

| Date/Time Opened | Contact Name | Subject | Description |
|------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--|
| 1/18/2023 16:48 | Margaret Holloway | Bees stadium move. | <p>I was joking tonight. My boss Daybreak. Councilman McGuire has been getting upset people messaging him about this new outcome. People want to start a petition against it. Will ruin the neighborhood. It is going to be sad to see the stadium go . Such a cool part of the city. Like the fairgrounds. History.</p> <p>Margaret Holloway</p> |
| 1/18/2023 16:49 | Margaret Holloway 1/2 | The old timers | <p>Okay the city will give millions to help build a community that is supposed to help 40 people.. The city gives out money to new companies hoping they can make it. i understand that to a degree. But when companies have been here for many many decades and have paid their dues to the city. We are told we are no longer needed. After all the shiny object in the window is always more appealing right? But the companies you are tossing aside were the heartbeat of employment during hard times. If they hadn't been they wouldn't still be here. But that is the point they are leaving. What is taking their place? Apartments not jobs. But that doesn't mean the residents spend their money here except on the high rent and fees. The small eateries can't even make it downtown. Lees grocery store couldn't make it even next to all those apartments. But established companies are being pushed out. Tax paying companies. I guess from what I read that is what the city wants. They want high end living downtown and the surrounding areas. Do the new small eateries or stores make it? I see more close than open. But have you gone to the proven places to see if they need help? It costs far more to start a business than to help keep one there. Unless the landlord or city wants you gone for something new. The RDA took out a working business and older homes replaced it with store fronts that have never been rented. 17 years. It is a shame they could have been apartments. Maybe they still will. The few that did rent them out closed after 6months to a few years. The rest never have been touched. Even with all the new apartments. Could it be because people don't have money left over? But the city gives out hundreds of thousands of dollars on a whim of what could be. Not supporting what already is but struggling. If we could find more skilled labor we sure could use them. Would you give us a tax break if we could add 5 more welders, We need to offer 10 more an hour. We already give the city 25,000 in sales tax from supplies. 25,000 in city property tax. How much is the bakery going to be able to give back?Are they going to find the employees?. Our payroll is 1.2 million. I see older places close up all the time . They get lets thankous for the decades of city employment and services. Time to move on. You give away prime real estate for a park on the roof. The store fronts on 300 west that the RDA built 17 years ago are still empty. 3 businesses have tried and failed. The leases are too high. Not your problem. New places have a hard time so you give them grant money.... DO you check on the old proven ones? To see how they are doing? Do you check to see what you can do to help them out?? No because it is better to tell people how you are bringing something shiny and new to the area. But then they are gone after a few years and it is empty space. Just look at the areas downtown and the places without apartments but older businesses. Why do you not help them??</p> |

| Date/Time Opened | Contact Name | Subject | Description |
|------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| 1/18/2023 16:49 | Margaret Holloway 2/2 | CONTINUED! The old timers | <p>Because they are expendable but now that the city is losing the sales tax from the Bees ticket sales. I wonder are the residents and the businesses that didn't get your tax breaks going to have to pay more? The office towers downtown are half empty. with no plans of being leased. ... The financial companies that laid off hundreds shout recession. But the tried and true who made it through the last recessions because of good business sense they are not helped. Just because they don't come hat in hand doesn't mean they are okay. . We are told we need to help the new companies. Really and why is that?? They compete with us for skilled workers. We keep losing our vendors because the pressure to sell to housing is so strong. . I was told by a council member Oh well the port might help. They are storage and do not pay sales tax since they don't buy anything.The job to drive a forklift is not high paying. But hey that is okay as long as the apartments can be built. But maybe they meant that they could hire our now out of work employees. Because when you own your land and building starting from scratch is really not something that is going to happen. Now you say you want to put a massive warehouse and manufacturing facility out on 2200 west. But how much are you going to give to them if they promise good paying jobs? How much are the rest of us going to have to pay. I mean residents too... Somebody has to pay. The housing for people coming from out of state is such demand. The state and county are already doubling everything saying how valuable a successful long time business is. Instead of saying thank you.... But they must have a developer looking at the area. Times change the shiny object always wins. I am 63 and not the shiny object people rehire these days. But most of our guys are in their 50's been here over 15 yrs. The owner is 82 But we won't go without fighting because we are too good at our work., I hope the bakery makes it and uses their grant well. i do not wish ill will on anyone. Just a fair playing field. Margaret Holloway.</p> |
| 1/18/2023 16:49 | Brandee Burnam | Belated Congrats on your new positions | <p>Hi, Just wanted to send warm wishes and congratulations to Victoria and Darin on their new positions as Chair and Vice Chair of the Salt Lake Community Council. This is belated but not any less enthusiastic. Ana is our District 4 representative but we look forward to meeting all of you in the near future as Rhianna and I will be working hard to make Central City Neighborhood Council a more active, involved, and intricate part of the network of neighborhood councils and bring positive change to all those that live within Central City and surrounding neighborhoods. Hope to talk to you soon. Have a good day!</p> |

| Date/Time Opened | Contact Name | Subject | Description |
|------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| 1/19/2023 13:44 | Ana Pineda | No re-zoning inside our neighborhood | <p>January 19, 2023 Hello again to our city planners and city council members, Several neighbors wanted to add their names to my previous message: I live in the Fairpark Community. Before I bought my house here, I checked with city planning and was told the city intended to maintain our zoning so it would remain a stable neighborhood of single family homes with yard spaces around them. Now, pressures on our area are clamoring to replace our primarily owner-occupied homes with various densities of units that can produce a wealth of rent. This is not the only place in Salt Lake City where people can own their own home, have a yard with space to raise families and have neighbors over for summer BBQs. Yet those wanting to exploit our local property tell us this change is inevitable and that, in any case, "individual homes can no longer be built and sold here." This is a lie. A lie that depends on this being seen as an undesirable area. In a time of political pressure to provide ever more housing, developers may see themselves as heroes while they plan their revenue streams. My neighbors and I see the disrespect in the crowding that they want to impose on us. And then to do this with your blessing. However, your roles are more like architects of community lifestyles. We want to keep ours intact - and keep on improving upon it. As we are encircled by the growing intensity of bordering development, we are depending on your oversight to protect our investments in property and in community-building. We see how both are threatened by inconsistent higher densities. With this, I want to add my "No" to the proposed zoning changes. Thank you, Ann and Salvador Pineda, Robyn Lopez, Kristine Young, Michael Wolf, Mariano Wilson, Ken and Dani Lobato</p> |
| 1/23/2023 16:54 | Carol Wicks | ADU | <p>will it a year to modify du regs since city council did not pass the proposal approved by planning also what is the status of revised parking regulations ie has it been passed by city council absolutely dont disagree with cocerns over parking with respect to adu very difficult to actually provide more housing without affecting parking issues almost all my tenants in antique buildings agree that they will own one car per person i suppose students might b the exception or maybe seniors anyway good luck to you and will follow up every quarter thanks for your help carol wicks</p> |
| 1/23/2023 16:57 | Margaret Holloway | New Ways | <p>I guess if you can't control STR's. Can't control slumlords. . So you want to add uncontrollable ADU's to the money mix. At least with ADU there were to parking and entrance regulations. But people already are renting bedrooms in these congested areas. There are no places to park on many many streets in RosePark. Poplar Grove If a home is renting illegally to people they usually comes with cars. So let's allow them to compete. There are no rules that are enforced in this area. Can you not get control of STRs. ? You keep blaming the stste. They are illegal and eat up housing. There were only 30 ADU applications. But how many are doing it illegally? Get control of slumlords. That you can do. Pass more enforcement for STR</p> |

