purpose statement for a planned development (section 21A.55.010 of this chapter) and will achieve at least one of the objectives stated in said section. To determine if a planned development objective has been achieved, the applicant shall demonstrate that at least one of the strategies associated with the objective are included in the proposed planned development. The applicant shall also demonstrate why modifications to the zoning regulations are necessary to meet the purpose statement for a planned development.

The Planning Commission should consider the relationship between the proposed modifications to the zoning regulations and the purpose of a planned development, and determine if the project will result in a more enhanced product than would be achievable through strict application of the land use regulations. **Answer- As noted above, the project consists of 2 parcels: 847 S 800 E is .50 Acres and currently zoned RM-45, while 833 S 800 E is .29 acres and currently zoned R-2. When we purchased the properties back in 2011, the 847 S 800 E has its current RM-45 zoning, and 833 S 800 E had a RM35 zoning. Utilizing the density afforded by both of the original zones would afford us the total 23 units we are currently requesting. Because 833 S 800E was rezoned to R-2 in 2015, we will be submitting a rezone request. While we are asking for a single zone for the consolidated lot of RM-45, (which would afford substantial density), we are seeking an approval, capping the development density at the proposed 23 total units. The economics of the additional 5 units requested, will support the extensive costs associated with the adaptive reuse effort on the historic building. Thus, the thrust of our proposal is an economic request to assist in saving the historic building. Furthermore, the added density as noted is essential to our efforts to preserve and restore the historic building. It goes without saying the adaptive reuse of the historic building costs 2.5 times more per square foot to complete compared to traditional new construction. The added density of 5 more residential units associated with our applications will afford us the economic capability to preserve the 16,000 square foot historic building. In the event we are not successful in gaining the added density, it may be necessary to demolish the historic building and simply use the existing density of 18 new structures (RMF-45 zone for 847 S allows for 16 units as survey of parcel is over 21,800 SF, and 833 S has 2 units available with current R-2 zone). We firmly believe that approval of our proposal as stated will result in a substantially enhanced community and preservation of an iconic local treasure.**

B. Master Plan Compatibility: The proposed planned development is generally consistent with adopted policies set forth in the Citywide, community, and/or small area Master Plan that is applicable to the site where the planned development will be located.

Answer- See Master Plan Amendment language above

C. Design And Compatibility: The proposed planned development is compatible with the area the planned development will be located and is designed to achieve a more enhanced product than would be achievable through strict application of land use regulations. In determining design and compatibility, the Planning Commission should consider:

- . Whether the scale, mass, and intensity of the proposed planned development is compatible with the neighborhood where the planned development will be located and/or the policies stated in an applicable Master Plan related to building and site design; **Answer- The existing historic building is 58' tall and represent and iconic landmark**

in the neighborhood. Restoration of this structure will make it the crown jewel of 9th and 9th, and source of pride for the immediate 800 east community.

- . Whether the building orientation and building materials in the proposed planned development are compatible with the neighborhood where the planned development will be located and/or the policies stated in an applicable Master Plan related to building and site design;
- . Whether building setbacks along the perimeter of the development: **Answer- See setbacks identified on site plan and described in narrative below.**
- . Maintain the visual character of the neighborhood or the character described in the applicable Master Plan. **Yes, the project provides. See site plan and renderings. The project philosophy is “Historic reverence with modern contrast”. We believe this project will fit in nicely with the “Eclectic, Bohemian 9th and 9th character.**
- . Provide sufficient space for private amenities. **Yes, the project provides. See site plan and renderings.**
- . Provide sufficient open space buffering between the proposed development and neighboring properties to minimize impacts related to privacy and noise. **Answer-See setbacks noted on site plan and narrated below. Also note :20’4” setback to residential house located on the North side of the project. We wanted to be particularly sensitive to this neighborhood housing transition.**
- . Provide adequate sight lines to streets, driveways and sidewalks. **Yes, the project provides.**
- . Provide sufficient space for maintenance. **Yes, the project provides.**
- . Whether building facades offer ground floor transparency, access, and architectural detailing to facilitate pedestrian interest and interaction; **Answer- Yes, the front porches to all 800 east oriented Townhomes, as well as the existing historic building provide notable pedestrian interest. See attached renderings.**
- . Whether lighting is designed for safety and visual interest while minimizing impacts on surrounding property; **Answer-Lighting package and orientation will be sensitive to the residential neighborhood. Soft life LED bulbs and down light fixtures will be tactically used.**
- . Whether dumpsters, loading docks and/or service areas are appropriately screened; and

. Whether parking areas are appropriately buffered from adjacent uses. **Answer- Dumpster location, and 46 parking stalls provided are 100% screened from the street. 34 stalls will be in garage's, while the final 12 stalls are in the northeast corner (see site plan for reference)**

D. Landscaping: The proposed planned development preserves, maintains or provides native landscaping where appropriate. In determining the landscaping for the proposed planned development, the Planning Commission should consider:

. Whether mature native trees located along the periphery of the property and along the street are preserved and maintained; **Answer- All Mature street trees will be preserved with the exception of two. Two trees will to be removed due to fire department requirements, will be replanted in accordance with Salt Lake Urban forestry requirements.**

. Whether existing landscaping that provides additional buffering to the abutting properties is maintained and preserved; **NA**

. Whether proposed landscaping is designed to lessen potential impacts created by the proposed planned development; and

4. Whether proposed landscaping is appropriate for the scale of the development.

Answer- The project design, landscape architecture, and planting schedule has been thoughtfully curated by the LOCI design group. The site plan was designed to place front porches in the manner that activates the street frontages of 800 east and Chase avenue. In addition to numerous raised planter beds, hundreds of trees, perennial grasses & flowers, the project amenities include a 10'X60' lap pool and a heavily forested roof top deck. See attached landscape plan and water wise species/planting schedule.

The planting scheme will feature a variety of hardy native and/or climate adapted trees, shrubs, and grasses. Areas will be designed with a focus on minimizing water use, enhancing the urban forest, and creating comfortable use areas through shading and screening. Additionally, the design will draw inspiration from the natural conditions of the Valley and surrounding mountains. Trees will be small to medium varieties that strive to provide year-round interest while also meeting aforementioned design goals. Shrubs will be low to medium height and ideally provide year-round interest.

Potential Tree Varieties include Serviceberry, Tatarian Maple, and Paperbark Maple

Potential Shrub Varieties include Creeping Oregon Grape, Gro Low Sumac, St. John's Wort

Potential Grass Varieties include Feather Reed Grass, Fountain Grass.

E. Mobility: The proposed planned development supports Citywide transportation goals and promotes safe and efficient circulation within the site and surrounding neighborhood. In determining mobility, the Planning Commission should consider:

- . Whether drive access to local streets will negatively impact the safety, purpose and character of the street; **Answer-36 of our parking stalls will enter and discharge on a 20' drive aisle on 800 E, while 10 additional garage stalls will utilize Chase Avenue**
- . Whether the site design considers safe circulation for a range of transportation options including: **Answer- See locations and narrative for bike storage above in Objectives section D**
- . Safe and accommodating pedestrian environment and pedestrian oriented design; **Answer-Bikers and pedestrians have multiple paths to street and sidewalk that don't conflict with vehicle drive aisle.**
- . Bicycle facilities and connections where appropriate, and orientation to transit where available; and **Answer- See locations and narrative for bike storage above in Objectives section D**
- . Minimizing conflicts between different transportation modes; **Answer-Bikers and pedestrians have multiple paths to street and sidewalk that don't conflict with vehicle drive aisle.**

Whether the site design of the proposed development promotes or enables access to adjacent uses and amenities; **NA**

Whether the proposed design provides adequate emergency vehicle access; and

Answer-The Fire department has reviewed and approved the proposed plan

Whether loading access and service areas are adequate for the site and minimize impacts to the surrounding area and public rights-of-way.

Answer- The site and the land plan provide excess parking and adequate loading areas for residents.

F. Existing Site Features: The proposed planned development preserves natural and built features that significantly contribute to the character of the neighborhood and/or environment.

Answer- Please refer to our narrative above in section B of Objectives: Preservation of the historic building

G. Utilities: Existing and/or planned utilities will adequately serve the development and not have a detrimental effect on the surrounding area. (Ord. 8-18, 2018)

Answer- We have conducted 2 DRT meetings for this project with all related Salt Lake City departments in preparation for this project. Public utilities may require that we upsize a pressurized water line from 900 South to the frontage of the subject property. All other needed utilities and capacities are present in the street frontage.

As part of this Planned Unit development application, we are seeking approval for the following setbacks and conditions (the statements below assume our rezone application is approved) (see site plan attached):

West- setbacks -800 East

The West side of the existing historic building currently sits 11'9" back from the property line. To maintain an inline street front, we are proposing the 4 new townhome structures fronting 800 E maintain the same setback as the historic building. The stated orientation of the buildings is designed to activate the 800 east street front

East- Setbacks

East Section "A", This is clearly a rear lot line, but is defined by the code as an interior side yard with an 8' setback requirement and/or a 10' landscape buffer requirement, and a 1' accessory dwelling requirement. Our structures in **Section A- East** are setback 37'6" and thus far exceed the 8' setback requirement. We are requesting a waiver to 0' on the landscape buffer (existing Landscape buffer on adjacent property is approximately 18'), and a waiver of the 1' accessory dwelling setback to 0'. This side of the property is contiguous to the Smiths commercial parking lot. Section "B" east is defined by the RM-45 code as a rear lot line. **Section B-East** is proposed as 5' setback. The formula in the RM45 zone would require a 30' setback in this direction. We are requesting to waive the 30' setback requirement in exchange for the proposed 5' setback.

It is important to note that the entire east reach of the project backs the massive 2 plus acre Smiths commercial parking lot, and thus, the proposed, will not negatively impact any adjacent party. Additionally, the smiths parking lot already includes a landscape buffer of approximately 18'.

North- Setbacks

North section A-The RM-45 zone requires an 8' interior side yard setback or a 10' landscape buffer. This North side of the project represents the direct transition from

our development to a single-family residential zone. Buildings on this side of the property will have a 20'4" setback from the property line of the contiguous residential lot. We felt that providing the said 20'4" setback was a more respectful transition than a 10' landscape buffer. We will not need a setback waiver as we have substantially exceeded the requirement. We are requesting to waive the 10' landscape buffer requirement. It's also important to note that the homeowner to the north asked for our consent last year for a city height variance on his side yard fence. The request was granted, and the neighbor now has an 8' high quality custom fence on the property line.

North Section B- The RM45 zone requires an 8' setback in this location, and we are requesting to waive the 8' setback in exchange for our proposed 4' setback. We are also seeking a waiver of the landscape buffer requirement. As with the East setback, it is important to note that this North reach of the project backs the massive 2 plus acre Smiths commercial parking lot, and thus will not negatively impact any party. As stated, the Smiths parking lot already includes a landscape buffer of approximately 15' as well

South- Setbacks

Chase Avenue- The south side of the existing historic building currently sits on the property line, while the new structures fronting Chase Avenue (private street) will have a 4' setback from the right of way. The RM45 zone requires an 8' setback in this location, and we are requesting to waive the 8' setback in exchange for our proposed 4' setback. All Chase Avenue owners have formally consented to the proposed 4' setback and development plan. The Chase Avenue owner's consents have been executed and notarized.

Height

The historic building height is 58'. This height will be maintained as part of the roof top deck area and restoration of the building. All new residential structures on the site will be capped at 30' or less.

Fire Safety

We anticipate and have budgeted the installation of fire sprinklers for all interior space in the historic building and new residential structures.

Sincerely,
Micah Wells Peters
Clearwater Homes

RE: MASTER PLAN AMENDMENT

PARCEL 16-08-176-015
847 South 800 East
Salt Lake City, UT 84102

PARCEL 16-08-176-026
833 South 800 East
Salt Lake City, UT 84102

The proposed project consists of consolidating two parcels, both owned by Micah Peters (Clearwater Homes): Parcel 16-08-176-015 located at 847 S 800 E is 0.50 Acres and Parcel 16-08-176-026 located at 833 S 800 E is 0.29 acres. The combined parcels will consist of 23 future residential units.

Clearwater Homes has been through a rigorous design process focused on preserving the existing 3-story, unreinforced masonry, 16,000 square foot historic Telephone & Telegraph building. The said structure was built in 1911 by the Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Company and served as one of the first Utah operator stations for the new telephone technology. In addition to the adaptive re-use efforts to place 6 residential lofts in the existing historic building, the project will have 17 3-story modern townhomes tactically placed in a manner that activates and completes the 800 east and Chase avenue street fronts.

Total # of Units 23

The 23 units include:

- 6 unique loft floor plans in the Historic building
- 8 1,750 SF, 3 bed, 4 bath town home unit types
- 9 1,350 SF, 2 bed, 3 bath town home unit types

Parcel 16-08-176-015 located at 847 South 800 East has been an unimproved warehouse for over 20 years, however the building has some historical significance. The added density as noted is essential to our efforts to preserve and restore the historic building. It goes without saying the adaptive reuse of the historic building costs 2.5 times more per square foot to complete compared to traditional new construction. As stated, the added density of 5 residential units associated with our 4 applications will afford us the economic capability to preserve the 16,000 square foot historic building. In the event we are not successful in gaining the added density, it may be necessary to demolish the historic building and simply use the existing density of 18 new structures (RMF-45 zone for 847 S allows for 16 units as survey of parcel is over 21,800 SF, and 833 S has 2 units available with current R-2 zone).

In order to restore/re-use the historic building and achieve the 23 total unit density on the site, SLC planning department has directed us to submit the following applications simultaneously with this Planned Development application.

- 1- Lot consolidation application.
- 2- Rezone application.
- 3- Planned Development Amendment application.

Lot consolidation application- This requirement is derived from the fact that the proposed project is comprised of 2 separate parcels. The consolidation of the two parcels will simplify the land plan and



clarify setback requirements throughout the project. Additionally, buildings and utilities will not end up bridging or straddling lot lines.

Rezone Application-As noted above, the project consists of 2 parcels: 847 S 800 E is .50 Acres and currently zoned RM-45, while 833 S 800 E is .29 acres and currently zoned R-2. When we purchased the properties back in 2011, the 847 S 800 E has its current RM-45 zoning, and 833 S 800 E had a RM35 zoning. Utilizing the density afforded by both of the original zones would afford us the total 23 units we are currently requesting. Because 833 S 800E was rezoned to R-2 in 2013, we will be submitting a rezone request. While we are asking for a single zone for the consolidated lot of RM-45, (which would afford substantial density), we are capping the development density at the proposed 23 total units.

Planned Development. This application simply details the land plan for the development, setbacks on the newly consolidated lot, as well as establishing the 30' height on the new residential structures.

Master Plan Amendment- The need for this application stems from a conflict in the Masterplan adopted in 2005. The conflict in the master plan is due to the master plan land use language to be low density throughout the neighborhood (10 - 20 units per acre), even on parcels zoned RMF-45 which is a moderate to high density multi-family residential zoning. Our application seeks simply to correct the noted Master plan conflict and utilize the density's associated with our current zoning.

City Masterplan References;

- *Central Community Master Plan, adopted 11/01/2005*
- *East Central Community Small Area Master Plan, adopted 12/1992: revised 01/1993*
- *9 Line Corridor Master Plan, adopted 03/03/15*

Central Community MP Bullet Points in support of the MP change;

- Conflicts with Zoning Ordinance and Master Plan. The MP indicates the Land use to be Low Density Residential (10-20 units per acre). The current zone is RMF – 45 Moderate/High Multi-Family Residential (31 units possible total units if zoning change is approved)
- Application is proposing 23 units, max.
- Promoting "intent" of the MP through the following;
 1. Preservation of the community's architectural heritage
 2. Protect and improve the quality of life
 3. Improve and support community involvement
 4. Capital improvement in the neighborhood
 5. Provide smarter and more creative development practices
 6. Overall project is a low dense project below the zoned maximum
 7. Preserving the historic structure and maintaining the residential neighborhood integrity
 8. Promote walkable development
 9. The increase of density will support neighborhood business uses and expand their use of common public facilities.
 10. With future expansion of the 9-Line system the project will maintain the integrity of the transit-oriented opportunities
 11. Promote quality of excellence to maintain and enhance the quality of living
 12. Modern townhouses offer the neighborhood a variety of housing types



13. All parking is contained on site

East Central Comm. Small Area MP Bullet Points in support of the MP change;

- Promoting “intent” of the MP through the following;
 1. Maintains and preserve residential neighborhood integrity and a sense of security with additional eyes on the street
 2. Maintain and preserves a viable commercial business district within the neighborhood.
 3. All parking is contained on site.
 4. Chase Avenue is will be upgraded. The Avenue is a private street and will be developed & enhanced with a plan that facilitates parking and currently signed off and supported by all property owners.

9-Line Corridor MP Bullet Points in support of the MP change;

- Promoting “intent” of the MP through the following;
 1. Residential density to support the future extension of the 9-line

The submittal of the Master Plan Amendment benefits from the supporting summary of the Planned Development Application, therefore, the summary overlay is included below:

Zero emissions residential community

Residential emissions accounts for 38% of all carbon dioxide contributions into the Wasatch Front local airshed. In addition to general climate change problems, local air quality is dramatically impacted by the widespread burning of natural gas as a residential furnace and hot water heating source. Clearwater Homes believes that development should not contribute to high frequency asthma for the developing lungs of Utah children. As such, the Telegraph Exchange lofts will work to eliminate residential gas meters by utilizing all electric furnaces and hot water heaters powered 100% by offsite renewable energy solar farms. Additionally, we plan to have 100% of our 47 onsite parking stalls include EV stations for electric vehicles (this parking stall count does not include the 4 parallel street parking stalls on 800 E).

Planned Development Information. Description of how your project meets one or more of the following objectives

- A. Combination and coordination of architectural styles, building forms, building materials, and building relationships;**
- B. Preservation and enhancement of desirable site characteristics such as natural topography, vegetation and geologic features, and the prevention of soil erosion;**
- C. Preservation of buildings which are architecturally or historically significant or contribute to the character of the city;**
- D. Use of design, landscape, or architectural features to create a pleasing environment;**
- E. Inclusion of special development amenities that are in the interest of the general public;**



- F. Elimination of blighted structures or incompatible uses through redevelopment or rehabilitation;**
- G. Inclusion of affordable housing with market rate housing; or**
- H. Utilization of "green" building techniques in development**

The Telegraph Exchange Lofts will meet objectives a, c, d, & h above, per the following:

A. Combination and coordination of architectural styles, building forms, building materials, and building relationships; The proposed project will carefully contrast historic reverence with modernism. Massing and exterior materials will include restored historic brick, cementitious/fiber cement panels, lap siding, smooth finished EIFS material, and architectural metals.

C. Preservation of buildings which are architecturally or historically significant or contribute to the character of the city; The proposed project will carefully contrast historic reverence with modernism. Adaptive re-use and preservation construction methodology will be important and central to the project. As noted above, the site houses a 1911, 3 story, 16,000 SF, historic building originally known as the Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph building. The brick exterior massing of the Telegraph building will be tucked, pointed, and sealed by a professional mason with historic restoration credentials. The notable plaster mold cornice, soffit, and fascia located on the west facing 3 story roof transition will be preserved, sealed and painted. High quality wood clad/steel divided light windows that meet the demands for historic tax credits will be installed.

We have provided pictures (see exhibit A) of the original historic porch circa 1920. The LDS Church demolished this porch due to security problems in the 1980's. As part of our adaptive re-use efforts, we will reconstruct a precise replica of the original front porch. As the tallest building in the 9th & 9th neighborhood, the Telegraph building is visible on the skyline for several blocks. We firmly believe that restoration and preservation of this iconic building will secure an important and contributing asset to the fabric of the 9th and 9th community for generations.

D. Use of design, landscape, or architectural features to create a pleasing environment; The project design, landscape architecture, and planting schedule has been thoughtfully curated by the LOCI design group. The site plan was designed to place front porches in the manner that activates the street frontages of 800 east and Chase avenue. In addition to numerous raised planter beds, hundreds of trees, perennial grasses & flowers, the project amenities include a 10'X60' lap pool and a heavily forested roof top deck. See attached landscape plan and water wise species/planting schedule.

The planting scheme will feature a variety of hardy native and/or climate adapted trees, shrubs, and grasses. Areas will be designed with a focus on minimizing water use, enhancing the urban forest, and creating comfortable use areas through shading and screening. Additionally, the design will draw inspiration from the natural conditions of the Valley and surrounding mountains. Trees will be small to medium varieties that strive to



provide year-round interest while also meeting aforementioned design goals. Shrubs will be low to medium height and ideally provide year-round interest.

Potential Tree Varieties include Serviceberry, Tatarian Maple, and Paperbark Maple

Potential Shrub Varieties include Creeping Oregon Grape, Gro Low Sumac, St. John's Wort

Potential Grass Varieties include Feather Reed Grass, Fountain Grass.

H. Utilization of "green" building techniques in development. The Telegraph Exchange Loft project falls within Clearwater Homes new "Subculture Loft" series. This represents a philosophy of Green Building and zero emissions residential construction. As such, all residences will be constructed with highly efficient electric furnaces and water heaters. With the absence of gas meters, the project will not contribute emissions to the local air shed. It is commonly known that residential natural gas comprises make significant contributions to pollution that negatively impact the air quality on the WASTACH FRONT. In addition to the "Zero Emissions "strategy, we will employ a number of other green building techniques and sustainable material applications.

As part of this Planned Unit development application, we have designed the land plan and are seeking approval for the following setbacks (see site plan attached):

West-800 East

The West side of the existing historic building currently sits 11'9"" back from the property line. To maintain an inline street front, we are proposing the 4 new townhome structures fronting 800 E maintain the same setback as the historic building.

East

This side of the property is contiguous to the Smiths commercial parking lot. Our new structures will be located at a section A-37'6", and Section B-5' setback from the property line.

North

Building on this side of the property will have a 20'4" setback from the property line of the contiguous residential lot. Landscape buffer between RMF-45 and R-2 will be completed on R-2 property. An agreement has been made between parties.

South

Chase Avenue- The south side of the existing historic building currently sits on the property line, while the new structures fronting Chase Avenue (private street) will have a 4' setback from the right of way. All Chase avenue owners have formally consented to the setback and development plan. The consents have been documented and notarized.

Height



The historic building height is 58'. This height will be maintained as part of the roof top deck area and restoration of the building. All new residential structures on the site will be capped at 30' or less.

Fire Safety

We anticipate and have budgeted the installation of fire sprinklers for all interior space in the historic building and new residential structures.

Additional purpose and Objective Bullet Points

- Encouraging efficient use of land and resources
- Encouraging innovative planning and development
- Reinforcing the character of the surrounding neighborhood
- Development will result in a more enhanced product than would be achievable through strict application of land use regulations through the Historic Preservation of the Telegraph Exchange building. The Telegraph Exchange building is a large contributor to the character of shaping the city and contributing to the general welfare of the city's residents.
- The development will be another contributor to the future extension of the 9-Line Corridor with the addition of residences to the area.

