

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Popular Topic	Subject	Description
12/7/2022 9:58	Tim Funk	Safety	FW: (EXTERNAL) Re: News from District Six: December Newsletter	Dear Dan, Truly decent of you to send out this note. The 1300 South 2100 East corner is always potentially dangerous. Every time I drive or walk through it I am on guard afraid of the traffic and pedestrians coming and going. It is probably time for the city and the state to look things over. Every time I pull out off of Yuma Street to go east or west on 13th I shudder a bit. It has been close more than once. Thankfully the speed limit is currently being monitored. That is a small start for what needs to be a more extensive look at how busy and dangerous the traffic and pedestrian flow has become. Best regards, Tim Funk
12/7/2022 10:01	David Harris	Safety	FW: (EXTERNAL) Gas station at Sugarhouse Park	Hi folks: My name is David Harris, and I live at 1617 Emerson Avenue in the Wasatch Hollow neighborhood. I have been encouraged to write you a note to register my opposition to the gas station that is planned to be going in where the Sizzler vacated recently. I have a couple of reasons for opposing this project: 1- This property sits on high ground above the lake and Parley's Creek. Should the storage tanks fail, and that is not really a very remote possibility, gasoline would enter the lake and the Creek and contaminate it, causing lots of damage to the environment and to Salt Lake City finances in fixing the resulting mess. 2- There's already a gas station across the street and, for those traveling North on 1300 East, there's a Sinclair station just four blocks north. I see no need for a gas station right there in that location. That said, I recognize that it is private property and that this constitutes a private transaction between the landowner and the gas station who would like to rent there. Still, I believe the public has a right to weigh in on decisions like this. In my opinion, the ideal situation would be for the city to acquire this property and add it into the holdings of the city park. However, I recognize that the city can't simply do that unilaterally. The next best thing would be for some sort of cafe or maybe an ice cream store or something along those lines to go in there. Or even a small grocery store along the lines of the Emigration Market. A gas station is, in my view, the last thing that is needed there. Thanks for listening, and thanks very much for the hard work you guys do to keep this city running. My family and I appreciate it very much! David Harris
12/8/2022 9:32	Peter McDonald	2100 S	RE: (EXTERNAL) 2100 South	Hi Amy, I wanted to send you an email as a Sugarhouse resident with regards to the proposed alternatives to 2100 South. Of the two options proposed, I wanted to email you in favor of the option with 3 lanes and a bikeway. In general, I love living in Sugarhouse - it's accessible to the U and downtown and makes living car-free very easy - I can take the 220 all the way to the ski bus! One of my main gripes with living in Sugarhouse, however, is how busy 2100 South is. I could go on and on about this, but there are two main reasons for this: 1. 2100S is totally useless to me as an East/West bike route - there's no shoulder for bikes so it's incredibly stressful to bike on for any amount of time * Even though the S-line is right there, the fact that you have to stop at almost every street crossing (versus having traffic lights on 1700 or 2700 south) means that it's not very practical for cross town trips 2. Walking along 2100S street is extremely unpleasant due to all the traffic. When I want to visit a business on 2100s, I instead walk or bike through back streets so that I arrive at the business with minimal (if any) time spent on 2100S * Alongside the work being done on Highland Drive and all the apartments being built, the 3 lane and bikeway option for 2100S stands to greatly improve the pedestrian experience on 2100S and I really think this could lead to a great sense of community unlike anything else in SLC (except for perhaps the 9-line, which I'm quite excited about!) Anyways, that's all for now - I hope the council will make the choice that supports the wellbeing of SLC residents and opts for the 3 lane + bikeway approach for 2100S! Best, Peter McDonald
12/8/2022 11:05	Cammy Fuller	Dangerous Conditions	1300 S and 2100 Tragic accident	Hi Dan, There has been numerous accidents even before this recent tragic one at the intersection. What can be done? One thought was to add speed bumps to 1300 S. It would be a pain but it would definitely slow down the traffic and perhaps deter people from taking that route. Traffic is just getting out of control with Research Park, the U, the hospitals, all the commerce at 1700 E. and 1300 S. Its ironic that we are trying to encourage pedestrian friendly builds in our neighborhood but not address the traffic patterns and trends that are so detrimental to the walkers and runners. Thanks so much for all you are doing to make our neighborhood a safe and wonderful place to live. Best, Cammy and Marc Fuller

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Popular Topic	Subject	Description
12/9/2022 8:16	Ciara Combs	FBUN2 zoning	Main Street rezone	Darin, I just watched your YouTube episode on the Ballpark Station Area plan. You quote, "now that it's official the master plan will help guide future development within the beloved Ballpark neighborhood" I do not see how, in good conscience, you can vote to rezone and introduce the detrimental FBUN2 zone. It truly goes against everything in the station area plan YOU just voted to approve and sets a dangerous precedent that city's plans are meaningless. I hope you honor your commitment to this plan and vote no. Ciara Combs Sent from my iPhone
12/9/2022 8:26	Parker Higgins	2100 S	FW: (EXTERNAL) Fixing 2100 S in Sugarhouse: Please go with Option 2!	Hi Dan, The Higgins' here in your district from Wasatch Hallow. Please vote for option 2 of the Sugarhouse Master Plan to include dedicated bike plan and 3 car lanes for 2100 S. I've lived in this neighbor to close to a decade and a graduate of Westminster. 2100 S is terrifying and awful for all types of transportation. I avoid it with our car, bikes, and even moped out of fear of being hit. As a result I'm less of a patron to businesses on 2100 S than I used to be during my college years at Westminster. I used to commute to the Red Man Building and crossed 2100 S every morning and evening. It's currently a mess and dangerous. Fixing 2100 S would bridge multiple neighborhoods around sugarhouse together, creating a walkable and more valuable community. I don't want our kids walking around with wild car traffic, especially on 2100 S. With the recent 11 y/o death up north in 2100 E 1300 S near foothill it's due time that an example is made to create SAFE neighborhoods. Best, -Parker Higgins
12/9/2022 10:52	Pamela Starley	Chicago Street Rezone	Re-zoning Parcel Chicago Street, Planning Commission	Planning Commission I ask you to please vote NO on the Re-zoning of 233 Chicago Street. A neighbor has written a passionate note about this subject on the Nextdoor website, and many of us are agreeing with her. We are against changing zoning parcel-by-parcels. It tears blocks apart and puts neighbor against neighbor. There is no other place in Salt Lake City like this area. Those who live on Chicago Street and 200/300 North are buffer blocks into Fairpark & Rose Park. "This is not the rebuilding of cities. This is the sacking of cities." - Jane Jacobs on 'Urban renewal' Thank you, Pamela Starley (Marmalade)