| Date/Time Opened | Contact Name | Subject | Description |
|------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| 1/23/2023 17:01 | Margaret Holloway | Not enough housing is a not an excuse | <p>Since when are we short on housing?? We are a landlocked built out city are we not???? Since when is the city responsible for cramming as many housing units into the smallest spaces? The STR's have over taken single residential streets. The people renting without permits are allowed to be. The small house communities don't have enough parking. Yet you keep trying to cram more in. Since when are the rest of the residents supposed to give up what they thought they bought into a nice neighborhood. You DO NOT crack down on slumlords who are working the system. Nor do you crack down on the illegal STR's . But by golly . The east side is all for this because it will never come to them... But since when does SLC owe anyone a place to live when the other cities just sit back and point to SLC. Where are the low cost housing units in all the other cities with LAND??? I fight back all the time on Nextdoor and RPFB that the city does not owe you anything. I tell people to commute from the other cities.... They complain they shouldn't have too..... They have larger lots with ample street parking. But drive down Colorado from 600 north. Dive down any of our smaller areas in Poplar Grove? Fairpark. Since when do you think you need to add to the mess that is already there? It is not upto this city to house all these people coming in from out of the state pushing the locals out. Affordable is non definition of housing. If someone can rent it someone can afford it. But the council is bound and determined to not stand up for the residents already invested here. So they have to commute 15-30 minutes so what?? The office towers are half empty. The rent in most of the new rentals are on the Upper side of what is already here. But what makes things worse is the landlords not fixing things in apartments and if you complain they threaten to kick them out. There is not a safe place to make sure the landlord is following the health department requirements. If they complain they get evicted..or they double the rent and they are allowed to.... So since when is it the city's responsibility to house everyone that wants to live here. It is called BUILT OUT. So stop cramming more into the smaller communities when you know the others would not put up with it. You can not build or ADU your way nor can you put millions into a village and expect things to change. It is not this city's taxpayers responsibility. The other cities are not bending over backwards they are fighting against redoing their ADU with no designated parking They know it what headaches it will cause the residents. But not SLC..... Margaret Holloway</p> |
| 1/23/2023 23:22 | Sean Allin | Proposed Changes to RMF-30 Zoning District | <p>I wanted to request additional information as to why the south side of 200 block of 900 south has been left off of any proposed zoning amendments. As it stands currently, the 10 houses between 200 and 300 east of 900 South (of which I am personally an owner of) are the only east of State Street to be zoned R-1. It seems apparent that the highest and best use is other than R-1, particularly in light of the 900 South redevelopment project. In Addition, in the 2005 version of Central City's master plan, this strip of parcels along 900 South are depicted as "Mixed Use." Have there been discussions to include this section of parcels in with zoning amendments?</p> |
| 1/24/2023 7:27 | Auburn Thayer | Grafitti VS. Vandalism | <p>https://www.graffitiremovalinc.com/products/safewipes There is a vandalism problem at the Geraldine E. King Legacy WRC. Grafitti Art is one issue and yet offensive vandalism is a seperate more heinous issue. Thank You.</p> |

| Date/Time Opened | Contact Name | Subject | Description |
|------------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| 1/24/2023 9:34 | Anonymous Constituent | ADU Concerns | The constituent is concerned that the code currently defines owner-occupied as a person on the deed or person related. If an ADU were to become a short term rental (Airbnb) the city would have a hard time enforcing this since Civil Enforcement could not require a resident to prove the person staying in the ADU is a relative. Additionally, there is concern on how the city would meet the concerns of citizens reporting illegal use of ADU's |
| 1/25/2023 13:44 | Margaret Holloway | Drought fee. | Okay we all know we are to brown our lawns I did that one year now I have dirt. But the airport the Salt Lake City International Airport which has 3 million people pass through it each year.. You know the one.... Have you ever been in the restroom there???? They have jet powered toilets. They must use 100 gallons of water per flush because they run for about 20 seconds. Granted the water goes to be treated BUT the water comes from the reservoirs first then treated then to the airport to be treated. Yet it fresh water treated water first. So when you say lets save water.... How about having the airport shorten the jet flushes... They are also around the valley. But known of those see 3 million possible flushes a year. I challenge you to go and investigate then charge the city payers a drought fee. Margaret Holloway I know i will never hear back... But put your words into action and help fix the problem. |
| 1/27/2023 9:53 | Cherish Clark | Opportunity for Art on I-15 Expansion Sound Walls | Hi Victoria, I'm Cherish Clark and I am a resident in the Fairpark neighborhood. I have been digging into the Noise Abatement policy for UDOT because of the looming highway expansion, and I found an opportunity for SLC to improve on its art and aesthetic. According to section C.2.d.6 of the policy, SLC can contribute funds to make "functional or aesthetic enhancements " to the sound walls. UDOT Noise Abatement Policy < https://www.udot.utah.gov/main_old/uconowner.gf?n=10496602977480171 > Right now our sound walls look like this... But they could look like this... Or this... or this! I know that art is important to you and that the council members are doing their retreat right now. I think that the council should consider taking advantage of the highway expansion to our benefit, especially given our chances of preventing it completely are slim. Kind regards, Cherish -- Cherish Clark |
| 1/30/2023 7:42 | Antonia Guigova | FW: (EXTERNAL) Oil and grease falling from gondola wires | Dear Madam, I m writing to you from Norway. I happened to read an article about the go dola project in your town from November 2022, where you ask a very sensible question of oil drips from the gondola lubrication on the watershed. I can inform you that this happens on a regular basis in the town of Voss in Borway, where both liqud drips (like dirty rain), and solidified grease lumps have been falling from the wires. I am sending a few photos from people living in the area. I hope it is bot too late to help you make th ight decision and protect the water and nature in the area. Kindest regards, Antonia Guigova Norway Liquid drips of oil on snow |
| 2/1/2023 16:17 | Lynn Frandsen | Don't raise our water bill | Dear City Council, You might have noticed that inflation has increased the cost of living for food, Fuel, Everything. Taxes have gone up, now we are hearing that the mayor wants to raise fees on the Water bill and call it a drought fee. I think you will discover that your constituents are very very displeased with this idea. Sincerely a concerned citizen |

| Date/Time Opened | Contact Name | Subject | Description |
|------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| 2/1/2023 22:01 | Michael Baker | ADU Amendments | just wanted to drop a quick note of support for the ADU amendments. since they are filling a dearly needed housing niche, could there be some incentive towards making these new DUs into affordable housing? perhaps some utility discount or property tax write-off for property owners who are providing rent at a mutually beneficial but more affordable price? Complaints about traffic from ADUs are NIMBY nonsense. i live across the street from +100 rental units and condos and there is no crippling traffic that destroys my quality of life. we need to defy the affordable housing headwinds of NIMBYism and short term rentals by expanding ADUs throughout the city. thanks for taking my feedback. |
| 2/4/2023 10:07 | Eric Montenegro | ADU Amendment | Do it. We need so much housing. The target rent to income to reduce homelessness is 22%, we are well above it and getting worse. We need to allow mid-density and mixed use zoning city wide. Even better, <u>take a look at what Vienna has been doing</u> |
| 2/5/2023 20:48 | Lilian Hayes | ADU Amendments | Hello! I don't think I can attend the public hearing on Feb 7, so I am submitting a comment. I ticked the box to be contacted about the issue because I would really appreciate a confirmation that this comment was received. I agree with removing the conditional use application, and with increasing the maximum size permitted for the ADU. It isn't a bad thing to allow bigger constructions and therefore more housing. Yes, please discuss using incentives for building ADUs and/or renting at affordable rates, or this won't help with the housing crisis at all. Additionally, consider including incentives for making wheelchair-accessible ADUs. There are many older singles or couples who need affordable housing, too. For that same reason, I disagree with the change to waive the required parking lot if the property is within a half-mile of biking paths. Even if the renter is able to use a bicycle and uses it as their daily mode of transportation- which the majority don't, and I'd argue the majority can't- they will need a parking space for moving in/out, for guests, for carpooling... It is hard to live in Salt Lake without access to a car, even in downtown SLC. You have to assume everyone will need parking in some way. Thank you for listening! |
| 2/6/2023 11:01 | Margaret Holloway | Drought fee. More money for general budget | I am told other cities do this.. Did other cities just see the city budget raise by 4 %. Did other cities just pass a good faith parks bond. That the cities past record under former mayor's have diverted the money to other projects and never put the money back. After we are absorbing the cost of the water treatment plant. After cutting back our water usage. MORE than any other city. I was told the east side is greener than the west. They need to be charged. Have you thought that maybe they have more trees and have shaded areas that don't turn brown. Where is this EXTRA CHARGE going to go. The general fund or to the treatment plant to lower our cost. NO. it is a fee. Telling the residents you need to be punished for having a garden . The wealthy people don't care. So where is this money going? You plant trees and yet then tell people not to water. So they die. So you replant and they die again. This is another tax on the residents for what?????? Where is it going????? The mayor's representative said well other cities do it. Did those other cities also brown their lawns per request? Like we did?? No. So they have to be taxed to do it. But this hits everyone who uses water. It gives landlords another reason to keep raising rates even if they don't use anymore water. The price increases effect everyone renting. It is a gimmick to raise rent. For what?? To say. Other cities do it . Try fixing the plumbing. SO WHAT. Margaret Holloway |

