

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
2/15/2023 20:02	Christine Clair	Support of	<p>Dear SLC City Council, As a sustainable modular home builder based in Salt Lake City, we write in support of the ADU Text Amendment. These revisions will benefit homeowners and tenants alike and are a vital part of the strategy to reduce the housing deficit in our city. By increasing the supply of housing and providing more affordable options for where people can live, ADUs can provide more homes without significantly changing the surrounding built environment. ADU legalization will help address our city's affordable housing crisis, give homeowners a new source of income, and provide more options for multigenerational families. In October 2022, we craned in our first modular home into downtown Salt Lake City. One of the main benefits of modular construction is the speed at which modular homes can be brought to market. Those benefits are currently reduced by the permitting process. We support the increased allowable sizes of 1,000 and 1,200 square feet, which would better allow for two bedroom ADUs. We are investing in a manufacturing facility expansion to better serve the market on modular ADUs and affordable housing projects. We look forward to being a leading solution for the residents of Salt Lake City. We applaud your work on loosening restrictions to address this issue. Salt Lake City again will be seen as a leader in citizen-friendly policy. Sincerely, Christine Clair VP of Marketing Stack Homes</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
2/16/2023 6:36	Anonymous Constituent	Rezone East Libert Park from R-2 to SNB	<p>Salt Lake City needs more quality affordable housing downtown not less. It makes no sense to destroy a beautiful landmark building with 4 apartments to rebuild a single family home • The owner has moved all units to long-term rental and has complied with all city requests so why is he getting fines of \$46,000/year by the city with no road to resolution? We demand justice for small property owners • The development agreement proposed by councilman Darin Mano that will require this property to stay residential and protect this landmark property is the right approach. I support the request to rezone the East Liberty Park property from a single- and two-family residential zone (R-2) to Small Neighborhood Business (SNB)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This property has not been used as a single-family home for over 60 years. It has operated as a cleaners business, a day-care center, and a beauty salon. The remodeling by the previous owner into a 4 plex was done 20 years ago so why are we making it so difficult for the current owner to bring his building back into compliance? The fines he is getting (\$46,000) seem completely out of proportion as he has done everything in his power to comply with city requirements.

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
2/16/2023 8:30	Jeremy Hughes	This is a real problem!	<p>Salt Lake City needs more quality affordable housing downtown not less. It makes no sense to destroy a beautiful landmark building with 4 apartments to rebuild a single family home The owner has moved all units to long-term rental and has complied with all city requests so why is he getting fines of \$46,000/year by the city with no road to resolution? We demand justice for small property owners The development agreement proposed by councilman Darin Mano that will require this property to stay residential and protect this landmark property is the right approach. I support the request to rezone the East Liberty Park property from a single- and two-family residential zone (R-2) to Small Neighborhood Business (SNB) This property has not been used as a single-family home for over 60 years. It has operated as a cleaners business, a day-care center, and a beauty salon. The remodeling by the previous owner into a 4 plex was done 20 years ago so why are we making it so difficult for the current owner to bring his building back into compliance? The fines he is getting (\$46,000) seem completely out of proportion as he has done everything in his power to comply with city requirements. We need this building back in compliance. It is a beautiful building that is well maintained.</p> <p>Let's help this owner contribute to the neighborhood's prosperity rather than making it impossible for him to operate his rental small business. I have attended the planning meeting commission and the public hearing on this topic, and it seems so unfair how people are viciously attacking this poor business owner by spreading lies about him. For example, they are saying he still does short-term rentals while all his leases are long-term. The people opposing him are offering no solution whatsoever. None of their arguments make sense so I am wondering what motivates them in blocking him to get into compliance. Jeremy D Hughes</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
2/16/2023 8:51	Anonymous Constituent	rezoning property located at 704 E 900 S near liberty park.	<p>Salt Lake City needs more quality affordable housing downtown not less. It makes no sense to destroy a beautiful landmark building with 4 apartments to rebuild a single family home The owner has moved all units to long-term rental and has complied with all city requests so why is he getting fines of \$46,000/year by the city with no road to resolution? I support the request to rezone the East Liberty Park property from a single- and two-family residential zone (R-2) to Small Neighborhood Business (SNB) This property has not been used as a single-family home for over 60 years. It has operated as a cleaners business, a day-care center, and a beauty salon. The remodeling by the previous owner into a 4 plex was done 20 years ago so why are we making it so difficult for the current owner to bring his building back into compliance? The fines he is getting seem completely out of proportion as he has done everything in his power to comply with city requirements. It is a beautiful building that is well maintained. Let's help this owner contribute to the neighborhood's prosperity people are saying he still does short-term rentals while all his leases are long-term. Jason Stevenson (East Liberty Park Community Organization)'s letter (https://drive.google.com/file/d/1lL6d9xHzkavw6J2qoLJWrT9mZ0dihUZC/view?usp=sharing) says it all. This building has to become compliant and the owner has shifted all units to long-term rental so deserves our support.</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
2/16/2023 9:12	Koby Elias	ADU ordinance	<p>Hello Amy Fowler, I am a resident of district 7. I hope you will vote for the updates to the city's ADU ordinance. including: 1. Eliminating conditional use requirement - this is needless administrative waste, get rid of it. 2. Removing height requirements for ADUs- allow them to be above a garage will also help parking congestion because people can keep off-street spaces below the ADU 3. reducing setback requirements - many lots in SLC are narrow 10ft setback in not feasible for many lots. 4. maximum ADU size to 1000 sq ft. - I hope you concur with the planning commission recommendation we need more housing for families in the city. 720 sq ft is not enough 5. prohibiting short term rentals - great idea, could use some enforcement. Also, this is often used as an argument for why the owner occupancy requirement should stay. I think that's bogus. It's easier to manage a long term lease from far away than a short term rental. 6. Removing owner occupancy requirement - This is critical to increasing the number of ADUs in the city. I am a homeowner in Sugar House and I also own one rental property. It is hard for me to build ADU's on either property right now. At the rental it's forbidden, and at my home there is risk that I may need to move for a job or family reasons, then I would need to evict a tenant or find a buyer willing to purchase the home with a tenant in the ADU, likely significantly limiting the pool of potential buyers. Also one note on the politics of this. I was at the city council meeting and gave public comment in support of these points. The final three comments were from three gentlemen from Yalecrest objecting to the liberalization of the ADU ordinance. They represent an anachronistic political force in this city. Let's nudge SLC in the direction of becoming denser while doing something to address housing affordability. Thanks,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Koby</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
