



COUNCIL STAFF REPORT

CITY COUNCIL of SALT LAKE CITY

TO: City Council Members

FROM: Brian Fullmer
Policy Analyst

DATE: August 19, 2025

RE: Zoning Map Amendment at Approximately 247 North 800 West
PLNPCM2024-00629

Item Schedule:

Briefing: August 19, 2025
Set Date: August 19, 2025
Public Hearing: September 2, 2025
Potential Action: September 9, 2025

BRIEFING UPDATE

August 19, 2025 briefing Council Members expressed general support for the proposed rezone. In response to a question about a requirement for the existing home to be preserved, Planning staff stated that is not required but if it is demolished, replacement housing must be provided. New homes on Hoyt Place would not be required to face the street because it is a private road. The applicant prefers to not have street facing garages, so they would likely be accessed from a private alley.

The following information was provided the August 19, 2025 briefing. It is included again for background purposes.

ISSUE AT A GLANCE

The Council will be briefed about a proposal to amend the zoning map for the parcels at 247 North 800 West in City Council District Two from their current R-1/7,000 (single-family residential district) and SR-3 (special development pattern residential) zoning to R-1/5,000 (single-family residential) and SR-3. The two subject parcels share the 247 North 800 West address and are shown in the image below.

The applicant's stated objective is to construct for sale family sized (at least three bedroom) single-family homes on the parcels. To accomplish this a lot line adjustment would likely be required and new homes constructed behind the existing home. The Hoyt Place facing parcel is vacant. No development plans have been submitted as of the date this report was written. It is important to note that if the zoning map amendment is adopted by the Council, the property could be redeveloped with any use allowed under the zone.



The Planning Commission reviewed the proposal at its April 19, 2025 meeting and held a public hearing at which one person spoke in support of the rezone. **Planning staff recommended, and the Commission voted 5:0 to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council with the following conditions:**

- At least half of the new units developed on the site will have a minimum of three bedrooms.
- If the existing home on the site is demolished replacement housing will be provided as outlined in City code.

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

POLICY QUESTIONS

1. The Council may wish to discuss with the applicant the Planning Commission's condition of requiring at least half of new dwelling units developed on the subject parcels be family sized, with a minimum of three bedrooms.
2. Is the Council supportive of conditions requiring family-sized units, and requiring replacement housing if the existing home is demolished?
3. The Council may wish to ask the applicant if there are any affordable units as part of their proposal. If so, how many and at what percentage of area median income.



Area zoning map with subject parcels outlined. Red area shows approximate area where SR-3 zoning would extend, reducing the yellow outlined parcel which is proposed to be rezoned to R-1/5,000.

Image courtesy of Salt Lake City Planning Division

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Combined, the two parcels total approximately one third acre. As shown below, surrounding zoning is a mix of R-1/7,000 for parcels facing 800 West, SR-3 within Hoyt Place. R-1/5,000 (single-family residential) is on the east side of 800 West, as is Jackson Elementary School (zoned PL (public lands)). Area development is primarily single-family homes and duplexes. Some small scale development, mostly infill, is occurring in the area that includes single-family attached and detached homes, and duplexes.

This neighborhood is well served by transit with the Jackson/Euclid Trax stop a block and a half from the subject site, and the Frontrunner station is within a half mile. In addition, there are five bus routes within two blocks, including a frequent transit network route.

The property is in the Salt Lake City Northwest National Historic District and the home is listed as a contributing structure. Unlike local historic districts, buildings in national historic districts do not have City protection from demolition, meaning the property owner may tear down the home as part of any property redevelopment.

When homes on the block were built, zoning was Residential R-2 which permitted single- and two-family dwellings by right. Minimum lot size was 5,000 square feet rather than today's 7,000 square feet within R-1/7,000 zoning. There was not a minimum lot width in Residential R-2 zoning, while current zoning requires a 50-foot minimum. Because of this several lots in the area do not meet existing zoning.

The existing R-1/7,000 and proposed R-1/5,000 zoning are nearly identical with the primary difference being minimum lot size. R-1/5,000 zoning also has slightly smaller side yard setbacks (4 feet on one side and 10 on the other vs. 6 feet on one side and 10 feet on the other in R-1/7,000). Both zones allow single-family detached homes, with an accessory dwelling unit (ADU) if enough space is available.