Sincerely,
Micah Wells Peters
Clearwater Homes

HISTORICAL TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE IMAGES



KEY

- PROPERTY LINE
- 3 STORY TOWNHOMES - 17 UNITS
- HISTORIC TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE BUILDING - 6 UNITS
- TOWNHOME GARAGE ENTRY
- SETBACKS

*FOR DETAILED SITE NOTES SEE "REFERENCE NOTES"

PROJECT SUMMARY


Unit Calculation: 17 Townhome Units
+ 4 Loft Units
= 23 Units total

Building Height: Historic Building: 58'-0"
Townhome Units: 30'-0"

Parking Calculation: Historic Building: 12 Stalls
Townhomes: 34 Stalls
= 46 Stalls

Extra Street Parking: 4 Stalls

(each townhome unit has a 2 car garage)
(all stalls provided with electric vehicle hook-up)
(Telegraph Exchange exceeds its parking requirements by 4 parking stalls)



A6 SITE PLAN
AS1-01 SCALE: 1/16" = 1'-0"



REFERENCE NOTES

- EXISTING FIRE HYDRANT
- EXISTING POWER POLE
- EXISTING LANDSCAPE
- EXISTING SIDEWALK
- EXISTING CURB
- NEW 6" CURB PER S.L.C. TRANSPORTATION STANDARD
- NOT USED
- NEW APPROACH TO TOWNHOUSE ENTRY
- NEW DRIVE AISLE ENTRY GATE
- NEW DRIVE AISLE
- NEW LANDSCAPE
- TRASH AND RECYCLE ENCLOSURE
- NEW 90 DEGREE PARKING AS PER S.L.C. DIVISION OF
TRANSPORTATION STANDARD, 12 PARKING SPOTS TOTAL
- CARPORIT OVERHANG
- CARPORIT SUPPORT COLUMN BELOW
- SHIPPING CONTAINER, RESTROOM AND KITCHEN
- NEW FIREPLACE
- NEW IN-GROUND POOL & HOT TUB
- NEW STAIRS TO ENTER BUILDING
- NEW SECURITY ENCLOSURE AND GATE
- NEW LIGHTING FOR IMPROVED SECURITY
- NEW LIGHT WELL
- TRAFFIC CALMING LANDSCAPE BULB-OUT AROUND
EXISTING POWER POLES
- EXISTING FIRE TRUCK CRASH GATE
- EXISTING BRICK WALL TO REMAIN
- PATH FOR BUILDING EXITING
- NEW SIDEWALK

STAMP

SITE PLAN
SCALE: 1/16" = 1'-0"

CITY APPLICATIONS

TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE
847 SOUTH 800 EAST
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84102

255 WEST 700 SOUTH SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84101
TELEPHONE 801.354.5151
ARCHITECTURE INTERIOR DESIGN

MJSA


REMARKS

THESE DRAWINGS ARE
INSTRUMENTS OF
SERVICE AND SHALL
REMAIN THE PROPERTY
OF THE ARCHITECT. NO
USE OR REUSE OF THESE
DOCUMENTS SHALL BE
PERMITTED UNLESS
APPROVED IN WRITING
BY MJSA ARCHITECTS
WITH APPROPRIATE
COMPENSATION.

PROJECT NO:
16033A

DATE:
OCT. 2019

SHEET:
AS1-01



TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE LOFTS



TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE LOFTS

VIEW A



TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE LOFTS
VIEW B



TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE LOFTS
VIEW C



TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE LOFTS

VIEW D



TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE LOFTS

VIEW E



TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE LOFTS

VIEW F



TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE LOFTS

VIEW G



TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE LOFTS

AERIAL VIEW



TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE LOFTS

VIEW H



TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE LOFTS

AERIAL VIEW



TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE LOFTS

VIEW I

TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE

LOFTS & TOWNHOMES

847 SOUTH 800 EAST SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84102

PROJECT
LOCATION



VICINITY MAP



SHEET INDEX

SHEET	DESCRIPTION	ADDITIONAL PROJECT DRAWINGS - LOFTS (HISTORIC BUILDING)	ADDITIONAL PROJECT DRAWINGS - LOFTS (HISTORIC BUILDING)	ADDITIONAL PROJECT DRAWINGS - HISTORIC BUILDING
GENERAL				
• AG0-00	COVER PAGE	• AD1-00 SITE DEMO PLAN	• AE4-41 UNIT 4 ENLARGED FLOOR PLAN & INTERIOR ELEVATIONS	• AE1-01 TOWNHOMES GARAGE LEVEL FLOOR PLANS
• AG0-01	ZONING CODE INFORMATION	• AD1-01 BASEMENT DEMOLITION PLAN	• AE4-42 UNIT 4 INTERIOR ELEVATIONS	• AE1-01 TOWNHOMES GARAGE LEVEL FLOOR PLANS
SITE		• AD1-02 1ST FLOOR DEMOLITION PLAN	• AE4-43 UNIT 4 INTERIOR ELEVATIONS	• AE1-02 TOWNHOMES GARAGE LEVEL UNIT FLOOR PLANS
• AS1-01	SITE PLAN	• AD1-03 2ND FLOOR DEMOLITION PLAN	• AE4-44 UNIT 4 INTERIOR ELEVATIONS	• AE1-03 TOWNHOMES 20' WIDE UNIT UPPER FLOOR PLANS
• AS1-02	ROOF PLAN	• AD1-04 3RD FLOOR DEMOLITION PLAN	• AE4-45 UNIT 4 INTERIOR ELEVATIONS	• AE1-04 TOWNHOMES 16' WIDE UNIT UPPER FLOOR PLANS
• AS2-01	RENDERINGS	• AE1-01 BASEMENT PROPOSED PLAN	• AE4-46 UNIT 5 INTERIOR ELEVATIONS	• AE4-01 TOWNHOMES 20' WIDE UNIT INTERIOR ELEVATIONS
• AS2-02	RENDERINGS	• AE1-02 1ST FLOOR PROPOSED PLAN	• AE4-47 UNIT 5 INTERIOR ELEVATIONS	• AE4-02 TOWNHOMES 20' WIDE UNIT INTERIOR ELEVATIONS
• LS-1	LANDSCAPE PLAN	• AE1-03 2ND FLOOR PROPOSED PLAN	• AE4-48 UNIT 5 INTERIOR ELEVATIONS	• AE4-03 TOWNHOMES 16' WIDE UNIT INTERIOR ELEVATIONS
• LS-2	PLANTING NARRATIVE	• AE1-04 3RD FLOOR PROPOSED PLAN	• AE4-49 UNIT 6 INTERIOR ELEVATIONS	• AE4-04 TOWNHOMES 16' WIDE UNIT INTERIOR ELEVATIONS
LOFTS (HISTORIC BUILDING)		• AE4-11 UNIT 1 ENLARGED FLOOR PLANS & INTERIOR ELEVATIONS	• AE4-50 WINDOW SCHEDULE & FINISH SCHEDULE	• AE4-06 TOWNHOMES SCHEDULES
• AE2-01	WEST EXTERIOR ELEVATION	• AE4-12 UNIT 1 INTERIOR ELEVATIONS	• AE4-51 DOOR SCHEDULE	• AE5-01 TOWNHOMES SCHEDULES
• AE2-02	SOUTH EXTERIOR ELEVATION	• AE4-13 UNIT 1 INTERIOR ELEVATIONS	• AE4-52 WINDOW SCHEDULE	• AE5-02 TOWNHOMES SCHEDULES
• AE2-03	EAST EXTERIOR ELEVATION	• AE4-14 UNIT 1 INTERIOR ELEVATIONS	• AE4-53 UNIT 6 INTERIOR ELEVATIONS	
• AE2-04	NORTH EXTERIOR ELEVATION	• AE4-21 UNIT 2 ENLARGED FLOOR PLANS & INTERIOR ELEVATIONS	• AE4-54 UNIT 6 INTERIOR ELEVATIONS	
• AE3-01	NORTH-SOUTH BUILDING SECTION	• AE4-22 UNIT 2 INTERIOR ELEVATIONS	• AE4-55 UNIT 6 INTERIOR ELEVATIONS	
TOWNHOMES		• AE4-23 UNIT 2 INTERIOR ELEVATIONS	• AE4-56 UNIT 6 INTERIOR ELEVATIONS	
• AE2-01	20' WIDE UNITS ELEVATIONS	• AE4-24 UNIT 2 INTERIOR ELEVATIONS	• AE4-57 UNIT 6 INTERIOR ELEVATIONS	
• AE2-02	16' WIDE UNITS ELEVATIONS	• AE4-31 UNIT 3 ENLARGED FLOOR PLANS & INTERIOR ELEVATIONS	• AE4-58 UNIT 6 INTERIOR ELEVATIONS	
• AE3-01	20' WIDE UNITS SECTIONS	• AE4-32 UNIT 3 INTERIOR ELEVATIONS	• AE4-59 UNIT 6 INTERIOR ELEVATIONS	
• AE3-02	16' WIDE UNITS SECTIONS	• AE4-33 UNIT 3 INTERIOR ELEVATIONS	• AE4-60 UNIT 6 INTERIOR ELEVATIONS	
		• AE4-34 UNIT 3 INTERIOR ELEVATIONS	• AE4-61 UNIT 6 INTERIOR ELEVATIONS	

CITY APPLICATIONS

TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE
847 SOUTH 800 EAST
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84102

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY
ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION
ARCHITECTURE - INTERIOR DESIGN

MJSA

REVISION:

THESE DRAWINGS ARE
INSTRUMENTS OF
SERVICE AND SHALL
REMAIN THE PROPERTY
OF THE ARCHITECT. NO
USE OR REUSE OF THESE
DRAWINGS SHALL BE
PERMITTED WITHOUT
THE WRITTEN CONSENT
OF MJSA ARCHITECTS
WITH APPROPRIATE
COMPENSATION.

PROJECT NO:


16033

DATE:

OCT 2019

DATE:

AG0-00




ZONING KEY MAP

YARD DESIGNATION	SETBACK FROM PROPERTY LINE
1. FRONT YARD	11'-10", in line with historic building
2. CORNER SIDE YARD	0'-0"
3. INTERIOR SIDE YARD A	20'-0" from nearest building, 0'-0" with trash enclosure in NE corner
4. INTERIOR SIDE YARD B	4'-0" or building foundation, 0'-0" with building overhang
5. REAR YARD A	41'-5" from nearest building, 0'-0" with carport
6. REAR YARD B	5'-0"

ZONING CODE ANALYSIS

Analysis based on combining an R-2 lot with an RMF-4S lot & rezoning the R-2 lot to RMF-4S				
Zoning District:	RMF-4S			
Minimum Lot Area & Width:	Multi family dwelling (15+) 21,000 sqft + 800 sqft for each additional unit up to 1 acre Actual Lot Area: 34,111,783 acre			
Minimum Lot Width:	80'-0"			
Actual Lot Width:	181'-7"			
Allowable Units Calculation:	34,111-21,000 = 13,111/800 = 16 15+16 = 31 UNITS ALLOWED 23 UNITS PROVIDED			
Maximum Bldg. Height:	45'-0" (Existing historic building exceeds 45'-0")			
Building Height Provided:	Historic Building: 50'-0" Townhome Units: 30'-0"			
Minimum Yard Req:	Front	Corner S.Y.	Interior S.Y.	Rear Yard
Setbacks:				
Required Setbacks:	No greater than ext. yard for bldg, built before 1995	20'-0"	8'-0"	25% of lot depth, not to exceed 30'
Provided Setbacks:	In-line with historic bldg.	See Zoning Key Map	See Zoning Key Map	See Zoning Key Map
Parking Restrictions in Yard:	Not Permitted(NP)	NP	NP within 10' if abutting res. zone	NP within 10' if abutting res. zone
Provided:	None	None	None	Abutting a commercial zone
Req. Landscape Yards:	The front yard & corner side yard will be maintained as landscaped			
Maximum Bldg. Coverage:	The surface coverage of all principal & accessory buildings shall not exceed 60% of the lot area			
Required:	13,941 sqft/34,111 = 41% Lot Coverage			
Provided:				
Landscape Buffers:	Landscape buffer between RMF-4S and R-2 will be completed on R-2 property. An agreement has been made between parties.			
Parking Requirements:	Historic Buildings: 1 stall for 1 bedroom, 2 stalls for 2 or more bedrooms Townhomes: 2 stalls per unit*			
Parking Provided:	Historic Building: 4 total units, 13 stalls provided onsite, 4 additional street parking stalls provided for guests Townhomes: 2 garage spaces provided per unit.			



- ## REFERENCE NOTES
1. EXISTING FIRE HYDRANT
 2. EXISTING POWER POLE
 3. EXISTING LANDSCAPE
 4. EXISTING SIDEWALK
 5. EXISTING CURB
 6. NEW 4' CURB PER S.L.C. TRANSPORTATION STANDARD
 7. FIRE TRUCK ACCESS
 8. NEW APPROACH TO TOWNHOUSE ENTRY
 9. NEW DRIVE ASLE ENTRY GATE
 10. NEW DRIVE ASLE
 11. NEW LANDSCAPE
 12. TRASH AND RECYCLE ENCLOSURE
 13. NEW 30 DEGREE PARKING AS PER S.L.C. DIVISION OF TRANSPORTATION STANDARD, 12 PARKING SPOTS TOTAL.
 14. CARPORT OVERHANG
 15. CARPORT SUPPORT COLUMN BELOW
 16. SHIPMENT CONTAINER, RESTROOM AND KITCHEN
 17. NEW FIREALACE
 18. NEW IN-GROUND POOL & HOT TUB
 19. NEW STAIRS TO ENTER BUILDING
 20. NEW SECURITY ENCLOSURE AND GATE
 21. NEW LIGHTING FOR IMPROVED SECURITY
 22. NEW LIGHT WELL
 23. TRAFFIC CALMING LANDSCAPE BULB-OUT AROUND EXISTING POWER POLES
 24. EXISTING FIRE TRUCK CRASH GATE
 25. EXISTING DRIVEWAY TO REMAIN
 26. PATH FOR BUILDINGS EXITING
 27. NEW SIDEWALK

CITY APPLICATIONS

TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE
847 SOUTH 800 EAST
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84102

1008 WEST 700 SOUTH SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84101
TEL PH OM 801.364.4141

ARCHITECTURE □ INTERIOR DESIGN

MJSA

REVISIONS:

THESE DRAWINGS AND INSTRUMENTS OF SERVICE AND SHALL REMAIN THE PROPERTY OF THE ARCHITECT. NO USE OR REUSE OF THE DOCUMENTS SHALL BE PERMITTED UNLESS AUTHORIZED IN WRITING BY MASA ARCHITECT WITH APPROPRIATE COMPENSATION.



PROJECT NO.: 16033A

DATE:
OCT. 2019

AS1-01

STAMP

SITE PLAN
SCALE: 1/16" = 1'-0"



REFERENCE NOTES

CITY APPLICATIONS

TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE
847 SOUTH 800 EAST
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84102

6868 WEST 760 NORTH SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111
 TEL 801 332 4111
 ARCHITECTURE □ INTERIOR DESIGN

MISA

157

16033A

DATE: _____


OCT. 2019

DEF:






AS2-02

STAMP

RENDERINGS
SCALE: NTS



CONCEPT_PLANT_SCHEDULE

	DECIDUOUS TREE	21
	SCREEN TREE	10
	SHRUB	2,737 sf
	ORNAMENTAL GRASS	628 sf
	TURF	4,149 sf

PROJECT NAME:
Telegraph Exchange
 847 South 800 East
 Salt Lake City, Utah 84102

loci

801.506.0390
 www.loci-llc.com
 698 East 2nd Avenue Building D
 Bldg. UT 58102

Principal: T. Budge
 Project Manager: A. Proctor
 Design By: A. Proctor
 D. Ouellet

Job No.
 Creation Date
 Plot Date: Oct 10, 2019

DESIGN
 DEVELOPMENT

**PLANTING
 PLAN**
L5-1

03/10/2019 10:42:00 AM
 C:\Users\T.Budge\OneDrive\Documents\Telegraph Exchange\Telegraph Exchange.dwg
 T. Budge

TREES



Sanicberry 'Autumn Brilliance' -
Amelanchier x grandiflora 'Autumn Brilliance'

Height: 10'-25'
Width: 10'-25'
Sun: Full Sun to Full Shade
Water: Medium
Zones: 4 to 9
Spring Color: White
Autumn Leaf Color: Bright Orange



HOT WINGS Tatarian Maple -
Acer tataricum 'Tataric'

Height: 15'-18'
Width: 15'-18'
Sun: Full Sun to Part Shade
Water: Medium to Dry
Zones: 4 to 10
Spring Color: Red Samaras
Autumn Leaf Color: Yellow to Red



Paperbark Maple -
Acer glabrum

Height: 10'-25'
Width: 10'-25'
Sun: Part Shade to Full Shade
Water: Medium
Zones: 5 to 9
Spring Color: White or Pink
Autumn Leaf Color: Bright Orange/Red

loci

GRASSES



Feather Reed Grass -
Calamagrostis x acutiflora 'Karl Foerster'

Height: 3'-5'
Width: 1.5'-2.5'
Sun: Full Sun
Water: Medium
Zones: 5 to 9
Spring Color: Green
Autumn Leaf Color: Yellow Seed Head



Fountain Grass -
Pennisetum alopecuroides 'Yamori'

Height: 2.5'-5'
Width: 2.5'-5'
Sun: Full Sun to Part Shade
Water: Medium
Zones: 6 to 9
Spring Color: Green
Autumn Leaf Color: Yellow

loci

SHRUBS



Creeping Oregon Grape -
Mahonia repens

Height: 2'
Width: 6'
Sun: Part to Full Shade
Water: Medium
Zones: 4 to 9
Spring Color: White
Autumn Leaf Color: Bright Orange



Gro Low Sumac -
Rhus aromatica 'Gro-Low'

Height: 1.5'-2'
Width: 6'-8'
Sun: Full Sun to Part Shade
Water: Dry to Medium
Zones: 3 to 9
Spring Color: Small Yellow Flowers
Autumn Leaf Color: Red



St. John's Wort -
Hypericum perforatum

Height: 1'-1.5'
Width: 1.5'-2'
Sun: Full Sun to Part Shade
Water: Medium
Zones: 5 to 9
Spring Color: Yellow Flowers
Autumn Leaf Color: Insignificant

loci

PLANTING NARRATIVE

Telegraph Exchange Planting Narrative

The planting scheme will feature a variety of hardy native or climate adapted trees, shrubs, and grasses. Areas will be designed with a focus on minimizing water use, enhancing the urban forest, and creating comfortable use areas through shading and screening. Additionally, the design will draw inspiration from the natural conditions of the Valley and surrounding mountains. Trees will be small to medium varieties that strive to provide year-round interest while also meeting aforementioned design goals. Shrubs will be low to medium height and ideally provide year-round interest. The following list is a sample of plants indicative of those that will be used on the project. It is not a comprehensive plant list and is for illustrative purposes only.

Potential Tree Varieties


- Sanicberry (*Amelanchier x grandiflora 'Autumn Brilliance'*)
- Tatarian Maple (*Acer tataricum 'Tataric'*)
- Paperbark Maple (*Acer glabrum*)

Potential Shrub Varieties

- Creeping Oregon Grape (*Mahonia repens*)
- Gro Low Sumac (*Rhus aromatica 'Gro-Low'*)
- St. John's Wort (*Hypericum perforatum*)

Potential Grass Varieties

- Feather Reed Grass (*Calamagrostis x acutiflora 'Karl Foerster'*)
- Fountain Grass (*Pennisetum alopecuroides 'Yamori'*)



B3 WEST EXTERIOR ELEVATION
AE2-01 SCALE: 3/16"=1'-0"

- ## REFERENCE NOTES

1. EXISTING BRICK
2. EXISTING MOLDING, TO BE REPAIRED AS NEEDED
3. EXISTING WINDOW OPENING, WITH NEW SIMULATED DIVIDED LITE WINDOW
5. ELEVATOR SHAFT
6. ARCHITECTURAL METAL PANEL
7. NEW STEEL EGRESS STAIRS
8. EGRESS WINDOWS & LIGHT WELL TO BE REBUILT
9. STAIRS TO BE REBUILT TO MIMIC ORIGINAL ENTRY FROM HISTORIC PHOTOS

CITY APPLICATIONS

TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE
847 SOUTH 800 EAST
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84102

1000 WEST 700 SOUTH SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84101
TELEPHONE 801.344.5141

ARCHITECTURE □ INTERIOR DESIGN

MISA

STAMP

1850


THESE DRAWINGS AND INSTRUMENTS OF SERVICE AND SHALL REMAIN THE PROPERTY OF THE ARCHITECT. NO USE OR RE-USE OF THESE DOCUMENTS SHALL BE PERMITTED UNLESS AUTHORIZED IN WRITING BY MUSA ARCHITECTS WITH A APPROPRIATE COMPENSATION.

DATE:
OCT. 2019

AE2-01

WEST EXTERIOR ELEVATION
SCALE: 3/16" = 1'-0"

10/1/2019 10:00 AM - A & B Engineering - Building/CAD/Interior - CITY APPLICABLE - 10/1/2019 - 10/1/2019



B1
AE2-02
SOUTH EXTERIOR ELEVATION
SCALE: 3/16"=1'-0"

REFERENCE NOTES

1. EXISTING BRICK
2. EXISTING MOLDING, TO BE REPAIRED AS NEEDED
3. EXISTING WINDOW OPENING, WITH NEW SIMULATED DIVIDED LITE WINDOW
4. ELEVATOR SHAFT
5. ARCHITECTURAL METAL PANEL
6. NEW STEEL EGRESS STAIRS
7. EGRESS WINDOWS & LIGHT WELL TO BE REBUILT
8. NEW SIMULATED DIVIDED LITE DOOR WITH TRANSOM
9. STEEL BALCONY
10. GLASS RAILING SYSTEM
11. EXISTING EGRESS STAIR REBUILT & EXTENDED TO ROOFTOP
12. NEW GLASS & STEEL BALCONY
13. EXISTING ROOFTOP PENTHOUSE
14. NEW MULTI SLIDE DOOR WITH TRANSOM

STAMP

SOUTH EXTERIOR ELEVATION
SCALE: 3/16"=1'-0"

CITY APPLICATIONS

TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE
847 SOUTH 800 EAST
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84102

MJSA
ARCHITECTURE - INTERIOR DESIGN

MJSA


REVISION:

THIS DRAWING IS THE PROPERTY OF MJSA ARCHITECTURE AND SHALL REMAIN THE PROPERTY OF MJSA ARCHITECTURE. NO USE OR REUSE OF THIS DOCUMENT SHALL BE PERMITTED WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF MJSA ARCHITECTURE.

PROJECT NO.:
16033A

DATE:
OCT. 2019

BY:
AE2-02



B3
AE2-09
EAST EXTERIOR ELEVATION
SCALE: 3/16"=1'-0"

REFERENCE NOTES

1. EXISTING BRICK
2. EXISTING MOLDING, TO BE REPAIRED AS NEEDED
3. EXISTING WINDOW OPENING, WITH NEW SIMULATED DIVIDED LITE WINDOW
5. ELEVATOR SHAFT
6. ARCHITECTURAL METAL PANEL
7. NEW STEEL EGRESS STAIRS
8. EGRESS WINDOWS & LIGHT WELL TO BE REBUILT
9. NEW SIMULATED DIVIDED LITE DOOR WITH TRANSOM
10. STEEL BALCONY
11. GLASS RAILING SYSTEM
12. EXISTING EGRESS STAIR REBUILT & EXTENDED TO ROOFTOP
13. NEW GLASS & STEEL BALCONY
14. EXISTING ROOFTOP PENTHOUSE

STAMP

EAST EXTERIOR ELEVATION
SCALE: 3/16"=1'-0"

CITY APPLICATIONS

TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE
847 SOUTH 800 EAST
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84102

100 WEST 100 SOUTH 100 EAST 100 SOUTH 100 EAST
ARCHITECTURE - INTERIOR DESIGN

MJSA

REVISION:

THESE DRAWINGS ARE
INDEPENDENT OF
SERVICE AND SHALL
REMAIN THE PROPERTY
OF THE ARCHITECT. NO
USE OR REUSE OF THESE
DRAWINGS SHALL BE
PERMITTED UNLESS
APPROVED IN WRITING
BY THE ARCHITECT.
THIS APPLICATES TO
ALL REVISIONS.

PROJECT NO.:

16033A

DATE:

OCT. 2019

DATE:

AE2-03

10/1/2019 - A & B Engineering - Submittal CAD, Layout, CITY APPROVAL, LAYOUT, 10/1/2019 - Submittal



B1
AE2-04
NORTH EXTERIOR ELEVATION
SCALE: 3/16"=1'-0"

REFERENCE NOTES

1. EXISTING BRICK
2. EXISTING MOLDING, TO BE REPAIRED AS NEEDED
3. EXISTING WINDOW OPENING, WITH NEW SIMULATED DIVIDED LITE WINDOW
4. ELEVATOR SHAFT
5. ARCHITECTURAL METAL PANEL
6. EGRESS WINDOWS & LIGHT WELL TO BE REBUILT
7. NEW STEEL EGRESS STAIRS
8. NEW SIMULATED DIVIDED LITE DOOR WITH TRANSOM
9. STEEL BALCONY
10. GLASS RAILING SYSTEM

STAMP

NORTH EXTERIOR ELEVATION
SCALE: 3/16"=1'-0"

CITY APPLICATIONS

TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE
847 SOUTH 800 EAST
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84102

100 WEST 100 SOUTH 100 EAST
ARCHITECTURE - INTERIOR DESIGN

MJSA

REVISION:


THIS DRAWING IS THE PROPERTY OF MJSA AND SHALL REMAIN THE PROPERTY OF MJSA. NO REUSE OR REPEAT OF THIS DOCUMENT SHALL BE PERMITTED WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF MJSA. ANY REUSE OR REPEAT OF THIS DOCUMENT WITHOUT THE WRITTEN PERMISSION OF MJSA IS PROHIBITED.