2/16/2023 9:30	Ale Gicqueau 1/2	In response to last week public hearing where I was prevented from speaking due to technical issues	<p>Dear councilman Dugan, I was at the last public hearing by phone but Brian Fulmer (Salt Lake City Council Staff) had a technical issue and could not get me in (see attached). As a result, I had no chance to respond to some of the people opposing the path for compliance for my property located at 704E 900S. First, I really don't know why some people that I have never met are showing so much antagonism towards me (it feels personal and irrational), and would go even as far as lying with conviction in a public hearing meeting. They first claimed that I still run short-term rentals at this property. This is utterly false. I moved all my units to long-term rentals. Please see attached all long-term leases. Actually, I have 4 nursing students that signed a long-term lease for the 4 bedroom apartment which demonstrates that I am providing quality affordable housing to the community.</p> <p>https://www.slc.gov/planning/frequently-asked-questions/#:~:text=Any%20use%20that%20leases%20living,zoning%20districts%20around%20the%20city. The City does not currently have regulations or allowances for land use known as "short-term rental." Currently, the City generally categorizes short-term rentals, such as Airbnb or Vrbo, as hotel, motel, or bed and breakfast uses because the lease period is less than 30 days. Any use that leases living space for less than 30 days cannot be considered a residential dwelling. Hotel, motel, and bed and breakfast uses are permitted in multiple zoning districts around the city. Hotel, motel, and bed and breakfast uses are generally not permitted in residential zoning districts. Though I am trying to get away from AirBnB, the city allows it for stays 30 days or more (see above). Unit #2 is rented for 30 days, unit #3 is rented for 57 nights and unit #4 is rented for 81 so they all qualify as long-term rentals according the city definition. As you can see, my smaller units are listed on zillow to get even longer one year leases. https://www.zillow.com/homedetails/704-E-900-S-2-Salt-Lake-City-UT-84105/2059781760_zpid/?view=public https://www.zillow.com/homedetails/704-E-900-S-3-Salt-Lake-City-UT-84105/2059934448_zpid/?view=public</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
2/16/2023 9:30	Ale Gicqueau 2/2	CONTINUED!! In response to last week public hearing where I was prevented from speaking due to technical issues	<p>Then they claim that "I am a rich out-of-state developer, and should be punished for building illegal units". This could not be further from the truth. First, though it is really not relevant, I am not rich. I have nothing invested in the stock market, and I have put all my hard earned savings towards the acquisition to a few houses, and I have big mortgages on those. Secondly, I never built any illegal units. This was done by the previous owner Barbara Brisco and I bought this property from her back in 2017. I have been working very hard over the last 2 years to legalize my units which have been there for 20 years. While this building has never been used as a single family home over the last 60 years, I am getting fines of \$46,000 a year for things I have absolutely no control over. This all thing has been so unfair and created so much distress for me and family. Third, I live in Salt Lake City. I reside at my house in the REDACTED. Again I am at loss to understand why people that don't know me are circulating these lies. Other people are stating that no commercial building should be allowed on this location. I have already accepted to sign a development agreement limiting the use of this property to residential. Other people are saying that SNB zoning would allow me to destroy this building. Again, I have already accepted to sign a development agreement that would prevent the destruction of the building. Actually, not changing the zoning would force me to destroy the 4 plex and build a single family home. I really don't want to do this as I am very attached to this property which is the pride of the neighborhood and I have taken very good care of it. Salt Lake City needs more quality affordable accommodation, not less. Preventing the rezone will lead to the destruction of 3 additional units for Salt Lake City in a prime location, right across Liberty Park. Please vote yes for this rezoning on the Feb 21st SLC council meeting. It is a win for all parties involved.</p> <p>Your support is greatly appreciated Sincerely, Ale Gicqueau</p>
2/16/2023 12:24	Josie Fife	ADU size restrictions	<p>ive been waiting for 8 months to start building my ADU. im currently living with my brother at 1522 Lincoln street, 84105. his house is on one of his two adjacent lots. the lots extend to the alley in the middle of the block, so there will be offstreet parking. id like to build a 750 square foot ADU. Thank you.</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
2/16/2023 14:15	Reginald Cherenfant	D1 - Mobile Business Ordinance	<p>Reginald Cherenfant came by the office after visiting with the Business licensing division about a starting a mobile massage business. He would like to start a mobile massage business. He was informed that personal services are not permitted as a mobile business by business licensing. He would like to see if there is appetite for changing the ordinance. Reginald is an Army Veteran who is about to purchase a home in Tooele but in the mean time would like to see what can be done. He requested and was provided with a copy of the mobile business ordinance. His address is on Morton Dr.</p>
2/16/2023 16:21	Jeremy Hughes	This is a real problem!	<p>Salt Lake City needs more quality affordable housing downtown not less. It makes no sense to destroy a beautiful landmark building with 4 apartments to rebuild a single family home The owner has moved all units to long-term rental and has complied with all city requests so why is he getting fines of \$46,000/year by the city with no road to resolution? We demand justice for small property owners The development agreement proposed by councilman Darin Mano that will require this property to stay residential and protect this landmark property is the right approach. I support the request to rezone the East Liberty Park property from a single- and two-family residential zone (R-2) to Small Neighborhood Business (SNB) This property has not been used as a single-family home for over 60 years. It has operated as a cleaners business, a day-care center, and a beauty salon. The remodeling by the previous owner into a 4 plex was done 20 years ago so why are we making it so difficult for the current owner to bring his building back into compliance? The fines he is getting (\$46,000) seem completely out of proportion as he has done everything in his power to comply with city requirements. We need this building back in compliance. It is a beautiful building that is well maintained.</p> <p>Let's help this owner contribute to the neighborhood's prosperity rather than making it impossible for him to operate his rental small business. I have attended the planning meeting commission and the public hearing on this topic, and it seems so unfair how people are viciously attacking this poor business owner by spreading lies about him. For example, they are saying he still does short-term rentals while all his leases are long-term. The people opposing him are offering no solution whatsoever. None of their arguments make sense so I am wondering what motivates them in blocking him to get into compliance. Jeremy D Hughes</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
2/16/2023 22:16	Anonymous Constituent	Rezoning of 704 E 900 S in SLC	Salt Lake City needs more quality affordable accommodation, not less. Preventing the rezone of this unit to multifamily housing or Small Neighborhood Business will lead to the destruction of 3 additional units for Salt Lake City in a prime location, right across Liberty Park. The governor and legislature have expressed a desire to improve access to affordable housing in Utah. This needs to include more options than just building more apartment buildings. This beautifully restored building already functions well as multi-family housing and has for decades. It would be contrary to the needs of the city and the state to reduce it to a single family home even with the inclusion of a single accessory unit. It would also result in two tenants being turned out of their home due to a biased law.
