

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/15/2023 10:57	Jody Millard	ADU's	Dear Councilman Wharton, Thank you for opposing lifting the requirement that the one of the units be owner occupied. This is an important piece it preserving the integrity of our neighborhoods. As you know developers have deep pockets and can dome into a neighborhood, pay cash for homes and then build an ADU and end up with two rental units. No responsibility to the neighborhood. Most of these developers don't even live in SLC and never would. If the city is worried about the time it takes to add additional ADU's, they could think of ways to incentivize homeowners to build. Maybe low or no interest construction loans, like they did with rehab loans a few years back. If something is not aggressively done to protect homeowner properties, we will end up with a city of nothing but renters and that is never a good look. The only neighborhoods that may continue to exist would be the ones one the benches. And I'm not sure even those could hold out against the lure of cash investment for their home. Please hold strong and do all in your power to convince your fellow councilmen to protect our neighborhoods from rampant destruction due to all rentals. I also love how the article I read only stated the wonderful statistic that other cities who have done this have seen an immediate increase in ADU's being built. They forgot to mention that developers did it and turned everything into rentals. I don't appreciate this type of one-sided information dissemination. Sincerely, Jo Ellen Millard District resident
3/15/2023 10:59	Jan Hemming	Thank you for your eloquent presentation today	Thank you for your eloquent presentation today Councilman Wharton: Thank you for your eloquent and compelling statement today at the City Council work session about the wisdom of owner occupancy. Without your clear-headed discourse Salt Lake's housing policies could have undergone historic transformation. You brought critical attention to the dynamics facing Utah housing — powerful national and investment forces that could, as you said, leave homeowners "outnumbered and outgunned." Your careful research underscored the reality of today's marketplace. You were not speaking in hypotheticals, but facts. I also appreciated the legal insight you presented at last week's council session during your exchange with city attorney Kimberly Chytraus. If you hadn't asked such a perceptive question about what removal of owner occupancy really meant, Salt Lake could have ended single family zoning on what appeared to be a "back door" technicality. If you can share your statement read to the City Council today I would appreciate having a copy. It was one for the ages and should go down in the annuals of City Council history as the day Councilman Chris Wharton brought sense and sensibility to the issue of owner occupancy and single family zoning. I'm copying GACC chair Merrilee Morgan, a fellow community council colleague. Best, Janet (Jan) Hemming Chair Yalecrest Neighborhood Council
3/15/2023 15:47	Jennifer Fegely	ADUs	I support the poposed changes to the ADU policy. Make it easier, allow for larger square footage, keep the owner occupancy rule, and please fugure out a way to make it more affordable. Pre-approved plans would help. We met with the planning commission to inquire about the feasiblity of an ADU but abandoned the idea when they told us that it would likely cost ~ \$230K for a detached garage/adu with a maximum 620 square feet
3/15/2023 16:19	Cm Crompton	ADU Ordinance update please. Attn. all members please	Due to poor communication, confusing and conflicting notices and rampant misinformation by officials and confused residents, please make clear what policies are a "done deal" and what policies and documents are negotiable. This information is essential for properly informed residents and the future of the city we all share. I have not received any response to my inquiries. C.Crompton
3/15/2023 16:21	Sabrina Fivas	ADU's	Hello, I'm writing to voice my opinion about requirements for ADU's. I live in Rose Park and I feel it would be a detriment to our neighborhood if the owner occupancy requirement was removed. Big companies will swoop in with cash and buy up existing houses making it even harder for hardworking people to buy their own homes. We will become a neighborhood of renters instead of helping people gain the financial stability of owning a home and hopefully helping their own family's "generational wealth" increase. Please keep the rule that owners must occupy a house on the property. Thank you, Sabrina Fivas