| Date/Time Opened | Contact Name | Subject | Description |
|------------------|------------------|--|--|
| 2/6/2023 11:04 | Vicki Pepler | ADU | WE have such a housing shortage, please pass the amendment allowing more accessory dwelling units. This is needed so much. Please pass this- |
| 2/6/2023 11:05 | Dave Iltis | SLC Mayor and Council: Please Rename Charles Lindbergh Drive to Tuskegee Airman Drive | Dear Mayor Mendenhall, Director Larsen, Chief Equity Officer Choi, and the Salt Lake City Council, I'm resending this to include the Council. For those who received this email earlier, please respond to this one as it includes a larger group. Salt Lake City needs to rename Charles Lindbergh Drive in the International Center. We don't need his name given prominence. He was a Nazi sympathizer and anti-semitic: https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/americanexperience/features/lindbergh-fallen-hero/ For more background, see also: https://www.smithsonianmag.com/videos/charles-lindbergh-and-the-rise-of-1940s-nazi-s/ My suggestion would be to honor the Tuskegee Airmen by changing the name to: Tuskegee Airmen Drive https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tuskegee_Airmen "The Tuskegee Airmen were a group of primarily African American military pilots (fighter and bomber) and airmen who fought in World War II." They are a much better choice to have a street named after than a Nazi sympathizer and anti-semitic. This also fits well with the International Center's street naming convention of naming streets after aviators. Another street renaming that would be appropriate would be for a block of 200 S or W. Temple is to honor Major Taylor, the black world champion track cyclist, who competed at the Salt Palace in the early 1900's when the Salt Palace was a bike racing track. One or both of these street renamings would be great to do this month as part of Black History Month. Please let me know your thoughts on this. Thanks, Dave Iltis |
| 2/6/2023 11:08 | Sierras Flesmaus | Climate Change and a population boom could dry up the Great Salt Lake in 5 Years | Perhaps by the time the Ivory project is complete and new tenants move in we won't have any water and all the toxic chemicals in the bottom of the lake will be circulating our head in dust storms. Good job, keep developing the desert! https://www.npr.org/2023/02/03/1153550793/climate-change-and-a-population-boom-could-dry-up-the-great-salt-lake-in-5-years Utah leaders are under pressure to end water diversions and enforce tougher restrictions in order save the dryin... Of course, you approved the development despite having historic low water levels, we already have limited parking available, there's already too much traffic on F. Street, and being one of the oldest neighborhoods in the valley that is already fully developed you go ahead and proceed against all the neighbors' wishes. In the past 25 years, the population has just about tripled in one of the driest States in the U.S. It's irresponsible and illogical! Your commission should pay the neighborhood's increased utility and service costs, as well as how to manage traffic and parking in the area. There's no way to repair the historic beauty taken away by constant development. My neighbors and I can't help but feel that when your last name is Ivory, all doors open for you and none of the neighbors' concerns are valid. We live here and are more than disappointed. You are chiseling away at the charm and the view in the Avenues the reason we all chose to live here. |

| Date/Time Opened | Contact Name | Subject | Description |
|------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|---|
| 2/6/2023 11:10 | Jim Jenkin | ADU Text Amendment | <p>Dear Council members, While I generally support the proposed terms of the text amendment, the height of ADU in residential neighborhoods should remain tied to the height of the existing dwelling. Allowing increased height by right will have negative impacts on light, air, and view (where protected) for neighbors, as well as general neighborhood characteristics. Negative effects will be exacerbated in hilly neighborhoods, where the angle of light makes it more easily blocked. I support the prohibition of ADU as short term rentals, but am concerned about its enforceability. I also note that hilly terrain can make straight-line distances measurements problematic for determining exemptions to requirements, unless grade change is considered. Sincerely yours, Jim Jenkin</p> |
| 2/6/2023 11:11 | Don Brown | ADUs will ruin Salt Lake City | <p>Please vote against this radical change to our city. In the name of helping, you are destroying our city, putting us on the path of so many once great cities that have succumbed to lunatic ideas. We have stayed here because we love it. We can leave and probably will if you turn it into a hell hole. Protect our neighborhoods! That is why we elected you. Don Brown SLC resident since 1974</p> |

| Date/Time Opened | Contact Name | Subject | Description |
|------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| 2/6/2023 16:33 | Kathleen Kelly 1/2 | Public Hearing ADU Codes | <p>Good morning Councilman Dugan: Unfortunately, I cannot be at the public hearing on the new ADU codes, and so need to let you know my heartfelt concerns with some of the proposed codes. You might remember me from our discussions last summer when we had an ugly ADU installed by our backyard neighbor, right up against our fence, which took away our mountain view and reduced our property value. Since then, we have spent \$30,000 on putting in landscaping that hopefully will eventually obscure the big white wall, and reduce some of the noise that is now always present in our formerly peaceful yard. (The ADU has a noisy air/heat element that is right above our fence.) On the 30,000 foot level, with our serious air pollution and water issues, it seems time for the State as a whole, and the Salt Lake City Council, to take a pause in their rush to create more housing. How many people can we ethically accommodate? While the current need is most acute for more affordable housing the ADU proposal (and much of the recent housing development) does not address rent control, or deed restrictions, etc. Developers who buy homes, knock them down, build multi-unit primary homes and then add ADU's can charge whatever the market will bear. Comments on some specific proposed code items: Automatic "on demand" approval of all ADU applications. This is chilling – in changing from a conditional use permit, a neighbor would have no input on a project that would most likely reduce property values, increase noise, restrict views. At least I was able to talk with you, the Planning Department, and the representative for the neighbor. Yes, democracy can be messy and time consuming, but "on demand approval" feels quite authoritarian. Also, human beings are not the best at following the rules – easier to ask forgiveness (after building an ADU that is not compliant) than ask permission. ALL ADU applications should be subject to rigorous review. ADU's size up to 1,000 to 1,200sf: The Planning Staff recommendation of 720sf makes much more sense; as does the requirement that an ADU be no larger than 50 percent of the footprint of the main structure. Also, the current 17 foot height restriction still makes for a looming presence. Two stories would be just awful. Setbacks reduced to 3 feet: I invite you to stop by my house and see how very close the current 4 foot setback brings the ADU to our property. Owner occupancy not required on multi-family properties: This seems an enticement to developers to buy properties and completely change the character of the properties – by converting single family homes to multi-family housing and then putting in the largest ADU possible. Although some would tag my belief as elitist or entitled, I believe that there is great value in protecting our historic neighborhoods as a key to the cultural personality and health of our city. Can you image Boston allowing ADU's on Beacon Hill?</p> |
| 2/6/2023 16:33 | Kathleen Kelly 2/2 | CONTINUED!! Public Hearing ADU Codes | <p>A city needs to value and protect its history and unique properties for future generations. I know that many in the Sugarhouse neighborhoods are heartbroken with the development that has happened there. Allowing ADU's almost everywhere will make our city less beautiful, neighborhoods less cohesive, and certainly create bad feelings among neighbors. Lastly, thank you so much for being willing to do your terrifically difficult job. My husband and I both worked for Park City Municipal for many years and understand the challenges of both City staff and Councils. Sincerely, Kathleen Kelly</p> |

| Date/Time Opened | Contact Name | Subject | Description |
|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|---|
| 2/6/2023 16:35 | James Webster 1/3 | ADU Proposal/D6 | <p>Councilman Dugan, I oppose the ADU proposal of the planning staff and commission for reasons based on facts and my 44 years of professional practice as a registered landscape architect, land and environmental planner, expert witness, and architectural historian. I hold graduate degrees in these disciplines from Harvard along with an academic teaching and guest lecture resume along with professional licensure in numerous states. Among my concerns are ordinance and code intent, socio-economic and environmental impacts, standards of practice, attractive nuisance doctrines, risk management, fire protection, ordinance enforcement, public utilities capacity, waste disposal, historic preservation, and the economic viability of completing ADU projects by unqualified builders given the city's incentives to ignore traditional enforcement processes. The following precedents, case studies, and ignorance of common sense illustrate my above concerns. 1. Ordinance and code intent: Euclidean zoning ordinances are critical protections of public health and welfare enabled by the police power, a basic U. S. Constitutional right. They serve to protect the established investment and equity of Salt Lake City residents and taxpayers, and they stabilize the local housing market for anticipated sales and the general economy. Specific protections ensured by building ordinances and codes include set-backs, building height restrictions, plumbing and fire protections, and other life-safety assurances. When Yalecrest residents invested in our neighborhood they were assured that these protections for our quality of life would be be perpetuated for the extent of our living in Yalecrest, as in all other responsible local jurisdictions. 2. So I-economic impacts: For Salt Lake City council members to arbitrarily abolish these long-standing ordinances and codes constitutes a serious violation of our civil rights and imposes life-safety risks and equity losses for absolutely no beneficial purpose, other than profiteering by third- party absentee investors. The advocacy that ADU's serve to provide affordable housing is nothing short of a fool's errand at the expense of a stable community. While real estate red-lining is generally associated with discrimination due to race by the upper middle-class, a decision by the council to impose these arbitrary and punitive impacts is nothing less than reverse red-lining, and a taking that likely affords legal restitution. As residents have the right to peace, quiet, privacy and minimal light intrusion the city appears to have no intention to ensure these components of our quality of life shoul the Council approve this matter. 3. Standards of practice: Violations of conventional building practices or standards are assured by competent and consistent permit and inspection by local governments.</p> |