2/17/2023 0:34	Anonymous Constituent	How to prevent the natural disaster of the Great Salt Lake evaporating	Have you ever considered building a PVC pipeline to pump salt water from the Pacific into the Great Salt Lake at a rate that will increase it's size back to where it used to be in order to avoid the natural disaster of dust storms kicking up all sorts of fungus and other potential allergens and perhaps diseases? If the federal government can spend all that money on the largest computer data center in the world to support their surveillance for the NSA, surely local, state and federal governments and perhaps private or public companies could design and build this solution. Why do people sit by and do nothing while a slow moving train wreck is headed toward their local environment? I would think that environmentalists would support replenishing the Great Salt Lake with salt water. I would.

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
2/17/2023 9:31	Trevor Oven	ADU Ordinance update	<p>Hello Council Member Dugan, Thank you for supporting the changes to the ADU ordinance recommended by the Planning Commission. Removing the Conditional Use requirement will remove a large, unnecessary barrier for homeowners who want to build an ADU. I understand that the Council is not particularly interested in removing the owner-occupancy requirement altogether, but have you considered creating a pathway for removing it after a year or so? In theory, this wouldn't be very hard to administer. Homeowners could request to remove the owner occupancy requirement after a set period of time by updating their rental dwelling business license. Planning staff could easily look up the Civil Enforcement records for the property to confirm that the owner has not received any substantiated complaints from neighbors regarding short term rentals, noise, trash, etc. Planning staff could then update the homeowner's business license to state that they have met the criteria to remove the owner occupancy requirement. An alternative to this would be to make non-owner-occupied ADUs a Conditional Use (preferably an administrative Conditional Use) to add an additional layer of discretionary review.</p> <p>This could ensure that ADUs are being built by homeowners rather than corporations, and may be more palatable to for you and your constituents. Thank you for your time, and for being a great representative for our City. Trevor Ovenden</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
2/17/2023 14:14	Kate Bowman	Support for ADU Text Amendment	<p>Hello, I am writing to express my support for the proposed changes to the city's ADU ordinance. I live in Yalecrest, and I love the neighborhood for its friendly community, greenery and proximity to parks, walkability, historic charm, and accessibility to both downtown and the University. I am also saddened to see how unaffordable it has become to live here, and I know that many people are priced out of the neighborhood. My house was built in 1913 and has stood through 100 years of changes and progress, and it's important for the neighborhood to continue to evolve to meet the needs of communities who live here. I am excited about the potential for more ADUs in the neighborhood to offer more flexible housing solutions and increase the diversity of folks who are able to live here, from multi-generational families to students, staff, and faculty at the U who are looking to cut down on their commute. I also support the provision that prohibits the use of ADUs for short term rentals, in order to ensure that ADUs actually increase housing available in communities rather than just driving up prices. Thank you for your consideration of this important matter, Kate Bowman</p>
2/17/2023 18:37	Garry Blake	Changes to ADU Requirements	<p>PLEASE maintain the requirement that the owner live on a lot that contains an ADU. We live near Westminster college, and we had a terrible experience a few years ago. A California couple bought the home next to us for their daughter to live in while she attended Westminster. Soon the house was packed with students, including in a detached garage behind the house. The noise was incredible, and students frequently urinated in the alley and onto our own garage. This went on for the two years the daughter was in school. One evening, the police were called to break up a loud, late-night party. Kids came out of that little house like clowns out of a clown car. They insulted the police, threw beer bottles at the police as they left, and they left garbage in our yard and neighboring properties. Many young children lived on our block. Neither the parents nor the college took any interest in mitigating this problem. That's one example of what we could expect if houses AND ADUs could be rented out without an owner on site--especially near Westminster College.</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
2/18/2023 9:31	Erika Wiggins	Plan Support	Hello, Both personally, and as Co-chair of the Sugar House Chamber, I support the proposed UF plan. In specific, I support adding ample trees to our underserved (previously redlined) neighborhoods. Doing so will not only benefit those residents, but also will mitigate the negative impacts on public health caused by the lack of UF in those areas. Erika Wiggins
2/19/2023 8:55	Anonymous Constituent	704e 900s	Jason Stevenson (East Liberty Park Community Organization)'s letter summarized the issue well. This building has to become compliant and the owner has shifted all units to long-term rental so there is no reason to deny his request especially that this building has really never been used a single family home. It feels to me that the owner is discriminated against because he was not born in the USA.
2/19/2023 9:00	Anonymous Constituent	Save historic house	I have attended the planning meeting commission and the public hearing regarding the landmark building across Liberty Park, and it seems so unfair how people are viciously attacking this poor business owner by spreading lies about him. For example, they are saying he still does short-term rentals while all his leases are long-term. The people opposing him are offering no solution whatsoever. None of their arguments make sense so I am wondering what motivates them in blocking him to get into compliance. The whole thing seem fishy. Maybe some developer is trying to run him out of business with the help of corrupt officials in the city's office.
2/19/2023 9:38	Anonymous Constituent	Need more housing not less in SLC!!!	Salt Lake City needs more quality affordable housing downtown not less. It makes no sense to destroy a beautiful landmark building with 4 apartments to rebuild a single family home!!! Approve the compliance of this building. I also heard the city is giving the owner insane amount of fines to drive out of business. Why???