PROJECT NO. 16033A

DATE: OCT. 2019

BY: AE2-04

1/1/2019 - A & B Engineering - Building/CAD/Interior Design - City Applications - 1/1/2019 - 1/1/2019



REFERENCE NOTES

STAMP

NORTH-SOUTH
BUILDING SECTION
SCALE: 3/16" = 1'-0"

CITY APPLICATIONS

TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE
847 SOUTH 800 EAST
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84102

1111 WEST 100 SOUTH, SUITE 100, SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111
ARCHITECTURE - INTERIOR DESIGN

MJSA

REVISION:

THESE DRAWINGS ARE
INDEPENDENT OF
SERVICE AND SHALL
REMAIN THE PROPERTY
OF THE ARCHITECT. NO
USE OR REUSE OF THESE
DRAWINGS SHALL BE
PERMITTED UNLESS
APPROVED BY THE
ARCHITECT. ANY
REPRODUCTION OR
MODIFICATION
WITHOUT THE
ARCHITECT'S
CONSENT IS
PROHIBITED.

PROJECT NO.:

DATE:

DATE:

DATE:



REFERENCE NOTES

1. DRYVIT EPS ON CEMENT BOARD

2. BRICK VENEER

3. WOOD RAIN SCREEN

4. METAL PANEL DETAILING

5. METAL REVEAL

6. GLASS RAILING SYSTEM

TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE TOWNHOMES

847 SOUTH 1800 EAST

SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84102

100 WEST 700 SOUTH, SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84101

1000 PIONEER BOULEVARD, SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84101

ARCHITECTURE - INTERIOR DESIGN

MJSA

PROJECT NO. 160338

DATE OCT. 2019

SHEET AE2-01

CITY APPLICATIONS

TOWNHOMES 20' WIDE UNITS ELEVATIONS

SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"



REFERENCE NOTES

1. DRYVIT EPS ON CEMENT BOARD
2. BRICK VENEER
3. WOOD RAIN SCREEN
4. METAL PANELS DETAILING
5. METAL REVEAL
6. GLASS RAILING SYSTEM

TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE TOWNHOMES
842 SOUTH 800 EAST
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84102

842 SOUTH 800 EAST
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84102
ARCHITECTURE - INTERIOR DESIGN

MJSA

KEY PLAN (NOT TO SCALE)

STAMP

CITY APPLICATIONS

TOWNHOMES 16' WIDE UNITS
ELEVATIONS
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

PROJECT NO.
160338

DATE
OCT. 2019

BY
AE2-02

ATTACHMENT D: Development Standards

The subject property at 833 S 800 E is zoned R-2 – Single and Two-Family Residential District. The purpose of the R-2 zoning district follows:

The purpose of the R-2 Single- and Two-Family Residential District is to preserve and protect for single-family dwellings the character of existing neighborhoods which exhibit a mix of single- and two-family dwellings by controlling the concentration of two-family dwelling units. Uses are intended to be compatible with the existing scale and intensity of the neighborhood. The standards for the district are intended to provide for safe and comfortable places to live and play and to promote sustainable and compatible development patterns.

The applicant has requested that the property be changed to the RMF-45 – Low Density Residential Multi-Family zoning district. The purpose of the RMF-45 zoning district follows:

The purpose of the RMF-45 Moderate/High Density Multi-Family Residential District is to provide an environment suitable for multi-family dwellings of a moderate/high density with a maximum building height of forty-five feet (45'). This district is appropriate in areas where the applicable Master Plan policies recommend a density of less than forty-three (43) dwelling units per acre. This district includes other uses that are typically found in a multi-family residential neighborhood of this density for the purpose of serving the neighborhood. Such uses are designed to be compatible with the existing scale and intensity of the neighborhood. The standards for the district are intended to provide for safe and comfortable places to live and play, promote sustainable and compatible development patterns and to preserve the existing character of the neighborhood.

The main differences between the R-2 and RMF-45 zoning districts are:

- The RMF-45 zone allows single-family attached and detached dwellings as well as multi-family dwellings. Twin-home or two-family dwellings are not allowed.
- The R-2 zoning district allows single-family and two-family uses but prohibits multi-family uses.
- Both zones prohibit
- Height and massing – the height and massing for the RMF-45 zone is substantially greater than for the R-2 zone. This is illustrated in the table below.

ZONING DISTRICT BULK AND LOT CONTROL COMPARISONS

	R-2– Single and Two-Family Residential– (Existing Zoning)	RMF-45 –Medium-High Density Multi-Family Residential (Proposed Zoning)
Maximum Building Height	Pitched roof: 28-feet to the ridge or average of other principle buildings on block face Flat roof: 20-feet	45-feet

Front Yard	Average of the existing buildings on the block face. Where no buildings exist, a minimum of 20-feet.	20% of lot depth, but need not exceed 25-feet
Corner Side Yard Setback	10-feet	Single-family attached: 10-ft Multi-family: 20-feet
Interior Side Yard Setback	For twin homes: No side yard along one lot line. A 10-foot side yard along the other. Other uses: 4-feet provided that on interior lots one yard must be at least 10-feet.	Single-family attached: No yard is required but if one is provided it can't be less than 4-feet. Multi-family: 8-feet Other permitted and Conditional uses: 10-feet on each side
Rear Yard Setback	25% of the lot depth but not less than 15-feet and need not exceed 25-feet.	25% of the lot depth but not less than 20-feet – need not exceed 30-feet
LOT AREA REQUIRED		
Single-family detached dwellings	5,000 square feet	5,000 square feet
Single-family attached dwellings	Not allowed	3,000 square feet per unit
Twin-home dwelling	4,000 feet per dwelling	Not allowed
Two-family dwelling	8,000 square feet	Not allowed
Multi-family dwellings	Not allowed	9,000 square feet – for 3 to 14 units, then 1,000 SF for each additional unit up to and including 14 units. 21,000 square feet for 15 units, plus 800 square feet for each additional dwelling unit up to 1 acre. For developments greater than 1 acre, 1,000 square feet for each dwelling unit is required.

ATTACHMENT E: Analysis of Standards

MASTER PLAN AMENDMENTS

State Law, Utah Code Annotated, Title 10 Chapter 9a, requires that all municipalities have a master plan. However, there is no specific criteria relating to master plan amendments. The City does not have specific criteria relating to master plan amendments. However, City Code Section 21A.02.040 – Effect of Adopted Master Plans or General Plans addresses this issue in the following way:

All master plans or general plans adopted by the planning commission and city council for the city, or for an area of the city, shall serve as an advisory guide for land use decisions. Amendments to the text of this title or zoning map should be consistent with the purposes, goals, objectives and policies of the applicable adopted master plan or general plan of Salt Lake City. (Ord. 26-95 § 2(1-4), 1995)

In this case, the master plan is being amended in order to provide consistency between the Central Community Master Plan and the proposed zoning designation of the subject property. This request facilitates a rezoning of the property to a district that will allow different uses on the property. State Law does include a required process in relation to a public hearing and recommendation from the Planning Commission in relation to a master plan amendment. The required process and noticing requirements have been met.

As noted in the Key Considerations section of this report, Consideration 3, the future land use map in the Central Community Master Plan applies the low-density residential designation to the property at 847 S 800 E that is currently zoned RMF-45. The applicant has requested to change this to medium/high density residential to accurately reflect the current zoning. Whether or not the master plan amendment for 833 S is approved or not, consideration should be given to amending the future land use map for the property at 847 South to accurately reflect the current RMF-45 zoning.

ZONING MAP AMENDMENTS

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

Factor	Finding	Rationale
1. Whether a proposed map amendment is consistent with the purposes, goals, objectives, and policies of the city as stated through its various adopted planning documents;	Complies	The applicant is seeking a master plan amendment because the proposed zoning amendment is not consistent with the future land use map in the Central Community Master Plan. However, as discussed in the Key Considerations section of this report, the proposed amendments are in line with some of the goals and policies in the Central Community Master Plan and in conflict with other. The proposed zoning map amendment would expand the Telegraph Exchange site and tie into a project aimed at preserving and adaptively reusing the historic and iconic building. The

		<p>proposed zoning amendment is also in line with growth and housing goals outlined in the citywide master plan, Plan Salt Lake, and the city's 5-year housing plan, Growing SLC. These goals include increasing medium density housing and providing more housing types and options in terms of unit size and price while directing growth to areas with existing infrastructure. At the same time, the proposal conflicts with policies aimed at the preservation of existing neighborhoods and discourages the expansion of multi-family uses in areas that are predominantly low-density or single-family in nature.</p>
<p>2. Whether a proposed map amendment furthers the specific purpose statements of the zoning ordinance.</p>	<p>Complies</p>	<p>The proposal helps to foster the city's residential development by allowing additional housing options to be established. The proposal would help to preserve a historic building so helps to promote the convenience, order, prosperity and welfare of the present and future inhabitants. The proposal helps to implement aspects of the City's adopted plans and policies as discussed above.</p>
<p>3. The extent to which a proposed map amendment will affect adjacent properties;</p>	<p>Complies</p>	<p>Concerns have been raised through the public outreach process in relation to the impact of the zone change on adjacent properties and the changing of a low-density zoning to multi-family and if this would set a precedent. There was also concern about changing the property designation in light of a change to R-2 that occurred in 2014. This is discussed further in the Key Considerations section of this report under Consideration 2.</p> <p>While staff finds that while the proposed zoning change could lead to additional impacts on neighboring properties, it is not substantially more than what could be experienced if the property was re-developed under the current zoning allowances in place.</p> <p>Staff is recommending the Planning Commission table the Planned Development to address potential impacts on neighboring properties associated with the specific site design</p>

		proposed under the development but support the zoning and master plan changes.
4. Whether a proposed map amendment is consistent with the purposes and provisions of any applicable overlay zoning districts which may impose additional standards;	Complies	The property is not located within an overlay district. This standard is not applicable.
5. The adequacy of public facilities and services intended to serve the subject property, including, but not limited to, roadways, parks and recreational facilities, police and fire protection, schools, stormwater drainage systems, water supplies, and wastewater and refuse collection.	Complies	No objections were received from other City departments regarding this amendment or the proposed development. Public Utilities did note that infrastructure in Chase is private and that other connections may need to be upsized for this development. Prior to obtaining a building permit, the development will need to comply with all city regulations. Other city departments and divisions provided preliminary comments, which are included in Attachment G .

PLANNED DEVELOPMENTS

21A.55.050: Standards for Planned Developments: The Planning Commission may approve, approve with conditions, or deny a planned development based upon written findings of fact according to each of the following standards. It is the responsibility of the applicant to provide written and graphic evidence demonstrating compliance with the following standards:

Standard	Findings	Rationale
A. Planned Development Objectives The planned development shall meet the purpose statement for a planned development and will achieve at least one of the objectives stated in said section. To determine if a planned development objective has been achieved, the applicant shall demonstrate that at least one of the strategies associated with the objective are included in the proposed planned development. The applicant shall also demonstrate why modifications to the zoning regulations are necessary to meet the purpose statement for a planned	Complies	The applicant argues that the proposed development complies with Planned Development objective B.1 – <i>Historic Preservation: Preservation, restoration, or adaptive reuse of buildings or structures that contribute to the character of the City either architecturally and/or historically, and that contribute to the general welfare of the residents of the City.</i> <i>The applicant’s narrative includes the following: The proposed project will carefully contrast historic reverence with modernism. Adaptive re-use and preservation construction methodology will be important and</i>

<p>development. The Planning Commission should consider the relationship between the proposed modifications to the zoning regulations and the purpose of a planned development and determine if the project will result in a more enhanced product than would be achievable through strict applicable of the land use regulations.</p>		<p><i>central to the project. In addition to typical adaptive reuse criteria such as structural/seismic, HVAC, electrical, and roofing, we also have special focus on: (a) the brick exterior massing of the Telegraph building will be tucked, pointed, and sealed by a professional mason with historic restoration credentials, (b) the notable historic plaster mold cornice, soffit, and facia located on the west facing 3 story roof transition will be preserved, sealed and painted, (c)historically appropriate high quality wood clad/steel divided light windows will be installed.</i></p> <p>The applicant also argues that the proposal meets Objective D related to mobility and Objective E related to sustainability. Further explanation of these is included in the applicant's narrative in Attachment C of this report.</p> <p>Staff agrees with this analysis. The proposed development meets at least one of the planned development objectives and the purpose statement for a planned development. This standard has been satisfied.</p>
<p>B. Master Plan Compatibility The proposed planned development is generally consistent with adopted policies set forth in the Citywide, community, and/or small area Master Plan that is applicable to the site where the planned development will be located.</p>	<p>Complies with Some Statements & Conflicts with Others</p>	<p>The proposed development is consistent with some of the goals and policies related to housing and historic preservation in the Central Community Master Plan. It is in conflict with others as they relate to neighborhood preservation.</p> <p>The proposal is consistent with the growth and housing goals outlined in the citywide master plan, Plan Salt Lake, and the city's 5-year housing plan, Growing SLC.</p> <p>The proposed development is compatible with the neighborhood in terms of the master plan and will contain a mix of units that creates more housing variety.</p>

<p>C. Design and Compatibility The proposed planned development is compatible with the area the planned development will be located and is designed to achieve a more enhanced product than would be achievable through strict application of land use regulations. In determining design and compatibility, the Planning Commission should consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whether the scale, mass, and intensity of the proposed planned development is compatible with the area the planned development will be located and/or policies stated in an applicable Master Plan related to building and site design; 2. Whether the building orientation and building materials in the proposed planned development are compatible with the neighborhood where the planned development will be located and/or the policies stated in an applicable Master Plan related to building and site design; 3. Whether building setbacks along the perimeter of the development: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Maintain the visual character of the neighborhood or the character described in the applicable Master Plan. b. Provide sufficient space for private amenities. c. Provide sufficient open space buffering between the proposed development and neighboring properties to minimize impacts related to privacy and noise. d. Provide adequate sight lines to street, driveways and sidewalks. 	<p>Does Not Comply</p>	<p>The proposed planned development incorporates an historic building that is generally somewhat out of scale for the neighborhood, but it is well-regarded by many and iconic in the area. The development also includes 17 more modern townhome dwellings that are generally conform with the development pattern of the neighborhood which includes an eclectic mix of dwellings. The townhomes will be more modern than many of the existing structures but will not be alone in that regard in the general area. The house to the immediate north is of a more modern design that does not emulate the typical development style in the neighborhood. That dwelling would be the transition point between new and old on the block face.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The scale, mass and general intensity of the proposed development is generally compatible with the area. The applicant is proposing an increase of 5 units above what the combined properties would support by right under the current zoning. Policies in the Master Plan and other City documents both support and conflict with the proposal. 2. The proposed development incorporates brick and other durable materials in the façade, which is a material commonly found in the area. It also uses a fiber cement board which would reflect the wood siding that many of the adjacent homes have. The Master Plan notes the eclectic architecture that can be found in the neighborhood. However, details of how the architecture will be compatible with the neighborhood have not been clearly articulated. 3. As discussed in Consideration #5 and #6, the reduced front yard setback would promote harmony between new construction on the site and the existing Telegraph Building. The smaller front
---	-------------------------------	--

<p>e. Provide sufficient space for maintenance.</p> <p>4. Whether building facades offer ground floor transparency, access, and architectural detailing to facilitate pedestrian interest and interaction;</p> <p>5. Whether lighting is designed for safety and visual interest while minimizing impacts on surrounding property;</p> <p>6. Whether dumpsters, loading docks and/or service areas are appropriately screened; and</p> <p>7. Whether parking areas are appropriately buffered from adjacent uses.</p>		<p>yard setback would also help to promote engagement with the street. The setbacks provide space for the driveways and utilities All of the setbacks provide enough space for maintenance and adequate sight lines. The north setback along the property line with a request to eliminate the landscaping buffer holds potential for additional impacts on that neighboring property. Staff is recommending the incorporation of at least a reduced sized landscaping buffer as a condition to mitigate the impact of this development with the property to the north.</p> <p>4. The units facing 800 E are designed to engage the street and promote interaction at the street level. A pool will be located between the Telegraph Building and the units on 800 E.</p> <p>5. A lighting plan has not been provided. Compliance will be verified at the building permit stage.</p> <p>6. Dumpsters will be located on the property line between the development and the R-2 property to the north. Staff is recommending that these be moved back from the property line in conjunction with a landscaping buffer to mitigate the impact on the adjacent property.</p> <p>7. Parking is located in the attached garages or in a surface area under a carport. The carport backs up to a large commercial use. Elimination of the landscape buffer has been requested. The parking areas will be adequately buffered from adjacent uses thought the proposed design and site conditions.</p> <p>8.</p>
---	--	---

<p>D. Landscaping: The proposed planned development preserves, maintains or provides native landscaping where appropriate. In determining the landscaping for the proposed planned development, the Planning Commission should consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whether mature native trees located long the periphery of the property and along the street are preserved and maintained; 2. Whether existing landscaping that provides additional buffering to the abutting properties is maintained and preserved; 3. Whether proposed landscaping is designed to lessen potential impacts created by the proposed planned development; and 4. Whether proposed landscaping is appropriate for the scale of the development. 	<p>Does Not Comply</p>	<p>The applicant is proposing some modifications to the required landscaping buffers within the project. Most notably, an elimination of the required 10-foot landscape buffer on the north side of the development between the Telegraph Lofts project and the single-family dwelling. This raises concerns with compatibility and impacts on adjacent properties. It is staff's opinion that the landscaping does not comply with this standard. This is also articulated elsewhere in this report.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The mature street trees will be preserved. Initial plans showed removal of some trees but this has been modified on subsequent in accordance with fire department access issues that will not necessitate removal of the trees. 2. There is landscaping on the property associated with the R-2 property that will be removed. The landscaping did not appear to provide any additional buffering between the properties. 3. The applicant is proposing street trees as required by the zoning ordinance and drought tolerant plants throughout the development. Staff is recommending that final plans, including the landscape plan, shall be provided to staff to ensure compliance with zoning standards. A condition of approval is recommended in relation to the landscaping buffers 4. The proposed landscaping is not appropriate for the scale of the development. The elimination of the required north side landscaping buffer will create impacts on the adjacent property that the buffer is intended to mitigate.
<p>E. Mobility: The proposed planned development supports City wide transportation goals and promotes safe and efficient circulation within the site</p>	<p>Does Not Comply</p>	<p>The proposed development supports City goals and promotes safe and efficient circulation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Only one drive access is proposed onto 800 E, limiting

<p>and surrounding neighborhood. In determining mobility, the Planning Commission should consider:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whether drive access to local streets will negatively impact the safety, purpose and character of the street; 2. Whether the site design considers safe circulation for a range of transportation options including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Safe and accommodating pedestrian environment and pedestrian oriented design; b. Bicycle facilities and connections where appropriate, and orientation to transit where available; and c. Minimizing conflicts between different transportation modes; 3. Whether the site design of the proposed development promotes or enables access to adjacent uses and amenities; 4. Whether the proposed design provides adequate emergency vehicle access; and 5. Whether loading access and service areas are adequate for the site and minimize impacts to the surrounding area and public rights-of-way. 		<p>curb cuts. Directing vehicular egress and ingress to the single driveway on the north side of the site helps limiting the width of curb cuts and reduces the traffic impact on 800 E but create negative impacts on the abutting residential property to the north.</p> <p>The five (5) units that face Chase Avenue will be accessed via that private street. The access to the site via Chase is already established and used. However, Chase is a private street and balconies on the south side of the Telegraph Building would encroach over the street. It is unclear whether that would be allowed by all parties that own the street and if this would impact Fire access requirements.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The development includes pedestrian walkways from 800 E to those units and within the site as well as a pedestrian walkway to Chase Avenue. Bicycle parking will be provided as required by Chapter 21A.44. There are no anticipated or foreseen conflicts between different transportation modes. 3. The development is largely self-contained within the site and units will have access to either the driveway or Chase Avenue. There has been concern expressed by the neighboring property owner to the north about the location of the driveway on the north side of the site. Staff is recommending the incorporation of a smaller landscaping buffer or solid barrier to help mitigate the impacts on the neighboring property. 4. The proposal will be required to comply with all fire code requirements before obtaining a building permit. Additional consultation is taking place with the Fire department as it
---	--	---

		<p>is unclear if the proposal meets the standards for Fire access with regard to the driveway width and Chase Avenue or if an AM&M has been applied for and/or approved by Fire. These issues are unresolved as of the date of this report.</p> <p>5. The loading and service areas are adequate for the site. However, the location of the dumpsters and their placement on the property line with the R-2 property along with the proposed elimination of the required landscape buffer would create negative impacts on the adjacent property. Staff is recommending that these be moved back from the property line in conjunction with a landscaping buffer to mitigate their impact on the adjacent property. The proposed location does not comply with this criterion.</p>
--	--	--

ATTACHMENT F: Public Process and Comments

The following is a list of public meetings that have been held, and other public input opportunities, related to this project:

Public Notices:

- Notice of the project and a formal letter requesting comments was sent to the Chairs of the East Liberty Park Community Organization and East Central Community Council on December 12, 2019.
- Staff sent an early notification announcement of the project to all residents and property owners located within 300 feet of the project site on December 20, 2019 providing notice about the project and information on how to give public input on the project.
- Staff hosted an Open House at the Tenth East Senior Center on January 9, 2020 to provide an opportunity for public comment and to have the applicant present to answer questions.
- Staff attended the East Liberty Park Community Organization meeting held on January 23, 2020 to answer questions about the project.
- The East Central Community Council (ECCC) provided a formal letter dated January 20, 2020 in relation to the project. The letter is included on the following pages.
- Several public comments were received about the project. Those comments have been included on the following pages.
- The 45-day recognized organization comment period expired on January 30, 2020.
- A Public Hearing with the Planning Commission was scheduled for May 27, 2020.

Public Hearing Notice:

- Public hearing notice mailed: May 14, 2020
- Public hearing notice sign posted on property: May 15, 2020
- Public notice posted on City and State websites & Planning Division list serve: May 15, 2020

Public Comments:

Numerous public comments were received in relation to the proposed development, both in opposition and support of the proposal. The following is a listing of the comments received as of the date of publication of this staff report. Comments received in writing are included on the following pages of this attachment.

Letters:

1. Letter from the East Central community Council – 01-20-2020
2. Letter from Jones-Waldo on behalf of Cody Derrick – 01-30-2020

Email Comments Received (As of the date of the Publication of the Staff Report):

1. Email from Nathan Florence – 01/01/2020
2. Email from Tracy Albers – 01/02/2020
3. Email from Angela Carlson – 01/04/2020
4. Email from Etherington – 01/09/2020
5. Email from Greg Joy – 01/09/2020
6. Email from Blattenberger – 01/12/2020
7. Email from McCloy – 01/12/2020

8. Email from Barnum – 01/13/2020
9. Email from Kathy – 01/14/2020
10. Email from Henri Prater – 01/22/2020
11. Email from Angela Carlson – 01/29/2020
12. Email from Nathan Florence – 01/30/2020
13. Email from Scott Nak – 01/30/2020
14. Email from Joshua Stewart – 05/15/2020



January 20, 2020

David J. Gellner, AICP, Principal Planner
Salt Lake City Planning Division
Sent via Email: david.gellner@slcgov.com

Regarding: PLNPCM2019-01110 & 01111 and PLNSUB2019-01112
Telegraph Exchange Lofts- 833 South 800 East and 847 South 800 East

Dear David;

The East Central Community Council, Executive Board and ECC Land Use Committee do not support a spot zone of the R2 parcel. The ECC supports the development and preservation of the historic building.

In order to come to this conclusion, the ECC held numerous committee meetings (including site visits), held discussions at the general membership meeting, board meetings and this application and associated information was also distributed via the ECC proprietary email system and posted on the ECC social media platforms in order to gather community based feedback. Many neighbors have written independent letters documenting their concerns to you directly.

Both the board vote (12) and email vote of the community at large (164 responses) was **unanimous in opposition** of the rezone of the R2 parcel. The six residential lofts in the Telegraph Exchange Building were supported.

The right development in the right locations.

While the ECC does support appropriate development, redevelopment and the 5 year City Housing Plan of the City (especially owner occupied workforce housing), we support this effort on the appropriate parcels **already zoned** or positioned for this type of density of which there are hundreds of parcels available in the ECC alone and multitude of opportunities on the fixed transit routes.

Spot zoning is rarely smart planning.