12/9/2022 10:56	Martina Nesi	Chicago Street Rezone	NO TO REZONING 233 CHICAGO St.	Dear Council, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the rezoning 233 Chicago St. I'm against rezoning parcel by parcel. This is a dead-end street and building townhomes will be a safety and traffic concern. Also, this rezoning will ruin the character and history of this beautiful neighborhood. I urge you to disapprove the proposed rezoning, and from recent meetings and discussions with neighbors, I know my opinions are shared by many who have not managed to attend meetings or write letters and emails. Thank you for your continued service and support of our communities. Best regards Martina Nesi -- Martina Nesi Lenzi
12/9/2022 11:13	Stacey Foster	Chicago Street Rezone	No on Rezone of 233 Chicago Street	Hello, I am writing to vote no for the rezone of 233 Chicago Street. I have friends in the homes very near to hear and I also live in this area. I do not like the rezoning of low density neighborhoods spot by spot. It ruins communities and there is already so much building going on in the edges of our neighborhood that is zoned for it. All parties should be treated equally. The road for this particular project is also not wide enough to accommodate services already. We do not want to change the character or historic feeling of our neighborhood. Residential properties need to be protected-- spot zoning is a threat to our peaceful urban neighborhood. This is gentrification of an already delicate neighborhood. This street is part of the buffer block into Rose Park and the Fairpark. It needs to stay this way. Everyone I have talked to in my neighborhood feels the same way and I hope many of them voice their concerns to you and are heard and that decisions are made in line with the desires of the many residents who have chosen to make their homes here. Thank you, Stacey Foster

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Popular Topic	Subject	Description
12/9/2022 11:16	Michelle Watts 1/2	Chicago Street Rezone	NO   rezone of 233 Chicago	<p>Hi All, I am writing to vote no for the rezone of 233 Chicago Street. We did our due diligence and bought on our block because it is a low density residential deadend. We are experiencing so much growth in North Temple. We do not need to build inside our city blocks. Where everyone's back yards will be in a shadow. Zoning parcels by parcels does not benefit a neighborhood. It puts neighbor against neighbor. I am a no for spot zoning. All parties should be treated equally. This mid block build will jam up an already bottlenecked and small road. Come see our street. All of our deliveries, garbage &amp; recycling can not turn around at the end of our road. Everyone has to back in and out. Imagine a fire truck or ambulance needing quick access to our street. It doesn't happen. We don't have the utilities or infrastructure to support this type of build. We do not want to change the character or historic feeling of our neighborhood. We do not want to live in the shadow of taller buildings. We do not want the noise or the traffic this will create on our deadend street. We don't need the extra congestion &amp; hazardous traffic conditions. Residential properties need to be protected— spot zoning is a threat to our peaceful urban neighborhood. This is gentrification of an already delicate neighborhood. We want a shadow study, we want a traffic study during Utah State Fair events &amp; off season. We have recently done our own digging into the private drive that runs a horseshoe behind the properties on Chicago Street's East side. In all of our property reports &amp; titles we have verbiage that states the front of our properties is a shared right of way into Chicago Street. This will be infringing on our/ MY personal property and land rights. We had a surveyor parked in our driveway on September 1, 2022. When I asked him to move he went to pull into a different part of our property. I asked him to move, again. He called ma a Nazi bitch. When I told him he can't go around calling people Nazi's he asked why. He didn't like my explanation. When my husband got home he violently got in Bill's face and admitted to calling me a Nazi. While saluting and stomping up &amp; down our property. I have the end of this on video. I do not want this company in my neighborhood. We do not feel this company or property owner will act in good faith. There are no renderings of what will be built. How will the home that is staying enter &amp; exit their drive? There is not enough transparency to change my vote from a no. Once they get a rezone they will try to demolish the home on 233 Chicago and build more. The current owner of 233 Chicago has broken and continues to break every good neighbor guideline and code set by the City. They store heavy machinery &amp; vehicles on loose gravel. They have burned chemicals. The City has been very thoughtful and closed our road during the Utah State Fair. These neighbors would park cars for cash on gravel &amp; grass. Environmental study? Their current garage and home is over stated on property that is not legally theirs. This has negatively affected the homes facing 1000 W.</p>
12/9/2022 11:16	Michelle Watts 2/2	Chicago Street Rezone	CONTINUED! NO   rezone of 233 Chicago	<p>This home has non permitted fixes that affect the integrity of utilities currently running to 233 Chicago. This property owner has been cited &amp; I believe continues to have open cases with civil enforcement &amp; the City's CAT. ^ From September 2020, Shows MLS listing of broken water line. There is no record that they fixed this with the City's oversight. If I could turn back time we would have bought this property in 2015. We need to protect more open spaces for future generations. It should house a real community garden or a park or home with an abundant garden and trees. We don't need to cut up and destroy neighborhoods with the last working and middle class families that thrive and support Downtown Salt Lake. We are doing enough- there are apartments on North Temple, there coming to Hoyt place &amp; the old Walgreens and the old storage facility behind 7-11. By the developers own map submitted — we are part of the buffer block into Rose Park and the Fairpark. We are a full colored yellow a low density block. We need to stay this way. If you don't know what to do with your large yard and space from your neighbors. I assure you someone wants to live &amp; thrive and keep the land, history &amp; space for their children. Bring more families to the Fairpark not more 1 bedrooms &amp; studios. These homes will not be affordable. Ale, Victoria &amp; Chris I urge you to vote NO. I have been welcomed into over 20 neighbors homes in one night. Only one needed to talk to their partner, the other needed to translate to their partner to make a decision. Everyone has matching concerns + more and voiced a strong no. I am hopeful your email boxes will fill up with similar requests. Thank You, Michelle Watts</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Popular Topic	Subject	Description
12/9/2022 13:13	Peter Stevens	Ivory Rezome	675 North F Steet	I attended the Nov. hearing virtually. Based upon the nearly unanimous objections voiced regarding the Ivory resining proposal, I hope the city council will vote to summarily reject it. Kind regards, Peter Stevens, MD
12/9/2022 13:18	Deidra Duffin	Ivory Rezome	Ivory homes rezone	Don't allow Ivory homes to rezone and build here. You will be opening a Pandora's box and have this type of building all over the avenues just like the city. Salt Lake City has been forever changed for the worse with this high density housing.