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
2/19/2023 9:40	Anonymous Constituent	Approve rezoning to preserve historic building	The development agreement proposed by councilman Darin Mano that will require this property to stay residential and protect this landmark property is the right approach. I support the request to rezone the East Liberty Park property from a single- and two-family residential zone (R-2) to Small Neighborhood Business (SNB). his property has not been used as a single-family home for over 60 years. It has operated as a cleaners business, a day-care center, and a beauty salon. The remodeling by the previous owner into a 4 plex was done 20 years ago so why are we making it so difficult for the current owner to bring his building back into compliance? The fines he is getting (\$46,000) seem completely out of proportion as he has done everything in his power to comply with city requirements.
2/19/2023 9:44	Anonymous Constituent	Need compliance	We need this building back in compliance especially considering it has been a 4 plex for over 20 years. It is a beautiful building that is well maintained. It is senseless to destroy it to build a single family home instead. Let's help this owner contribute to the neighborhood's prosperity rather than making it impossible for him to operate his rental small business. The owner has moved all units to long-term rental and has complied with all city requests so why is he getting fines of \$46,000/year by the city with no road to resolution? We demand justice for small property owners
2/19/2023 15:35	Anonymous Constituent	704 E 900 S SLC Property	Hello, This is in regards to the property located at 704 East, 900 S in Salt Lake City: The owner has moved all units to long-term rental and has complied with all city requests, so why is he getting fines of \$46,000/year by the city with no road to resolution? We demand justice for small property owners. We need this building back in compliance. It is a beautiful building that is well maintained. Let's help this owner contribute to the neighborhood's prosperity rather than making it impossible for him to operate his small rental business. Please approve the rezoning of this property. Thank you, Caroline

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
2/21/2023 9:12	Margaret Holloway	Drought fee is just a money grab.	<p>Why don't you just call it what it is? More money for the less water usage. So it hits the west side the hardest if you are looking to punish the east side. Then up their charges. AFTER. The city fixes the leaking pipes under the city loosing 10 percent of all processed water.. the mayor said in today's article. It is to make up the cost of what we are not paying. Then call it what it is!!? A hike in price. NOTHING TO DO WITH THE LAKE!!!, Why do you guys have to keep lying about this? The meter is processed water coming from the reservoir. Yet the west side already has brown lawns. Do not say this is about the lake. It is not. Why are we keeping our golf courses then??? They use the water that GOES. To the lake. According to the city own water district the amount of watering leaking underground and blowing up water mains. Needs to be addressed aggressively .If the city cares and not making a public statement. Oh look. At what we are doing.. but the trees are going to die. The people will be paying more for their gardens.. the east bench will still. Use the water. So yes let's just be HONEST it is an additional tax on us who already conserve and are trying to keep the trees alive grow some food. Who don't qualify for the MINI GRANT. yeah I want to see where and how you are going to enforce this? So why are the golf courses who use water that GOES STRAIGHT to the lake being allowed to do so. But the rest of us are told pay up. Flip your strip. Just to say. Oh look what we are doing.. it doesn't cost anything to stop watering it. How much ? So yes this new FEE is a new tax on us you don't have to ask permission for.. I wish I had not voted for the park tax bond. You would have found a way to fee is anyway.. The trees are going to suffer and people trying to grow food. Why do we have to apply to grow food?. Seriously. This is wrong for what you are selling it as. Water for the lake. It is about the money pure and simple. More for the city. Otherwise the airport wouldn't be flushing 100 gallons per flush . But is money for the city isn't it. Not about the lake. Margaret So when is the next election ????</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
2/21/2023 9:14	Caroline Henry	704 E 900 S SLC Property	Hello, This is in regards to the property located at 704 East, 900 S in Salt Lake City: The owner has moved all units to long-term rental and has complied with all city requests, so why is he getting fines of \$46,000/year by the city with no road to resolution? We demand justice for small property owners. We need this building back in compliance. It is a beautiful building that is well maintained. Let's help this owner contribute to the neighborhood's prosperity rather than making it impossible for him to operate his small rental business. Please approve the rezoning of this property. Thank you, Caroline H

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
2/21/2023 9:17	Turner Bitton 1/2	Support for ADU Policy Changes and Removing Owner Occupancy Requirements	<p>Salt Lake City Council Members, It is my pleasure to submit this letter on behalf of SLC Neighbors for More Neighbors in support of the proposed ADU policy changes.</p> <p>We are also reiterating our desire to see owner occupancy requirements eliminated for ADUs. ADUs are a critical part of establishing neighborhood scale infill housing and affordable units as called for by most master plans in the city. Code changes permitting increased construction of ADUs therefore number among the many important policies that must be passed for Salt Lake City to meet its urgent housing needs. I won't belabor the benefits of ADUs because I know that the council recognizes them. I would, however, like to draw attention to the potential that ADUs provide for healing our historically divided city. Salt Lake City has a long history of deep divisions between East and West due to the pernicious legacy of redlining and deliberate policy choices designed to keep highly desirable neighborhoods out of reach for many residents in the city. Everyone should have the opportunity to live in our city and the benefits of ADUs go far beyond housing. They're an investment in the social capital of our city, in the strength of neighborhoods, and they are a physical representation of our commitment to inclusion and equity. Among other benefits, ADUs provide the opportunity for seniors to age in place, for adults with disabilities to live with family, and for students to pursue an education in stable, affordable housing. You have an opportunity tomorrow to tip the scales away from historic division and toward inclusive, equitable neighborhoods. ADUs alone will not undo the legacy of decades of housing policy aimed at keeping certain users out of high opportunity neighborhoods. However, removing barriers to their construction can tip the scales away from powerful interests and toward a more equitable city. The purpose of land use policy should be to regulate land use; not users. As the attached letter elaborates, removing the owner occupancy requirement for ADUs (coupled with the proposed policy changes) will add energy to the emerging market for ADUs. An energized ADU market will lead to a more equitable, inclusive, and sustainable city.</p> <p>Here's how:</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
2/21/2023 9:17	Turner Bitton 2/2	CONTINUED!! Support for ADU Policy Changes and Removing Owner Occupancy Requirements	<p>1) Removing the homeowner occupancy requirement will increase the production of ADUs and build opportunity for residents in every neighborhood of our city. Thus creating access to the highest opportunity neighborhoods in the city. 2) Removing the homeowner occupancy requirement is a matter of equity and access. ADUs have proven to be more affordable and accessible to communities that historically have been excluded from high opportunity neighborhoods. 3) Removing the owner-occupancy requirement is not likely to result in more short-term rentals and more investors buying properties. Each of the points above is reinforced by the attached letter supporting the removal of owner occupancy requirements. We encourage you to stand on the side of data and evidence, not scare tactics designed to demonize an incremental, neighborhood scale housing intervention that is proving successful in communities across the country. Thanks,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Turner Bitton (he/him)</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