The community dedicated more than three years of weekly work by dozens of community members to correctly identify the zoning that should be in place for the ECC area. This work was completed with our City Council Representative after the 2005 master plan was adopted to better address the patchwork quilt zoning issues we were left with and to lessen impacts and work load to all involved. By correctly targeting where development should take place and where it should not would allow a lessened work load and stress on the community and City alike, as well as better informing the development community. This was a block by block effort. The first down zone application was then sponsored with this 800 East block included. The majority of properties were down zoned to R2 to protect the residential character and compatibility of this existing neighborhood from new inappropriately scaled multi-family housing.



Spot zoning this parcel to higher density is in direct conflict with the extensive work completed by this previous painstaking community wide effort/petition. Instead this parcel could be infilled with appropriately scaled work force housing that is so desperately needed.

A master plan and existing zoning map helps inform people as they make significant investment decisions of where to live and thrive. The impact of this spot zone and development as proposed is significant to every home owner who has invested in this area and to their quality of life. The ECC and neighbors cite negative impacts such as scale of the proposed development, increase in traffic patterns, lack of setback, loss of mature trees that provide better air/shade/visual improvements, etc., buffers to adjacent neighbors, size and locations of trash/recycling impacts, density, loss of privacy, light, visual impact of height, design, property values, block face pattern disruption and lack of design compatibility to historic and other features.

The ECC is fragile. Each block face matters.

The ECC is a unique gem within not only Salt Lake City but unique in the US for its walkability and historic features. It includes all types of housing such as student, families, workforce, senior and assisted living with all types of buildings from cottages to historic mansions and multifamily dwellings. It has unique wide park strips, gardens and old growth trees. All types of resources are a stroll or short transit ride away from coffee shops to medical facilities; from the University of Utah to shopping Downtown or at 9th and 9th.

This is a community where you can truly age in place.

Due to its location the ECC continues to be an area highly sought after for development as it is seen as a significant profit generator. Rather than utilize parcels already zoned for higher density, many developers seek to spot zone lower cost properties with little regard for the impacts they bring. Developers cite financial hardship and that they need to bring extra density to make the project “pencil”, yet the day to day financial hardship brought to existing property owners who have a loss of quality of life and property value must be considered.

We suggest that it is especially important that all rezoning and development be carefully considered to not destroy the fabric of the existing neighborhood. **The ECC cannot possibly accommodate the scope of all growth needed without losing the very essence of what makes the ECC unique.** We cannot continue to sacrifice the ECC with already the highest density in the City.

We urge you to submit a negative recommendation for this proposal as it is currently outlined.

With best regards,

Esther Hunter, Chair East Central Community Council

In behalf of the East Central Executive Board and the Community Council at large

eastcentralcommunity@gmail.com

Maps of parcels zoned for higher density within the ECC area available on our web site eastcentralcc.org.



T: 801.521.3200
F: 801.328.0537

170 South Main Street
Suite 1500
Salt Lake City, UT 84101

www.joneswaldo.com

January 30, 2020

Via Email

elpscslc@gmail.com

jason.stevenson@gmail.com

darryl.high@comcast.net

estherehunter@gmail.com

darin.mano@slcgov.com

david.gellner@slcgov.com

RE: Telegraph Exchange Lofts

To Whom It May Concern:


Cody Derrick wishes to submit the following preliminary comments on the Clearwater Homes development called "Telegraph Exchange Lofts" located at 833 and 847 South, 800 East (the "Proposed Development"). Mr. Derrick owns the neighboring property located at 829 South 800 East which is directly to the north of the proposed development. Of major concern to Mr. Derrick is the density of the Proposed Development and negative impact to his home. The Proposed Development includes a lot (833 S. 800 E.) that was very recently rezoned in 2013 from a high-density zoning to R-2 to comply with the City's Central Community Master Plan for the area (which designates the property as low density residential). It is now slated to have 17 residences and the total density for both lots in the Proposed Development is 23 residences. This is a dramatic change from the current zoning and not something Mr. Derrick anticipated when purchasing his home. In addition, the 2013 rezone was initiated over the neighborhood's concerns regarding several other high-density developments slated for the area and an intent to preserve the single-family residential feel of the neighborhood. Under Salt Lake City Ordinance 21A.50.050(B), the goals, objectives, and policies of the City must be considered by the City Council in approving an amendment to the zoning map. The zoning map amendment must also comply with the Central Community Master Plan. *Id.* Here, it seems clear the City intended to preserve the single-family residential character of the lot at issue and the current proposal violates not only the Master Plan but also the objectives and policies for the neighborhood as evidenced in the 2013 rezone.

In addition, the City is required to consider the affect this application will have on adjacent properties for the zoning map amendment application as well as for approval of the planned unit development application. *Id.* See also SLC Ordinance 21A.55.050. Planned unit developments are also required to provide mechanisms to reduce negative impacts to privacy and noise on neighboring properties. *Id.* From the documents Mr. Derrick has obtained through a public records request, it appears the Proposed Development will violate several requirements of the R-45 zoning designation including setbacks and landscaping buffers, which will negatively impact Mr. Derrick's property as well as other surrounding properties in violation of the zoning

map amendment standards as well as the planned unit development ordinance. Specifically, a 10-foot landscaping buffer is required under City ordinance's on the North side of the property, but the plans submitted to the City at this time do not include a much smaller buffer. Adequate buffering between properties is required under SLC Ordinance 21A.55.050 (C)(3)(c). In addition, the Proposed Development includes only one access, a driveway, that will funnel all of the traffic entering and exiting the development right next to Mr. Derrick's home. Having all of the traffic enter and exit directly adjacent to Mr. Derrick's property will unquestionably negatively impact the quiet enjoyment of his home in violation of SLC Ordinance 21A.55.050(E) among other provisions. The Developer also indicated that all guest parking for the development will be street parking, which will add a large amount of traffic congestion to the surrounding neighborhood in violation of SLC Ordinance 21A.55.050(E). Mr. Derrick is also concerned about the rooftop decks and height of the buildings that will overlook his property and infringe upon his privacy in violation of 21A.55.050(C)(3). Mr. Derrick is also concerned about the removal of existing landscaping and trees at the Proposed Development and the impact of the removal of the same on his property, in violation of SLC Ordinance 21A.55.050(D).

Mr. Derrick intends to submit more detailed comments to the Planning Commission outlining his concerns regarding the Proposed Development as the applications move through the City's administrative approval process. In the meantime, please add Mr. Derrick and myself to any notice lists or electronic mailing updates for the Proposed Development.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "J. Bauer". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first letter of the first name being a large, stylized "J".

Janelle Eurick Bauer

Gellner, David

From: Nathan Florence <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, January 1, 2020 12:01 PM
To: Gellner, David
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Telegraph Exchange Lofts project Case numbers PLNPCM2019-01110 through 01112

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Gellner,

I am writing to you in opposition to the proposed Telegraph Exchange Loft project by Clearwater Homes.

We are homeowners at [REDACTED] and have been engaged with the community council and planning commission on several projects for the 18 years that we have lived here. We were first involved in the gas station construction at the Smith's grocery store behind our home and then worked with our City Council representative at the time on a neighborhood-wide project to rezone the blocks from 700 E-900 E and 700 S-900 S as R-2. This was in an effort to preserve existing homes and buildings, while allowing for new construction of homes if necessary. As a neighborhood we also wanted to prevent land owners from consolidating multiple properties with homes on them and demolishing these buildings to build larger complexes of apartments or condominiums. The Telegraph Exchange project is in direct conflict with this effort.

I would like to hold up an example of the positive results of our efforts by using the group of homes and buildings on the Southeast and west corners of 8th S and 8th E which now host Vis optical, Vantage clothing and several small homes with cottage businesses. These properties were ALL owned by a single individual with the intention of consolidating them, demolishing existing structures and building large apartment complexes. If we had not worked together as a community council, Planning Commission, City Council and neighborhood, in harmony with the existing area master plan, we would not have these beautifully restored and highly useful and productive neighbors. We have worked together to preserve the character and history of the neighborhood, while at the same time making huge improvements to those same characteristics that make this such a desirable place to live.

We believe that an equally vital and viable option could exist for the Telegraph Exchange project without having to demolish existing structures and set a precedent for rezoning R-2 properties whenever it suits the needs of a developer. In conversation with other developers they have expressed a confidence that there are multiple viable and sustainable options for preserving and using that structure without the need for such large expansion. We understand and support the need for increased density of residential properties, but with multiple projects in this area and limiting the Telegraph project to the existing single property where it sits, we are doing this already.

To sum up:

We support the need for density while preserving neighborhood character.

Objections are spot rezoning to suit large developers, demolition of existing homes, old growth tree loss (home to nesting owls, by the way)

We are unable to attend the open house scheduled for this project as we have a previous obligation. We will be involved as much as we can in the process and welcome a conversation.

Nathan and Marian Florence

[REDACTED]

Gellner, David

From: Tracy Albers <T[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, January 2, 2020 6:47 PM
To: Gellner, David
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Telegraph Exchange Lofts project Case numbers PLNPCM2019-01110 through 01112

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Gellner,

I am writing to you in opposition to the proposed Telegraph Exchange Loft project by Clearwater Homes.

I have been the homeowner at [REDACTED] for fifteen years. Several years ago, I was involved in the neighborhood-wide project to rezone the blocks from 700 E - 900 E and 700 S - 900 S as R-2. Our persistent efforts were successful and we have preserved existing homes and buildings in the neighborhood, while allowing for new construction of homes as necessary.

While I support the development of the existing Telegraph Exchange site, I am opposed to over-expansion of the site to include the R-2 property that has been acquired by Micah Peters of Clearwater homes. The rezoning and demolition of this R-2 property will clearly benefit Micah Peters' agenda, allowing him unjustified special treatment while undermining the pre-existing rights and uses of adjacent property owners.

Sincerely,

T
[REDACTED]

Gellner, David

From: angela carlson <[REDACTED]> on behalf of angela carlson
<[REDACTED]>
Sent: Saturday, January 4, 2020 1:34 PM
To: Gellner, David; [REDACTED]
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Fw: Telegraph Exchange Lofts project Case numbers PLNPCM2019-01110 through 01112

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

To whom it may concern,
I'm writing in opposition to the proposed Telegraph exchange Loft project by Clearwater Homes, 833 & 847 South 800 East.

I am a homeowner at [REDACTED] and longtime resident of this neighborhood. I have included a copy of our neighbor's letter they sent to you on January 1st of this year because I am in agreement with their statements and concerns. I've worked with the Florences in the past in support of preserving the residential character in the neighborhood.

It's my understanding that Salt Lake City's Planning Division is considering amendments to update the City's four Multi-Family Residential (RMF) zoning districts, starting with the RMF-30: Low-Density Multi-Family Residential district, with the intent of implementing the recently adopted Growing SLC: A Five Year Housing Plan (2018-2022). This would discourage the collection or "banking" of multiple parcels of land to accommodate large developments, a lot width maximum has been proposed that would limit the width of new lots to 100 feet wide or less. Based on average lots widths in the RMF-30 district, this would typically prevent the consolidation of more than 2 or 3 parcels. This concern is not isolated to one type of zoning in residential neighborhoods and especially applies to this proposed development.

The proposed drawings show the destruction of mature city trees on the parking strip. These trees contribute to the property values and overall health of our urban landscape, their removal is unnecessary and unacceptable. The plans I was shown for this project feature a swimming pool placed where effective ingress and egress currently exists. Those plans arbitrarily create an ingress and egress where decades old healthy, habitat providing trees stand on the city owned parking strip (not to mention the old growth pines, home to owls on the private property parcel).

I understand the need for housing density, and support the preservation of neighborhood character. Objections are spot rezoning to suit large developers, demolition of existing homes and our city's urban forest.

Angela Carlson Licensed Realtor @ Urban Utah Homes & Estates
[REDACTED]

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Nathan Florence** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Wed, Jan 1, 2020 at 12:00 PM

Subject: Telegraph Exchange Lofts project Case numbers PLNPCM2019-01110 through 01112

To: <David.Gellner@slcgov.com>

Dear Mr. Gellner,

I am writing to you in opposition to the proposed Telegraph Exchange Loft project by Clearwater Homes.

We are homeowners at [REDACTED] and have been engaged with the community council and planning commission on several projects for the 18 years that we have lived here. We were first involved in the gas station construction at the Smith's grocery store behind our home and then worked with our City Council representative at the time on a neighborhood-wide project to rezone the blocks from 700 E-900 E and 700 S-900 S as R-2. This was in an effort to preserve existing homes and buildings, while allowing for new construction of homes if necessary. As a neighborhood we also wanted to prevent land owners from consolidating multiple properties with homes on them and demolishing these buildings to build larger complexes of apartments or condominiums. The Telegraph Exchange project is in direct conflict with this effort.

I would like to hold up an example of the positive results of our efforts by using the group of homes and buildings on the Southeast and west corners of 8th S and 8th E which now host Vis optical, Vantage clothing and several small homes with cottage businesses. These properties were ALL owned by a single individual with the intention of consolidating them, demolishing existing structures and building large apartment complexes. If we had not worked together as a community council, Planning Commission, City Council and neighborhood, in harmony with the existing area master plan, we would not have these beautifully restored and highly useful and productive neighbors. We have worked together to preserve the character and history of the neighborhood, while at the same time making huge improvements to those same characteristics that make this such a desirable place to live.

We believe that an equally vital and viable option could exist for the Telegraph Exchange project without having to demolish existing structures and set a precedent for rezoning R-2 properties whenever it suits the needs of a developer. In conversation with other developers they have expressed a confidence that there are multiple viable and sustainable options for preserving and using that structure without the need for such large expansion. We understand and support the need for increased density of residential properties, but with multiple projects in this area and limiting the Telegraph project to the existing single property where it sits, we are doing this already.

To sum up:

We support the need for density while preserving neighborhood character.

Objections are spot rezoning to suit large developers, demolition of existing homes, old growth tree loss (home to nesting owls, by the way)

We are unable to attend the open house scheduled for this project as we have a previous obligation. We will be involved as much as we can in the process and welcome a conversation.

Nathan and Marian Florence

[REDACTED]

Gellner, David

From: Nick Etherington <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, January 9, 2020 10:22 AM
To: Gellner, David
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Telegraph Exchange Lofts

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

David,

I wanted to send you this email representing my complete support of the Telegraph Exchange Lofts project. I love the old Telegraph Exchange building and am quite please to hear that it will not be demolish, but revitalized into an active part of the community. I have spent much of my life in the 9th and 9th area. My parents have owned and operated a store in the area for 35+ years and I grew up on Douglas Street several blocks East of the project. I continue to frequent the area for dining and shopping, as I lived on Laird and now on 9th South (East of the 9th and 9th area). We love the 9th and 9th area and once again, think the subject project does nothing, but enhance and maintain the look and feel of the area. Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

NICK ETHERINGTON
TAYLOR DERRICK CAPITAL



This message, including all attachments, is confidential and intended only for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. The contents of this message must not be disclosed to another person without the sender's authority. If you are not the intended recipient, you are not authorized to, and must not, disclose, copy, distribute, or retain this message or any part of it. If you have received this message in error, please immediately notify the sender and delete this message, together with any attachments, from your computer. Thank you.

Gellner, David

From: Greg Joy <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, January 9, 2020 2:21 PM
To: Gellner, David
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Telegraph Exchange Lofts Project

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

David,

I own two properties within a couple of blocks of the proposed development at 833 & 847 South 800 East by Micah Peters. (My homes are [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]).

I am writing in support of the project. I have met with Micah and was impressed by his goal to keep the character of the area while revitalizing an impressive older building. I appreciate his goal to be energy neutral and support electric vehicles in every off-street space.

It is this thinking towards the future which separates Micah from many other builders in SLC. It is my belief the project will enhance 800 East and the 9th and 9th area in general.

I would be happy to discuss at any time.

Regards,

Greg Joy
[REDACTED]

Gellner, David

From: Beth Blattenberger <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, January 12, 2020 1:18 PM
To: Gellner, David
Subject: (EXTERNAL) historic 9th and 9th

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

As a resident of 9th and 9th [REDACTED], I love the old architecture, including the Telegraph Building. I also understand the need for more housing as our population grows, and I support density rather than sprawl. If there is a way to keep the historic character of the Telegraph Building while incorporating additional housing, I would applaud that, and hope creative ways can be found and approved by city planning officials.

Sincerely,
Beth Blattenberger

Gellner, David

From: Marjorie McCloy <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, January 12, 2020 2:35 PM
To: Gellner, David
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Telegraph Exchange building

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Happy to hear that this beautiful and mysterious building will get a new life. We live just down the street ([REDACTED]) and have long admired its architecture and wondered at its providence.

I hear it is to be reimagined in a sustainable way. I hope that means good insulation, rooftop solar, and other earth-friendly considerations.

Thank you!

Best,
Margie McCloy

Sent from my iPad

Gellner, David

From: Wally Barnum Gmail <w[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, January 13, 2020 12:02 PM
To: Gellner, David
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Old Telegraph Building

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hello David, I saw a post on Next Door about the Telegraph Building.
[Keep The Old Telegraph Exchange Building Standing](#)

I want to let you know that I support Micah's request to ask for more units in the building. I'd like to see the building refurbished and given new life.
I have known Micah for 25 years and have a lot of confidence in him as a developer and faith in his good intent for our city.
My family lives nearby in the neighborhood ([REDACTED]). I like the direction 9th and 9th and Sugarhouse is heading. We need more density for a ton of reasons.

BTW, I like the new traffic circle at 9th and 11th if you had anything to do with that...

Best Regards,

Wally Barnum
[REDACTED]

Gellner, David

From: Kathy <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2020 9:47 PM
To: Gellner, David
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Old telegraph bldg

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I am in support of not destroying the old telegraph building. I hope you take the neighborhood requests into consideration.

Sent from my iPhone

Gellner, David

From: Henri Prater <h[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, January 22, 2020 5:40 PM
To: Gellner, David
Subject: (EXTERNAL) rezoning

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr. Gellner,

I live in the neighborhood where a proposed rezoning (PARCEL 16-08-176-026) is requested by Clearwater Homes.

They want to rezone to increase the density of their parcels. This is not the nature of our neighborhood. (10 to 20 units per acre.)
Also, the high-density units are NOT reflective of the architecture in our community. Large Flat-roofed buildings? You just couldn't get any more basic than Clearwater did with their design. There is nothing attractive about it. Creative? They can't claim that in these designs.

This will not improve the neighborhood's quality of life. Quite the opposite.
While it would be advantageous to our community to have the historic building next to this parcel turned into 6 dwelling units, it is not worth it. And I'm one who almost always desires historic preservation.

Clearwater Homes is claiming a "conflict" in our Masterplan. **Our neighborhood** does not have a conflict with our Masterplan. We all worked VERY HARD to get our neighborhood zoned for R-2. We are invested in our neighborhood. I've lived here for 29 years. And don't start thinking that I'm just this old person who doesn't want things to change. Not true. I know they need to change but please, not in this way.

Our neighborhood lost our challenge to the Nexus apartments on 900 S. The planning dept. overrode what our neighborhood wanted.
I'm losing hope that our neighborhood has any say in what happens to us.

So, mark me down for being against this. But I suspect that it won't make any difference.

H. Prater
[REDACTED]

Gellner, David

From: angela carlson <[REDACTED]> on behalf of angela carlson
<[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, January 29, 2020 2:01 PM
To: Marian Florence; Gellner, David
Cc: jason.stevenson@gmail.com; East Liberty Park 1 CC Chair; estherehunter@gmail.com; Mano, Darin
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Re: Telegraph Exchange: Community Council feedback due tomorrow(!)
Attachments: 20-01-Telegraph-comments.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I agree that the developer inaccurately indicated that the property owners who live on the street approve of the development, the majority of us do not. There was one property owner who owns the home at [REDACTED] (where no one lives but a daycare is run out of) and a vacant commercial property to the south of the proposed development voicing his support yet he does not live in this particular neighborhood.

I'm all for historically sensitive and creative reuse of the Telegraph Building. I know it's possible to do some of what the developer wants to do and do it well. Arbitrarily designing the project to destroy city trees is unacceptable. I'm in agreement on the main points that Marion Florence states on the prior email.

Homeowner at [REDACTED] since 1992

Angela Carlson
Licensed Realtor
Urban Utah Homes & Estates
[REDACTED]

From: Marian Florence <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, January 29, 2020 1:34 PM
Cc: jason.stevenson@gmail.com; Darryl High; estherehunter@gmail.com; darin.mano@slcgov.com
Subject: Telegraph Exchange: Community Council feedback due tomorrow(!)

Hey neighbors -

At the ELPCO Community Council meeting, there was some lively debate about Micah's project, but clearly (I thought) a misrepresentation of enthusiastic neighbor support. Micah had brought several vocal sycophants, so I'm writing to get your input to share with ELPCO and ECCC in an official way.

ELPCO and ECCC's deadline is **JANUARY 30 (tomorrow)** to present their comments to the City. Can you please look at this tonight? Thanks!

Jason and Darryl, who run ELPCO, have written to us to say that in order to properly report on their community's stand on the project they need our concerns documented. He wrote: *While approval of these proposals does not operate on a majority rule basis, community interest and support matters. If you believe that the 800 East community does not support the proposal to the extent that has been represented, or that support is nuanced or more complex (i.e. split between different aspects of the project), I would encourage you to **document that somehow**.*

Can you please write to Jason/Darryl/Esther (all copied here) with **your suggestions/comments** (of course you are under no obligation to agree with us! I just want to make sure all voices are heard) with a note stating that you are an 800 E neighbor? I have attached the ELPCO comment cards if you would like to use them and their email addresses are copied above.

Our main points:

1. we support the preservation of the historic building but would like to see it fit in the neighborhood in terms of scale and design

2. we have concerns with

- the reworking of the Master Plan - this project does not meet the aims of the Master Plan which is to "conserve the neighborhood's residential character" and "ensure new multi-family development is carefully sited, well designed and **compatible in scale**"
- the rezoning of an R2 plot to RMF45 (we only just got this downzoned to R2 a few years ago to protect the neighborhood)
- the setbacks he is requesting (11'9" when the zoning requires 25' on the front; the rear and side setbacks are also much reduced from what is required by RMF45)
- the loss of mature trees (owl habitat and urban forest)
- the absence of a suitable (10ft) landscape buffer on the north side
- the placement of trash/recycling for all 23 units along the neighbor's lot, rather than on the east side
- the density of 17 townhomes on the property
- the height of the proposed townhomes
- the ensuing traffic from the property
- the exclusive feel of a gated "campus" on the street

We would welcome a project that was similar but with fewer townhomes, that complemented the neighborhood without dwarfing it.

The next step for this project is to go to Planning Commission. I would urge you to share your comments with David Gellner of the City Planning Department (david.gellner@slcgov.com).

Thanks for reading and for adding your comments - if you want more information I can get you the site plans and city correspondence.

Marian and Nathan

[REDACTED]

Gellner, David

From: Marian Florence <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, January 30, 2020 1:09 PM
To: Gellner, David
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Telegraph Exchange

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Mr. Gellner,

At the ELPCO Community Council meeting, there was some lively debate about Micah's project, but clearly (I thought) a misrepresentation of enthusiastic neighbor support. Micah had brought several vocal sycophants, so I'm writing to add my reasons for hoping for a continued process.

1. I support the preservation of the historic building but would like to see it fit in the neighborhood in terms of scale and design
2. I have concerns with
 - the reworking of the Master Plan - this project does not meet the aims of the Master Plan which is to "conserve the neighborhood's residential character" and "ensure new multi-family development is carefully sited, well designed and **compatible in scale**"
 - the rezoning of an R2 plot to RMF45 (we only just got this downzoned to R2 a few years ago to protect the neighborhood)
 - the setbacks he is requesting (11'9" when the zoning requires 25' on the front; the rear and side setbacks are also much reduced from what is required by RMF45)
 - the loss of mature trees (owl habitat and urban forest)
 - the absence of a suitable (10ft) landscape buffer on the north side
 - the placement of trash/recycling for all 23 units along the neighbor's lot, rather than on the east side
 - the density of 17 townhomes on the property
 - the height of the proposed townhomes
 - the ensuing traffic from the property
 - the exclusive feel of a gated "campus" on the street

I would welcome a project that was similar but with fewer townhomes, that complemented the neighborhood without dwarfing it.