| Date/Time Opened | Contact Name | Subject | Description |
|------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|---|
| 2/6/2023 16:35 | James Webster 2/3 | CONTINUED!! ADU Proposal/D6 | <p>As established conditional use permitting and follow-up inspection are arbitrarily abolished by the ADU permitting process these assurances subject adjacent homeowners to unforeseen risk and loss of property value. Case in point is the city's approval of an ADU garage within one foot of my backyard. We were informed by the SLC inspector that because this request was for an ADU the applicant was not required to inform us of his intentions or comply with established building criteria. When pressed that the proposed ADU approval was not yet applicable, the city walked back its prior assertion. However, we have yet to see any building documents and our once existent tomato garden is now covered with lead based paint as we were never informed of demolition by the city, the applicant had no obligation to contain lead under the city's presumed ADU approval, and we are now confronted with an expensive haz-mat clean-up that will never result in a safe environment. The extent of this impact is scheduled to be defined this Spring by Salt Lake County.</p> <p>4. Attractive nuisance: Open utility tranches and related excavation obstacles impose otherwise avoidable risk that appears to be ignored by the ADU approval and oversight process.</p> <p>5. Risk management: The extent to which the city intends to assure safety during construction for the general public is not defined by the ADU proposal. No requirement of professional oversight by the Utah Division of Occupational Licensing (DOPL) is required as anyone with (or without) a pick-up truck can be his own general contractor despite a complete lack of building experience, bonding, or other means of assuring public safety.</p> <p>5. Fire protection: Throughout Yalecrest and the East Bench, fire lines are 6" in diameter and therefore non-compliant. The failure of Salt Lake City to conform to current fire codes is further aggravated should the City Council impose greater demand on fire lines and hydrants by arbitrarily imposing greater housing density. Access for fire equipment to free-standing housing in back yards was never anticipated through the subdivision approval process of the 1920-30's and is inadequate and illegal. There is a very good reason why housing was required to have been built within a responsible radius of available fire infrastructure. ADU's do not conform to this standard.</p> <p>6. Ordinance enforcement: As indicated above, ordinances and conventional code compliance will not be enforced by the city in these arbitrarily conceived neighborhoods. The long-standing adage that the only reason we need local government is to provide for citizens' welfare in those areas where they cannot provide for themselves. This clearly will not apply in Salt Lake City if ADU's are allowed.</p> |

| Date/Time Opened | Contact Name | Subject | Description |
|------------------|-------------------|--------------------------------|---|
| 2/6/2023 16:35 | James Webster 3/3 | CONTINUED!! ADU Proposal/D6 | <p>7. Public utility capacity: Each time an ADU is imposed on a former single-family parcel, the demand for utility services increases by 200%. New sanitary sewer laterals, new culinary lines, new gas and new electric service lines will extend the construction timeframe and disrupt local traffic. Who will pay for expanded infrastructure capacity? Oh wait, I know. It will be established residents impacted by absentee investors who have been incentivized by the city's ADU arbitrary initiative. Will these intruders pay for lighting, or just leave this to the rest of us? 8. Waste disposal: The demand for additional garbage and recycling receptacles will exasperate available space for on-street parking and thereby restrict the ability of SLC Streets to clean debris and remove snow. 9. Historic preservation: A primary concern of existing homeowners is preservation of the architectural history and character of our established neighborhoods. Housing that appears to be a travel trailer with no contributing elements to historic character is clearly unacceptable and a detrimental impact on the established real estate equity of impacted neighbors. 10. Economic viability of completing projects: As is clearly evident from my years of residential design and project management, the capability of non-licensed contractors to accurately estimate the full extent of construction cost, attract timely and available sub-contractors, and complete ADU projects within a reasonable timeframe is very questionable. Subs owe no favors to self-made generals. The city's ADU approval process fails to address bonding or other forms of oversight to ensure timely completion, or prevent the abandonment of unfinished projects that impose a blighted environmental impact. Jim Webster</p> |

| Date/Time Opened | Contact Name | Subject | Description |
|------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|--|
| 2/6/2023 16:36 | Don Hartley 1/2 | Public Hearing ADU/D6 | <p>Hello, Dan. My wife and I live at REDACTED. Due to various other meetings and commitments we will not be able to attend the subject public hearing on Tuesday evening. While we are sympathetic regarding the lack of affordable housing in SLC we adamantly oppose the proposed ADU zoning ordinance for the following reasons: 1) The amendments as described at the P&Z website "...would provide incentives to developers who include affordable homes in their projects." Allowing (encouraging) real estate developers who have no interest in the long-term quality of the affected neighborhoods, to totally alter the neighborhoods' character and viability by subdividing and adding onto existing homes, placing stand-alone ADU's on already-compact lots, demolishing existing homes and replacing them with inappropriately designed du-, tri-, and four-plexes, is unacceptable. Developers (and indifferent property owners) stand to make lots of money in this give-away scheme, but where's the consideration for the current residents that have to live with the negative impacts? Especially those residents that have worked to create and sustain the "desirable" neighborhoods that the City now wishes to degrade through implementing this ordinance. 2) What will be the negative impacts? The safety problems and pollution from increased auto traffic and parking on narrow streets - streets that were intended for fewer - not more - vehicles; property neglect resulting from absentee and indifferent landlords; an influx of transient renters that, like the developers, have no real long-term interest in the health and safety and welfare of the neighborhoods. Expecting the current residents in the affected neighborhoods to gladly accept such negative impacts is insulting. 3) Where the ordinance will be applied is baffling. Why would the City base long-term planning policy and ordinances on something as impermanent as UTA's current transit routes? The trax lines are unlikely to be changed for the foreseeable future but what about the bus lines? Can UTA or SLC say with confidence that the bus routes that will determine which neighborhoods are going to be subject to the ordinance are even going to be in existence in a decade from now? It seems that UTA is constantly modifying its bus routes. Also, SLC planners and policy makers are ignoring reality if they think that aligning the affected neighborhoods with transit routes will result in fewer vehicles. UTA's bus service is so minimal and unreliable, and the residential and commercial development in the Salt Lake Valley is so spread-out and far flung, that it's impossible for the vast majority of residents to live here without a personal vehicle. ADU (and TOD) residents are not exempt from this reality and have vehicles, even if only occasionally used, that they want to have parked near to where they live. 4) What may be the biggest problem with the ADU's lies in their regulation and enforcement.</p> |

| Date/Time Opened | Contact Name | Subject | Description |
|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| 2/6/2023 16:36 | Don Hartley 2/2 | CONTINUED!! Public Hearing ADU/D6 | SLC P&Z, by their own admission, does not have the resources to administer the ordinance - such as ensuring that rents meet the criteria for "affordability" when an ADU is created and then stay affordable for decades into the future, and preventing ADU's from being used as short-term rentals. To think that developers and unconcerned property owners will police themselves in this misguided attempt to provide affordable housing seems very naive. Need proof? The City can't (or won't) regulate the surge of unregistered, illegal short-term rentals that have cropped up in the city so why would regulating ADU's be any different? If SLC is truly committed to affordable housing, why aren't the developers that are flooding the city with high-density and highly unaffordable apartments being required to provide affordable units, either that the City participates in financially (carrot) or require as a condition of permitting (stick)? It seems that creating affordable housing in major new developments that are already located close to transportation, education and commercial infrastructure makes more sense than forcing an unpopular zoning ordinance onto aggrieved property owners. Thank you for taking our comments. Please feel free to contact me if you wish to discuss this correspondence. Don - |
| 2/6/2023 16:38 | Susan Fleming | Yalecrest ADU/D6 | Hello, I live on the edge of the Yalecrest neighborhood and am very concerned about adding Accessory Dwelling Units to houses in this very special historic neighborhood. 1) We do not need further congestion and crowding. Intersections with cars and pedestrians here are getting increasingly dangerous and a little girl was killed by a vehicle at 13th south and 21st East just a month or so ago. 2) Many of the homes here are historic and the ADUs would not add any appeal aesthetically to someone's side yard or backyard. What would they look like? 3) The height of such dwellings is way too high--the roof of the primary residence might be lower. 4) Balconies on an ADU might interfere with privacy of the neighbors, especially if they could be added in any direction. 5) Parking is getting crowded along our streets--we do NOT need more cars parking on the street. It is my understanding that off-street parking can be easily waived. And what about families that own 2 or more cars? 6) A three foot setback is not enough between an existing property and an ADU 7) Owner occupancy should be required, since properties often deteriorate if an owner is not present. Sincerely, Susan F. Fleming |
| 2/7/2023 9:11 | Margie McCloy | ADU | Hello, I live in the 9th and 9th neighborhood, and I support the change in law to allow ADUs throughout the city, with the following caveats: * 800 sq ft, not 1,000 * height 12-14', not 24 (1 story only) * side yard setback 8 ft, not 3 * rooftop solar required if conditions merit (metric could be years to break-even—energy bill savings vs upfront costs) * not restricted to owner occupancy Thanks for your attention. Margie McCloy |