2/21/2023 9:18	Jen Colby 1/4	Please vote to deny a rezone from R-2 to SNB at 704 E 900 South or simply legalize as non-conforming	<p>Dear Councilmember Valdomoros and Mano, fellow councilmembers, and staff, Please vote to deny a rezone from R-2 to SNB at 704 E 900 South, listed as C1, Potential Action Items, on the February 21st meeting agenda. The unanimous negative recommendation and record from the Planning Commission should have been sufficient to convince you. If it has not, I submit the following additional comments for your consideration. Unfortunately, in my opinion, the council staff report failed to clearly convey the additional information provided by the public and the owner or the discussion and rationale of the negative recommendation from the October 12th Planning Commission meeting. Instead, it largely relied on the planning staff report, which at best had a highly conditional and tepid recommendation that many members of the public took issue with. All speakers at the PC hearing opposed the rezone to SNB according to the posted meeting minutes. Under code, yes, owners have the right to a city council review and vote on a zoning amendment petition regardless of a negative PC recommendation. But that in no way means they are entitled an outcome in their favor. I spoke at the February 7 public hearing in opposition to the proposed zoning amendment and remain steadfastly opposed to this action. If anything, the proposed development agreement and motion sheet as written only make such a rezone worse. They do not meet the stated goal of any council action and actually undermine it. The cleanest action right now would be to simply vote to deny a rezone. Alternatively, please move to defer action to a future meeting until the report and motion sheet can be amended to a more effective set of actions if you feel compelled to find a way to legalize the current unit count. I have drafted an alternative “adopt” motion for your consideration that you will find at the end of this comment. The current motion sheet right now does not actually meet the stated goal of the proposed ordinance. It fails to specify ‘4 units’ (or any number at all) and therefore could potentially result in the loss of most or all housing units. This is an oversight that could lead to unintended outcomes beyond those already anticipated from an SNB zone.</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
2/21/2023 9:18	Jen Colby 2/4	CONTINUED!! Please vote to deny a rezone from R-2 to SNB at 704 E 900 South or simply legalize as non-conforming	<p>The Planning Commission seemed particularly concerned about potential loss of housing due to the weak Housing Loss Mitigation standards and use options under SNB. I hope you are, too, given the Council's repeated and vocal commitment to meeting our city's housing needs. There is an excess of commercial property right now due and any rezone from residential to commercial is not appropriate.</p> <p>Development agreements are already a dubious policy strategy that should be subject to substantive review and formal comment prior to any vote. Once again, proposed terms have become public just days before your possible action, buried in a staff report released just before a long weekend holiday. This is poor public involvement and administration. Moreover, it is problematic for the Council once again to simply re-state existing city code in a development agreement. Two of the 4 proposed conditions do this: that proper building permits will be obtained and that rentals less than 30 days ("short term rentals") are prohibited. This is a tacit acknowledgement of the owner's lack of compliance with current code and the city's apparent inability to meaningfully and consistently enforce the rule of law for rental property owners. It is also an insult to any rental property owner who actually follows current code banning short-term rentals and requiring licensing and permitting. Of the two, I find the extensive track record of short term rentals by the current owner at this property the most concerning. Will you really reward this with a rezone? Affirmative proof of compliance and settlement of any citations should be required prior to any council action. An amended motion could reject a zoning amendment as the wrong tool to meet the goal. Instead of a spot rezoning with a weak development agreement, the Council could simply grant a non-conforming residential unit legalization for the 4 units that the owner says existed at the time of his purchase. Unit legalization is per Chapter 21A.38.075, https://codelibrary.amlegal.com/codes/saltlakecityut/latest/saltlakecity_ut/0-0-0-80129 . Unfortunately, instead of including a rolling date, such as "10 years prior to application," the code specifies a fixed date, April 12, 1995,</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
2/21/2023 9:18	Jen Colby 3/4	CONTINUED!! Please vote to deny a rezone from R-2 to SNB at 704 E 900 South or simply legalize as non-conforming	<p>that is now effectively impossible to meet. Given the Council’s legislative authority, you may simply override the now-illogical fixed prior existence date at this location. [Also please take future action to amend this section of code to a rolling rather than fixed date. There are certainly more structures with excess units needing legalization citywide.] Unit legalization in the existing residential zoning is a much better solution for multiple reasons. 1. It complies with the existing Central Community Master Plan 2. Non-conforming use legalization far better protects historic structures than rezones, especially rezones from residential to commercial categories. The extra units are tied to the structure, not the zone. a. The proposed development agreement for a 50-year preservation clause does not specify “in good repair and contributory condition” so a future owner could simply heavily modify or even board up the building and wait out the timeline to demolition, or even create such a nuisance this would be changed after public clamor. Sadly, this is not uncommon. Rezoning + development agreement is the wrong preservation tool. 3. This preserves all units as housing, not conversion to some or all other commercial uses as allowed by right in SNB. The Small Neighborhood Business zone would allow other uses such as offices, medical clinics, retail sales and services, art studios and galleries, group homes, and day cares. Any SNB rezone should specify in the development agreement that housing is the only permitted use. 4. It does not grant an otherwise significant valuation increase that would result from a rezone to commercial, therefore helping to stabilize the ongoing land and real estate price inflation that is making housing un-affordable for the majority of residents of Utah. In conclusion, the proposed motion sheet action for a zoning amendment to SNB with a development agreement as written does not meet the stated goal of the action, i.e. to create a way to legalize the existing 4 units, including the 2 currently unpermitted excess units for housing. Further, it will put the structure at risk in the long term and also allow for commercial uses with are not compatible with neighboring properties or the current master plan.</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
2/21/2023 9:18	Jen Colby 4/4	CONTINUED!! Please vote to deny a rezone from R-2 to SNB at 704 E 900 South or simply legalize as non-conforming	Please either vote to deny the zoning amendment and retain the R-2 zoning, potentially with a conditional unit legalization agreement rather than the one currently drafted. As an alternative, here is my proposed alternative motion (much as I dislike development agreements) if you wish to take a compromise action rather than simply a flat denial of the petition for a rezone: MOTION 1 (adopt) I move that the Council adopt an ordinance to legalize up to 4 dwelling units as non-conforming legal uses in the existing R-2 zone with a requirement that the petitioner enter a development agreement with the following conditions as outlined in the ordinance: the owner shall: •Document the existence of the units prior to the owner’s acquisition •Obtain and complete all necessary permits for construction work to meet current life-safety and other building codes • Comply with the requirement that all dwelling unit rentals be 30 days or longer with affirmative proof provided to city officials upon request • Retain the existing structure in good repair and unboarded as housing for a minimum 50-year period. An owner’s violation of any of these terms may lead to revocation of the excess unit legalization. Sincerely, Jen Colby, MPA, personal comments District 4 resident
2/21/2023 9:19	Byron Marchant	Capitalism	Do you support capitalism? This is Capitalism Taxation Policy: https://www.britannica.com/topic/taxation/Principles-of-taxation If you do, how do you justify your trickle-down Liberty Park Tennis facility (which eliminates Central City residents in benefiting from its existence and has done so since 1969)?