12/9/2022 13:19	Gregory Chachas	Ivory Rezome	Ivory	I don't understand why this is even being considered. We do not need more traffic in the avenues. We are not for sale in Capital Park, especially to Ivory. Greg chachas -- Regards: Greg
12/9/2022 13:20	Tyler Jack	Ivory Rezome	ivory project <b>**ATTACHMENT</b>	Good morning, If the rezone is approved or not, please consider the 3 homeowners that live on the west side of the subject property. I'm just worried about the setback with Ivory's plan in having homes 10 feet from my property line. Their property elevation is much higher than ours and I would love not to have homes so close looking down onto my yard/home. Please come to the Ivory property and see what I'm talking about. Please try to keep the setback at 35 ft. I think the project will be nice, but I just don't want another home less than 35 feet from my property line. Below is a photo from my window to show you what I mean.
12/9/2022 13:22	Carolyn R Chase	Ivory Rezome	675 North F Street	Dear Council, I am heartily in support of providing affordable housing, but this development will not be doing that. It will simply be adding to overcrowding, and will increase an already heavy load on Second Ave and Third Ave. It doesn't provide access to public transport and it is not reasonable to walk downtown from there or to ride a bicycle really. The zoning that's in place provides for a reasonable number of homes and would not be a drastic departure from the density of the surrounding area. since it was first put forth to the community there has been an overwhelming rejection of the change. As the people charged with the best interests of the city as a whole, I urge you to keep the zoning as it is. I hope that a decision along that line will prohibit further attempts to make the change, and the waste of Council's time and taxpayer's money. Thanks, Carolyn
12/9/2022 13:23	Bryn Ramjoue	Ivory Rezome	NO to 675 N F street special, density Vote	I live in the avenues and am aghast about the density of building going on in SLC and I want you to protect the Avenues. The Avenues cannot support the density proposed by this property and the fall out of allowing it leads to other, similar developments. Keep the Avenues special. Ivory can build to current code or elsewhere. Don't give in. Your neighbors will thank you. Who cares if the big business appreciates you – that kind of appreciation is fleeting. Think long term. Bryn Ramjoue' 8th and K 23 year resident of The Avenues. Maybe the Avenues needs branding – a haven for historic homeowners. A place people want to live, a tourist opportunity to photograph wonderful of homes and a character picture of a great neighborhood. Don't ruin it. Please.
12/9/2022 13:24	Jan McKinnon	Ivory Rezome	Ivory Proposed Rezone	We have made a good case against the rezone, but you have made yourselves clear on this point. At the very least, have Ivory stay true to the zone. They can build up to 18-19 homes without the huge retaining walls and it would look like an Avenues neighborhood. After all, the purpose statement of SR-1 says that "uses are intended to be compatible with the existing scale and intensity of the neighborhood." These "smaller" homes would be more affordable, family friendly with lots big enough for a yard, and would add to the character of the neighborhood. With a strict adherence to the SR-1 zone, modest, safe retaining walls could be used in the building process. There wouldn't be a need for 1625 linear feet of retaining walls with some being as tall as 17 feet. You might ask yourselves who will accept the liability for the walls? Ivory will have sold the homes and be long gone. Will an HOA want to take on that liability? What if a child climbs up on the wall (heaven forbid) and falls and is injured? Who is liable for this terrible act? A responsible builder would not ask to build retaining walls violating city specs that were put in place within just a year or two. Density has a price and shouldn't be built without consideration of all the risks and hazards. Reasonable density should be the desired outcome for this lot. It would be nice to know that you have heard our voices and have considered our concerns just as you have listened to Ivory. Thank you. Jan McKinnon

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Popular Topic	Subject	Description
12/9/2022 13:25	Casey McDonough	Ivory Rezome	Rezone and Master Plan Amendment at 675 North F Street - Public input...	Dear council members, I am sending this message about the rezone and master plan amendment at 675 North F Street. I hope that you each vote in a way that best represents the residents most affected by a possible rezone of this property, and I think their desire is clear, more density and modifying the master plan is a bad idea for this property. Ivory Homes knew full well of the zoning limitations of this property when they purchased it. While more density on this property, whether primary residences or ADU's will add housing stock; those added units will not be affordable in any way and they will only add to an already ample stock of high end, high cost, high income housing options in the avenues. If you do conclude that Ivory deserves to get the added density they are asking for, then ask them to provide rent controls on some of the residences and ADU's or require other conditions that will actually help with the truly affordable housing stock problem we have. I don't know anyone who is arguing that there is a shortage of high-end housing options and that is what Ivory is looking to get, more density of high-end housing so they can maximize their return on their purchase cost of this property. Please do not vote for more density on this property. Without judgement, Ivory wants to make more money on their investment, that is why they are in business. Your job isn't to help them do that, it is to help the people, it is to vote in a way that best represents the desires of your constituents, and most importantly; more density on this property will not help anyone that really needs it, because those in need will not be able to afford any of the housing Ivory proposes on this property. Thank you for your time and consideration. Casey O'Brien McDonough
12/9/2022 13:27	Ruth Andersen	Ivory Rezome	Avenues Ivory Home Plan	I continue to be amazed that Ivory Homes appears to have so much influence over the City Council. They are submitting a ridiculous plan to shoehorn many dwellings into a pristine Avenues hillside. (Image the look of the retaining walls?) Yours and Ivory's disregard for what the surrounding community wants is astounding. If Ivory can't make enough money building homes that fit within the zoning ordinances, they should sell the land to a developer who can. By the way, does the city council pass zoning ordinances just for the hell of it? You already decided what could be built on this land. Why are you doing it again? Why for Ivory? This will not create affordable housing. The only people benefitting from this plan are the owners of Ivory Homes! Ruth Andersen