Marian Florence
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Gellner, David

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 30, 2020 8:23 AM
To: Gellner, David
Subject: (EXTERNAL) RE: Telegraph Exchange: Community Council feedback due tomorrow(!)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

To all concerned, my name is Scott Nak I live just a few houses north of said proposed project I have lived at [REDACTED] [REDACTED] for 61 years my wife has lived with me for thirty of those years. we are in complete agreement with all of Nathan & Marian Florence comments, We were never approached by Micah to discuss this project and in no way do we approve of it as it was submitted. The said town houses are thirty feet tall which would be completely out of caricature with the neiborhood. The code as it stands for my side of the street is 20' I know this because my neighbor on the south at 829 south built a home which is 20' high and I had the city come out and measure it and they told me it is to the inch of being in code, I can no longer even see the sky out of my kitchen window all I see is a black wall, so to be even 10' taller on these townhouses is in total disrespect for are neiborhood. I have watched smithfood king take complete advantage of our neiborhood by being allowed expand several times and demolish most of our neiborhood and now Micah wants to take the rest. This is a beautiful neiborhood and I personally would like to see it preserved as such.

From: SCOTT MARIE NAK [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 30, 2020 6:03 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: [EXT] FW: Telegraph Exchange: Community Council feedback due tomorrow(!)

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, January 29, 2020 2:46 PM
To: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] Community Council feedback due tomorrow(!)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Marian Florence <[REDACTED]>
Date: Wed, Jan 29, 2020 at 1:33 PM
Subject: Telegraph Exchange: Community Council feedback due tomorrow(!)
To:
Cc: <jason.stevenson@gmail.com>, Darryl High <darryl.high@comcast.net>, <estherehunter@gmail.com>, <darin.mano@slcgov.com>

Hey neighbors -

Gellner, David

From: Joshua Stewart <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Friday, May 15, 2020 3:56 PM
To: Gellner, David
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Telegraph Exchange Lofts Rezoning, Master Plan Amendment & Planned Development at approximately 833 & 847 South 800 East

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

David and Planning Commission,

If the intent is to build 3 story townhouses R-35 should be high enough density to fit 3 story townhouses. R-45 would allow the developer to go 4 story or perhaps more and this would be out of scale with the other residential properties on the street. Please limit the height of development at this location to 3 stories and units should have front doors at grade level facing the street- half buried parking structures facing the street.

I would suggest also making a condition that the architectural style and materials of the development be historically compatible with the neighboring homes that face it. Otherwise this massive development will overwhelm the charming character of this street.

Josh Stewart

[REDACTED]
Salt Lake City

LEAVE A COMMENT!



**SALT LAKE CITY
PLANNING**

PROJECT NAME: TELEGRAPH BUILDING

DATE: 1/9/2020

NAME: CINDY CROMER

EMAIL: [REDACTED]

ADDRESS:

COMMENTS: THIS AREA WAS IN A COMPREHENSIVE REZONE ADOPTED IN 2014. THE PROJECT WAS ONE OF THE LARGEST SINCE 1995. IT EXTENDED FROM 700 E TO 900 E AND 700 S TO 900 S. THE CITY NEEDS TO EVALUATE WHETHER THIS REZONING HAS HAD ITS INTENDED EFFECT.
SECONDLY THE EDGES OF THE 9TH AND 9TH AREA ARE CLEARLY DEFINED IN TERMS OF INTENSITY OF USE. THIS PROPOSAL CHANGES THE EDGE ON 800 E, AND SIMILAR PROPOSALS TO EXPAND THE AREA OF MORE INTENSE USE WILL FOLLOW.

STAY INFORMED // Please provide your contact information to be notified of future information and other meetings on this project. You can submit this sheet before the end of the Open House, or provide your comments via email or mail.

DAVID GELLNER // david.gellner@slcgov.com

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING DIVISION
451 S. State Street // Salt Lake City, UT 84114-5480 // P.O. Box 145480

LEAVE A COMMENT!



SALT LAKE CITY
PLANNING

PROJECT NAME: *Telegraph Exchange*

DATE: *1/9/2020*

NAME: *Robert Creedman*

EMAIL: [REDACTED]

ADDRESS:

COMMENTS: *I appreciate the adaptive reuse!*

Personally, I feel that parking and housing is a zero sum game; please build more housing, not more parking. As someone looking for low income housing previously, I was upset when I saw so many cars, and so much parking prioritized over ~~my~~ housing. Also, I hope this project is mixed use! that'd be exciting

STAY INFORMED // Please provide your contact information to be notified of future information and other meetings on this project. You can submit this sheet before the end of the Open House, or provide your comments via email or mail.

DAVID GELLNER // david.gellner@slcgov.com

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING DIVISION

451 S. State Street // Salt Lake City, UT 84114-5480 // P.O. Box 145480

ATTACHMENT G: Department Review Comments

The following comments were received from other City divisions/departments with regards to the proposed development:

Zoning

The following criteria apply to the RMF-45 zone.

The maximum allowed height in the RMF-45 zone is forty-five feet (45').

The front yard setback is twenty percent (20%) of lot depth but need not exceed twenty-five feet (25'). For buildings legally existing on April 12, 1995, the required front yard shall be no greater than the existing yard.

The minimum side yard is eight feet (8'); provided, that no principal building is erected within ten feet (10') of a building on an adjacent lot.

The rear yard requirement is twenty five percent (25%) of the lot depth but need not exceed thirty feet (30').

The maximum the surface coverage of all principal and accessory buildings is sixty percent (60%) of the lot area.

Landscape yard requirements will apply to the front and one interior side yard.

A landscape buffers will be required along the north property line: Where a lot abuts a lot in a single-family or two-family residential district, a landscape buffer shall be provided in accordance with chapter 21A.48, "Landscaping And Buffers", of this title. (Ord. 46-17, 2017: Ord. 66-13, 2013: Ord. 12-11, 2011: Ord. 62-09 § 7, 2009: Ord. 26-95 § 2(12-13), 1995)

Any deviation from these requirements will need to be approved through the planned development process.

Engineering – Scott Weiler

The Architectural Site Plan, sheet AS1-01, shows new sidewalk to be installed on the south side of Chase Avenue. SLC Engineering has no objection to this but since Chase Avenue is a private street, consent of the property owners who have rights to Chase Avenue must be obtained prior to installation of the sidewalk.

Prior to performing work in the public way of 800 East, a Permit to Work in the Public Way must be obtained from SLC Engineering by a licensed contractor who has a bond and insurance on file with SLC Engineering.

Public Utilities - Jason Draper

SLCPU does not maintain the 2" private main in Chase Ave. It is the responsibility of the properties connected to it to maintain that line.

No objections to the proposed amendments or setback for the planned development.

Conditions and comments on the proposed project:

Water and sewer service is available in 800 East.

The sewer main is in the park strip and new trees will need to be coordinated to be at least 5 feet from this main.

The existing 6" water main in 800 East is likely insufficient to provide culinary and fire flows for this project and the main may need to be upsized. This must include reconnection of existing services.

One water meter may be reused for irrigation service.

Unused water and sewer service will need to be capped at the main.

Plans must meet SLCDPU standards, policies, ordinance and practices.

Plans must be submitted for review.

Building Code – Steven Collett

The International Existing Building Code (IEBC) is the applicable code for existing buildings.

The International Existing Building Code (IEBC) is a model code in the International Code family of codes intended to provide requirements for repair and alternative approaches for alterations and additions to existing buildings. This code allows for options for controlled departure from full compliance with the International Codes dealing with new construction, while maintaining basic levels for fire prevention, structural and life safety features of the rehabilitated building.

Drawings do not clearly identify interior circulation, or layout of the units.

This project could fall under the provisions of the IRC which regulates the following: The construction, alteration, movement, enlargement, replacement, repair, equipment, use and occupancy, location, removal and demolition of townhouses not more than three stories above grade plane in height with each unit having a separate means of egress.

STORY ABOVE GRADE PLANE. Any story having its finished floor surface entirely above grade plane, or in which the finished surface of the floor next above is either of the following:

1. More than 6 feet (1829 mm) above grade plane.
2. More than 12 feet (3658 mm) above the finished ground level at any point.

MEANS OF EGRESS. A continuous and unobstructed path of vertical and horizontal egress travel from any occupied portion of a building or structure to a public way. A means of egress consists of three separate and distinct parts: the exit access, the exit and the exit discharge.

Fire – Steven Collett

Fire department access roads shall be a minimum of 26 foot clear width and 13 foot 6 inches clear height for which measured from the lowest fire department access road to the highest occupied floor is 30 foot and greater.

--Aerial apparatus access roads shall be located within a minimum of 15 feet and a maximum of 30 feet from the building, and shall be positioned parallel to one entire side of the building(s)

--Fire hydrants shall be within 400 feet of all exterior walls of the structure.

--Fire Department access roads that are dead ends greater than 150 feet shall be provide with a turn-around.

--The turning radius of fire department access roads are 45 foot outside and 20 foot inside.

--Fire department access roads are measured from the inside edge of the waterway of the curb and gutter to the inside edge of the curb and gutter.

--Fire Department Connection(s) FDC shall be located on the address side of the structure.

--Fire Department Connections(s) FDC shall be within 100 feet of a fire hydrant.

ADDITIONAL NOTES on Fire Requirements

In discussion with Fire officials, the following additional information was provided:

- The proposed driveway on the north side would not meet Fire access requirements at 20-feet wide since the proposed townhomes are 30-feet tall. At a height of 30-feet or taller, the access road width will need to be 26-feet wide.
- The turning radii of the proposed access drive would not meet Fire Department requirements. A turn-around has not been included as part of the design.
- As a private street that dead ends, Chase Avenue cannot be used as a Fire Department access road.
- There is a possibility that if Chase Avenue were continued through into the Smith's grocery store site, that fire access could be accomplished in that manner. That would require an agreement with Smith's and any property owners that have ownership and access to Chase Avenue. Such a proposal has not been discussed with other City departments that Staff is aware of.
- An Alternate Means & Method (AM& M) agreement to meet fire and building code requirements could be pursued with the Fire Bureau and Chief Building Official to allow alternatives to these access requirements. Approval of an AM&M is on a case-by-case basis and no such approvals have been granted at this time.

The applicant is working with the Fire Department toward resolution on these issues.

Transportation – Michael Barry

The minimum parking requirements are listed in 21A.44. The parking layout must conform to 21A.44.020.

3f. Planning Commission Agenda and Minutes for May 27, 2020

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA
This meeting will be an electronic meeting pursuant to Salt Lake City Emergency
Proclamation No. 2 of 2020 (2)(b)
May 27, 2020 at 5:30 p.m.
(The order of the items may change at the Commission's discretion)

This Meeting will **not** have an anchor location at the City and County Building. Commission Members will connect remotely. We want to make sure everyone interested in the Planning Commission meetings can still access the meetings how they feel most comfortable. If you are interested in watching the Planning Commission meetings, they are available on the following platforms:

- YouTube: www.youtube.com/slclivemeetings
- SLCTv Channel 17 Live: www.slctv.com/livestream/SLCtv-Live/2

If you are interested in participating during the Public Hearing portion of the meeting or provide general comments, email; planning.comments@slcgov.com or connect with us on Webex at:

- <http://tiny.cc/slc-pc-05272020>

Instructions for using Webex will be provided on our website at SLC.GOV/Planning

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING WILL BEGIN AT 5:30 PM
APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR MAY 13, 2020
REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR
REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. **ADU Conditional Use at approximately 2174 South 1900 East** - Antonio Padilla, property owner, is requesting Conditional Use approval for a 750 square foot accessory dwelling unit (ADU) to be located in the basement of a new home proposed at approximately 2174 S 1900 E. The property is zoned R-1/7,000 Single-Family Residential, where ADUs must be processed as a conditional use. The property is located within Council District 7, represented by Amy Fowler. (Staff contact: Chris Earl at (801) 535-7932 or christopher.earl@slcgov.com)
Case number PLNPCM2020-00064
2. **ADU Conditional Use at approximately 567 E Hollywood Ave** - Tom Candee, architect representing the property owner, is requesting Conditional Use approval for an 803 square foot accessory dwelling unit (ADU) to be located in the basement of a new home proposed at approximately 567 E Hollywood Avenue. The property is zoned R-1/5,000 Single-Family Residential, where ADUs must be processed as a conditional use. The property is located within Council District 5, represented by Darin Mano. (Staff contact: Chris Earl at (801) 535-7932 or christopher.earl@slcgov.com) **Case number PLNPCM2020-00104**

3. **Maplewood Addition Street Closure & Subdivision Amendment at approximately 6780 W North Temple** - Corbin Bennion, the engineer representing the School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration, the adjacent property owner, is requesting to close the streets dedicated in the Maplewood Addition subdivision located north of Interstate I-80 and west of the Salt Lake International Airport. The subdivision was platted in 1911 but never developed as intended. The applicant would like to close the streets to incorporate it into the adjacent parcel. This request is being referred to the Planning Commission for a second hearing due to a noticing error. The subject property is located in the M-1 (Light Manufacturing) zoning district and Council District 1, represented by James Rogers. (Staff contact: Mayara Lima at (801) 535-7118 or mayara.lima@slcgov.com) **Case numbers PLNPCM2019-00567 & PLNSUB2019-00755**
4. **Azure Place Planned Development & Preliminary Subdivision at approximately 637 North 300 West, 641 North 300 West and 642 N Pugsley Street** - Paul Garbett of Garbett Homes, the property owner, is requesting approval for a new residential development at 637 N 300 West, 641 N 300 West and 642 N Pugsley Street. The request is to consolidate the three parcels and subdivide the property to create 29 residential three-story townhomes. The proposed project is subject to the following applications:
 - I. **Planned Development** – The Planned Development approval is needed to address the lack of street frontage, to modify the rear yard setback from 20 feet to a setback of 13.5 feet next to building one and for ten additional parking spaces from what is allowed in the MU (Mixed Use) zoning regulations. **Case number PLNSUB2020-00074**
 - II. **Preliminary Subdivision** - A preliminary plat is necessary to consolidate the existing three parcels and create individual new lots. **Case number PLNSUB2020-00073**

The site is located within Council District 3, represented by Chris Wharton. (Staff contact: Katia Pace at (801) 535 6354 or katia.pace@slcgov.com)
5. **Zoning Map Amendment at approximately 2960, 2964 & 2970 S Richmond Street** - Mike Akerlow, with Community Development Corporation of Utah, property owner, is requesting a Zoning Map Amendment to rezone the properties at approximately 2960, 2964 and 2970 S Richmond Street from R-1/7,000 Single-Family Residential District to R-MU-45 Residential/Mixed Use District. The applicant would like to rezone the properties to redevelop them as a multi-family residential development which would consist of 60 to 80 residential units. The proposed development would include market rate as well as affordable residential units. The property is zoned R-1/7,000 Single-Family Residential. The property is located within Council District 7, represented by Amy Fowler. (Staff contact: Chris Earl at (801) 535-7932 or christopher.earl@slcgov.com) **Case number PLNPCM2020-00108**
6. **Telegraph Exchange Lofts Rezoning, Master Plan Amendment & Planned Development at approximately 833 & 847 South 800 East** - Micah Peter of Clearwater Homes, the property owner, is requesting a Master Plan Amendment, Zoning Map Amendment, and Planned Development approval to construct a twenty-three (23) unit residential development called the Telegraph Exchange Lofts at 833 & 847 South 800 East. The proposal involves two (2) properties, one of which would be rezoned. A total of six (6) residential lofts would be developed within the existing Telegraph Exchange Building and an additional seventeen (17) new 3-story townhouse units would be added to the site. A total of 47 parking spaces will be provided. The proposed project is subject to the following petitions:

- I. **Master Plan Amendment** - The petitioner is requesting to amend the future land use map in the Central Community Master Plan from low-density residential to medium/high density residential for the parcel at 833 South 800 East. **Case number PLNPCM2019-01110**
- II. **Zoning Map Amendment** - The petitioner is requesting to amend the zoning map designation of the property at 833 South 800 East from R-2 Single and Two-Family Residential to the RMF-45 – Moderate/High Density Residential Zoning district. **Case number PLNPCM2019-01111**
- III. **Planned Development** –Planned Development approval is needed to address various yard setbacks to property lines for the proposed multi-family development. **Case number PLNSUB2019-01112**

The property is located within Council District 5, represented by Darin Mano. (Staff contact: David Gellner at (801) 535-6107 or david.gellner@slcgov.com)

For Planning Commission agendas, staff reports, and minutes, visit the Planning Division's website at slc.gov/planning/public-meetings. Staff Reports will be posted the Friday prior to the meeting and minutes will be posted two days after they are ratified, which usually occurs at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Planning Commission.

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

**This meeting was held electronically pursuant to Salt Lake City Emergency Proclamation
No. 2 of 2020 (2)(b)
Wednesday, May 27, 2020**

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:30:26 PM](#). Audio recordings of the Planning Commission meetings are retained for a period of time.

Present for the Planning Commission meeting were: Chairperson Adrienne Bell; Vice Chairperson Brenda Scheer; Commissioners Maurine Bachman, Amy Barry, Carolynn Hoskins, Jon Lee, Matt Lyon, Andres Paredes, Sara Urquhart, Crystal Young-Otterstrom.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Michaela Oktay, Planning Deputy Director; Nick Norris, Planning Director; Paul Nielson, Attorney; Wayne Mills, Planning Manager; Chris Earl, Principal Planner; Mayara Lima, Principal Planner; David Gellner, Principal Planner, and Marlene Rankins, Administrative Secretary.

Michaela Oktay, Planning Deputy Director, provided participation information.

APPROVAL OF THE MAY 13, 2020, MEETING MINUTES. [5:32:20 PM](#)

MOTION [5:32:33 PM](#)

Commissioner Lyon moved to approve the May 13, 2020, meeting minutes. Commissioner Scheer seconded the motion. Commissioners Bachman, Lyon, Paredes, Scheer, Urquhart, and Young-Otterstrom voted “Aye”. Commissioner Barry abstained from voting. The motion passed 6-1.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR [5:34:44 PM](#)

Chairperson Bell stated she had nothing to report.

Vice Chairperson Scheer stated she had nothing to report.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR [5:34:54 PM](#)

Michaela Oktay, Planning Deputy Director stated she had nothing to report.

[5:35:08 PM](#)

ADU Conditional Use at approximately 2174 South 1900 East - Antonio Padilla, property owner, is requesting Conditional Use approval for a 750 square foot accessory dwelling unit (ADU) to be located in the basement of a new home proposed at approximately 2174 S 1900 E. The property is zoned R-1/7,000 Single-Family Residential, where ADUs must be processed as a conditional use. The property is located within Council District 7, represented by Amy Fowler. (Staff contact: Chris Earl at (801) 535-7932 or christopher.earl@slcgov.com) **Case number PLNPCM2020-00064**

Chris Earl, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff recommended that the Planning Commission approve the Conditional Use request with the conditions listed in the staff report.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- Clarification on differences between an ADU and duplex

Antonio Padilla, applicant, was available for questions.

Commissioner Lee seconded the motion. Bachman, Barry, Hoskins, Lee, Urquhart, and Young-Otterstrom voted “Aye”. Commissioners Lyon, Paredes, and Scheer voted “Nay”. The motion passed 6-3.

Commissioner Andres Paredes was excused from the meeting.

[8:25:17 PM](#)

Telegraph Exchange Lofts Rezoning, Master Plan Amendment & Planned Development at approximately 833 & 847 South 800 East - Micah Peter of Clearwater Homes, the property owner, is requesting a Master Plan Amendment, Zoning Map Amendment, and Planned Development approval to construct a twenty-three (23) unit residential development called the Telegraph Exchange Lofts at 833 & 847 South 800 East. The proposal involves two (2) properties, one of which would be rezoned. A total of six (6) residential lofts would be developed within the existing Telegraph Exchange Building and an additional seventeen (17) new 3-story townhouse units would be added to the site. A total of 47 parking spaces will be provided. The proposed project is subject to the following petitions:

- I. **Master Plan Amendment** - The petitioner is requesting to amend the future land use map in the Central Community Master Plan from low-density residential to medium/high density residential for the parcel at 833 South 800 East. **Case number PLNPCM2019-01110**
- II. **Zoning Map Amendment** - The petitioner is requesting to amend the zoning map designation of the property at 833 South 800 East from R-2 Single and Two-Family Residential to the RMF-45 – Moderate/High Density Residential Zoning district. **Case number PLNPCM2019-01111**
- III. **Planned Development** –Planned Development approval is needed to address various yard setbacks to property lines for the proposed multi-family development. **Case number PLNSUB2019-01112**

The property is located within Council District 5, represented by Darin Mano. (Staff contact: David Gellner at (801) 535-6107 or david.gellner@slcgov.com)

David Gellner, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff recommended that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to approve the Master Plan Amendment and Zoning Map Amendment. He also stated Staff recommended that the Planning Commission table the Planned Development.

Micah Peters, applicant, provided a presentation along with further details including plans for a roof-top deck complete with outdoor kitchen, a possible art piece on the building, outdoor elevator and roof-top landscaping.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- Clarification on the existing building being 16,000 square feet
- Number of units proposed
- Whether the units are rentals or for purchase
- Clarification on individual unit sizes

PUBLIC HEARING [8:55:26 PM](#)

Chairperson Bell opened the Public Hearing;

Judi Short – Stated she in favor of the restoration of the building but is not in favor of the rezone and doesn't like the design of the Planned Development. She referenced the previous downzoning of the area in 2013, felt the setback should match the rest of the street, said the planned development would have a "gated community feel". She also suggested eliminating the pool to provide more space to neighboring properties.

Jason Stevenson, Co-Chair of East Liberty Park Community Organization – Stated the community submitted a letter that covered the community outreach. He raised concern with the impact that reversing the previous downzoning would have on other Community Councils and neighborhoods across the City as the effort was a good example of a neighborhood self-determination effort.

Zachary Dussault – Spoke in favor of the application for all 3 parts of the request. Stated that having vehicles enter from Chase Avenue would be a better design. The townhomes would provide a step-down from the taller building to the rest of the neighborhood.

Janelle Bauer – Representing Cody Derek, property owner to the North of the project, raised concern regarding the lack of separation between his him and the neighboring townhomes. She stated that her client relied on the previous rezone from RMF-35 to R-2 to buffer him from the Telegraph property when he built his house.

Julie Bjornstad – Provided an email comment stating her opposition of the request. This was read into the record by staff.

Sebastian Hoch – Provided an email comment stating his opposition of the request. This was read into the record by staff.

Missy Greis – Provided and email comment stated her support of the request. This was read into the record by staff.

Numerous other emails and letters, both in support and opposed to the project were provided in the staff report packet and the Planning Commission Dropbox.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- What the plans are for the existing trees
- Location of the new curb cut
- Clarification on whether there is a protected status on the property
- Whether it's appropriate in the process to wait on making a zoning decision until the concerns regarding the Planned Development are addressed

Cindy Cromer – Stated she disagrees with staff and evaluation of the Master Planning documents because the most important one is the most recent one. She said that rezoning should be a comprehensive effort and not piecemeal and that people should be able to expect the zoning in an area to not change. A new effort was overdue for the area.

Seeing no one else wished to speak; Chairperson Bell closed the Public Hearing.

The applicant addressed the public's concerns.

The Commission and Applicant further discussed the following:

- Clarification on zoning choice the applicant is requesting

- Whether the applicant explored other options for access and parking
- Concerns with the fire access requirements and resolution of those issues
- Tabling the whole thing would be better so that the PC could learn more about the planned development
- The neighborhood self-determination issue it is heading
- Need to balance public concerns but also acknowledge that there are positive comments
- The scale generally works
- The area is walkable with Smith's nearby

The applicant should explore the following items:

- Driveway location
- Fire access requirements
- Setback issues

MOTION [9:46:13 PM](#)

Commissioner Scheer stated, I move that we table all 3 pending applications until the applicant can resolve the issues identified in the staff report with the Planned Development.

Commissioner Urquhart seconded the motion. Commissioners Young-Otterstrom, Urquhart, Scheer, Lyon, Lee, Hoskins, Barry, and Bachman voted "Aye". The motion passed unanimously.

The following is a list of Q&A's that were received during the meeting:

Q&A Session for Planning Commission Meeting May 27, 2020

Session number: 969768690

Date: Wednesday, May 27, 2020

Starting time: 8:04 PM

Zachary Dussault (zacharytdussault@gmail.com) - 6:55 PM

Q: nothing to do with the roads

Priority: N/A

Zachary Dussault (zacharytdussault@gmail.com) - 5:44 PM

Q: I would like to speak but I cant raise my hand

Priority: N/A-

-Nick Norris - 5:44 PM

A: Thanks, we will call on you.