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/16/2023 7:48	Anonymous Constituent	homeless camps at liberty park	liberty park has been overrun by tents, cars that are being lived in and garbage leftover from camps. i no longer take my kids to the park because the pavilions, tables and gazebo have people living there. its realy out of hand. i feel bad for the people that are in the tents as the temps are freezing and they do not have adequate facilities. everyone in the city government should be ashamed of how they are addressing unhoused citizen issues and the issues created by inadequate care for the citizens trying to enjoy public spaces
3/16/2023 15:45	Margaret Miller	Please do not loosen requirements for ADU's	Please reconsider your plan to make it easier to build ADU's. I live in the avenues which has a higher density of housing than most neighborhoods and a lot of short term rentals. Removing the owner occupancy requirements will increase these even more. This will not increase affordable housing but will make it easier for investors to take over neighborhoods. This causes more cars coming and going along with more noise and disruption from the constant stream of people. Please don't make these changes. Margaret Miller
3/16/2023 15:46	Baylee White	HOME-ARP Allocation Plan Draft - Comments from The Road Home	Attached are The Road Home's public comments for Salt Lake City's HOME-ARP allocation plan draft. We appreciate Salt Lake City's diligence in reviewing the community's needs and evaluating best uses of funds for Salt Lake City. Please let us know if you have any questions or would like to discuss further. Thank you! Baylee White
3/16/2023 15:47	Kathy Larkin	Northpoint small area	Good afternoon, Thank you for your email- I would like to vote IN FAVOR of the Northpoint Small Area Plan. I own property at 2828 North 2200 West SLC- we have our landscaping business, a hobby farm, greenhouse and apiary located on the property. We enjoy our time there, however, we are of retirement age and this is a wonderful opportunity for us to sell and receive enough money to live on. The area already has 5 large warehouses built and another 400 acres across the street from us being developed. We understand this is how the area is moving and we have property that could accommodate the continuing growth. Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter, Sincerely, Kathy Larkin
3/17/2023 11:38	Devin Zander	Highland Drive Reconstruction - D/7	Hi Amy, I hope this email finds you well. My name is Devin, I am one of your constituents living in Highland Park. I am a cyclist and a public transportation user and I use Highland Drive daily to get to work. I was hoping that the city would reconsider the multi-use path on Highland Drive. The multi-use path eliminates the south bike lane that we currently have, and does not provide adequate bicycle/pedestrian traffic mitigation. Please consider the attached layout instead of the multi-use path. Not only would it provide shade to both pedestrians and cyclists, it would also make it so the bus would not need to cut off the bike lane when they make stops. Thank you so much for your consideration, Devin Zander **Attachment 1
3/17/2023 15:25	Lon a. Jenkins	Letter re comment on ADU ordinance	Please see the attached letter. Thank you. Lon Jenkins **Attachment 2
3/17/2023 15:26	Lyndal Cole	THANKS!	I am celebrating, this St. Patrick's Day, the awesome experience of having Liberty Park return to the neighborhood community. I have lived in this neighborhood for almost 50 years and I, my children and my grandchildren have joyfully used the park daily until this last year. The many encampments in Liberty Park were oppressive, safety risks and prohibited the free usage of the space by the surrounding community. Until this morning, I have felt cheated of my tax investment for a green, open space for safe play, exercise and outdoor enjoyment. So, I write today to express my gratitude for the clearing and cleaning of the park and re-posting of no camping signs. I will resume my daily usage with much appreciation and the hope of continued patrolling and enforcing of the law. Lyndal Cole

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/17/2023 18:52	Devin Zander	ADU Tenant Transportation Needs	I worry that by focusing too much on ADUs the city fails to address the need for safe public streets for people biking and walking. From my experience on my street, more ADUs comes with more cars in the neighborhood. There are streets in our city that do not have bike lanes such as 1300 E, State Street, and Redwood Road, and 2100 S. This makes it very difficult to get where I need to go without a car. To curb the induction of additional traffic in our neighborhoods, I am asking that the city makes bold action to achieve Vision Zero by committing to safe bike lanes on *every major arterial road* in the city in conjunction with any extra ADU permissions. The action you take now will literally save lives by reducing vehicle miles travelled, reducing pollution, increasing public transportation use, as well reducing the traffic in our neighborhoods. Thank you for your consideration.