12/9/2022 13:49	Anne Albaugh	Ivory Rezome	Rezone and Master Plan Amendment at 675 North F Street	The issue with Ivory Homes is all about money...their future money and how much they can make developing land that they purchased with the approval for 11 homes...and now many many more...in addition they want to change OUR Avenues Community Master Plan to allow them to do more hideous things in the Avenues. More cheap instant slums...look around our City and see what they have built! As an Avenues resident, I am committed to protecting our northern border for the benefit of the wildlife and native plants. I also support careful use by people in the wild lands. Ivory Homes wants to create a big hole in our zoning so they can expand their reach further into our neighborhood...who knows what they are planning next. Please, please do not vote to approve this nightmare. Has anyone on the Council asked about all the concrete they plan to put into the retaining walls? At 10 yards per trip, how many loads of concrete is that going up to the site? Does anyone care? This is a big powerful company with their reach firmly into our State Legislature...they never expect to be told NO! This reminds me of the nightmare the neighborhoods near the Inland Port are experiencing, although the Inland Port is much much worse. No one cares about any of us. When Ivory Homes bought this land they knew that the approved zoning was for eleven homes...they proceeded immediately to get our zoning laws changed for their benefit...can we please tell them NO? Thank you, Anne Albaugh

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Popular Topic	Subject	Description
12/9/2022 13:50	Bruce Reitz	Ivory Rezome	675 North F St. rezone	<p>City Council, The Ivory Homes project should not be granted their zoning changes. 1- The project doesn't have proper sidewalks to allow neighbors to pass the development safe without walking in the streets. 2- This is definitely NOT increasing affordable housing in the area, Those additional living units will be very expensive to rent. 3- The additional units in the houses will most likely be used as Air Bed and Breakfast units, thus not providing places for people to live. 4- All the retaining walls that will need to be constructed will destabilize the existing homes 5- The retaining walls will be unsightly to all of the surrounding neighbors 6- Traffic will increase in the area more due to the additional units and with no sidewalks that creates a public hazard. 7- The area has established single family homes with a variety of designs and architecture, these cookie cutter McMansions will detract from the established character of the neighborhood. 8- There is not enough room for guests and visitors to park on the narrow street. 9- Changing the zoning is just simply unnecessary they can build using all the existing codes without requiring these unsafe amendments to the existing zoning 10- Is it right and fair for the City Council to allow a company to disrupt the quality of life of a neighborhood in our city just because they can put pressure on and influence the City Council. The current zoning was established with a purpose and that purpose should be respected, otherwise why even have zoning ordinances? Respectfully</p> <p>Bruce A. Reitz</p>
12/9/2022 13:51	Amy Lambert	Ivory Rezome	Request to rezone 675 N F Street	<p>I am writing re: the request to rezone 675 N F Street. I understand the property owner, Ivory Development, is requesting an amendment to the Future Land Use Map in the Avenues Community Master Plan (1987) from Very Low Density to Low Density. We are OPPOSED to the rezone from FR-3 to SR-1 for 675 N F Street in the Avenues of Salt Lake. We own two homes in the Avenues and are very concerned about the strain these additional homes will add to the Avenues. We are very much against these changes. The current proposal creates changes that are very different from the surrounding neighborhood as far as density and green space and setbacks which will not blend into the existing neighborhood. This will also add additional traffic to the neighborhood which will increase noise and traffic in the area which is already busy and loud. It will also affect the safety of pedestrians and other drivers in the area. Please do not allow this to go forward. Thank you, Amy Lambert</p>
12/9/2022 13:51	Michael Stewart	Ivory Rezome	675 N F street	<p>I wish to voice my objection to the dense-pack housing project Ivory wants to install. Thank you Michael Stewart</p>
12/9/2022 13:52	David Tanner	Ivory Rezome	Ivory Homes	<p>It continues to concern me that Ivory is requesting changes to the zoning which then cause man hours to be consumed which are dollars spent by the residents to defend what they own. If the over riding is for densely housing. That works in new developments no 100 year old plus areas. Along with the fact that \$800,000.00 is not a starter house. I guess I will know the outcome when I hear the council cave in.</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Popular Topic	Subject	Description
12/9/2022 13:53	Pat Richards	Ivory Rezome	Proposed Rezone and Master Plan Amendment at 675 N F Street	Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the above request. I remain deeply concerned about the negative impact of the proposed master plan amendment that would change the density of this area from very low density to low density. In addition to changing the character of the neighborhood and reducing property values, it is likely that this proposed change will lead to increased traffic (that poses a potential safety issue to pedestrians and school children) and increased crime in the neighborhood. I am also deeply concerned about the proposed re-zone from FR-3 to SR-1. Again, my concerns about the re-zone are related to increased traffic, potential safety issues related to reduced access for city vehicles including fire trucks, ambulance, and police, as well as other city services (trash collection, tree trimming, etc.). I have no objection to ADU's per se, and support the availability of ADUs under the existing FR-3 standards. However, the density of the ADUs under the requested SR-1 is concerning. It will be difficult to monitor and prevent inappropriate use of the ADUs for short term rentals. There is a high likelihood of increased use of these ADUs for short-term rentals, which in turn, leads to traffic congestion (and a negative impact on air quality), safety issues, and reduced property values. If the SR-1 designation is approved despite strenuous objections of local residents, it is my understanding that Ivory Homes is planning to request waivers from the SR-1 rules. I would respectfully request that if the SR-1 designation is approved, that no additional modifications to SR-1 rules (such as lot size, primary dwelling size, detached dwelling size, yard size, height, slope, etc.) be allowed. Thank you for your consideration. Patricia R. Richards and Joseph E. Beaumont Homeowners