2/21/2023 9:21	Sonja Chesley	Affordable Hosing Incentive /City Zoning Ordinances	Attention SLC Government Representatives: We are totally against the City changes in zoning codes in the Yalecrest Community area. We do not want developers changing the heights, reducing parking requirements, and adding additional living quaters on lots. We are against the demolition of intact, stable, historic homes. Also, we are against changing the neighborhoods with 4-plexes and other higher lot density housing. The City's serious consideration of these issues is critical for honoring and respecting the citizens in the entire Yalecrest area. Sincerely, Sonja E. Chesley and Errol P. EerNisse

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
2/21/2023 9:29	Cathy Cunningham	Laird Heights LHD in process — ADUs, AHI	<p>Hello Dan, My name is Cathy Cunningham. I have lived on Uintah Circle for many years. I am part of an organizing group for the Laird Heights LHD. The City has announced that we successfully submitted our LHD application. We are in the City process of obtaining (hopefully) a Local Historic District LHD designation. I am aware that District 6 has several Local Historic Districts. I am writing to ask you to support the Laird Heights LHD and the other LHDs while making decisions and voting for/against stipulations regarding ADUs and AHI. Please represent us by insisting that ADUs in LHDs follow the City's Historic District building guidelines. Please represent us by protecting the in-process LHDs in the same manner the designated LHDs are protected from demolishing single family homes to be replaced with 4 plexus in the AHI overlay. I will plan on talking with you in person during one or more of your Discussions with Dugan events. Thank you, Cathy Cunningham</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
2/21/2023 9:32	Lynn Pershing	ADU Ordinance	<p>I noticed the following in the modified ADU Ordinance ADU Parking: 1. The number of parking stalls provided for the principal use shall not be reduced below the minimum identified in Chapter 21A.44 of this Title in order to accommodate an ADU. One parking stall is required for the ADU, except as indicated below: a. The property is in a zoning district with no minimum off street parking requirement; b. The property already contains at least one accessible stall above the minimum parking requirement for the principal use; c. The property is within a 1/4 mile radius of a public transit stop; d. The property is within 1/2 mile of a city-designated bicycle lane or path; or e. The City allows on-street parking along the street frontage of the property and there is a minimum, uninterrupted curb length which meets city requirements to accommodate at least one on-street parking stall. Regulation of Decks, Patios, and Outdoor Space for Detached ADUs: Rooftop patios on a detached ADU are prohibited. Yes! Patios are permitted. A patio may be covered with a roof provided the square footage of the roof is no larger than 120 square feet and the covered patio complies with the setbacks required of the ADU. A covered patio shall not count towards the maximum square footage requirement of the ADU, but does count towards the total building coverage of the lot. Roof over patio-how tall? Balconies on ADUs: a balcony is permitted on a building containing an ADU provided the balcony does not extend into a required ADU setback and extends no further than 5 feet from an exterior wall of the ADU. No This "asset" on a tall ADU will nonetheless impact abutting property owners privacy, sight lines unless it is oriented to face the principal bldg on the property and avoid facing side yards of rear yards.</p> <p>No negotiation? Just prohibit Alley ADU An ADU located on an alley that exists on the recorded plat maps or Atlas Plats of the city but has not been used for vehicular access or is otherwise blocked by encroachments such as fences or vegetation are exempt from this requirement. What about 3' utility access areas in rear yards and alleyways. Will these impact ADU placement in properties?? Utility/Telecommunication companies must have access to utility lines Second story windows: doesn't stipulate that all electrical lines into primary residence and ADU must be at least 6' from a second story window on All bldgs on property Lynn</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
2/21/2023 9:36	Ann Busico 1/3	Opinion on proposed 2023 ADU	<p>MR. DUGAN: We are Ann and Joe Busico. We live at REDACTED, previously Ann's grandmother's home and have been here since 1985. Ann grew up on Herbert Ave. ...1752.. and has lived in this neighborhood (most gratefully) for 66 years. We have good neighbors all around us who take good care of their homes and take pride in keeping their yards and property well maintained. We love this neighborhood for the quiet, safe, happy family environment that it is and raised our family to adulthood here.... First....We support a previous email that was sent to you by Jan Hemming, stating many issues with the new ADU codes. Second, we are adding our stern objections to ADU's going forward at all and especially with these new codes.</p> <p>As follows: 1. It is no secret anywhere that more density of population - ie cramming more and more people into a confined neighborhood - increases crime exponentially. 2. Our Mayor wants to spend tax payer dollars to increase and develop 'green space' in our city - normally a great idea for many reasons - so how much sense does it make to allow neighborhoods to demolish trees and other flora and fauna that beautifies our neighborhood to put up structures that impacts the carbon imprint and deplete open areas, breathing room if you will. 3. We were implored over and over again by city government to decrease or even eliminate watering our lawns with a reminder that we live in a desert state and that water is a precious resource that is easily depleted. We have been in a draught for several seasons and are at the mercy of our snow/water fall every year. We find it hypocritical that the city has allowed over building when water is a big concern especially for those of us who tried to comply. More people, more water required. Examples: 2 summers ago the cities of Kamas and Oakley Utah put a moratorium on any more building, including those in progress, as their wise city leaders realized that until they found new water sources, they could not support more population going in to their cities. Another example: a decade or so ago, Tooele city allowed uncontrolled building with little thought to the strain it would put on water supplies. Many houses went empty and communities complained about no water pressure in their homes -</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