3/20/2023 8:58	Jan ellen BURTON	Northpointe--Warehouse Jobs	I previously spoke out at the city council meeting on March 7 regarding my opposition to the rezoning of the Northpointe area. I have since been checking out warehouse jobs. The average full time warehouse worker in the US is paid \$32,744 per year or \$15.74/hour. The entry level salary is typically \$29, 250.--this is according to google, and of course this varies some from state to state. However, there are a number of jobs currently available to substantiate that claim. A warehouse employee would not typically make more than \$38,000 per year. Not "high paying", by any means. A warehouse manager in Utah can get \$66,750/year. In Wyoming, this could be \$80,000. Of course, Utah is lower paying with the minimum wage still being \$7.25. The warehouse manager is in charge of ALL the operations. Information regarding the Elwood Inland Port in Illinois (the largest inland port) indicates about 60% of the jobs are temporary or supplied by temporary agencies—no benefits. Someone at a meeting said the percentage of non-permanent workers in warehouses was about 63%--so, similar statistics. The US Federal Poverty Guidelines used to determine financial eligibility for certain programs sets the 2023 guidelines for the 48 contiguous states and the District of Columbia at \$30,000 for a family of 4. So, do we want to set up jobs so the people of Utah can apply for federal subsidies? Where does this make sense? Additionally, by adding warehouses we are increasing the health risks for the overall population of SLC. Why would we add LOW paying jobs in areas particularly at risk for health problems, when the people who have those jobs cannot afford health insurance? Jan Ellen Burton
3/20/2023 9:29	Adam Gmyrek	Apathetic council leadership in SLC, UT.	Council members, It is a shame that our city leadership has chosen to do nothing about the public health and safety issues taking place in Warm Springs Park and along Victory Rd in SLC, UT. The conditions are beyond appalling. This is a prime example of the horrific SLC leadership hlthat has and continues to embolden and enable the actions of vagrants, squatters, and the homeless. I look forward to receiving the councils rethorical and feckless response as to why the our leaders have chosen to allow this blantant public health and safety issues in a City Park and along a common thoroughfare? Signed, A disillusioned and fedup Westside resident.
3/20/2023 9:33	Jim Jenkin	ADU TEXT AMENDMENT	Dear Council Members, I strongly object to any relaxation of the owner property occupancy requirement for ADU's, primarily on the basis that it would negatively impact the affordability of housing in Salt Lake City. My 1400 sq ft 1920's home in the Avenues, is already a target for rental investors, should I sell. I could not currently afford to convert my garage to an ADU, but an investor probably could, bringing the potential gross income closer to \$2500 a month, or \$2,000 a week as a short term rental. I respectfully submit that Salt Lake City does not have a comprehensive method for policing short term rentals, but, either short term or monthly, removing the owner occupancy requirement for ADU's would make eligible homes across the City a target for real estate investors, driving up prices. Residential buyers cannot, in general, compete with commercial interests. If the City wishes to retain housing stock in the reach of residential buyers, creating more competition with commercial owners is contraindicated, and I, therefore, strongly support the retention of owner occupancy requirements for ADUs. Respectfully submitted, Jim Jenkin

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/20/2023 9:33	Rhianna Riggs	ADUs	<p>Hello, As a resident of the Central City neighborhood for the past 16 years, I have and continue to see multiple single-family homes being demolished and replaced with high-rise apartment buildings. Considering Central City consists of only 16% owner-occupied housing, I feel that removing the owner-occupancy requirement from the ordinance will negatively impact our already low rate of owner-occupied housing and stock, and make it more difficult for people wanting to purchase a home in a walkable neighborhood. Additionally, if an out-of-state investor purchases the property, there is the potential for zero accountability to their tenants and/or their neighbors for how they manage the property. Please take this into consideration before making a decision. Thank you for your time, Rhianna Riggs</p>
3/20/2023 9:49	Cm Crompton	Affordable Housing Incentive	<p>Hello Mr. Dugan, After reading and re-reading all the potential stipulations for AHI I am deeply concerned. These issues need extensive discussion and thoughtful mitigation. I am concerned about rentals, considering the units in my neighborhood are characterized by neglect. The city seems to have no concern or clout in dealing with numerous rational, dignified concerns and complaints. What will the future bring? Even more parking problems? The snow plow often passes Amanda due to on street parking, some from houses on Ninth So. and the U. Catering to greedy developers, we've seen our share, is not going to solve housing problems. What about the integrity of neighborhoods? My simple bungalow is not red meat for unmanageable growth. I value my privacy and the quality of my old home. I have chosen to live in a calm neighborhood. This is the social contract I have made and kept for years. Many others have done the same. How can I continue this essential discussion? Regards, Constance Crompton.