12/9/2022 13:54	Amber Fitzsimmons	Ivory Rezome	Ivory homes in the avenues	Hello, My name is Amber Fitzsimmons and I own a home in the area. I continue to be dismayed at how far ivory has gotten with the city on the rezone request in capital park. The idea that this will help affordable housing is absolutely absurd at best and dishonest and not true at worst. The council is aware that there are serious safety concerns regarding public safety including fire trucks not able to turn around and questionable plans for setbacks and now the idea of a massive 17' wall??? Who accepts liability is someone gets hurt climbing this wall (which kids will do no doubt)! Here is what most of us think about Ivory: their houses are poorly built, they are "in" politically with SLC (including the council) and no one will ever win an argument against them. The truth is that this is NOT affordable housing, it is not going to attract below market tenants, it doesn't fit into the neighborhood, it is an unprecedented use of ADU ordinance, and this misuses the planned development to shrink setbacks and squeeze in more lots. I am 100% against this project and if they are really interested in affordable housing—they should develop that in the lot—but they are not. These homes will be well over a million dollars, which last I looked was not a definition of affordable housing. Please show us that the council makes good decisions, follows our ordinances, and can see a wolf in sheep's clothing. Why are the voices of the avenues not given any weight in this decision? What a dismal decision for the Avenues. Amber Fitzsimmons
12/9/2022 13:56	Jack Dolcourt	Ivory Rezome	Opposition to rezoning 675 F Street	Dear City Council, I am a long term resident of the Avenues section of Salt Lake City. I am strongly opposed to the rezoning proposal for 675 F Street for many reasons, including: -the higher population density will increase automobile traffic and worsen the safety of pedestrians, and other motorists, especially when streets are icy; - it will unalterably change the character of the Avenues neighborhood which has no other similarly dense housing developments; -it will negatively affect wildlife habitat for birds and other species; -the area is not well served by public transportation, forcing these inhabitants to use motor vehicles, which negatively affects the local environment; Ivory Homes proposal requiring unique rezoning is inappropriate for the Avenues and should be denied. Sincerely, Jack Dolcourt
12/9/2022 13:57	Pamela King	Ivory Rezome	Please don't do this	I've written many times begging the city council not to go for the money but instead listen to actual residents about the Ivory Home issue. It is not wanted by the people who live in the avenues! Next I see again and again that this project is going forward despite heavy opposition to it. Why? Think long term. What is your legacy? Is money the only thing that matters to you? Buy the land with city money and make a permanent green area there. I just voted for that huge bond

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Popular Topic	Subject	Description
12/9/2022 13:57	Sarah Van Voorhis	Ivory Rezome	F Street rezone	<p>My name is Sarah Van Voorhis and I own a home in the lower Avenues. My understanding is that the City Council is poised to approve the Ivory homes rezone request. I ask if that is the case, that the city council pay close attention to the retaining wall issue. It is important that the council drive to the location in order to properly envision the 17 foot retaining walls Ivory is proposing and understand the related safety concerns in order to properly oversee this issue. A structural engineer needs to be involved for oversight. I think we are all aware of how cheap and poorly built Ivory constructions are. There is no reason to believe that they will properly construct retaining walls given their widely accepted and known poor quality construction. Please provide the necessary oversight regarding the retaining wall issue. Warm Regards, Sarah Van Voorhis</p>
12/9/2022 13:58	Judy DENCKER	Ivory Rezome	Zoning change request/Ivory/13th Ave "F" Street/neighbors	<p>All council members – I am hopeful that this message to you will get read by each and everyone of you as I’m fairly certain none of the previous messages sent to you by members of POAZC, GACC, or from individual taxpayers (your part-time job salary providers) and other concerned Avenues residents, have been read. I’m tired – tired of MY elected council, the appointed planning commission members who are tied so very closely to the mayor who appointed them and to Ivory development, who has ties to at least one planning commission member and others through the University of Utah, ignoring us. Evidently a very small minority of you, actually listen to your constituents. But let it be some high-powered developer who thinks in lockstep with you, or is it the other way around, and you are “all in”. I’m tired of this city being run for a few “important” people and to hell with the majority who do not subscribe to your personal dense/green/woke/whatever, agenda. “You people” (like that – probably not) work for the taxpayers who are, whether or not you like it, a critical part of the equation. It’s not the other way around. You may want to reconsider why you ran for office and why you now don’t want to hear anything from any taxpayer since you are comfortably installed in your council position. You pretended to listen long enough to get some people to support your bid for office and donate money to get you elected Money seems to be the only way anyone gets elected to any office these days. Only a small minority of you give a damn about what over 2000 Avenues residents voted on and against granting Ivory a zoning change. I’d like to suggest that you cleanly come out of the woods, resign your council or commission position, and go to work for the organizations/companies who got you elected. You certainly, and conveniently, aren’t listening to those in the neighborhoods who are impacted. We don’t want your density with cracker jack box houses stacked on top of each other. We can see that everyday downtown, Sugarhouse and other parts of the city you are helping to destroy. No thanks! Have just a swell Christmas. Judy Dencker</p>



Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Popular Topic	Subject	Description