| Date/Time Opened | Contact Name | Subject | Description |
|------------------|----------------|--|---|
| 2/7/2023 9:13 | David Grainger | ADU comments for Council consideration | <p>To the Salt Lake City Council: As the City Council is reviewing a city ordinance text amendment that may make it easier for property owners to have an Accessory Dwelling Unit, or ADU, intended to increase the number of ADUs in my city, I would like to comment that: 1. increased ADU numbers will impact city infrastructure, particularly more people living per unit area. This means more trash/recycling cans, more cars and car-associated issues, more off-street parking requirements, more pets, etc. ADU approvals should be required to provide off-street occupant parking and trash can storage for all ADUs. 2. ADUs in my neighborhood are primarily university student ghettos with unregulated slumlords allowing excess person occupancy without oversight, taking exorbitant rents without upkeep, maintenance or providing parking for excessive cars for excessive unrelated occupants. This cannot be continued. 3. ADUs should be required to pay property and occupant taxes necessary to support their new, on-going infrastructural load on city services and urban infrastructure. Respectfully submitted, Dave Grainger Salt Lake City resident, home-owner, parent, taxpayer and voter</p> |
| 2/7/2023 9:13 | Ira Hinckley | ADU's | <p>Hello, I am completely opposed to all of the proposed changes to promote ADU's. I can hardly think of a better way to destroy our neighborhoods. Passing these proposals would prove to me that you have absolutely no regard for our neighborhoods and certainly do not have our best interests at heart. Ira Hinckley resident</p> |

| Date/Time Opened | Contact Name | Subject | Description |
|------------------|---------------------|--|---|
| 2/7/2023 9:15 | Casey McDonough 1/2 | City hearing on rezone application for historic house at 704 E 900 S - Application has not been made in good faith, please vote NO | <p>Council members et al, The bullet points at the end of this message are surely things about the 704 E 900 S rezone application you have already been made aware of. They seem to outline more than enough negatives than positives for a rezone of this property. My more specific comments to you all would be that this application is a clear case of speculative real estate investment and dealing with the neighborhood and the city disingenuously and in bad faith. If it were simply a case of the property owner speculating that they may be able to rezone the property and increase its value as a result, that would be one thing. But they are asking for a rezone while knowingly and willingly engaging in illegal short-term rentals as well as renting unpermitted units on the property. Please do not reward the bad behavior of what is now clearly the continued willful illegal acts by the property owner. Approving this application will set a precedent for speculators across the city that they can ignore our ordinances and break the law, that they can ignore the limits set by the zoning of their properties to make as much money as possible, that they can do all this with complete disregard for their neighbors and our neighborhoods. Please give a resounding and unanimous NO to this application. Thank you all for your time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Planning Commission (PC) unanimously voted to forward a negative recommendation to the City Council at the 10/12/22 meeting. The City Council is the final decider so the owner has asked them to overrule the PC. • The property at 704 E 900 S does not meet the city code standards for a rezone from R-2 (single & two family residential) to SNB (Small Neighborhood Business) zone, including lack of conformity to the Central Community Master Plan; • It does not meet the goals of Plan Salt Lake either; • The historic house is legal as a duplex. It was at some point prior to this owner's purchase divided into 4 units without permits. The current out-of-state owner bought it as an investment but apparently did not do his homework on legal status or uses. The extra units are not up to code and would need retrofits to be legal as a 4-plex. Rezoning is not the right tool to fix this issue. • The SNB zone allows by right numerous non-residential uses such as medical offices & retail shops, so housing would not necessarily be preserved if the zone is changed; • Development agreements should not be used. They are private agreements negotiated behind closed doors that are poor civic tools that have substantial fairness, consistency, & enforceability issues. • Non-conforming uses and unit legalization are more protective of historic structures than rezones with conditions; • Upzoning increases the land value and thus is a monetary public gift to property owners. This also drives real estate inflation and undermines affordability in the absence of strong value capture fees, which do not exist in SLC. |

| Date/Time Opened | Contact Name | Subject | Description |
|------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| 2/7/2023 9:15 | Casey McDonough 2/2 | CONTINUED!! City hearing on rezone application for historic house at 704 E 900 S - Application has not been made in good faith, please vote NO | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The owner stated at the Planning Commission hearing that he choses to offer illegal short term rentals because he makes 40% more profit than long term rentals; his main problem is that someone reported him & he is trying to use rezoning to solve a problem of his own making. • The owner is facing civil enforcement for both short term rentals and renting extra unpermitted units. If he is granted a rezone, apparently his enforcement problems & fines are dismissed. We have no information about the status of enforcement and if this has been settled yet. • In the meantime, the property continues to be listed for short term rentals as of today on AirBNB. o https://www.airbnb.com/rooms/812641410918876087?check_in=2023-02-24&check_out=2023-02-26&guests=1&adults=2&s=67&unique_share_id=d4ee0d15-3f19-4a2d-8296-02dac01e3d9d • By continuing to operate short-term rentals on the property, the owner continues to disregard existing city code despite enforcement efforts by the city. This behavior will likely continue and should not be |
| 2/7/2023 9:32 | Rich Wilcox | Comment re Item 9 Proposed re-zone | <p>I oppose the zoning change proposed for this property. Please follow the negative recommendation from the Planning Commission and vote to deny rezoning. The property should remain in a residential zone to protect housing. The adjacent properties are all lower density residential and R-2 is appropriate for this lot. 900 South is a historic dividing line for land use. The north corner commercial buildings are the wrong zoning model to follow. Key city goals are to preserve, improve, and stabilize existing housing stock. A rezone to a commercial use violates this. The SNB Small Neighborhood Business zone would allow other uses such as offices, medical clinics, retail, art galleries, group homes, and day cares. The city needs the housing, not more space for these other uses. If the property were used for these other commercial uses it would also cause negative impacts to neighbors. The owner has also been using the house for short term rentals as he admitted to the Planning Commission. He said this was due to the 40% more income he got. Rentals less than 30 days are not allowed in Salt Lake City. They reduce available housing for residents. They also often negatively affect neighbors due to parking, noise, activity levels, and more. An owner doing short term rentals should not be rewarded with a rezone. Rezoning to commercial would also increase the land value. This gives owners a windfall and harms affordability. A rezone to commercial makes it more likely the historic house would be torn down and replaced with a new commercial building in the future. Please vote to deny a rezone. Thank you.</p> |
| 2/7/2023 9:46 | Joel Ban | EV chargers | <p>I would encourage the city to also require charges in all existing multifamily developments such as condos. I see there may be a requirement already but don't see where this rule is written please provide cite? appreciate it. thanks! joel</p> |

| Date/Time Opened | Contact Name | Subject | Description |
|------------------|-----------------|--|---|
| 2/7/2023 9:52 | Jan Hemming 1/3 | Opinion on proposed 2023 ADU ordinance | <p>Dan: I've reviewed the legislative draft pertaining to Title 21A of the Salt Lake City Code that deals with accessory dwelling unit regulations pursuant to petition PLNPCM2022-00475, watched the 90-minute discussion the City Council held on the matter during a 1.17.23 work session, and have consulted with residents who have been impacted by the existing ADU code. Here are my observations: 1. No mitigation provision. There is nothing in the code that would protect adjacent homeowners or property owners from the obtrusive impact of a 17-24 foot high ADU within 3 feet of their property line. These ADUs can range in size from 720 to 1,000 square feet, opening the door to two houses — of varying sizes — on the same property. Kathleen Kelly, a homeowner in Wasatch Hollow, experienced significant impact from a 17-foot high ADU installed next to her property last year. (see photos) At their own expense, Kathleen told me she and her husband paid \$30,000 for new landscaping last fall in an effort to hide this unattractive, industrial-looking ADU. It will take years before these trees mature. How is it fair that one property owner has "rights" to build something but the affected property owner seemingly has no "rights" or recourse? If the city is going to grant these ADUs "on demand, over-the-counter," without conditional use approval, the city must also provide relief for these severe impacts. Kathleen believes the property value of the house has been negatively affected. Sadly, she and her husband are considering moving — after being in the home for just over a year. 2. Up to 1,000 sf ADU in single family zones. The legislative draft would allow ADUs up to 1,000 sf in residential single family zones in Salt Lake with some type of caveat that they can't be larger than 50% of the existing home's footprint. But there also seems to be a contradiction that ADUs can be at least 720 sf. — regardless of the existing home's square footage. The code is very confusing. Much more clarification is needed. I oppose 1,000 sf ADUs on ANY single family lot in Salt Lake (especially our small 5,000sf lots) because of how big and obtrusive they would be to neighbors and the negative impact to the environment — requiring the removal of trees, plants, grass and other green matter. This is simply a bridge too far. The Planning Division's original draft of 720 sf is something that seems much more responsible — but that raises questions as well. For example, my home is 1,080 sf. A 720 sf ADU is larger than 50% of the existing home footprint — closer to 70%. Based on the code, I could have a house and 3/4s of a house on my 5,000sf lot. The mayor is proclaiming that we need more trees and this will contribute to their removal. Kathleen Kelly said a beautiful mature tree was cut down when the ADU was installed next to her house. What happened to the push for green spaces and the health they bring not only to humans, but all living things in the environment —</p> |