2/21/2023 9:36	Ann Busico 2/3	COMPLETED!! Opinion on proposed 2023 ADU	<p>residents who have lived all their lives out there. We experienced this for months at a time in our business that we operated in Tooele that required water on a daily basis to run our business. Our business struggled as a result. 4. The regulations and codes that have been in place up to this point in our quiet, safe family neighborhoods are in place for a reason and have been working relatively well Why does the city see the need to 'fix' something that is not broken?.....except to say that those codes seem to be selective. We are surrounded by garages on all 3 sides of our backyard. All 3 are 17 'plus in height. The previous neighbor behind us put in an 'illegal' (at the time) garage that exceeded current code with an ADU apartment on top. How were these approved? We have been trying to replace a delapidated 1940's garage. We have turned in 2 different plans that comply with the strict code and would not impede or detract from current style of our neighbors garages and yet we cannot get a permit. But the city wants to allow building for ADU'S ON DEMAND? Our house footprint is only 1000sf. An ADU would be like building another house just like ours in our backyard essentially allowing for no open space. We once had a great view of the east mountains from our back porch. We no longer get that view. We need to build a garage. Once again the standards are contradictory, inconsistent and hypocritical. 5. We live in one of the highest tax brackets - property tax- in the city and yet our streets are awful - patched, potholes, deteriorating for years and yet we can't even get them replaced. The street of 1600 east between Harrison Ave. and 1700 south was totally resurfaced nice and new and that street was not even close to the damage that is on our street of 1800 east and also Legrand (which feels like a cobble stone street to drive on - without the charm!) All of our voices in our neighborhood have gone unheard....ignored. But let's tear up our neighborhood to build ADU's on top of each other.... WHAT? 6. ADU's are NOT the answer for "Affordable Housing" in the name of "equity". I am not sure what that means. We have worked very hard for what we have and where we live. Has there even been any talk of RENT CONTROL for affordable housing?</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
2/21/2023 9:36	Ann Busico 3/3	COMPLETED!! Opinion on proposed 2023 ADU	<p>My daughter has friends, educated working young people, who have had to move several times as the rent in these high rises going up keeps going higher and they can't afford to stay. There seems to be so many other solutions in the name of affordable housing. This list could actually be a lot longer with concerns, but we will stop here. It seems as though these ADU'S are a smokescreen that feels politically motivated, gives advantage to developers or those with cash to run rampant, that will ruin quiet family neighborhoods and therefore relationships and community with neighbors. The hypocrisy at our federal government level seems to be running rampant in our city as well! My brother and his family just moved here from a nice neighborhood in California that started to implement some of these same policies. It was ruining their part of the world so they moved back to Salt Lake (where they both grew up).....only to find Salt Lake City becoming more of the worst of California. And then Governor Cox referred to them in a quote as California refugees. Wow! hypocrisy once again. We used to love Salt Lake City.....the wonderful view of the majestic mountains as one drives into the city from the freeway and now that view is being obliterated by high rises going up everywhere.</p> <p>We are losing the very structure and essence as to what made Salt Lake City great! Please consider that we are good citizens and community members! There are neighbors who feel the same way we do but may not express it as they also feel it lands on deaf ears. We look forward to hearing from you Ann and Joe Busico</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
2/21/2023 13:07	Margaret Holloway	It made the Tribune today	<p>I am glad it did after the mayor's article yesterday. A drought fee? Thanks for the insult, SLC leaders The Salt Lake Tribune Salt Lake City residents were asked to cut back in 2021 to save the reservoir for 2022. We cut back 2.2 billion gallons just by asking. Then again in 2022. We responded again. But for 2023 we are being told that the mayor and City Council are going to enact an additional new drought fee.</p> <p>The baseline being winter usage. So anything above that usage will have an additional charge. The reason given: "because other cities do it." Which cities mayor? The insult here is we are responsible citizens. We voluntarily cut back. Now the gardens and trees we have will cost more, many already gave up their lawns. The ones who abuse the water and can pay won't care. But the west siders who are just trying to feed their families will be punished, We are told group gardens are exempt. If you are chosen. How many trees am I allowed to save? But we are already paying for the treatment plant, new parks bond and increased city budget. And we face raised housing costs. The mayor is promoting the new investment in trees and grow-your-ownfood programs. Does she mention, "By the way just don't use the water"? The city loses 10% of all treated water to leaking underground pipes. Flip the strip program is a waste of money since you can simply not water it.</p> <p>Thank you, mayor and City Council for insulting the hard-working, underserved people of the city again. This money goes where again? Margaret Holloway</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
2/21/2023 16:40	Rich Wilcox	Oppose Rezone/D4	<p>I am a resident of SLC District Four, and 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 is contrary to this principle. 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. Why would the owner follow a development agreement re-stating existing city code against short term rentals when he has ignored the rules for years and made excess profit? 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. Rich</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Rich Wilcox</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
2/21/2023 16:50	Matthew Carmody	SLC/Sugar House Park Electric Vehicle Charging	<p>Greetings, My name is Matthew Carmody, a resident within the Sugarhouse neighborhood, and given today's announcement of federal government initiatives regarding electric vehicle infrastructure, I believe it's important to point out Sugarhouse Park may be a strategically important location for the city to build out electric vehicle charging capabilities. Due to its unique positioning along a major highway, Sugarhouse Park would be a perfect destination for people within the city (or those traveling along the I-80 corridor) to charge their vehicle as they enjoy the park's outdoor recreation, amenities, and accessibility to Sugarhouse's downtown businesses. Although charging stalls could be built out within the park's existing parking lots, the parcel of land at the SE corner of 13th E & 21st S (former Sizzler) offers a unique opportunity for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Easy access to/from the interstate • Direct access to the park • Access to downtown Sugarhouse through the developed Hidden Hollow path • Access to multiple bus stops • Beautiful unobstructed views of the mountain range for those who wish to remain by their cars <p>It would be ideal if the city could use funds to purchase this land from the private owner and incorporate it into the park, given the buildout of such a project may be subsidized. If not possible, perhaps the city could attempt to broker a deal between parties who may be willing to use this land for such a purpose. Thank you for your time. Matthew Carmody</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