12/12/2022 11:51	Judy Daly	Ivory Rezome	Ivory Homes Proposal to Develop 675 North F Street - Retaining Wall Concerns relating to Northpoint Estates	<p>Dear Council Members, I write to you on behalf of Northpoint's 100 residents in my capacity as President of the Northpoint HOA. Before you vote on this matter, I would like to reiterate our deeply held concerns regarding the safety of the retaining wall Ivory wishes to construct on the boundary with Northpoint and request that the council insist that this wall be constructed in conformance with city ordinance 21A.36.020B. Northpoint has only one ingress and egress which is Northpoint Drive which runs the length of the boundary with Ivory. We cannot risk our only ingress and egress being compromised. I have just read the letter from Mr. Whitmer of IGES dated December 8th, 2022 (copy attached) and could not have been more disappointed. I had thought the city had asked Ivory to detail how they would safely engineer a complex retaining wall structure on our boundary. Instead, we get a one paragraph generic description of the process. This is totally unsatisfactory to us and presumably also to the city council. We find it terrifying that Ivory wishes to excavate up to 13 feet of soil directly adjacent to our property line. This is not normal practice and turns Northpoint Drive into an elevated roadway 18 feet above grade. Key unanswered questions are: ● How will Ivory prevent the collapse of our current boundary wall and road during the construction phase? Structural engineers we have consulted with say that it can be buttressed during this phase but describe it as an inherently risky operation. ● Who will pay for the emergency repairs from a collapse of our wall and road caused by Ivory? Will the city require them to post a bond to cover this risk? ● Ivory's plan, ref. Section A on page 43 of the staff report, calls for our nearly 40-year-old boundary wall to be integrated into their retaining wall. The condition of this wall is unknown and again this is high risk. ● Our current boundary wall was never designed as a protective barrier for an elevated roadway. Do I now have to consider adding a crash barrier to the side of our road to prevent vehicles breaching a weakened boundary wall and plunging 18 feet down into Ivory's housing below? I hope the above discussion demonstrates that there is far more to this matter than has been answered by Ivory's cursory response. Their proposal appears to be reckless and irresponsible. The city has ordinances for a reason and such safety critical ordinances as those that control retaining wall design should not easily be tossed aside. Thank you, Joel Deaton President Northpoint HOA</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Popular Topic	Subject	Description
12/12/2022 12:04	Keiko Jones	I-15	The West side, I-15 expansion	<p>Hello Mayor and City Council Members of Salt Lake City, There were 3 open houses/panel discussions regarding the I-15 expansion (I had informed you of them) last week (the week of the 4th of December). I attended all three of them and one previous week at Fairpark Community Council meeting, and I wanted to share with you what I posted on social media afterwards. Sometimes I may come across harsh or snarky, but I CARE about my community and it's my frustration that comes through. "My thoughts on 4 open houses/panel discussions re. I-15 expansion" I was out of town when UDOT had their open house in the middle of November. But I joined the open houses/discussions at Fairpark Community Council meeting, Sorenson Unity Center, Mestizo Coffee House, and Fairgrounds. I not only expressed my concerns, but also got to listen to other residents' opinions, concerns, questions, answers, and it was well worth attending all of them. At panel discussions, answers from Tiffany (UDOT project manager) were short and dismissive. I understand she must have been tired of listening to questions and concerns when she knows they (questions and concerns) will not change anything they are going to do. She said "need" is more important than "impact." I felt like it was a "show" or pretense to have these meetings. I also encouraged/asked some people, including the mayor and all the city council members, to come to at least one of these meetings. None of them came. Except Rocky Anderson, our former mayor. He personally responded to me promising to come, and he did! I was very grateful for him to care enough to come to listen to the voices of the residents who live here. An article said Mayor Mendenhall said we need to protect homes. The liaison for Council Member Wharton said Chris shares my concerns and that he will keep pushing for an alternative. You know what? Being at their desks and saying the right things is easy. Why not come out and hear the real voices, concerns, plea, anger, etc. of real people who will be impacted most? Why not stand with us? I'm very disappointed that the city let us stand alone. We know it's a state matter, but I really hoped we'd get support from our local government. We are stuck with inland port, prison, and unequalled number of affordable housing (apartments with small units without off-street parking) on the west side. Salt Lake County has an increased sales tax because of the prison being built here as if we wanted it here. How much more do we have to put up with injustice on the west side?! Keiko</p>
12/12/2022 12:28	Jenny Compton	Chicago Street Rezone	Rezone 233 Chicago Street - OPPOSITION	<p>I am writing to express my strong opposition of the proposed rezoning of 233 Chicago Street. A new and likely unaffordable development will be detrimental to the area, nearly all residents in the neighborhood are completely opposed to the addition of multi-family housing that will cause traffic and safety problems, and will also negatively impact safety for children, since students walk to school in the mornings. Traffic and safety of pedestrians are major areas of concern. Traffic jams are routinely observed in and around Chicago Street by city vehicles, i.e., waste management, emergency vehicles, UPS (and the like) trucks, without any way of turning around on small Chicago Street. 233 Chicago is virtually a landlocked parcel(s). The access presented in the proposed development is not viable. A new rezone for MF use would be a great oversight by the city and developer. It would threaten and potentially lower the property values of the existing community. Property values are likely to go down in the area if multi-family apartments or condominiums are built. Multifamily dwellings are inconsistent with the neighborhoods developed in the area. Consideration of our already vast food desert, lack of nearby emergency care facilities as well as a threat to ruin a small, historic Salt Lake neighborhood would be appreciated. I urge you to disapprove of the proposed rezoning, and from recent discussions with neighbors, I know my opinions are shared by many (if not all). The council should not approve multi-family dwellings in this area. Thank you for your service and support of our communities. Sincerely, Jenny Compton</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Popular Topic	Subject	Description