| Date/Time Opened | Contact Name | Subject | Description |
|------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| 2/7/2023 9:52 | Jan Hemming 2/3 | CONTINUED!! Opinion on proposed 2023 ADU ordinance | <p>animals, birds, trees and gardens? The construction of large backyard or side yard ADUs will reduce Salt Lake’s green acreage. 1. Mandatory Owner Occupancy. It appears from the Council discussion on 1.17.23, at least 3, possibly 4 Council members (including you!) favor mandatory owner occupancy. The Utah League of Cities and Towns encourages owner-occupancy for ADUs or the home for a minimum of six months. It should be a permanent requirement. Without mandatory owner-occupancy, problems related to maintenance and renter issues can arise. It also opens the door to the proliferation of short term rentals. Non-compliance should carry penalties, however there should be allowances for temporary owner absences (military, hospitalization, vacation, etc.) 2. Parking. One off-street parking space is a necessity. Salt Lake is a car-centric city, even with options like TRAX, bus lines and active alternatives like biking. If a couple or family with teens live in an ADU there is a good possibility they will drive more than one car and those extra vehicles will be parked on the street, added to our already crowded roadways. The narrow, winding streets in Yalecrest are already jammed with cars that accommodate existing homeowners. This is also the case in many other parts of the city — from ELPCO, Wasatch Hollow, and Foothill/Sunnyside to the steep hillsides of the Avenues; dense urban passageways in Sugar House; crowded roadways in the Central City, Liberty Wells, and East Central as well as Ballpark, Westpointe and Rose Park. 3. 3-foot side and rear yard setbacks. Shrinking the rear and side setbacks to 3 feet from the adjoining property line not is not only an invitation to build animosity between neighbors but a perfect example of what happens when planners try to cram a 720 -1,000 sf ADU on a small 5,000 sf lot with an existing house; lots that already accommodate a 1 or 2-car garage. Why stop there? What’s being lost, is the recognition of why we have these regulations in the first place. They were intended to grant mutual respect — as fairly as possible — to all adjoining neighbors and respect privacy (see below). Now the city will be choosing sides; picking winners and losers. 4. Privacy. Justice Brandeis recognized the right of home privacy in a landmark 1920 ruling. Since that time, privacy rights related to the home have become part of established law. It was disheartening to see the director of SLC Planning Division casually call privacy nothing more than “personal preference” during the January Council work session and dismiss it as something that doesn’t factor into their decision-making. The City Council has a Solomon-like decision: grant 720-1,000 sf ADUs on the city’s modest lots and breed potential discontent between neighbors while respecting the time-honored reasons we have those provisions in the first place. Growth must not compromise “quality of life.” It’s a delicate balance.</p> |

| Date/Time Opened | Contact Name | Subject | Description |
|------------------|-----------------------|--|---|
| 2/7/2023 9:52 | Jan Hemming 3/3 | CONTINUED!! Opinion on proposed 2023 ADU ordinance | <p>These ADU regulations will have a far-reaching impact throughout the city. There is a limit to how much Salt Lake City can grow and still maintain the characteristics that have attracted record numbers of people in the last decade. The well-respected publication Governing has done many studies about the difference between a city that has a majority of homeowners versus a majority of renters. Among the renter-centric characteristics: higher crime, less involvement in civic engagement, lower voting percentages, more housing controlled by real estate investors, etc. SLC is already in the renter-centric column and the way these new codes are currently drafted will open the gap even further, since ADUs are primarily rental units. 5. Conditional use vs. on-demand. As a Salt Lake resident and homeowner, it was gratifying to see several Council members during the January work session defend the original promise made when the ADU concept was first approved few years ago —the conditional use provision. By removing that, neighbors won't be given advance notice of proposed new ADUs. They will just suddenly appear. Nor will there be opportunities to have discussions about how potential impacts could be adjusted — to the benefit of all parties. Zoning polices can enrich the fabric that make neighborhoods friendly and cohesive or gradually erode them. I hope the Council votes to keep the conditional use provision.</p> |
| 2/7/2023 9:54 | Travis Allred | Please allow ADUs without owner occupancy | <p>I'm not a resident of SLC, but would have liked to lived in town. Work downtown, and commute in from the other end of the valley. My comment might not even be allowed since I don't live in the city, which is funny, since the whole point of planning for the future is to prepare for people and advocate for people who aren't here yet. You know we are in a housing crisis, one that took decades to get into, that will absolutely take decades to get out of. It will not get better without strong decisive action from leaders at the top. Other cities and towns look to you to act. To be the example. Please weigh the overwhelming latent demand against the paltry (but annoyingly loud) super minority in your decision.</p> <p>Thanks, Travis Allred, Evisior, Utah</p> |
| 2/7/2023 13:52 | Anonymous Constituent | 704e 900s | <p>Yes I hope it gets approved. There is no other option as the current owner bought it as a 4 plex from the past owner Barbara Brisco who passed away. Converting it back to a single family home is not only cost prohibitive but would also mean the destruction of a beautiful historic building. The current development agreement proposed by the city council would protect the building and preserve its residential status while providing more affordable quality housing in our neighborhood. It is a win-win</p> |
| 2/7/2023 14:37 | Dave < Martin | Excited about anything that will make ADU's easier | <p>I hope the proposed changes happen and that the city continues to be a supportive partner in the development of these awesome spaces.</p> |
| 2/7/2023 14:43 | Carol Steffens | 704 East 900 South Rezone | <p>Dear SLC Council Members, I am opposed to PBM-00005392. Development agreements are not enforceable. By granting development agreements, city is not enforcing our codes and is giving into developers and ruining affordable housing. Our city will not and does not have the ability to regulate and enforce these. A good example.....nightly rentals in our RESIDENTIALLY ZONED neighborhoods. Start limiting and regulating nightly rentals in our city. They ruin affordable housing. Do not give this investor an agreement to help him continue destroying our residential neighborhood. Carol Steffens</p> |

| Date/Time Opened | Contact Name | Subject | Description |
|------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| 2/7/2023 15:54 | Cindy Cromer | Rocky Mountain Power's request for a rezoning | How often does an applicant request rezoning to allow housing at a site which the City has never considered appropriate for housing? Well, maybe not since the rezoning of Mark Steel, right next door to this request. How many places are there in the City which could support housing, but we have never considered the appropriateness of housing there before? Ever. I don't need two minutes to comment on this application, -because the property owner has vision, -because the consultants are my personal heroes, and -because the design team has a long history of serving Salt Lake well. (Thanks RMP for hiring locally.) It doesn't take two minutes to say, "Thank you." And I hope everyone is noticing that I am not always grumpy. I am delighted to work with great ideas and talented people. |
| 2/7/2023 15:59 | Christy Porucznik | 704E 900S & ADU's | Dear all, thanks for your work to make our city better. Regarding the request for re-zoning the house at 704E 900S - this request had a unanimous negative recommendation from the Planning Commission, and although you can overturn this decision, I urge you not to do so. It is being used inappropriately for short-term rentals and as more units than allowed. A rezone will enable this bad behavior and encourage others to do the same. Regarding the ADU issue -- ADU's can contribute positively to the availability of housing in our city when they are used for actual tenants and not for short-term rentals. I encourage enforcement of existing rules about rentals, including short-term rentals, and allowing ADU construction throughout the city without requiring owner occupancy. On a personal note, I have a rental property with the house built at the front of a long, narrow lot that has alley access. I would build a 2-car garage with an apartment above at the rear of the lot if it were allowed, thus creating another housing unit and providing one parking space for the house and one for the apartment. If the rental were a duplex, I could build the garage+apartment whether or not there was an owner occupant. Under the current proposal, I think it would be easier for me to raze the existing house and build a three-unit row house planned development than to build a garage + apartment off the alley, because of the owner occupancy requirement. I'm not sure what benefit is gained with the owner occupancy requirement, and I think it should be removed when you expand ADU permissibility. Christy Porucznik |
| 2/7/2023 16:56 | Anonymous Constituent | ADU | Just say no to more ADUs! Stop pitting neighbor against neighbor. Preserve healthy vegetation in our neighborhoods. Stop over crowding in our neighborhoods! |
| 2/7/2023 17:03 | Anonymous Constituent | urban forest | I wholeheartedly support our urban forest! That is why I am against any proposal to do away with 1/3 vegetation on park strips. It is vital that trees have sustaining soil systems and water if they are to survive. |
| 2/7/2023 17:10 | Jeff Sandstrom | Ballpark Station Area Plan | The Ballpark Station Area Plan is an outstanding roadmap and vision for our neighborhood. It was created through countless hours of contribution from area residents, businesses, owners, and stakeholders including The Planning Commission staff: I believe the plan will maintain the quality and vitality of the area while including many improvements. I am in full support of any Hawkins recommendations to include and the suggestion for additional tree canopy planning to be included in the plan. I also think the proposal to include connectivity of walking and biking pathways to the 400 W corridor is an outstanding improvement to the plan. Thank you, Jeff Sandstrom. |