SR-3 zoning is designed for interior portions of blocks and is a medium-density zoning district that doesn't change neighborhood character. It is intended for infill development with building size, height, and setbacks that are comparable with R-1/7,000 zoning. In addition to single-family detached dwellings, this zone allows single-family attached, two-family, and twin-home dwellings. A table comparing the current and proposed zones is found in Key Consideration 1 below.

The Council is only being asked to consider rezoning the property. Because zoning of a property can outlast the life of a building, any rezoning application should be considered on the merits of changing the zoning of that property, not simply based on a potential project.

KEY CONSIDERATIONS

Planning staff identified four key considerations related to the proposal which are found on pages 6-12 of the Planning Commission staff report and summarized below. For the complete analysis, please see the staff report.

Consideration 1 – R-1/5,000 and SR-3 Neighborhood Compatibility

Planning staff noted that similarities between the current R-1/7,000 and SR-3 and proposed R-1/5,000 zoning districts would lead to development that is compatible with the existing neighborhood. Although additional housing types (attached single-family, duplexes, and twin homes) could be built within the SR-3 district, the size and scale of structures would be similar to the current neighborhood development pattern.

The following table comparing zoning standards of R-1/7,000, R-1/5,000, and SR-3 districts is found on page 6 of the Planning Commission staff report. It is replicated here for convenience. Zoning standards that are identical across zoning districts are shaded in green.

| Zoning Standards | Existing R-1/7,000 Single Family Residential | Proposed R-1/5,000 Single-family Residential | Existing/Proposed SR-3 Special Development Pattern |
|--------------------------------|---|---|---|
| <i>Maximum Building Height</i> | 28 feet | 28 feet | 28 feet |
| <i>Maximum Wall Height</i> | 20 feet | 20 feet | 20 feet |
| <i>Front Setback</i> | Average of the block face | Average of the block face | Average of the block face |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|---|---|
| <i>Side setback</i> | 6 feet on one side, 10 feet on the other. | 4 feet on one side, 10 feet on the other. | 4 feet |
| <i>Rear setback</i> | 25 feet | 25% of lot depth or 20 feet, whichever is less. | 20% of lot depth. No less than 15 feet, no more than 30 feet. |
| <i>Maximum lot coverage</i> | 40% | 40% | 60% for detached dwellings, 70% for attached dwellings. |
| <i>Minimum lot size</i> | 7,000 square feet | 5,000 square feet | Single-family detached: 2,000 square feet. Single-family attached: 1,500 square feet. Two-family dwelling: 3,000 square feet. Twin home dwelling: 1,500 square feet. |
| <i>Minimum lot width</i> | 50 feet | 50 feet | Single-family detached: 30 feet. Single-family attached: 22 feet. Two-family dwelling: 44 feet. Twin-home dwelling: 22 feet. |

Consideration 2 – General Plan Compatibility

Planning staff found that the proposed zoning map amendment aligns with principles and goals found in *Plan Salt Lake*, the *North Temple Boulevard Plan*, and *Housing SLC*. Furthermore, the *North Temple Boulevard Plan* (page 52) calls for infill development on the blocks between 800 and 1000 West, and 200 and 300 North.

Consideration 3 – R-1/5,000 and SR-3 Development Potential

Planning identified several potential development scenarios under the current R-1/7,000 and SR-3 zoning, and within the proposed R-1/5,000 and SR-3 zoning. The lists below are based on total square footage and do not account for lot coverage and setback requirements. When these requirements are factored in, they may further limit the number of units allowed.

Existing R-1/7,000 and SR-3

- Consolidate the parcels and expand the house toward the back.
- Consolidate the parcels and add an attached or detached ADU.
- Adjust lot lines and request planned development approval to build one additional single-family home in the back without street frontage.
- Use affordable housing incentives to build up to four additional units in the rear of the property. This requires 25-50% of the units to be sold or rented at an affordable level determined by City code.

Proposed R-1/5,000 and SR-3 (assumes existing single-family home is maintained, and lot lines are adjusted to meet 5,000 square foot minimum required under R-1/5,000.)

- Build four detached single-family dwellings behind the existing home.
- Build three two-family/duplex (for rent) or twin home (for sale) structures behind the existing home (total of six additional units).
- Build six attached single-family dwellings behind the existing home.

- Use affordable housing or building preservation incentives to build additional units (requires maintaining the existing home).