12/12/2022 14:44	Sara DeLong	Ivory Rezome	Avenues re-zone December 13 vote	<p>Dear City Council, This letter to the editor to the Salt Lake Tribute was not published, so I thought I would send it to the council instead. Thank you for your thoughtful consideration. -Sara DeLong, 13th Avenue resident</p> <p>Ivory Homes, At It Again Tribune article "Objections to Avenues housing project ignite east side vs. west side spat" conjures a time worn tale of rich vs. poor. (Tribune 11/12/2022). However, that tale is only half true. The real headline should read "Ivory Homes, At It Again." Ivory carries a well-earned reputation for throwing their weight around to get what they want. In Midvale, Ivory wanted to build a development where low-income and senior citizens already lived. Ivory bought the underlying land and then deployed massive rent increases, 44% in six months, to try and force these people out of their homes. (Tribune 1/1/2014). In Holladay, Ivory tried to build a massive residential project at the defunct Cottonwood mall site. Holladay residents rejected the project by referendum because it would over-burden local infrastructure, including street capacity. Undeterred, Ivory lobbied Holladay City to approve the ill-fated project. Holladay City then found itself defending Ivory's aggressive development project in a legal battle, at taxpayer expense, that went all the way to the Utah Supreme Court. (Tribune 1/4/2019). Holladay City and Ivory lost the case. Currently under consideration by the Salt Lake City Council, Ivory's Capitol Park "Cottages" are \$1 million+ homes, packed onto a tiny lot that will burden city resources and even private residential roadways. Perhaps intentionally overlooked, Ivory's high-end luxury project depends on access through a limited, and old, easement. If the Salt Lake City Council approves the project, the City might find itself defending Ivory's project just as Holladay City did and, again, at taxpayer expense. During a recent Council meeting, a few Salt Lake City west side residents seemed in favor of Ivory's project with one resident telling Ivory they would "happily receive you" as a developer in their neighborhood. Considering Ivory's track record of squeezing every dollar from land, often at the expense of local residents and taxpayers, these folks should be careful what they wish for.</p>
12/12/2022 14:47	Cindy Van Klaveren	Ivory Rezome	Ivory Homes Retaining Walls	<p>City Council Members, Please make sure the retaining walls for the Ivory project are built to code. Code requirements protect people and save lives. We just remodeled our basement in our Northpoint unit and had to follow all building codes and arrange for all inspections. Why? To make sure no one gets hurt due to faulty construction. How can you not require Ivory to do the same? Why do we have building codes and a department of code enforcement? If the rules are only for some, what good are they? We have had at least 3 retaining wall failures here at Northpoint. Broken water pipes, excessive rain, and concrete failure were the causes. Each episode caused expensive damage. Who will pay for possible failures of Ivory's retaining walls? Ivory could easily build their 19 units all with ADU's and keep the same density. The houses might have to be a bit smaller, but at least the retaining walls would be safe if built to code. Please keep everyone safe. As a retired teacher, I have done thousands of playground duty shifts. I am here to tell you there isn't a tree that can't be climbed nor a wall that can't be scaled by a child. A 17-foot retaining wall could be the scene of a terrible disaster. Thank you for doing the right thing. Cindy van Klaveren</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Popular Topic	Subject	Description
12/12/2022 14:51	Don Warmbier 1/2	Ivory Rezome	Dec. 13 Discussion and Vote on Rezone and Master Plan Amendment at 675 North F Street	On Tuesday, Dec. 13 meeting, the Salt City Council will continue discussing the rezone request and Master Plan Amendment at 675 North F Street. This discussion should deal with the following not yet addressed aspects of this issue: 1. Ivory's requested exemption of the retaining walls required by its development plans from meeting the standards of Salt Lake City's Building Code will increase the risk that its taller, thinner, weaker retaining walls adjacent to and supporting Northpoint Drive will collapse. But those plans also contain an additional, fatal, inherent design flaw. Ivory's proposed sheer 17' retaining walls would create an enormous attractive nuisance, with risks to the safety of children who will be attracted to and play on these walls. If children are injured or killed falling from these walls, the City Council will be complicit in such injuries or deaths, because the City Council exempted the walls from meeting the standards of the Salt Lake Building Code. Even if Salt Lake City would not be legally liable for injuries or deaths caused by the City Council's approving the building of sheer 17' retaining walls, it would be morally responsible. And even if Ivory also escapes legal liability, by passing it off to a future Home Owner's Association (HOA) formed to manage the common areas of Ivory's development, that HOA would clearly be subject to a potentially huge, but difficult to estimate, future legal liability, built into the very structure of this development, and therefore impossible to correct. Potential buyers of homes in this development, learning of this liability, may well be reluctant to purchase a home that comes pre-encumbered with a huge potential pre-existing liability of unknown size, making such homes much more difficult to sell. By refusing to grant the requested exemption from its Building Code, and instead requiring the building of shorter and wider retaining walls that conform to the standards of Salt Lake City's Building Code, not only will the Salt Lake City Council avoid complicity in the future deaths and injuries of children attracted to the attractive nuisance of sheer 17' retaining walls, it will also be saving Ivory from making what, even from Ivory's own business standpoint, would be an enormous mistake. 3. At the November 10 City Council meeting on this matter, when Councilman Wharton attempted to make any rezone approval conditional on retaining walls meeting the standards of Salt Lake City's Building Code, Councilman Puy impugned Councilman Wharton's motives, telling Councilman Wharton that "I think what you are trying to do is making walls wider so there are less houses on this property...I struggle to believe this is about safety, but more about making less houses on this property." But if Councilman Puy had taken the time to understand the City Building and Zoning Codes before attacking Councilman Wharton, he would see that Ivory could easily fit the same number of houses on this property, by replacing its proposed highly dangerous 17 ft retaining walls supporting several multi-house terraces, with shorter conforming retaining walls between each house.
12/12/2022 14:51	Don Warmbier 2/2	Ivory Rezome	CONTINUED!! Dec. 13 Discussion and Vote on Rezone and Master Plan Amendment at 675 North F Street	Of course, to have the same number of houses on its property, Ivory would have to downsize its McMansions to the smaller houses normally built on SR-1 zoned property. These smaller houses would also be much more affordable than Ivory's proposed million dollar plus houses. If the City Council refuses even to condition a rezone on retaining walls meeting the standards of Salt Lake City's Building Code, it will show that not only safety, but also affordability, take second place to developer profits.