| Date/Time Opened | Contact Name | Subject | Description |
|------------------|-------------------|---|--|
| 2/7/2023 19:50 | Justin White | General Comment | I am aware of the Electractal and Euchorger RFP. I am a laocal rep for the Evchorgers. We do planning, sales, installation, and post-install support. |
| 2/7/2023 19:53 | Carol Steffens | Zoning Map Amendment at Approximately 704 East 900 South | I urge the city to deny the attempt to rezone a preperty that is for sale and has not followed the city laws regarding zonging and rentals. |
| 2/7/2023 19:58 | Josie Fife | Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Text Amendment | I want to build an ADU on my brother's property in sugarhouse. The property faces Lincoln street and ends at the alley, so there will be off street parking. His home is 1100 square feet, so the size of my ADU can only be about 550 square feet. I want to know when the city will be voting on size restrictions. I hope to break ground this soring. |
| 2/7/2023 20:00 | Soren Simonsen | Land Exchange to Facilitate the Bridge to Backman Project | The Jordan River Commision has participated for many years in supporting this project and encourages this real estate to transfer to support next steps in bringing the fall prject to fruition. |
| 2/7/2023 21:33 | Kevin Christensen | ADU and Zoning Needs | I am nearing retirement. For years, I have worked towards my retirement plan staying right here in my house after some added work. My son and his wife, currently rent here in SLC, however even with a good paying job, they have zero hope of coming up with an \$80k downpayment on a house of their own... so we have to rely on generational 'wealth'. My dream is been to expand my house, and upon retirement (in 3 years), move into that portion and have my son and his wife move into the portion of the house that I currently live in. It's a large sacrifice on my part, but we're just trying to figure out the details. However, I ran afoul of zoning regulations. For reference, I am in Zone R-1-7000, Westpoint Plat B, Lot 54. I spent thousands of dollars purchasing 17'x35' of land from my neighbor (behind me) this year, however that doesn't help me. I have 14' clearance on both sides of my house. I want to expand on one side to 3' within the fence. Zoning demands that there be 6' clearance, but that wouldn't even leave me enough room for a bedroom. I believe that 3 feet is still ample room on the side farthest away from the driveway and there is still 14" clearance on the other side. This is very important to me personally as I want to be able to provide for my family. I would like the ADU proposals to address my situation as well. Thank you, Kevin Christensen |
| 2/8/2023 8:50 | Richard Long | ADU's | Without removing the owner occupancy requirement, there will be little to no change. any property in the city can be rented. Carving out an exception for an ADU accomplishes nothing. |

| Date/Time Opened | Contact Name | Subject | Description |
|------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|--|
| 2/8/2023 8:51 | Ale Gicqueau | 704e 900s rezone | <p>all my units are rented long-term and I can prove it. Also I am not a rich developer. I am a simple guy who worked very hard to buy this property. As the owner of 704e 900s, i support the recommendation of both elpco and the city council to make current building compliant with SNB zoning. The development agreement will ensure the protection of this historic building while ensuring it stays residential to help the current housing shortage in SLC. Approving this new zoning will create a net gain of 3 housing units in East Libert Park neighborhood. I bought this property as a 4 plex 6 years ago. Civil enforcement is giving me fines of \$46,000/year for zoning violation while this property has never been used as a single family home over the last 60 years (cleaners, daycare center, beauty salon). Converting this 4 plex into a single family home would not only be cost prohibitive but would lead to the destruction of this beautiful landmark beautiful property which is the pride of the neighborhood. This new zoning is the only viable option and a win-win for all parties involved.</p> |
| 2/8/2023 8:52 | Deborah CANDLER | Re-zoning 704 E 900 S | <p>Greetings, I feel quite frustrated that four months later, we are once again having to address requests from 704 E 900 S. Please reread my original statement as this is exactly how I felt 4 months ago and nothing has changed. PLEASE put the people of this great neighborhood over the profits!!! The owner does not live in the neighborhood and clearly couldn't care less on how this request will impact the neighbors. Gratefully, Deborah Candler ----- Original Message ----- From: DEBORAH CANDLER <deborahcandler@comcast.net> To: "planning.comments@slcgov.com" <planning.comments@slcgov.com>, "council.comments@slcgov.com" <council.comments@slcgov.com>, "mayor@slcgov.com" <mayor@slcgov.com> Date: 10/12/2022 4:42 PM Subject: Re-zoning 704 E 900 S Greetings, I am writing in opposition to the proposed re-zoning of 704 E 900 S in Salt Lake City. I am a home owner just a few doors down from this property. I am highly concerned about the negative impacts this re-zoning will have on our neighborhood. One of my greatest concerns is the potential unexpected consequences that could occur if this property were rezoned to officially allow nightly, hotel-style, rentals. The owners of this property could add more dwellings or potentially tear down the existing unit, opting for a higher density option. Those who live in our neighborhood know the challenges we already experience with public parking. Many of our homes do not have off street parking. We do not have the infrastructure to accommodate greater growth on our, already crowded, streets. I have already experienced a loss of parking due to the influx of guests staying at this property. I have served in public education in our lovely city for over 20 years. Over the past four years, I have witnessed a huge loss in our student population. We know that one of the greatest issues our community members are facing is housing. We are not facing a shortage of nightly rentals, but we are facing a shortage of rental options in our neighborhoods. We are at a time when supporting our fellow neighbors couldn't be more critical and yet, you are considering watering down our community with nightly rentals. Prioritizing profits for out of state investors over those of us who live and work in this neighborhood is dangerous. We need to stand up for our people, for our communities, for our neighbors. I plead with you to please stand up for this great neighborhood and my fellow neighbors by voting no to re-zoning 704 E 900 S. Much gratitude, Deborah Candler</p> |

| Date/Time Opened | Contact Name | Subject | Description |
|------------------|----------------|--|---|
| 2/8/2023 8:53 | George Chapman | Comments against 704E 900S rezone Item 9 on agenda PLNPCM2022-00251 | <p>I urge the City to deny the attempt to rezone a property that is for sale and that has never followed the City laws regarding zoning and rentals. This property is not paying their fair share of taxes and it is increasing the cost of housing. A rezone will take a house that should be around \$600,000 and rent to families for \$2000 (a couple of years ago it was renting for \$1400 a month) and result in a house that will need to rent for \$4000 a month! That will push potential families out of the neighborhood and convert housing to single persons renting a room. That is why the cost of housing is going up. This landowner has always fought the City on zoning violations and the City has never been able to hold him to the law or to supposed agreements. So it is questionable why anyone in the City should believe that the landowner will follow any agreement, especially if he sells the property and the next owner can legally ignore the agreement. Short term rentals can increase the cost of housing and this property is a good example of a house that should be and could be rented to a family, and is instead generating double the revenue by renting to short term renters. Please deny this rezone request and demand, legally, that the owner get a sales tax and business license. He should be paying sales tax and the City should demand a transient room tax too (Legislature is working on it - Tax Commission recommends it.). The City can demand to see his Utah income tax papers to prove that he is paying the State required taxes. Airbnb does not give Tax Commission addresses and the taxes do not seem to be paid. This is an illegal operating business and the City should not bend over for him. George Chapman</p> |
| 2/8/2023 8:54 | Greg Joy | Owner requesting zoning change of 704 E 900 South from 1-2 families to Small Neighborhood Business | <p>Dear Council Members, I am presently traveling, so I am writing to represent my view on this zoning request. I am strongly against this change. I own a house on 900 South, very close to this address. An SNB zoning change will be detrimental to the houses in the area. At the Planning Committee meeting in October, the committee unanimously voted to advise the City Council to vote against the zone change. The property owner talked up the history of the Victorian residing at that location. The caveat is the property is currently up for sale, and any new owner could raze the existing structure and build something that would not be appropriate for the neighborhood. The area already has a great deal of street noise. Street parking is tight and will only get tighter with the 900 South redevelopment, which will hit our area later this year. While I am not against allowing the owner to develop a couple of apartments in the present building, an SNB zoning change will be detrimental to the neighborhood. The change would open the gates for new SNB requests that will negatively impact the local residents and our already severe lack of local housing. Thank you for the opportunity to submit my letter. Sincerely, Greg Joy</p> |