2/22/2023 9:23	Judi Short 1/2	704 S 900 East Rezone	<p>This is a request to rezone a home zoned R-2, to SNB – Small Neighborhood Business. I object. I have spent a lot of time over the past few years with various committees, reviewing all the Text Amendments the city has written regarding housing. This is the city’s attempt to do something about increasing the number of available housing units in the city since we are some 50,000 units shy of what we require as a community. Over time, we have seen great numbers of affordable housing units torn down, several at a time, or many at a time, because someone wants to rezone a parcel to use that would allow very expensive housing or business use. The cumulative impact is causing lots of problems, such as the number of homeless individuals. We have no empty affordable units in this city.</p> <p>The Planning Commission voted on October 12, 2022, to deny this rezone. Everyone who spoke at the hearing was not in favor of the rezone. The written comments in the PC Staff Report are against the rezone, with a few exceptions. This is a great example of why we are losing affordable housing in Salt Lake faster than we can build new, very expensive rental housing. Investors are interested in profit, and the city will do anything to make them happy. Older buildings are being torn down right and left. Commercial businesses are having a hard time staying afloat in this economy. I think it is because we don’t have enough people in the neighborhoods with money to spend on “stuff”, whether it be meals out, or clothes, or beer, because they are spending so much of their income on housing, whether rent or a mortgage. We don’t need more businesses in this area, this building doesn’t need to be SNB. That benefits the property owner, but really does nothing to benefit the residents of Salt Lake City. Supposedly, we have a housing loss mitigation ordinance. Ha! The Mayor's Housing Report in 2021 says the Ordinance is being worked on. Yet, it is not on the City Council website as a project they are working on, and I have never seen a draft. It is stuck in the ether somewhere. So, there is no penalty for the applicant, if he sells the building or tears it down. The applicant has been using this building as a Short-Term Rental. Even after he was told these were not allowed in Salt Lake City,</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
2/22/2023 9:23	Judi Short 2/2	CONTINUED!! 704 S 900 East Rezone	<p>and fined for doing this after professing his innocence, he continues to this day. I see it when I drive by. And, there is a For Sale in the yard, and if you google the address, he is asking a hefty price. And if you look further down the list of what Google gives you, he is trying to rent out apartment #3, a one-bedroom apartment for \$1500. This City Council staff report says that the city thinks the SNB zone is a better fit for this corner. Are you aware that a Bed and Breakfast is an allowed use in the SNB zone. You should not reward bad behavior, or talk out of both sides of your mouth. Deny this request. You have taken forever to get some ordinances written that might help solve this problem. He has the parcel for sale, it has been for sale for months now. If he gets good money, he will walk all the way to the bank. The new ordinances may change the math required to put four units into this building. And if it takes long enough, a Housing Loss Mitigation Ordinance might be well on its way, requiring a \$100,000 fee to remove a housing unit in Salt Lake City. Just say no. I've seen the development agreement language. The language is good, as long as the building retains four long-term rental apartments. But the agreement doesn't quite say that. The apartments should be brought up to city code, and you don't need to rezone to SNB at the same time. There is no desire to put retail on the first floor, and to do that, limits the number of units that can be renovated in the existing building. And there is no desire to try to put another building on the property to provide space to bring the total to four units. Please vote no on this rezone, it benefits no one except the landowner. It doesn't further the goals of Plan Salt Lake. Judi Short</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
2/22/2023 9:53	Nigel Swaby	Ordinance: Rezone at approximately 130 North 2100 West	<p>Dear Council Chair Mano, I am writing to share my opinion on the rezone and removal of the property at 130 North 2100 West from the airport overlay zone. First, I'm concerned about the optics of removing a "safety" protection from a vulnerable class of people who will reside in the 94 proposed deeply affordable units. I think the City should be considering removing or modifying barriers like the airport overlay zone altogether. This country hasn't had a major airline crash since 2009. Airports like La Guardia in Manhattan have 71 flights per hour over a highly dense population without major incident. The airport overlay zone doesn't promote safety, it prohibits residential development. It's very concerning the exception is for this poorer population who have extremely limited choices. Secondly, the continued existence of the airport overlay zone limits development choices in other areas. Right now you're considering the Northpoint small area plan which suggests an upzone from agricultural to business park or manufacturing/warehouse. The overlay is one of the artificial barriers which prevents you from considering housing as an option. Remove the overlay zone or allow a waiver to be instituted for those developers who will build housing. It makes no sense to upzone from agricultural to manufacturing when the surrounding properties are residential and the surrounding residents are opposed to manufacturing. Finally, I'd like to return to the subject property at 130 N 2100 W. While I admire the work the operator of the property does, I'm concerned how nearly 140 units of deeply affordable housing came into being with zero community engagement. The former Airport Inn became a "temporary" homeless shelter behind closed council doors with no public feedback. Then Switchpoint purchased it to become permanent deeply affordable housing with residents of a similar demographic to those who used it as a temporary shelter. The same thing is happening at this current subject property. I'll restate that Switchpoint is a good operator, but what happens to neighborhoods when a less savory operator uses these precedents to make their case? We're seeing what that looks like right now at the former Ramada Inn on North Temple. In summary, I support removing the airport overlay or creating a waiver system for all housing within its boundaries. Thank you for your consideration. Nigel Swaby</p>