Zachary Dussault (zacharytdussault@gmail.com) - 8:20 PM

Q: still has to go before the city council, will take weeks

Priority: N/A

Zachary Dussault (zacharytdussault@gmail.com) - 8:41 PM

Q: Dont see the presentation

Priority: N/A

Jason Stevenson (jstevenson51@hotmail.com) - 8:59 PM

Q: I would like to speak, too

Priority: N/A

Jason Stevenson (jstevenson51@hotmail.com) - 8:59 PM

Q: I would like to speak, too

Priority: N/A

Zachary Dussault (zacharytdussault@gmail.com) - 9:24 PM

Q: Bad echo

Priority: N/A

Zachary Dussault (zacharytdussault@gmail.com) - 9:49 PM

Q: Staff suggested the setback be greater. it was originally planned closer to the street for the townhomes.

Priority: N/A

Zachary Dussault (zacharytdussault@gmail.com) - 9:50 PM

Q: goodnight yall!

Priority: N/A

Zachary Dussault (zacharytdussault@gmail.com) - 9:50 PM

Q: oh boy its just gonna be all me complaining.

Priority: N/A

The meeting adjourned at [9:48:59 PM](#)

4. Additional Public Comments Received after the May 27, 2020 PC Public Hearing

Gellner, David

From: Marian Florence <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, June 29, 2020 11:19 AM
To: Gellner, David
Cc: Nathan Florence
Subject: Re: (EXTERNAL) Telegraph Exchange Project: July 8

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Thanks, David.

I notice that the revisions don't address some of our main concerns -

- the landscape buffer on the north side is required to be 10' - not 4'
- the Master Plan amendment is not warranted, especially when ensuring that the proposal is "compatible in scale"
- setbacks are still not addressed
- loss of mature trees is still not addressed
- density, height, traffic, neighborhood compatibility not addressed

We would welcome a discussion of a compatible project that did not propose such unsuitable/unsustainable density onto this block. We support the preservation of the historic building, but question the developer's insistence (and threats) that this plan is the only way to preserve the building.

What can we do to continue this conversation and ensure that developers meet the requirements of the City Master Plan and zoning laws? We rely on the Planning Department and Planning Commission to hold developers to these requirements.

Thanks,

Marian

[REDACTED]

On Mon, Jun 29, 2020 at 9:00 AM Gellner, David <David.Gellner@slcgov.com> wrote:

Marian and Nathan,

Your comments and concerns will be considered by the Planning Commission and they are included in the staff report attachment for public comments via the emails you sent to me on 01/01/2020, 01/30/2020 and 05/19/2020.

In terms of plan changes, the applicant has changed the following things since the last Planning Commission meeting:

1. A landscaping buffer has been added along the north side of the driveway adjacent to the single-family property to the north. The landscaping buffer is 4-feet wide and will be planted with trees.
2. The proposed trash and recycling dumpster on the north property line has been removed. Each of the units will be served by individual cans per unit.
3. A pedestrian gate between the property and the Smith's site will be added on the east side of the development to allow residents to more easily access Smith's and the 9th and 9th business district.

Those are the extent of the changes since the last PC meeting. If you have any additional questions, please let me know. D.

Regards,

DAVID J. GELLNER, MAG, AICP

Principal Planner

Salt Lake City Planning Division

Desk: **801-535-6107**

From: Marian Florence <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, June 28, 2020 9:05 AM
To: Gellner, David <David.Gellner@slcgov.com>
Cc: Nathan Florence <[REDACTED]>
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Telegraph Exchange Project: July 8

Mr. Gellner,

We notice that the project proposal is on the July 8th agenda for the Planning Commission - can you please ensure that all of our comments and concerns are still in consideration, and let us know if the plans have been amended at all prior to this meeting? Micah has been unresponsive to us as neighbors, and our concerns about the amendment to the Master Plan and high density zoning changes remain.

I am happy to reiterate them if necessary.

Thanks,

Marian Florence

817 S 800 E



Gellner, David

From: missy greis [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, July 3, 2020 6:54 PM
To: Gellner, David; Mano, Darin
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Support For Telegraph

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hello Gentlemen!

I am re-submitting my thoughts (below) from my May email regarding the Telegraph Exchange project. For reference, I am the owner of the Publik restaurants and have owned the property at 931 E. 900 S. since 1997, which has housed Publik Kitchen since 2016. Until last year I resided at 931 S. 900 East, but I still consider 9th/9th my home and my neighborhood. For 23 years I have watched this special neighborhood expand and grow. I have watched City Hall navigate builders and developers and residents who have made investments in the improvement of our cool, popular business district and neighborhood.

My sentiment from May remains the same today, two months later. I fear that there will be further comments dissenting from many of us who live/work in the neighborhood. Many of these people may not have followed the entire timeline and path of this project and may not understand the results of the proposed variances/permits not being approved : Another developer could procure this parcel, raze the existing building and construct something average and mediocre. I have watched the progression of the referenced project and I feel strongly that the proposed development of the Telegraph Exchange Lofts is a "win" for our neighborhood due to several factors, but here are three that I feel, as a third party, are important to note:

1. The developer has a proven track record in SLC of building with responsible + sustainable practices. He is local. He understands the sensibility of our unique neighborhood. He and his family plan to live in the building.
2. The size and scale are an investment being made by the developer that not only make the project financially feasible but also create a tasteful + superior design (one that another out of state, or out of touch, developer couldn't capture).
3. The project meets the ordinances, specifically parking, which is the one issue that has always been a concern with our property owners.

All my best to you both and thank you for your time.

missy greis
publik coffee roasters



Gellner, David

From: Adina Hamik Gardner [REDACTED] >
Sent: Friday, July 3, 2020 1:15 PM
To: Gellner, David
Subject: (EXTERNAL) 833 & 847 South 800 East

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear David,

My husband Rob and myself wanted to draft a note to you regarding Micah's property on 833 & 847 South, 800 East and the upcoming July 8th P&Z hearing.

We own two properties on 800 East - Corner of 800 East and 900 South as well as the Adjacent building to Micah's building (859s 800 East). We are well aware of the project and the breath of the reconstruction of the old Telegraph building and attended planning meetings in the past. We are in total support of Micah and this project.

As you can imagine, we look at this building every day. We always hoped someone would take the building and repurpose it into something useful for the community. Micah's project is perfect for this street and his attention to parking and environmental sensitivity goes up and beyond what we could hope for in a neighbor.

We hope your committee gives final approval to this project knowing his next door neighbors give full support behind him.

Feel free to contact us with any other questions.

Adina and Rob Gardner

Gellner, David

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, July 6, 2020 1:15 PM
To: Gellner, David
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Micah Peter's Telegraph building project.

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hello David,

I've lived in the 9th and 9th neighborhood for over 25 years now. I love the old trees and the architecture of the victorian style houses. The Telegraph building has captured my imagination from the beginning. I've had many fantasies about what I would do to restore it and make it a lasting gem. I've always feared that "progress" would level the building and something dreadfully utilitarian would replace it. When I found out the Micah Peters had bought the building and had plans to restore it, I was relieved and excited.

I've had the opportunity to talk to Micah about his intentions. I've seen the plans for both the restoration and apartments. I love that Micah has been conscientious about how his project will impact the neighborhood. From what I understand, part of his hopes for the apartments is to create a gathering place and promote community. This is unusual for a developer and sets this project apart from the normal "just business" approach.

I get that Salt Lake County has a housing shortage and I'd much rather have someone concerned with aesthetics and neighborhood impact preserve and build something tasteful than see one more ugly highrise complex go up.

As a house owner who loves this area, I'm very much in support of Michah's Telegraph building restoration and apartment complex plans.

Sincerely,
Mike Roskelley
1047 Sout 800 East
Salt Lake City Utah 84105

Gellner, David

From: Brad Waltman <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, July 6, 2020 4:31 PM
To: Gellner, David
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Telegraph Project

Hi David -

I wanted to reach out and pass along my support for the Telegraph Project that is being considered for the 9th and 9th neighborhood. I work in the neighborhood as an architect and designer and own a store with my wife, Meggan on Lincoln Blvd. a few blocks away. We are excited to have a project that has been well planned and will add density our neighborhood in a thoughtful way. Mica Peters has reached out several times to ask for critical feedback and our input on how to execute his vision while keeping the community vibe we love about the current neighborhood. After spending many years studying urban planning, I recognize the next necessary phase for our neighborhood is more density. I work with many clients each year that are leaving the suburbs and purchasing homes in the 9th and 9th area, seeking a pedestrian life that eliminates driving time and beige strip malls.

Please let me know if you have any questions of me, in our support for this project.

Best Regards,

Brad Waltman

Inhabit
[REDACTED]

Gellner, David

From: Sebastian Hoch <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, July 6, 2020 10:28 PM
To: Gellner, David; Mano, Darin
Cc: elpcoslc@gmail.com; Planning Public Comments
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Telegraph Exchange Project - Planning Commission meeting 8 July 2020

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

To the Planning Commission and concerned parties,

Before to previously tabled Telegraph Exchange Project (TEXP) comes to a vote I would like to use the opportunity to express my opposition against the original and revised form of plans for the Telegraph Exchange Building and the neighboring lot presented by Micah Peters. The revisions made in the project since the May 27 meeting do not address the following:

The plans are in direct opposition of

- the Central Community Master Plan to "conserve neighborhood's residential character"
- the Central Community Master Plan to "ensure new multi-family development is carefully sited, well designed, and compatible in scale"
- the recent efforts of our community the preserve the neighborhood that resulted in the rezoning to R-2, which was aimed to exactly prevent this kind of developer's overreach.

Here are just some of the characteristics that highlight why the proposed plan are not compatible with the neighborhood's character:

- The vast amount of units would basically double the number of residences on the street (i.e. the development is clearly NOT in scale)
- The disregard of, and thus request for changes of, the required setbacks, (i.e. change in neighborhood character).
- The height of the additional units (3-stories instead of 2), (i.e. change in neighborhood character).
- The "gated" character that is the result of squeezing a pool onto the property (i.e. change in neighborhood character).

I'd like to stress that I am in no means opposed the preservation of the historic Telegraph Exchange Building. Recent changes (renovation and remodel) to the properties on the north end of the block clearly show that buildings and neighborhood character can be preserved. This is the kind of development the neighborhood needs and supports. More moderate changes - and compatible in scale to the existing neighborhood - would be welcomed. The threat with the demolition of the historic building if the developer does not get his plans approved in the present form is further evidence that he is not interested in the neighborhood but in maximizing the number of units that can be squeezed onto the lots, and ultimate the developer's economic gain.

I urge the members of the council to hear our voices and to protect us residents on the street from changes led by developer's massive overreach and the blatant disregard for rules set in place by the Central Community Master Plan to protect the character of our neighborhood.

I thus herewith urge you to oppose:

- the Master Plan Amendment
- the Zoning Map Amendment
- and the Planned Development

Thank you,

Sebastian Hoch (813 S 800 E)

Gellner, David

From: Robert Gardner <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, July 6, 2020 11:43 PM
To: Gellner, David
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Proposed Telegraph Exchange Lofts Project: 833 & 847 South 800 East

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr Gellner,

My name is Robert Gardner. And I am writing you to encourage your efforts to support and ultimately approve the Proposed Telegraph Exchange Lofts Project at 833 & 847 South 800 East. As the property owner of two properties on the 800 block of 800 East, one immediately adjacent to the project (849 S 800 East) and one diagonally across the street (777 E 900 South) I am vested in both the overall community of 9th and 9th, and in a neighborhood project immediately next door. Additionally, my wife and have our residence within a half block of the 9th n 9th intersection (943 S Lincoln St). It's not an overstatement to say we are drawn to the unique character and quality of life the area offers.

We were able to actually acquire the property immediately next door (849 S 800 East) to the proposed Telegraph Exchange Lofts, because we assured the seller (The Life in Christ CDC Church) that our intentions to remodel the building would be in keeping with the overall character and vibe of the neighborhood, and continue to serve the community. A commitment we take to heart, to us it's about maintaining a neighborhood we know and love.

One need not look too hard around Salt Lake City, to see examples of "investments" made by various entities which are both an affront to the character of the surrounding neighborhood and the residents themselves. Having attended several community hearings and open houses where Micah Peters has both presented his proposed project and solicited resident inputs, several things are quite evident. 1) Mr Peters not only wants to "reside" in the neighborhood, but wants to be a genuine "part" of the community. 2) He is going to great lengths to not only preserve a unique historic structure and restore it - thereby ensuring it's survival - but will maintain those design elements in the adjacent new construction. In the decades the building has stood empty, I am unaware of anyone else willing to dedicate such personal effort and significant financial resources to that end. And, 3) given the choice between the potential for a wonderful historical neighborhood building to remain derelict, be demolished, or be restored and repurposed into a valuable and vibrant part of the community. My wife and I, and the overwhelming majority of our neighbors, would wholeheartedly support Micah Peters Telegraph Exchange Lofts project.

As a next-door neighbor and re-developer, Micah Peters has our full support for his proposed telegraph Exchange project. It is our hope the city will also recognize his well considered efforts, and the asset Mr Peters would be to the 9th n 9th area and the City overall.

Sincerely,

Robert L Gardner
849 S 800 East
Salt Lake City

[REDACTED]

Gellner, David

From: vipada chitratont <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, July 7, 2020 12:01 AM
To: Gellner, David
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Letter of support for The Telegraph Exchange Lofts

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Mr. Gellner,

My name is Vipada Chitratont, and I am the Owner of Thai Garden Restaurant and the property located at 868 E 900 South.

I wanted to write a letter of support for the Telegraph Exchange Loft project. I am familiar with other quality projects completed by Micah Peters and Clearwater Homes and believe they will complete a wonderful project that will benefit all aspects of the 9th & 9th community. Our business district needs more residents and walkability to continue to be viable. This project provides an economic boost to the neighborhood, while still providing ample parking for the new residents. I look forward to seeing this project completed, and encourage the Planning commission and the City Council to approve the proposal.

Sincerely,
Vipada Chitratont



Virus-free. www.avast.com

Gellner, David

From: Robert Gardner <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, July 6, 2020 11:43 PM
To: Gellner, David
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Proposed Telegraph Exchange Lofts Project: 833 & 847 South 800 East

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Mr Gellner,

My name is Robert Gardner. And I am writing you to encourage your efforts to support and ultimately approve the Proposed Telegraph Exchange Lofts Project at 833 & 847 South 800 East. As the property owner of two properties on the 800 block of 800 East, one immediately adjacent to the project (849 S 800 East) and one diagonally across the street (777 E 900 South) I am vested in both the overall community of 9th and 9th, and in a neighborhood project immediately next door. Additionally, my wife and have our residence within a half block of the 9th n 9th intersection (943 S Lincoln St). It's not an overstatement to say we are drawn to the unique character and quality of life the area offers.

We were able to actually acquire the property immediately next door (849 S 800 East) to the proposed Telegraph Exchange Lofts, because we assured the seller (The Life in Christ CDC Church) that our intentions to remodel the building would be in keeping with the overall character and vibe of the neighborhood, and continue to serve the community. A commitment we take to heart, to us it's about maintaining a neighborhood we know and love.

One need not look too hard around Salt Lake City, to see examples of "investments" made by various entities which are both an affront to the character of the surrounding neighborhood and the residents themselves. Having attended several community hearings and open houses where Micah Peters has both presented his proposed project and solicited resident inputs, several things are quite evident. 1) Mr Peters not only wants to "reside" in the neighborhood, but wants to be a genuine "part" of the community. 2) He is going to great lengths to not only preserve a unique historic structure and restore it - thereby ensuring it's survival - but will maintain those design elements in the adjacent new construction. In the decades the building has stood empty, I am unaware of anyone else willing to dedicate such personal effort and significant financial resources to that end. And, 3) given the choice between the potential for a wonderful historical neighborhood building to remain derelict, be demolished, or be restored and repurposed into a valuable and vibrant part of the community. My wife and I, and the overwhelming majority of our neighbors, would wholeheartedly support Micah Peters Telegraph Exchange Lofts project.

As a next-door neighbor and re-developer, Micah Peters has our full support for his proposed telegraph Exchange project. It is our hope the city will also recognize his well considered efforts, and the asset Mr Peters would be to the 9th n 9th area and the City overall.

Sincerely,

Robert L Gardner
849 S 800 East
Salt Lake City

[REDACTED]

5. Original Petitions



Master Plan Amendment

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING

☐ Amend the text of the Master Plan

☐ Amend the Land Use Map

OFFICE USE ONLY

Received By:

Date Received:

Project #:

PLNPCM2019-0110

11/22/19

A. Anglin

Name of Master Plan Amendment:

Telegraph Exchange E&TS

PLEASE PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION

Address of Subject Property (or Area):

847 SOUTH 800 EAST, SLC, UT 84102

Name of Applicant:

CLEARWATER HOMES / MICAH PETERS

Phone:

801-599-1839

Address of Applicant:

336 W. BROADWAY #110, SLC, UT 84101

E-mail of Applicant:

MICAH@CLEARWATERHOMESUTAH.COM

Cell/Fax:

801-599-1839

Applicant's Interest in Subject Property:

☒ Owner

☒ Contractor

☐ Architect

☐ Other:

Name of Property Owner (if different from applicant):

SAME AS ABOVE

E-mail of Property Owner:

SAME AS ABOVE

Phone:

SAME AS ABOVE

Please note that additional information may be required by the project planner to ensure adequate information is provided for staff analysis. All information required for staff analysis will be copied and made public, including professional architectural or engineering drawings, for the purposes of public review by any interested party.

AVAILABLE CONSULTATION

Planners are available for consultation prior to submitting this application. Please call (801) 535-7700 if you have any questions regarding the requirements of this application.

REQUIRED FEE

Filing fee of \$970 plus \$121 per acre in excess of one acre.

\$100 for newspaper notice.

Plus additional fee for mailed public notices.

SIGNATURE

If applicable, a notarized statement of consent authorizing applicant to act as an agent will be required.

Signature of Owner or Agent:

Date:

[Signature]

11/20/2019

SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

Staff Review

1. Project Description (please attach additional sheets.)

- | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Describe the proposed master plan amendment. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | A statement declaring the purpose for the amendment. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Declare why the present master plan requires amending. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Is the request amending the Land Use Map?
If so, please list the parcel numbers to be changed. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Is the request amending the text of the master plan?
If so, please include exact language to be changed. |

WHERE TO FILE THE COMPLETE APPLICATION

<i>Mailing Address:</i>	Planning Counter PO Box 145471 Salt Lake City, UT 84114	<i>In Person:</i>	Planning Counter 451 South State Street, Room 215 Telephone: (801) 535-7700
-------------------------	---	-------------------	---

INCOMPLETE APPLICATIONS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED

- ☒ I acknowledge that Salt Lake City requires the items above to be submitted before my application can be processed. I understand that Planning will not accept my application unless all of the following items are included in the submittal package.
-

RE: MASTER PLAN AMENDMENT

PARCEL 16-08-176-015
847 South 800 East
Salt Lake City, UT 84102

PARCEL 16-08-176-026
833 South 800 East
Salt Lake City, UT 84102

The proposed project consists of consolidating two parcels, both owned by Micah Peters (Clearwater Homes): Parcel 16-08-176-015 located at 847 S 800 E is 0.50 Acres and Parcel 16-08-176-026 located at 833 S 800 E is 0.29 acres. The combined parcels will consist of 23 future residential units.

Clearwater Homes has been through a rigorous design process focused on preserving the existing 3-story, unreinforced masonry, 16,000 square foot historic Telephone & Telegraph building. The said structure was built in 1911 by the Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Company and served as one of the first Utah operator stations for the new telephone technology. In addition to the adaptive re-use efforts to place 6 residential lofts in the existing historic building, the project will have 17 3-story modern townhomes tactically placed in a manner that activates and completes the 800 east and Chase avenue street fronts.

Total # of Units 23

The 23 units include:

- 6 unique loft floor plans in the Historic building
- 8 1,750 SF, 3 bed, 4 bath town home unit types
- 9 1,350 SF, 2 bed, 3 bath town home unit types

Parcel 16-08-176-015 located at 847 South 800 East has been an unimproved warehouse for over 20 years, however the building has some historical significance. The added density as noted is essential to our efforts to preserve and restore the historic building. It goes without saying the adaptive reuse of the historic building costs 2.5 times more per square foot to complete compared to traditional new construction. As stated, the added density of 5 residential units associated with our 4 applications will afford us the economic capability to preserve the 16,000 square foot historic building. In the event we are not successful in gaining the added density, it may be necessary to demolish the historic building and simply use the existing density of 18 new structures (RMF-45 zone for 847 S allows for 16 units as survey of parcel is over 21,800 SF, and 833 S has 2 units available with current R-2 zone).

In order to restore/re-use the historic building and achieve the 23 total unit density on the site, SLC planning department has directed us to submit the following applications simultaneously with this Planned Development application.

- 1- Lot consolidation application.
- 2- Rezone application.
- 3- Planned Development Amendment application.

Lot consolidation application- This requirement is derived from the fact that the proposed project is comprised of 2 separate parcels. The consolidation of the two parcels will simplify the land plan and



clarify setback requirements throughout the project. Additionally, buildings and utilities will not end up bridging or straddling lot lines.

Rezone Application-As noted above, the project consists of 2 parcels: 847 S 800 E is .50 Acres and currently zoned RM-45, while 833 S 800 E is .29 acres and currently zoned R-2. When we purchased the properties back in 2011, the 847 S 800 E has its current RM-45 zoning, and 833 S 800 E had a RM35 zoning. Utilizing the density afforded by both of the original zones would afford us the total 23 units we are currently requesting. Because 833 S 800E was rezoned to R-2 in 2013, we will be submitting a rezone request. While we are asking for a single zone for the consolidated lot of RM-45, (which would afford substantial density), we are capping the development density at the proposed 23 total units.

Planned Development. This application simply details the land plan for the development, setbacks on the newly consolidated lot, as well as establishing the 30' height on the new residential structures.

Master Plan Amendment- The need for this application stems from a conflict in the Masterplan adopted in 2005. The conflict in the master plan is due to the master plan land use language to be low density throughout the neighborhood (10 - 20 units per acre), even on parcels zoned RMF-45 which is a moderate to high density multi-family residential zoning. Our application seeks simply to correct the noted Master plan conflict and utilize the density's associated with our current zoning.

City Masterplan References;

- *Central Community Master Plan, adopted 11/01/2005*
- *East Central Community Small Area Master Plan, adopted 12/1992: revised 01/1993*
- *9 Line Corridor Master Plan, adopted 03/03/15*

Central Community MP Bullet Points in support of the MP change;

- Conflicts with Zoning Ordinance and Master Plan. The MP indicates the Land use to be Low Density Residential (10-20 units per acre). The current zone is RMF – 45 Moderate/High Multi-Family Residential (31 units possible total units if zoning change is approved)
- Application is proposing 23 units, max.
- Promoting "intent" of the MP through the following;
 1. Preservation of the community's architectural heritage
 2. Protect and improve the quality of life
 3. Improve and support community involvement
 4. Capital improvement in the neighborhood
 5. Provide smarter and more creative development practices
 6. Overall project is a low dense project below the zoned maximum
 7. Preserving the historic structure and maintaining the residential neighborhood integrity
 8. Promote walkable development
 9. The increase of density will support neighborhood business uses and expand their use of common public facilities.
 10. With future expansion of the 9-Line system the project will maintain the integrity of the transit-oriented opportunities
 11. Promote quality of excellence to maintain and enhance the quality of living
 12. Modern townhouses offer the neighborhood a variety of housing types



13. All parking is contained on site

East Central Comm. Small Area MP Bullet Points in support of the MP change;

- Promoting “intent” of the MP through the following;
 1. Maintains and preserve residential neighborhood integrity and a sense of security with additional eyes on the street
 2. Maintain and preserves a viable commercial business district within the neighborhood.
 3. All parking is contained on site.
 4. Chase Avenue is will be upgraded. The Avenue is a private street and will be developed & enhanced with a plan that facilitates parking and currently signed off and supported by all property owners.