| Date/Time Opened | Contact Name | Subject | Description |
|------------------|---------------|---|--|
| 2/8/2023 8:56 | Karen N/A 1/2 | PLNPCM2022-000475 ADU ordinance changes | <p>I am writing to express concern with the ordinance change for ADUs. When these were initially proposed we were told there would be limits, but those limits are being eroded and now properties that would not have been eligible for an ADU are not only eligible, but the size, scale, encroachment etc. are increasing. A neighboring home on a split lot was sold last year, not to one of the dozens of couples and families that looked at it, but to a wealthy man who planned to develop it by building an ADU. He overbid people that wanted to live in SLC District 5 and contribute to our community. He was able to do this because it was an investment that he planned to maximize. He lives in Cottonwood Heights and has zero regard for my family or our property or my neighbors or this city. He said he was going to maximize his investment by getting as many renters as possible on the property between the existing house and the ADU he planned to build. He stated these things plainly and when asked about the owner occupant requirement for the property, he said he had a kid that 'might' live there when she went to college or he would find another relative to game the system in order to get the ADU approved. This issue is literally right next door to me. An ADU will cover most of the neighboring yard. It will shade my yard and garden completely as their home does to part of my property, but now it will be along most of my property. I have a fully landscaped yard so the loss of sun is a significant issue. The backyard is where kids play, run around and yell etc. It is where my family spends a considerable amount of time. It is acceptable to place a hot tub there, a side yard is not. An ADU is a residence, people live in it, so now my backyard activities, ones I do not conduct next to my neighbors houses, ie the side yard between houses, out of respect, civility and code will necessarily become an issue for those living in a small backyard. People living in the neighboring backyard will absolutely be an issue for me. Especially as it was made clear by the new owner that it will be as many people as he can get in there. He mentioned students would be good for that. I purchased my home and property with codes in place to protect it. These changes in favor of the increasing "anything goes" cover every square inch of our city with a shanty run counter to the interests of the citizens. The best interests of citizens should be the top priority of representatives and planners. To that extent, growth at all costs is irresponsible. SLC has limited resources like water and clean air (which geography dictates and no amount of clean energy will eliminate). Limited and smart growth is advisable. Green space is very important. Building over all of it negatively impacts the quality of life in many ways. With a growing demand for housing there needs to be a growing demand for thoughtful implementation.</p> |
| 2/8/2023 8:56 | Karen N/A 2/2 | CONTINUED!! PLNPCM2022-000475 ADU ordinance changes | <p>For example, it behooves the University of Utah to work with developers to build apartment complexes on some of their vast properties to house thousands of students. That would be preferable to creating a gold rush to destroy familial neighborhoods by rapaciously greedy people who don't live with the consequences because they don't live here. Again, happening now, right next door because you have opened the floodgates. I would like you to close them and please start thinking about a sustainable long term plan that does not include ignoring existing property rights, protected by codes and destroying residents quality of life in every neighborhood.</p> |

| Date/Time Opened | Contact Name | Subject | Description |
|------------------|----------------|--|--|
| 2/8/2023 8:57 | Julie Chytraus | Public Hearing Notice on Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance | <p>Dear City Council, My name is Julie Chytraus and I would like to express my disagreement with your intent to change the prohibition against ADU's in my neighborhood. I believe allowing ADU's will be a detriment to the family/residential area and it feels like it is the intent of this change to pack as many people into as many nooks and crannies as is humanly possible. The reason many of us purchased homes in this neighborhood is to have our own space, to not be crowded into set boxes, to be able to turn to either side and not be directly nose to nose with another person, who has been squeezed into that atom sized area separating our properties. We are a neighborhood, not a compound, nor a hive, nor a sardine can. Many around me have spoken up and said that we do not want this, but what we are hearing back is, "we don't care what you want. This is what WE want, and your wants are immaterial. This is our edict so deal with it." If that is not what you are really saying, please know this is how it is being heard and interpreted. Changing the zoning laws would also allow for the promotion of AirBnb and Vrbo rentals. While this is supposed to be prohibited in this neighborhood, it is already going on, and the city has told me that nothing can be done; that they have no authority to stop them. Yes, it has been reported, and yet, it continues. From my front door I can point at 5 illegal AirBnb's, one of which was, a few years ago, the subject of a permission request before this very city council for a conditional use ADU and wherein they EXPRESSLY conveyed to this council that they would NOT utilize it for the purpose of a short term rental. It is being used as an AirBnb. I can only imagine how many more "secret" housing units would pop up, and still nothing will be done, should your plans to allow a "come one, come all" free-for all. I am sure you will point out to me that there will be regulations and restrictions on the ADU's but really, those are only paper promises. They have no more teeth behind them then telling the rain not to fall on your car because you just washed it. As I have seen, your promises of enforcement and strict requirements of adherence mean nothing, so I expect nothing different in the future. I am very weary of repeatedly jumping up and down with my sign saying NO, and having the city stare at me and say, "well, since no one is against it, we'll just go forward." So, let this be my official: VOTE NO CHANGES TO THE ADU RESTRICTIONS ORDINANCES! request. Please do not turn my lovely neighborhood into a place that is ugly and unpleasant to live. Thank you for your time, Julie Chytraus</p> |

| Date/Time Opened | Contact Name | Subject | Description |
|------------------|--------------|--|---|
| 2/8/2023 8:58 | Nigel Swaby | Rocky Mountain Power Rezone - Fairpark CC | <p>Councilmembers, I'm including the letter Fairpark CC sent to the Planning Department regarding the rezone and redevelopment of the first phase of the Rocky Mountain Power site. Since that letter was sent last Fall, further engagement has been done by the petitioner that makes the parking concerns moot. We are looking forward to seeing the final plans and taking part in the community engagement process. We hope this helps inform your decisions about the project. Nigel Dear David, I'm writing on behalf of Fairpark Community Council regarding the proposed rezone of 1223 West North Temple, about a three acre parcel. We had a brief discussion about this proposal at our August 25th meeting. As a community we are excited of the prospect of that property being better utilized and see it move away from being a manufacturing and storage facility. We are hopeful to see more activation of that section of the corridor with housing, workers and community amenities. So we are very much looking forward to the specific design proposal in the near future. With that being said, the pervasive concern for the zone change was the zero parking requirement the new zone allows. We recognize many builders construct in this zone and build parking as well. We also recognize many investors don't like zero parking buildings. It was pointed out we will have an opportunity once the design is presented to comment on any parking concerns if they exist at that time. Fairpark Community Council voted to support the rezone and withhold judgment on the parking until the site plan and design are submitted. Thank you for your attention to this matter. Best regards, Nigel Swaby Chair, Fairpark Community Council</p> |
| 2/8/2023 8:59 | Maria Goller | Concern with Foothills trail plan | <p>Hello. My name is Dr. Maria Goller and I'm an ecologist with 20 years of experience hiking, birding, and photographing life in the Foothills. I attended the Council meeting to voice my concern and disappointment with the current Foothills trail plan. The Foothills is an important ecological area that supports, among other life, over 120 bird species. It also is a fragile ecosystem, which is clear when you visit high traffic sections on trails developed in the past. I visited some of these areas, like the Bobsled mtn bike trail, and found almost no bird or insect life. These stretches of eroded slopes and packed earth also have no flowers or grasses. Degraded habitat like this loses its ecological and recreational value. I attended meetings with the environmental and trails consultants hired by Public Lands to assess and revise their trail plan and it is clear that ecological concerns are not being taken seriously. This ecosystem will take many years to recover from any mistakes made during trail construction and development. I worry that unless ecological impact is considered NOW, creation of the planned trails will lead to additional areas devoid of wildlife and wildflowers. I would like to ask the City Council to: First, ensure that the SWCA actually does the ecological work they were hired to do Second, that Public Lands and the SE group use ecological data, including human usage data, to develop their trail plan, And, finally, that the City Council maintains oversight to ensure trail development is done properly. Thank you for your time.</p> |