12/12/2022 14:53	Tammie Smith	Ivory Rezome	675 N. F Street redone	Dear Council Office, we remain OPPOSED to ANY rezoning of the property at 675 N. F Street by Ivory Development. Regards, Terrell & Tammie Smith Avenues residents since 1976
12/12/2022 15:12	Tammie Smith	Ivory Rezome	Rezone and Master Plan Amendment at 675 North F Street – Tuesday, Dec. 13	Dear Council Office, we remain OPPOSED to ANY rezoning of the property at 675 N. F Street by Ivory Development. Regards, Terrell & Tammie Smith Avenues residents since 1976

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Popular Topic	Subject	Description
12/12/2022 15:14	David Garcia	Ivory Rezone	675 North F Street	Topic: Comments on Rezone and Master Plan Amendment to facilitate Ivory Development proposal at 675 North F Street 1. After several presentations and modifications by Ivory Development, Avenues residents voted against the proposals by a ratio of over 50:1. Looking at it another way, approximately 98% were against the project. Will elected officials reflect the will of their constituents? Or arbitrarily set aside long-established zoning and Master Planning directives, overthrowing decades of beneficial guidance? 2. In a marketing thrust, Ivory Development has raised the banner of social benefit, packaging the overload of dwelling units as ADU's, creating a fuzzy image of housing for low income demographics. But the properties would be on the market for significantly in excess of \$1 million. NOT friendly to low income demographics. The premise of social benefit is hollow. 3. In a political thrust, Ivory Development has appealed to jurisdictions outside the Avenues, framing their project in class warfare terms. Political representatives outside the immediately affected area have been courted by images of privilege for the Avenues. No, it's just because this is our neighborhood and we don't want the philosophical equivalent of a chemical waste disposal site.
12/12/2022 15:18	Jeannine Gregoire	Ivory Rezone	AGAINST Ivory request for rezone	To all concerned: I am one of over 1200 who are profoundly adamant against the Ivory Homes request for a rezone from FR-3 Foothills Residential with 12,000 square foot lots to SR-1 Single Residence with 5000 square foot lots. Ivory Request to put 33 residences into a spot where 9 are zoned?! This is the vacant land North of the old Veterans Hospital at 675 North F Street. In my opinion and that of countless others: 1. It seems the City Council has already decided to allow it, no matter what Avenue residents have said. On November 10, at 7:PM, few City Council Members listened to the many, many in- person residents 2 minute speeches, saying "No", to this request. 2. There needs to be an independent environmental study done to learn if the Ivory project is even feasible. Who will do that? Ivory should pay for it. 3. If allowed, this project is a step closer to turning us into the disaster that is downtown Sugarhouse. 4. If this is allowed, the retaining walls need to be built to City specs. Who will police Ivory? 6. This is not "low income" housing. 7. The requested homes design do not fit into the neighborhood. 8 . Who will maintain the "private park", which is, in reality, a drainage basin? These just a few of the many concerns voiced by Avenues Residents. Is anyone listening? Sincerely, Jeannine Gregoire Avenues Resident
12/12/2022 17:09	Kirk Huffaker		Imperial Street Improvements Request <b>**ATTACHMENT</b>	Dear Amy, Please see the attached letter. I look forward to hearing from you on this important issue in District 7. Best Regards, Kirk
12/12/2022 17:11	Veron Rice	Ivory Rezone	Ivory Home Rezone	Concerning the land on F Street in Salt Lake City now owned by Ivory Homes, as we understand, Ivory seeks to change zoning to allow some undisclosed number of units, perhaps up to 33, to be compressed into that lot. We don't understand how any city official could fail to see why this proposal is extreme and inappropriate for this area. As nearby residents, we also do not understand why a revised plan to allow perhaps up to 18 new homes, whatever the particular zoning, will not accommodate the reasonable interests of the builder and the City. Approving a plan that allows more dwelling units than that, especially up to 33, strikes us as excessive and simply punitive to nearby residents. Loretta and Vernon Rice

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Popular Topic	Subject	Description
12/12/2022 17:12	Jan McKinnon	Ivory Rezone	Ivory Proposed Rezone	<p>We have made a good case against the rezone, but you have made yourselves clear on this point. At the very least, have Ivory stay true to the zone. They can build up to 18-19 homes without the huge retaining walls and it would look like an Avenues neighborhood. After all, the purpose statement of SR-1 says that "uses are intended to be compatible with the existing scale and intensity of the neighborhood." These "smaller" homes would be more affordable, family friendly with lots big enough for a yard, and would add to the character of the neighborhood. With a strict adherence to the SR-1 zone, modest, safe retaining walls could be used in the building process. There wouldn't be a need for 1625 linear feet of retaining walls with some being as tall as 17 feet. You might ask yourselves who will accept the liability for the walls? Ivory will have sold the homes and be long gone. Will an HOA want to take on that liability? What if a child climbs up on the wall (heaven forbid) and falls and is injured? Who is liable for this terrible act? A responsible builder would not ask to build retaining walls violating city specs that were put in place within just a year or two. Density has a price and shouldn't be built without consideration of all the risks and hazards. Reasonable density should be the desired outcome for this lot. It would be nice to know that you have heard our voices and have considered our concerns just as you have listened to Ivory. Thank you. Jan McKinnon</p>
12/12/2022 17:13	Nathan <> Hatch	Safety	North Temple Redevelopment	<p>Hello Council, I'm a current resident of West North Temple and it is currently a busy hub of development projects and new residential buildings. As you well know these are being developed on a traxx line and largely intended for transit users who do not drive or own cars. Unfortunately, the biking access for these same buildings is completely nonexistent, and there is only a bare margin of dangerous shoulder for bikers to commute. Being also very near the Jordan River trail it is extremely unsafe for bikers to even access the trail without risking severe injury or death, or riding on the sidewalk, especially since traffic on North Temple is actually very sparse and as such there are drivers who greatly exceed the speed limit and drive recklessly due to the general absence of traffic. It has also become a hub for drag racers and joyriding at night, being so open and generally unused. I am asking that the City Council seriously consider redeveloping the entirety of West North Temple, from downtown to the airport, to include a fully protected and landscaped bicycle commute lane to replace one of the unnecessary car lanes, to complement the Traxx stations, apartment density, and help us have better and safer access to the new businesses coming in as well as the Jordan River Trail. Such a lane would also increase foot traffic and attract more local businesses to fill the currently vacant storefronts. Considering this artery is also the first street seen by arrivals from the airport, it would greatly benefit Salt Lake City's image to be a well designed, pedestrian and biking safe, landscaped, and populated thoroughfare. I absolutely love living here, especially not having a car, and the new development is so exciting. But without a protected bike lane it also feels (and is) dangerous, but it also holds the potential to be a real world-class, walkable and bikeable metropolitan neighborhood. If this does occur I will be opening a business in one of the several vacant new storefronts myself. Thanks! Nathan Hatch</p>