9-Line Corridor MP Bullet Points in support of the MP change;

- Promoting “intent” of the MP through the following;
 1. Residential density to support the future extension of the 9-line

The submittal of the Master Plan Amendment benefits from the supporting summary of the Planned Development Application, therefore, the summary overlay is included below:

Zero emissions residential community

Residential emissions accounts for 38% of all carbon dioxide contributions into the Wasatch Front local airshed. In addition to general climate change problems, local air quality is dramatically impacted by the widespread burning of natural gas as a residential furnace and hot water heating source. Clearwater Homes believes that development should not contribute to high frequency asthma for the developing lungs of Utah children. As such, the Telegraph Exchange lofts will work to eliminate residential gas meters by utilizing all electric furnaces and hot water heaters powered 100% by offsite renewable energy solar farms. Additionally, we plan to have 100% of our 47 onsite parking stalls include EV stations for electric vehicles (this parking stall count does not include the 4 parallel street parking stalls on 800 E).

Planned Development Information. Description of how your project meets one or more of the following objectives

- A. Combination and coordination of architectural styles, building forms, building materials, and building relationships;**
- B. Preservation and enhancement of desirable site characteristics such as natural topography, vegetation and geologic features, and the prevention of soil erosion;**
- C. Preservation of buildings which are architecturally or historically significant or contribute to the character of the city;**
- D. Use of design, landscape, or architectural features to create a pleasing environment;**
- E. Inclusion of special development amenities that are in the interest of the general public;**



- F. Elimination of blighted structures or incompatible uses through redevelopment or rehabilitation;**
- G. Inclusion of affordable housing with market rate housing; or**
- H. Utilization of "green" building techniques in development**

The Telegraph Exchange Lofts will meet objectives a, c, d, & h above, per the following:

A. Combination and coordination of architectural styles, building forms, building materials, and building relationships; The proposed project will carefully contrast historic reverence with modernism. Massing and exterior materials will include restored historic brick, cementitious/fiber cement panels, lap siding, smooth finished EIFS material, and architectural metals.

C. Preservation of buildings which are architecturally or historically significant or contribute to the character of the city; The proposed project will carefully contrast historic reverence with modernism. Adaptive re-use and preservation construction methodology will be important and central to the project. As noted above, the site houses a 1911, 3 story, 16,000 SF, historic building originally known as the Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph building. The brick exterior massing of the Telegraph building will be tucked, pointed, and sealed by a professional mason with historic restoration credentials. The notable plaster mold cornice, soffit, and fascia located on the west facing 3 story roof transition will be preserved, sealed and painted. High quality wood clad/steel divided light windows that meet the demands for historic tax credits will be installed.

We have provided pictures (see exhibit A) of the original historic porch circa 1920. The LDS Church demolished this porch due to security problems in the 1980's. As part of our adaptive re-use efforts, we will reconstruct a precise replica of the original front porch. As the tallest building in the 9th & 9th neighborhood, the Telegraph building is visible on the skyline for several blocks. We firmly believe that restoration and preservation of this iconic building will secure an important and contributing asset to the fabric of the 9th and 9th community for generations.

D. Use of design, landscape, or architectural features to create a pleasing environment; The project design, landscape architecture, and planting schedule has been thoughtfully curated by the LOCI design group. The site plan was designed to place front porches in the manner that activates the street frontages of 800 east and Chase avenue. In addition to numerous raised planter beds, hundreds of trees, perennial grasses & flowers, the project amenities include a 10'X60' lap pool and a heavily forested roof top deck. See attached landscape plan and water wise species/planting schedule.

The planting scheme will feature a variety of hardy native and/or climate adapted trees, shrubs, and grasses. Areas will be designed with a focus on minimizing water use, enhancing the urban forest, and creating comfortable use areas through shading and screening. Additionally, the design will draw inspiration from the natural conditions of the Valley and surrounding mountains. Trees will be small to medium varieties that strive to



provide year-round interest while also meeting aforementioned design goals. Shrubs will be low to medium height and ideally provide year-round interest.

Potential Tree Varieties include Serviceberry, Tatarian Maple, and Paperbark Maple

Potential Shrub Varieties include Creeping Oregon Grape, Gro Low Sumac, St. John's Wort

Potential Grass Varieties include Feather Reed Grass, Fountain Grass.

H. Utilization of "green" building techniques in development. The Telegraph Exchange Loft project falls within Clearwater Homes new "Subculture Loft" series. This represents a philosophy of Green Building and zero emissions residential construction. As such, all residences will be constructed with highly efficient electric furnaces and water heaters. With the absence of gas meters, the project will not contribute emissions to the local air shed. It is commonly known that residential natural gas comprises make significant contributions to pollution that negatively impact the air quality on the WASTACH FRONT. In addition to the "Zero Emissions "strategy, we will employ a number of other green building techniques and sustainable material applications.

As part of this Planned Unit development application, we have designed the land plan and are seeking approval for the following setbacks (see site plan attached):

West-800 East

The West side of the existing historic building currently sits 11'9"" back from the property line. To maintain an inline street front, we are proposing the 4 new townhome structures fronting 800 E maintain the same setback as the historic building.

East

This side of the property is contiguous to the Smiths commercial parking lot. Our new structures will be located at a section A-37'6", and Section B-5' setback from the property line.

North

Building on this side of the property will have a 20'4" setback from the property line of the contiguous residential lot. Landscape buffer between RMF-45 and R-2 will be completed on R-2 property. An agreement has been made between parties.

South

Chase Avenue- The south side of the existing historic building currently sits on the property line, while the new structures fronting Chase Avenue (private street) will have a 4' setback from the right of way. All Chase avenue owners have formally consented to the setback and development plan. The consents have been documented and notarized.

Height



The historic building height is 58'. This height will be maintained as part of the roof top deck area and restoration of the building. All new residential structures on the site will be capped at 30' or less.

Fire Safety

We anticipate and have budgeted the installation of fire sprinklers for all interior space in the historic building and new residential structures.

Additional purpose and Objective Bullet Points

- Encouraging efficient use of land and resources
- Encouraging innovative planning and development
- Reinforcing the character of the surrounding neighborhood
- Development will result in a more enhanced product than would be achievable through strict application of land use regulations through the Historic Preservation of the Telegraph Exchange building. The Telegraph Exchange building is a large contributor to the character of shaping the city and contributing to the general welfare of the city's residents.
- The development will be another contributor to the future extension of the 9-Line Corridor with the addition of residences to the area.

Sincerely,
Micah Wells Peters
Clearwater Homes



Zoning Amendment

☐ Amend the text of the Zoning Ordinance ☒ Amend the Zoning Map

OFFICE USE ONLY

Received By: <i>PNP/CMZ/19-0111</i>	Date Received: <i>11/22/19</i>	Project #: <i>A Anglin</i>
Name or Section/s of Zoning Amendment: <i>Telegraph Exchange Cofts</i>		

PLEASE PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION

Address of Subject Property (or Area): 833 SOUTH 800 EAST, SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84102	
Name of Applicant: CLEARWATER HOMES / MICAH PETERS	Phone: 801-599-1839
Address of Applicant: 336 W. BROADWAY #110, SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84101	
E-mail of Applicant: MICAH@CLEARWATERHOMESUTAH.COM	Cell/Fax: 801-599-1839
Applicant's Interest in Subject Property: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Owner <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> Architect <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	
Name of Property Owner (if different from applicant): SAME AS ABOVE	
E-mail of Property Owner: SAME AS ABOVE	Phone: SAME AS ABOVE
<p>Please note that additional information may be required by the project planner to ensure adequate information is provided for staff analysis. All information required for staff analysis will be copied and made public, including professional architectural or engineering drawings, for the purposes of public review by any interested party.</p>	

AVAILABLE CONSULTATION

- If you have any questions regarding the requirements of this application, please contact Salt Lake City Planning Counter at (801) 535-7700 prior to submitting the application.

REQUIRED FEE

- Map Amendment: filing fee of \$1,034, plus \$121 per acre in excess of one acre
Text Amendment: filing fee of \$1,035, plus \$100 for newspaper notice.
Plus additional fee for mailed public notices.

SIGNATURE

- If applicable, a notarized statement of consent authorizing applicant to act as an agent will be required.

Signature of Owner or Agent: <i>[Signature]</i>	Date: 11/20/2019
--	---------------------

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING

SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

Staff Review

1. Project Description (please attach additional sheets.)

- | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | A statement declaring the purpose for the amendment. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | A description of the proposed use of the property being rezoned. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | List the reasons why the present zoning may not be appropriate for the area. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Is the request amending the Zoning Map?
If so, please list the parcel numbers to be changed. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Is the request amending the text of the Zoning Ordinance?
If so, please include language and the reference to the Zoning Ordinance to be changed. |

WHERE TO FILE THE COMPLETE APPLICATION

Mailing Address: Planning Counter
PO Box 145471
Salt Lake City, UT 84114

In Person: Planning Counter
451 South State Street, Room 215
Telephone: (801) 535-7700

INCOMPLETE APPLICATIONS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED

☒ I acknowledge that Salt Lake City requires the items above to be submitted before my application can be processed. I understand that Planning will not accept my application unless all of the following items are included in the submittal package.

RE: ZONING AMENDMENT

PARCEL 16-08-176-015
847 South 800 East
Salt Lake City, UT 84102

PARCEL 16-08-176-026
833 South 800 East
Salt Lake City, UT 84102

This application is accompanied with three other applications associated with the proposed development. The three other applications are: PUD, Lot Consolidation, and Master Plan Amendment.

The project consists of consolidating two parcels that are both owned by Micah Peters: Parcel 16-08-176-015 located at 847 S 800 E is 0.50 acres and currently zoned RMF-45; and Parcel 16-08-176-026 located at 833 S 800 E is 0.29 acres, which was historically zoned RMF-35 until 2013, at which time the parcel was rezoned R-2. The Zoning Application is requesting that the new consolidated parcel adopt the existing zoning of Parcel 16-08-176-015 of RMF-45. The consolidated parcel with the new zoning of RMF-45 will provide enough land area and density to create a balanced residential project that will allow the owner to preserve the historical structure while providing additional housing for the area.

The combined parcels will consist of 23 residential units. Clearwater Homes has been through a rigorous design process focused on preserving the existing 3-story, unreinforced masonry, 16,000 square foot historic Telephone & Telegraph building. The said structure was built in 1911 by the Mountain States Telephone company and served as one of the first Utah operator stations for the new telephone technology. In addition to the adaptive re-use efforts to place 6 residential lofts in the existing historic building, the project will have 17 3-story modern townhomes tactically placed in a manner that activates and completes the 800 east and Chase avenue street fronts.

Total # of Units 23

The 23 units include:

- 6 unique loft floor plans in the Historic building
- 8 1,750 SF, 3 bed, 4 bath town home unit types
- 9 1,350 SF, 2 bed, 3 bath town home unit types

When Micah Peters purchased the properties back in 2011, the 847 S 800 E has its current RMF-45 zoning, and 833 S 800 E had a RM35 zoning. Utilizing the density afforded by both of the original zones would afford the total 23 units we are currently requesting. Because 833 S 800 E was rezoned to R-2 in 2013, we are requesting this zoning amendment. The properties immediately to the south of our parcels along 800 East are also zoned RMF-45, and so our parcels are simply a continuation of that zoning designation. While we are asking for a single zone for the consolidated lot of RMF-45, which would afford a higher density, we are asking that our approvals are conditioned on a cap of 23 total residential units; 6 residential units in the 3-story historic building, and 17 new residential units on the surrounding combined parcel.

Parcel 16-08-176-015 located at 847 South 800 East has been an unimproved warehouse for over 20 years, however the building has historical significance. The added density, as noted, is essential to our efforts to preserve and restore the historic building. It goes without saying the adaptive reuse of the



historic building costs 2.5 times more per square foot to complete compared to traditional new construction. As stated, the added density of 5 more residential units associated with our applications will afford us the economic capability to preserve the 16,000 square foot historic building. In the event we are not successful in gaining the added density, it may be necessary to demolish the historic building and simply use the existing density of 18 new structures.

In order to restore/re-use the historic building and achieve the 23 total unit density on the site, SLC planning department has directed us to submit the following applications simultaneously with this Planned Development application.

- 1- Lot consolidation application.
- 2- Planned Development application.
- 3-Master Plan Amendment application.

Lot consolidation application- This requirement is derived from the fact that the proposed project is comprised of 2 separate parcels. The consolidation of the two parcels will simplify the land plan and clarify setback requirements throughout the project. Additionally, buildings and utilities will not end up bridging or straddling lot lines.

Rezone Application- As noted above, the project consists of 2 parcels: 847 S 800 E is .50 Acres and currently zoned RM-45, while 833 S 800 E is .29 acres and currently zoned R-2. When we purchased the properties back in 2011, the 847 S 800 E has its current RM-45 zoning, and 833 S 800 E had a RM35 zoning. Utilizing the density afforded by both of the original zones would afford us the total 23 units we are currently requesting. Because 833 S 800E was rezoned to R-2 in 2013, we will be submitting a rezone request. While we are asking for a single zone for the consolidated lot of RM-45, (which would afford substantial density), we are capping the development density at the proposed 23 total units.

Planned Development. This application simply details the land plan for the development, setbacks on the newly consolidated lot, as well as establishing the 30' height on the new residential structures.

Master Plan Amendment- The need for this application stems from a conflict in the Masterplan adopted in 2005. The conflict in the master plan is due to the master plan land use language to be low density throughout the neighborhood (10 - 20 units per acre), even on parcels zoned RMF-45 which is a moderate to high density multi-family residential zoning. Our application seeks simply to correct the noted Master plan conflict and utilize the density's associated with our current zoning.

Sincerely,
Micah Wells Peters
Clearwater Homes



Planned Development

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING

OFFICE USE ONLY

Project #:	Received By:	Date Received:	Zoning:
P1NBUB2019-0112	A Anglin	11/22/19	RMF-45
Project Name: Telegraph Exchange Lofts			

PLEASE PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION

Request:	
Address of Subject Property: 847 SOUTH 800 EAST, SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84102	
Name of Applicant: CLEARWATER HOMES	Phone: 801-599-1839
Address of Applicant: 336 W. BROADWAY #110, SLC, UT 84101	
E-mail of Applicant: MICAH@CLEARWATERHOMESUTAH.COM	Cell/Fax: 801-599-1839
Applicant's Interest in Subject Property: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Owner <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> Architect <input type="checkbox"/> Other:	
Name of Property Owner (if different from applicant): SAME AS APPLICANT	
E-mail of Property Owner: SAME AS APPLICANT	Phone: SAME AS APPLICANT
<p>Please note that additional information may be required by the project planner to ensure adequate information is provided for staff analysis. All information required for staff analysis will be copied and made public, including professional architectural or engineering drawings, for the purposes of public review by any interested party.</p>	

AVAILABLE CONSULTATION

- Planners are available for consultation prior to submitting this application. Please call (801) 535-7700 if you have any questions regarding the requirements of this application.

WHERE TO FILE THE COMPLETE APPLICATION

Mailing Address:	Planning Counter PO Box 145471 Salt Lake City, UT 84114	In Person:	Planning Counter 451 South State Street, Room 215 Telephone: (801) 535-7700
------------------	---	------------	---

REQUIRED FEE

- Filing fee of \$775 plus \$121 per acre in excess of (1) acre.
Plus additional fee for required public notices.

SIGNATURE

- If applicable, a notarized statement of consent authorizing applicant to act as an agent will be required.

Signature of Owner or Agent:	Date:
	11/20/2019

SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

Staff Review


- ☐ ☒ **1. Project Description**
Description of your proposed use and existing use (please attach additional sheet/s)
- ☐ ☒ **2. Planned Development Information.**
Description of how your project meets one or more of the following objectives
(please attach additional sheet/s)
- a. Combination and coordination of architectural styles, building forms, building materials, and building relationships;
 - b. Preservation and enhancement of desirable site characteristics such as natural topography, vegetation and geologic features, and the prevention of soil erosion;
 - c. Preservation of buildings which are architecturally or historically significant or contribute to the character of the city;
 - d. Use of design, landscape, or architectural features to create a pleasing environment;
 - e. Inclusion of special development amenities that are in the interest of the general public;
 - f. Elimination of blighted structures or incompatible uses through redevelopment or rehabilitation;
 - g. Inclusion of affordable housing with market rate housing; or
 - h. Utilization of "green" building techniques in development.
- ☐ ☒ **3. Minimum Plan Requirements**
- ☐ ☒ One paper copy (24" x 36") of each plan and elevation drawing
 - ☐ ☒ A digital (PDF) copy of the each plan and elevation drawing
 - ☐ ☒ One 11 x 17 inch reduced copy of each plan and elevation drawing
- ☐ ☒ **4. Site Plan**
Site plan (see *Site Plan Requirements* flyer for further details)
- ☐ ☒ **5. Elevation Drawing** (if applicable)
- ☐ ☒ Detailed elevation, sections and profile drawings with dimensions drawn to scale
 - ☐ ☒ Type of construction and list the primary exterior construction materials
 - ☐ ☒ Number, size, and type of dwelling units in each building, and the overall dwelling unit density

INCOMPLETE APPLICATIONS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED

☒

I acknowledge that Salt Lake City requires the items above to be submitted before my application can be processed. I understand that Planning will not accept my application unless all of the following items are included in the submittal package.

HISTORICAL TELEGRAPH EXCHANGE IMAGES



RE: PLANNED DEVELOPMENT Memo-Updated June 17, 2020 in response to Planning and Zoning commission comments from the 5/27/2020 meeting.

Specifics updates to the project resulting from the comments received at the 5/27/2020 Planning and Zoning meeting. The items below brought forth in the may Planning and Zoning meeting have been addressed as follow.

1-Fire Approval: We have been working with the City fire representatives for over 2 years on this project and have designed the land plan in accordance with the standards set forth. At this time, we have full fire approval of the plan presented in this updated submittal. Mr. Steven Collett and Mr. Ted Itchon have been very helpful, and we appreciate the assistance.

2-North Landscape Buffer: In an effort to enhance the transition from the town homes to the single-family residences on the North of the project, we have incorporated a 4' landscape buffer. The said Buffer will be in addition to the 20' setback, creating an overall side yard setback on the north of the project at 24'4". Our landscape plan for this 149' long, by 4' wide buffer includes, a count of twenty-four (24) "Kindred Spirit" columnar oak trees, to be planted every 6'. These trees will be 1-3/4" to 2" caliper, 10'-14' tall at installation. Growth pattern for this tree species is 3 feet per year in height, with a 35'-40' mature height, and 6'-8' wide. We believe this planting plan and the 24'4" setback will provide a generous transition to the single-family residential homes.

3- Removal of Northeast dumpster location: We have opted for all residences to have 39 Gallon private recycling and trash containers.

4- Gates to Smiths and the 9th&9th business district. See location on south east portion of the campus.

5- 800 East permanent fire pad has been removed: The approved fire plan does not require this infrastructure. 2 large historic trees in the park strip will now be able to stay and not be impacted by the development.

6-Member of the P&Z request that we look at options with layout and driveway location: specifically, to consider putting more traffic into the development from Chase and less from the driveway on the north in order to not impact adjacent properties and provide better circulation throughout the site. There have been numerous land plan iterations developed throughout the design process for this site. Knowing the importance of fire access, we worked closely with Ted Itchon, SLC Fire Department. After a 2-year process, the current layout has been accepted by the fire department. Loading up Chase Avenue with additional cars impacts the existing users. Vehicular traffic on Chase Avenue (private street) in the current land plan, has been approved by all Chase owners. The planned traffic will consist of 10 cars from the Telegraph site, two existing residences, and two existing duplexes. Adding cars and creating an additional egress onto Chase does not comport with agreement with the owners and the approval from the Fire department. Additionally, each existing lot in the proposed PUD, currently has its own existing curb cut. With the lot consolidation we are eliminating one of the two existing curb-cuts so that the development as a whole has one curb-cut/access to 800 E that is driven by our agreement with fire.

7-Front setback for 800 E townhouse units – the PC wanted us to look at having the front setback be closer to the homes up the block rather than matching the Telegraph Building so that the development would be more connected to the neighborhood and also highlight the Telegraph Building. This application is based on the approval of the Lot Consolidation to RMF-45. IN RMF-45 the setback is 25 feet or because the historic Telegraph Exchange building (referred to hereafter as TEX) is a legally existing building built before April 12, 1995, the required front yard shall be no greater than the existing yard established by the existing building (TEX). The language for establishing front yard setbacks in R-2 also includes text indicating that if there is a legally existing structure on the property built before April 12, 1995, the required front yard shall be no greater than the existing yard. The common factor for both R-2 & RMF-45 zones is the inclusion of the existing April 12, 1995 building, which we have acknowledged this in our current land plan. Finally,



according to the current SLC Planning department goals, we are promoting a walking community. The closer proximity to the sidewalk engages the street activity better than if we were to push the townhomes farther the street. At this location, with 800 East being so wide with a center island, 25 feet setback would be counter to street activation. The historic TEX building is currently 18'-10" off of the sidewalk. Additionally, moving the 800 E townhomes back from the street would void our fire approval and force a loss of density that would compromise our ability save/re-use the historic TEX building. This is a unique neighborhood with a vital neighborhood commercial zone.

8-Design elements of the Townhomes – materials and colors of townhomes and how they transition to neighborhood. The materials of the townhomes would be brick, metal panels, cementitious siding, natural wood, and stucco. These materials are contextual to the neighborhood. Infill modern townhomes like the ones proposed, are being built throughout the city in existing neighborhoods with existing housing. The newly constructed house contiguous to the north of the 833 lot is starkly modern and represents the eclectic and transitional architectural nature of the existing housing stock. In the last few years, numerous modern homes of a similar vernacular have recently been built in the 9th and 9th neighborhood. Of the stock of east side townhomes in SLC have been recently approved and built, I would contend that our proposed architecture is of high quality, compelling, and an enhancement to the community.

9-Balcony encroachments – over Chase – permission from other property owners.

The roof and cornice overhang of the existing TEX building is 2' over the property line. While our project approval from the Chase owners doesn't specifically contemplate the overhang of the decks matching the existing roof overhang, the roof overhang is already established. We can go back to the Chase Ave owners for approval of this detail but prefer a conditioned approval from the PC that states the required Chase owner's approval. If the approval on this item is not achieved from the Chase owners, we can simply pull those 2 south facing decks back the 2 feet. That being said, we firmly believe that the protruding decks are a nice detail on the south face of the TEX building, which serves to create an interesting depth and dimension to an otherwise long, flat section.

10-Summary: It is important to reiterate that the current plan allows us to justify the expense of saving the historic TEX building. Any loss of units/density associated with the approval process will jeopardize our ability to complete the adaptive re-use of the TEX building and will likely result in demolition of the historic structure. The plan presented is thoughtful and ready to proceed. This project would be an enhancement to the residential community, while also supporting local businesses and economic development.

PARCEL 16-08-176-015
847 South 800 East
Salt Lake City, UT 84102

PARCEL 16-08-176-026
833 South 800 East
Salt Lake City, UT 84102



The proposed project consists of consolidating two parcels, both owned by Micah Peters (Clearwater Homes): Parcel 16-08-176-015 located at 847 S 800 E is 0.50 Acres and Parcel 16-08-176-026 located at 833 S 800 E is 0.29 acres. The combined parcels will consist of 23 future residential units.

In addition to the adaptive re-use efforts to place 6 residential lofts in the existing historic building, the project will have 17 3-story modern townhomes tactically placed in a manner that activates and completes the 800 east and Chase avenue street fronts.

Total # of Units 23

The 23 units include:

- 6 unique loft floor plans in the Historic building
- 8 1,750 SF, 3 bed, 4 bath town home unit types
- 9 1,350 SF, 2 bed, 3 bath town home unit types

Parcel 16-08-176-015 located at 847 South 800 East has been an unimproved warehouse for over 20 years, however the building has historical significance. The added density as noted is essential to our efforts to preserve and restore the historic building. It goes without saying the adaptive reuse of the historic building costs 2.5 times more per square foot to complete compared to traditional new construction. As stated, the added density of 5 more residential units associated with our applications will afford us the economic capability to preserve the 16,000 square foot historic building. In the event we are not successful in gaining the added density, it may be necessary to demolish the historic building and simply use the existing density of 18 new structures (RMF-45 zone for 847 S allows for 16 units as survey of parcel is over 21,800 SF, and 833 S has 2 units available with current R-2 zone).

In order to restore/re-use the historic building and achieve the 23 total unit density on the site, SLC planning department has directed us to submit the following applications simultaneously with this Planned Development application.

- 1- Lot consolidation application.
- 2- Rezone application.
- 3- Master Plan Amendment application.

Lot consolidation application- This requirement is derived from the fact that the proposed project is comprised of 2 separate parcels. The consolidation of the two parcels will simplify the land plan and clarify setback requirements throughout the project. Additionally, buildings and utilities will not end up bridging or straddling lot lines.