Consideration 4 – Community Benefit

Zoning map amendments are required to demonstrate a community benefit the rezone will provide as outlined in Chapter 21A.50.050.C *Salt Lake City code*. The applicant identified Community Benefit A as the primary benefit provided by the proposal. It reads:

Providing housing that aligns with the current of future needs of the community as determined by the general plan. Needs could include the level of affordability in excess of the number of dwellings that exist on the site, size in terms of number of bedrooms, or availability of housing for purchase.

Planning staff noted feedback from Fairpark neighborhood residents expressing concerns with large developments on North Temple, without family-sized units, next to single-family neighborhoods. It is Planning’s opinion that the proposed infill development could help address this through additional housing choices that would be available for purchase.

Planning staff and the Planning Commission recommended at least half of any new units would be required to have a minimum of three bedrooms. This could be accomplished with a development agreement and offer some assurance that the community benefit will be provided.

The applicant expressed an intention to preserve the existing home, but the City cannot require it. As discussed above, if the Council adopts the proposed rezone, approval could include a condition that replacement housing is provided if the home is demolished.

Analysis of Standards

Attachment F (pages 44-49) of the Planning Commission staff report outlines zoning map amendment standards that should be considered as the Council reviews this proposal. The standards and findings are summarized below. Please see the Planning Commission staff report for additional information.

| Factor | Finding |
|--|-----------------|
| Whether a proposed map amendment is consistent with and helps implement the purposes, goals, objectives, and policies of the city as stated through its various adopted planning documents. | <i>Complies</i> |
| Whether a proposed map amendment furthers the specific purpose statements of the zoning ordinance. | <i>Complies</i> |
| The extent to which a proposed map amendment will affect adjacent and nearby properties due to the change in development potential and allowed uses that do not currently apply to the property. | <i>Complies</i> |
| Whether a proposed map amendment is consistent with the purposes and provisions of any applicable | <i>Complies</i> |

| | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| overlay zoning districts which may impose additional standards. | |
| 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. | <i>Complies</i> |
| The status of existing transportation facilities, any planned changes to the transportation facilities, and the impact that the proposed amendment may have on the city's ability, need, and timing of future transportation improvements. | <i>Complies</i> |
| The proximity of necessary amenities such as parks, open space, schools, fresh food, entertainment, cultural facilities, and the ability of current and future residents to access these amenities without having to rely on a personal vehicle. | <i>Complies</i> |
| The potential impacts to public safety resources created by the increase in development potential that may result from the proposed amendment. | <i>Complies</i> |
| The potential for displacement of people who reside in any housing that is within the boundary of the proposed amendment and the plan offered by the petitioner to mitigate displacement. | <i>Complies with conditions</i> |
| The potential for displacement of any business that is located within the boundary of the proposed amendment and the plan offered by the petitioner to mitigate displacement. | <i>Complies</i> |
| The community benefits that would result from the proposed map amendment. | <i>Complies with conditions</i> |

City Department Review

Public Utilities clarified that utilities on Hoyt Place are public, and the road is private. They noted some upgrades may be needed at the developer's expense, and any development will need to meet the requirements found in the code. Transportation recommended a fire truck turn-around before they would be supportive. Other responding departments and divisions did not express opposition to the proposed rezone.

PROJECT CHRONOLOGY

- May 29, 2024 – Petition for zoning map amendment received by Planning Division.
- September 9, 2024 – Petition assigned to Aaron Barlow, Senior Planner

- October 22, 2024 –

- Information about the proposal was sent to the Fairpark Community Council to solicit public comments and start the 45-day recognized organization input and comment period.
 - Planning 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.
- October-December 2024 – Online open house.
- December 2024-March 2025 – Planning staff worked with the applicant to improve the quality of their application material, including refining the applicant’s analysis of relevant standards and reviewing options for meeting the community benefit requirements.
- March 26, 2025 – Planning staff posted notices on City and State websites and sent notices via the Planning listserv for the April 9, 2025 Planning Commission meeting. Public hearing notice mailed.
- March 28, 2025 – The applicant posted a public hearing notice sign on the property with project information and notice of the Planning Commission public hearing.
- April 9, 2025 – The Planning Commission held a public hearing for the request and voted 5-0 to forward a negative recommendation to the City Council for the proposed zoning map amendment.
- May 12, 2025 – Ordinance requested from City Attorney’s Office.
- June 3, 2025 – Planning received signed ordinance from the Attorney’s Office.
- June 24, 2025 – Transmittal received in City Council Office.