Rezone Application- As noted above, the project consists of 2 parcels: 847 S 800 E is .50 Acres and currently zoned RM-45, while 833 S 800 E is .29 acres and currently zoned R-2. When we purchased the properties back in 2011, the 847 S 800 E has its current RM-45 zoning, and 833 S 800 E had a RM35 zoning. Utilizing the density afforded by both of the original zones would afford us the total 23 units we are currently requesting. Because 833 S 800E was rezoned to R-2 in 2013, we will be submitting a rezone request. While we are asking for a single zone for the consolidated lot of RM-45, (which would afford substantial density), we are capping the development density at the proposed 23 total units.

Master Plan Amendment- The need for this application stems from a conflict in the Masterplan adopted in 2005. The conflict in the master plan is due to the master plan land use language to be low density



throughout the neighborhood (10 - 20 units per acre), even on parcels zoned RMF-45 which is a moderate to high density multi-family residential zoning. Our application seeks simply to correct the noted Master plan conflict and utilize the density's associated with our current zoning.

Planned Development.

Specific areas of application compliance with 2018 published Planned Development Objectives detailed in 21A.55.010
objectives: B, D, E

B. Historic Preservation: Preservation, restoration, or adaptive reuse of buildings or structures that contribute to the character of the City either architecturally and/or historically, and that contribute to the general welfare of the residents of the City.

Clearwater Homes has been through a rigorous design process focused on preserving the existing 3-story, unreinforced masonry, 16,000 square foot historic Telephone & Telegraph building. The said structure was built in 1911 by the Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Company and served as one of the first Utah operator stations for the new telephone technology.

The proposed project will carefully contrast historic reverence with modernism. Adaptive re-use and preservation construction methodology will be important and central to the project. In addition to typical adaptive reuse criteria such as structural/seismic, HVAC, electrical, and roofing, we also have special focus on: (a) the brick exterior massing of the Telegraph building will be tuckered, pointed, and sealed by a professional mason with historic restoration credentials, (b) the notable historic plaster mold cornice, soffit, and fascia located on the west facing 3 story roof transition will be preserved, sealed and painted, (c) historically appropriate high quality wood clad/steel divided light windows will be installed.

We have provided pictures (see exhibit A) of the original historic porch circa 1920. The LDS Church demolished this porch due to security problems in the 1980's. As part of our adaptive re-use efforts, we will reconstruct a precise replica of the original front porch. As the tallest building in the 9th & 9th neighborhood, the Telegraph building is visible on the skyline for several blocks. We firmly believe that restoration and preservation of this iconic building will secure an important and contributing asset to the fabric of the 9th and 9th community for generations.

D. Mobility: Enhances accessibility and mobility:

Improvements that encourage transportation options other than just the automobile.

The proposed Telegraph Exchange Lofts benefits from a location and land plan that encourages "walkability", "Bike-ability", and "skate-ability" (or pick your form of alternative transportation). As noted above, 46 onsite parking stalls will be EV stalls. Residents will be encouraged to use onsite bike racks, or extra garages space to safely



store bikes. Pedestrians, riders, and skaters, can elect to walk north, south, east, or West to find restaurants, parks, entertainment, and shopping at their fingertips. Local (obvious) attractions include the Ninth & Ninth business district, Trolley Square, and Liberty Park.

E. Sustainability: Creation of a project that achieves exceptional performance with regards to resource consumption and impact on natural systems:

- . Energy Use and Generation: Design of the building, its systems, and/or site that allow for a significant reduction in energy usage as compared with other buildings of similar type and/or the generation of energy from an on-site renewable resource.

Zero emissions residential community

Residential emissions accounts for 38% of all carbon dioxide contributions into the Wasatch Front local airshed. In addition to general climate change problems, local air quality is dramatically impacted by the widespread burning of natural gas as a residential furnace and hot water heating source. Clearwater Homes believes that development should not contribute to high frequency asthma for the developing lungs of Utah children. As such, the Telegraph Exchange lofts will work to eliminate residential gas meters by utilizing all electric furnaces and hot water heaters powered 100% by offsite renewable energy solar farms.

1A.55.050: STANDARDS FOR PLANNED DEVELOPMENTS:



The Planning Commission may approve, approve with conditions, or deny a planned development based upon written findings of fact according to each of the following standards. It is the responsibility of the applicant to provide written and graphic evidence demonstrating compliance with the following standards:

A. Planned Development Objectives: The planned development shall meet the purpose statement for a planned development (section 21A.55.010 of this chapter) and will achieve at least one of the objectives stated in said section. To determine if a planned development objective has been achieved, the applicant shall demonstrate that at least one of the strategies associated with the objective are included in the proposed planned development. The applicant shall also demonstrate why modifications to the zoning regulations are necessary to meet the purpose statement for a planned development. The Planning Commission should consider the relationship between the proposed modifications to the zoning regulations and the purpose of a planned development, and determine if the project will result in a more enhanced product than would be achievable through strict application of the land use regulations. **Answer- As noted above, the project consists of 2 parcels: 847 S 800 E is .50 Acres and currently zoned RM-45, while 833 S 800 E is .29 acres and currently zoned R-2. When we purchased the properties back in 2011, the 847 S 800 E has its current RM-45 zoning, and 833 S 800 E had a RM35 zoning. Utilizing the density afforded by both of the original zones would afford us the total 23 units we are currently requesting. Because 833 S 800E was rezoned to R-2 in 2015, we will be submitting a rezone request. While we are asking for a single zone for the consolidated lot of RM-45, (which would afford substantial density), we are seeking an**



approval, capping the development density at the proposed 23 total units. The economics of the additional 5 units requested, will support the extensive costs associated with the adaptive reuse effort on the historic building. Thus, the thrust of our proposal is an economic request to assist in saving the historic building. Furthermore, the added density as noted is essential to our efforts to preserve and restore the historic building. It goes without saying the adaptive reuse of the historic building costs 2.5 times more per square foot to complete compared to traditional new construction. The added density of 5 more residential units associated with our applications will afford us the economic capability to preserve the 16,000 square foot historic building. In the event we are not successful in gaining the added density, it may be necessary to demolish the historic building and simply use the existing density of 18 new structures (RMF-45 zone for 847 S allows for 16 units as survey of parcel is over 21,800 SF, and 833 S has 2 units available with current R-2 zone). We firmly believe that approval of our proposal as stated will result in a substantially enhanced community and preservation of an iconic local treasure.

B. Master Plan Compatibility: The proposed planned development is generally consistent with adopted policies set forth in the Citywide, community, and/or small area Master Plan that is applicable to the site where the planned development will be located.

Answer- See Master Plan Amendment language above

C. Design And Compatibility: The proposed planned development is compatible with the area the planned development will be located and is designed to achieve a more enhanced product than would be achievable through strict application of land use regulations. In determining design and compatibility, the Planning Commission should consider:

- . Whether the scale, mass, and intensity of the proposed planned development is compatible with the neighborhood where the planned development will be located and/or the policies stated in an applicable Master Plan related to building and site design; **Answer- The existing historic building is 58' tall and represent and iconic landmark in the neighborhood. Restoration of this structure will make it the crown jewel of 9th and 9th, and source of pride for the immediate 800 east community.**
- . Whether the building orientation and building materials in the proposed planned development are compatible with the neighborhood where the planned development will be located and/or the policies stated in an applicable Master Plan related to building and site design;
- . Whether building setbacks along the perimeter of the development: **Answer- See setbacks identified on site plan and described in narrative below.**



- . Maintain the visual character of the neighborhood or the character described in the applicable Master Plan. **Yes, the project provides. See site plan and renderings. The project philosophy is "Historic reverence with modern contrast". We believe this project will fit in nicely with the "Eclectic, Bohemian 9th and 9th character.**

- . Provide sufficient space for private amenities. **Yes, the project provides. See site plan and renderings.**

- . Provide sufficient open space buffering between the proposed development and neighboring properties to minimize impacts related to privacy and noise. **Answer-See setbacks noted on site plan and narrated below. Also note :20'4" setback to residential house located on the North side of the project. We wanted to be particularly sensitive to this neighborhood housing transition.**

- . Provide adequate sight lines to streets, driveways and sidewalks. **Yes, the project provides.**

- . Provide sufficient space for maintenance. **Yes, the project provides.**

- . Whether building facades offer ground floor transparency, access, and architectural detailing to facilitate pedestrian interest and interaction; **Answer- Yes, the front porches to all 800 east oriented Townhomes, as well as the existing historic building provide notable pedestrian interest. See attached renderings.**

- . Whether lighting is designed for safety and visual interest while minimizing impacts on surrounding property; **Answer-Lighting package and orientation will be sensitive to the residential neighborhood. Soft lite LED bulbs and down light fixtures will be tactically used.**

- . Whether dumpsters, loading docks and/or service areas are appropriately screened; and

- . Whether parking areas are appropriately buffered from adjacent uses. **Answer- 46 parking stalls provided are 100% screened from the street. 34 stalls will be in garage's, while the final 12 stalls are in the northeast corner (see site plan for reference)**

- D. Landscaping: The proposed planned development preserves, maintains or provides native landscaping where appropriate. In determining the landscaping for the proposed planned development, the Planning Commission should consider:
 - . Whether mature native trees located along the periphery of the property and along the street are preserved and maintained; **Answer- All Mature street trees will be preserved with the exception of one. Two trees will to be removed due to its location in the drive**

lane. The said tree will be replanted in accordance with Salt Lake Urban forestry requirements.

- . Whether existing landscaping that provides additional buffering to the abutting properties is maintained and preserved; **NA**
- . Whether proposed landscaping is designed to lessen potential impacts created by the proposed planned development; and

4. Whether proposed landscaping is appropriate for the scale of the development.

Answer- The project design, landscape architecture, and planting schedule has been thoughtfully curated by the LOCI design group. The site plan was designed to place front porches in the manner that activates the street frontages of 800 east and Chase avenue. In addition to numerous raised planter beds, hundreds of trees, perennial grasses & flowers, the project amenities include a 10'X60' lap pool and a heavily forested roof top deck. See attached landscape plan and water wise species/planting schedule.

The planting scheme will feature a variety of hardy native and/or climate adapted trees, shrubs, and grasses. Areas will be designed with a focus on minimizing water use, enhancing the urban forest, and creating comfortable use areas through shading and screening. Additionally, the design will draw inspiration from the natural conditions of the Valley and surrounding mountains. Trees will be small to medium varieties that strive to provide year-round interest while also meeting aforementioned design goals. Shrubs will be low to medium height and ideally provide year-round interest.

Potential Tree Varieties include Kindred Spirit Oak, Serviceberry, Tatarian Maple, and Paperbark Maple

Potential Shrub Varieties include Creeping Oregon Grape, Gro Low Sumac, St. John's Wort

Potential Grass Varieties include Feather Reed Grass, Fountain Grass.

E. Mobility: The proposed planned development supports Citywide transportation goals and promotes safe and efficient circulation within the site and surrounding neighborhood. In determining mobility, the Planning Commission should consider:

- . Whether drive access to local streets will negatively impact the safety, purpose and character of the street; **Answer-36 of our parking stalls will enter and discharge on a 20' drive aisle on 800 E, while 10 additional garage stalls will utilize Chase Avenue**
- . Whether the site design considers safe circulation for a range of transportation options including: **Answer- See locations and narrative for bike storage above in Objectives section D**



. Safe and accommodating pedestrian environment and pedestrian oriented design;

Answer-Bikers and pedestrians have multiple paths to street and sidewalk that don't conflict with vehicle drive aisle.

. Bicycle facilities and connections where appropriate, and orientation to transit where available; and **Answer- See locations and narrative for bike storage above in Objectives section D**

. Minimizing conflicts between different transportation modes; **Answer-Bikers and pedestrians have multiple paths to street and sidewalk that don't conflict with vehicle drive aisle.**

Whether the site design of the proposed development promotes or enables access to adjacent uses and amenities; **NA**

Whether the proposed design provides adequate emergency vehicle access; and

Answer-The Fire department has reviewed and approved the proposed plan

Whether loading access and service areas are adequate for the site and minimize impacts to the surrounding area and public rights-of-way.

Answer- The site and the land plan provide excess parking and adequate loading areas for residents.

F. Existing Site Features: The proposed planned development preserves natural and built features that significantly contribute to the character of the neighborhood and/or environment.

Answer- Please refer to our narrative above in section B of Objectives: Preservation of the historic building

G. Utilities: Existing and/or planned utilities will adequately serve the development and not have a detrimental effect on the surrounding area. (Ord. 8-18, 2018)

Answer- We have conducted 2 DRT meetings for this project with all related Salt Lake City departments in preparation for this project. Public utilities may require that we upsize a pressurized water line from 900 South to the frontage of the subject property. All other needed utilities and capacities are present in the street frontage.



As part of this Planned Unit development application, we are seeking approval for the following setbacks and conditions (the statements below assume our rezone application is approved) (see setbacks on site plan attached as well as 2nd story overhang notes):

West- setbacks -800 East

The West side of the existing historic building currently sits 11'9" back from the property line. To maintain an inline street front, we are proposing the 4 new townhome structures fronting 800 E maintain the same setback as the historic building. The stated orientation of the buildings is designed to activate the 800 east street front

East- Setbacks

East Section "A", This is clearly a rear lot line, but is defined by the code as an interior side yard with an 8' setback requirement and/or a 10' landscape buffer requirement, and a 1' accessory dwelling requirement. Our structures in **Section A- East** are setback 37'6" and thus far exceed the 8' setback requirement. We are requesting a waiver to 0' on the landscape buffer (existing Landscape buffer on adjacent property is approximately 18'), and a waiver of the 1' accessory dwelling setback to 0'. This side of the property is contiguous to the Smiths commercial parking lot. Section "B" east is defined by the RM-45 code as a rear lot line. **Section B-East** is proposed as 5' setback. The formula in the RM45 zone would require a 30' setback in this direction. We are requesting to waive the 30' setback requirement in exchange for the proposed 5' setback.

It is important to note that the entire east reach of the project backs the massive 2 plus acre Smiths commercial parking lot, and thus, the proposed, will not negatively impact any adjacent party. Additionally, the Smiths parking lot already includes a landscape buffer of approximately 18'.

North- Setbacks

North section A-The RM-45 zone requires an 8' interior side yard setback or a 10' landscape buffer. This North side of the project represents the direct transition from our development to a single-family residential zone. Buildings on this side of the property will have a 24'4" setback from the property line of the contiguous residential lot. We felt that providing the said 24'4" setback was a more respectful transition than a 10' landscape buffer. We will not need a setback waiver as we have substantially exceeded the requirement. We are requesting to waive the 10' landscape buffer requirement in exchange for a 4' landscape buffer. It's also important to note that the homeowner to the north asked for our consent last year



for a city height variance on his side yard fence. The request was granted, and the neighbor now has an 8' high quality custom fence on the property line.

North Section B- The RM45 zone requires an 8' setback in this location, and we are requesting to waive the 8' setback in exchange for our proposed 4' setback. We are also seeking a waiver of the landscape buffer requirement. As with the East setback, it is important to note that this North reach of the project backs the massive 2 plus acre Smiths commercial parking lot, and thus will not negatively impact any party. As stated, the Smiths parking lot already includes a landscape buffer of approximately 15' as well

South- Setbacks

Chase Avenue- The south side of the existing historic building currently sits on the property line, while the new structures fronting Chase Avenue (private street) will have a 4' setback from the right of way. The RM45 zone requires an 8' setback in this location, and we are requesting to waive the 8' setback in exchange for our proposed 4' setback. All Chase Avenue owners have formally consented to the proposed 4' setback and development plan. The Chase Avenue owner's consents have been executed and notarized.

Height

The historic building height is 58'. This height will be maintained as part of the roof top deck area and restoration of the building. All new residential structures on the site will be capped at 30' or less.

Fire Safety

We anticipate and have budgeted the installation of fire sprinklers for all interior space in the historic building and new residential structures.

Sincerely,
Micah Wells Peters
Clearwater Homes

6. Mailing List

OWN_FULL_NAME	OWN_ADDR	OWN_CITY	OWN_STATE	OWN_ZIP
ES 187779 LC	1099 S WINDSOR ST	SALT LAKE CITY	UT	84105
ASHTAR COMPANIES LLC	47 E COLUMBUS CT	SALT LAKE CITY	UT	84103
ERNESTINE LINDBERG	847 S MENDON CT	SALT LAKE CITY	UT	84105
EB JONES & SONS LLC	2064 E ASHTON CIR	SALT LAKE CITY	UT	84109
PHANSAMORN CHANGKIENDEE	766 S 700 E	SALT LAKE CITY	UT	84102
ANGELA CARLSON; MICHAEL S JACOBSEN (JT)	818 S 800 E	SALT LAKE CITY	UT	84102
CATHERINE E LILLY	824 S 800 E	SALT LAKE CITY	UT	84102
BRADLEY R CAIRNS	828 S 800 E	SALT LAKE CITY	UT	84102
CHARLES T GRAYSON; MELANIE S GRAYSON (JT)	832 S 800 E	SALT LAKE CITY	UT	84102
800 EAST FOURPLEX LLC	3734 E THOUSAND OAKS CIR	MILLCREEK	UT	84124
TRACY R ALBERS	844 S 800 E	SALT LAKE CITY	UT	84102
JENNIFER R DENHAM; PER AAKE ANDERS KRONBERG (JT)	PO BOX 58102	SALT LAKE CITY	UT	84158
ANDRES NEVAREZ OROZCO	763 E 900 S	SALT LAKE CITY	UT	84105
VICTORIA L RAYBORN; STAGBROOK DE CLAIMONT, BRUCE & STAGBROOK DE	765 E 900 S	SALT LAKE CITY	UT	84105
IRENE DE BIASE; CHRISTOPHER G DOWELL (JT)	775 E 900 S	SALT LAKE CITY	UT	84105
ROBERT L GARDNER	4563 S FORTUNA WY	MILLCREEK	UT	84124
CHRISTOPHER DEMURI; MEREDITH DEMURI (JT)	1099 S WINDSOR ST	SALT LAKE CITY	UT	84105
JULIA BJORNSTAD	813 S 800 E	SALT LAKE CITY	UT	84102
NATHAN S FLORENCE; MARIAN C FLORENCE (JT)	817 S 800 E	SALT LAKE CITY	UT	84102
ROBERT S NAK; MARIA L NAK (JT)	823 S 800 E	SALT LAKE CITY	UT	84102
CODY V DERRICK	645 E SOUTHTEMPLE ST	SALT LAKE CITY	UT	84102
CLEARWATER HOMES, LLC	336 W BROADWAY ST	SALT LAKE CITY	UT	84101
SMITH'S FOOD KING PROPERTIES INC	1014 VINE ST	CINCINNATI	OH	45202
SMITH'S FOOD KING PROPERTIES INC	1014 VINE ST 7TH FLOOR	CINCINNATI	OH	45202
JOSH COOK	2461 S HIGHLAND DR	SALT LAKE CITY	UT	84106
SMITH'S FOOD & DRUG CENTERS INC	1014 VINE ST 7TH FLOOR	CINCINNATI	OH	45202
SMITH'S FOOD & DRUG CENTERS INC	1014 VINE ST	CINCINNATI	OH	45202
FIRST CHRISTIAN REFORMED CHURCH	803 E 900 S	SALT LAKE CITY	UT	84105
CHRISTIAN REFORMED CHURCH OF SALT LAKE CITY	803 E 900 S	SALT LAKE CITY	UT	84105
SJ DUPLEX LLC	5334 S CASTLEGATE DR	MURRAY	UT	84117
CALVIN D TOLMAN (JT)	1169 E 500 S	SALT LAKE CITY	UT	84102
DAVID M BRONSO	4562 SWILCAN BRIDGE LN N	JACKSONVILLE	FL	32224
CHASE AVENUE LLC	1435 E LOGAN AVE	SALT LAKE CITY	UT	84105
SMITHS FOOD & DRUG CENTERS INC	1014 VINE ST	CINCINNATI	OH	45202
JAMES J FORWOOD; CAROL FORWOOD (TC)	819 E 900 S	SALT LAKE CITY	UT	84105
KAYE C CHATTERTON	821 E 900 S	SALT LAKE CITY	UT	84105
TERRY L MARTIN	825 E 900 S	SALT LAKE CITY	UT	84105
JIAMNING WU; WENCHEN LUO (JT)	3540 GREER RD	PALO ALTO	CA	94303
TRUST NOT IDENTIFIED	839 E 900 S	SALT LAKE CITY	UT	84105
DANIEL V COLANGELO	841 E 900 S	SALT LAKE CITY	UT	84105
WOODMAN ASSOCIATES LC	859 E 900 S # 200	SALT LAKE CITY	UT	84105
Current Occupant	802 S 800 E	Salt Lake City	UT	84102
Current Occupant	839 S MENDON CT	Salt Lake City	UT	84105
Current Occupant	847 S MENDON CT	Salt Lake City	UT	84105
Current Occupant	851 S MENDON CT	Salt Lake City	UT	84105
Current Occupant	853 S MENDON CT	Salt Lake City	UT	84105
Current Occupant	814 S 800 E	Salt Lake City	UT	84102
Current Occupant	818 S 800 E	Salt Lake City	UT	84102
Current Occupant	824 S 800 E	Salt Lake City	UT	84102
Current Occupant	828 S 800 E	Salt Lake City	UT	84102
Current Occupant	832 S 800 E	Salt Lake City	UT	84102
Current Occupant	836 S 800 E	Salt Lake City	UT	84102
Current Occupant	844 S 800 E	Salt Lake City	UT	84102
Current Occupant	848 S 800 E	Salt Lake City	UT	84102
Current Occupant	854 S 800 E	Salt Lake City	UT	84102
Current Occupant	763 E 900 S	Salt Lake City	UT	84105
Current Occupant	765 E 900 S	Salt Lake City	UT	84105
Current Occupant	775 E 900 S	Salt Lake City	UT	84105
Current Occupant	777 E 900 S	Salt Lake City	UT	84105
Current Occupant	801 S 800 E	Salt Lake City	UT	84102
Current Occupant	803 S 800 E	Salt Lake City	UT	84102
Current Occupant	809 S 800 E	Salt Lake City	UT	84102
Current Occupant	813 S 800 E	Salt Lake City	UT	84102
Current Occupant	817 S 800 E	Salt Lake City	UT	84102
Current Occupant	823 S 800 E	Salt Lake City	UT	84102
Current Occupant	829 S 800 E	Salt Lake City	UT	84102
Current Occupant	847 S 800 E	Salt Lake City	UT	84102

Current Occupant	832 E 800 S	Salt Lake City	UT	84102
Current Occupant	829 E CHASE AVE	Salt Lake City	UT	84102
Current Occupant	825 E CHASE AVE	Salt Lake City	UT	84102
Current Occupant	810 E 800 S	Salt Lake City	UT	84102
Current Occupant	835 E CHASE AVE	Salt Lake City	UT	84102
Current Occupant	833 S 800 E	Salt Lake City	UT	84102
Current Occupant	834 E 800 S	Salt Lake City	UT	84102
Current Occupant	859 S 800 E	Salt Lake City	UT	84102
Current Occupant	865 S 800 E	Salt Lake City	UT	84102
Current Occupant	801 E 900 S	Salt Lake City	UT	84105
Current Occupant	818 E CHASE AVE	Salt Lake City	UT	84102
Current Occupant	822 E CHASE AVE	Salt Lake City	UT	84102
Current Occupant	826 E CHASE AVE	Salt Lake City	UT	84102
Current Occupant	830 E CHASE AVE	Salt Lake City	UT	84102
Current Occupant	834 E CHASE AVE	Salt Lake City	UT	84102
Current Occupant	819 E 900 S	Salt Lake City	UT	84105
Current Occupant	821 E 900 S	Salt Lake City	UT	84105
Current Occupant	825 E 900 S	Salt Lake City	UT	84105
Current Occupant	829 E 900 S	Salt Lake City	UT	84105
Current Occupant	839 E 900 S	Salt Lake City	UT	84105
Current Occupant	841 E 900 S	Salt Lake City	UT	84105
Current Occupant	859 E 900 S	Salt Lake City	UT	84105
Current Occupant	876 E 800 S	Salt Lake City	UT	84102
Current Occupant	850 E 800 S	Salt Lake City	UT	84102
Salt Lake City Planning Division David Gellner	PO BOX 145480	Salt Lake City	UT	84114