</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/20/2023 14:50	Lonnie Newman 1/2	North point small area	<p>Dear Salt Lake City Council, I am writing to you to express my support for the North Point small area rezoning plan. As a concerned citizen, and an avid hunter in the state of Utah. I visited the area in question to see the effects I feel, that can affect the hunting and growth of the area. I was looking to see if the zoning could disturb the flight paths of water fowl or if it would be more acceptable as commercial use to the Salt Lake Valley. I listened last week to the zoom meeting of an individual stating he worked on Hill Air Force Base, and his concerns. First, I would like to say as a retired Air Force member, I do believe Hill Air Force Base has no input on any land issues that does not directly affect the base itself. I feel that the gentleman that mentioned the base and not supporting the North Point Small Area Plan, was using that for his personal gain and is uneducated on the military's stand toward states personal business. I for one will say, that was in the military (retired now) and now works on Hill Air Force Base, it brings in business around in support of the base itself. By brining in business for its support, those businesses will start bringing in other businesses, which will expand our states economy and population. Just buy these actions the state must make decisions for these businesses and population to survive in Utah. Sometimes these decisions require land to be expanded, and that land can turn in to sell from personal land to commercial land. With that said, this is where the decisions can affect people, their living, their right to use the land as personal activity, which intern does seem to be an issue. As a hunter, I visited the land in question to see how that land will affect me as a waterfowl hunter and the business expansion in Utah. As I looked at the land, I did not see any effect on the rezoning for me on hunting. In fact, it will be better, even if it does go up for commercial sale, because the land, even though it's not developed, it still does not help me on hunting waterfowl. Reason is, it is private, and it is by areas where buildings are, and hunting cannot be permitted. I do see though, the pros on rezoning the land to commercial use, because most of the land around there is already in commercial use or being constructed now. . So, the land in question that is up for rezoning, I feel it should be zoned for commercial use, just for the fact that it will allow businesses to move in there, rather than to seek other land that can be more important to the effects of a hunting or wildlife management. The land in question is right next to the interstate, it does not affect the flight path of the waterfowl and it basically helps the expansion of commercial land to be isolated in one area at a time. I do believe that economics is important for the state and when economic growth happens, land like this will benefit the growth of the Salt Lake Valley. With three major intrastates crossing here in the Salt Lake Valley, this is a major pro for transportation and movement of supplies and materials to different parts of the country. Salt Lake can be a major hub of these areas being that they have these intersections, and next to the international airport.</p>
3/20/2023 14:50	Lonnie Newman 2/2	CONTINUED!! North point small area	<p>I do feel, that all the Great Salt Lake basin areas should be looked at and protected for future use of the for the Utah people and tourist. The land in question on the North Point, I do not feel like it will affect anything for the hunting or waterfall movement coming from the north during the fall, or future preservation of the Great Salt Lake Basin. That little bit of land that I observed, I feel and I'm, (I'm not an expert), does not affect the waterfowl or any of the wildlife around that area that has already been pushed off from the building going on around it, plus there is plenty of land for them to move to for the ground animals and the waterfowl will stay on their normal paths. This is just my personal opinion; I feel that the land in question would be no problem to be zoned for commercial use. By doing so, this can possibly save other land in areas that might be in question, which could have a bigger effect on waterfowl or the wildlife in those areas if moved to a different location. Again, I am not speaking for HAFB but I am speaking for the businesses it brings in for support of it, and the businesses that support them. I am also looking at the big picture of the Salt Lake Valley with the interstates, the airport, the logistics for that land I feel, is a great investment for commercial property to help the Salt Lake Valley and Utah's expansion and population growth. Sincerely, Lonnie Newman</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/20/2023 14:51	Dave Brach	ADU comment	My wife Cari and I have been following the ADU "debate" since we moved to Salt Lake in 2004. The first time around (~2008) we were warned the sky was going to fall if they were legalized. But of course it did not. Nobody even noticed. And it won't fall this time if we make them easier to build, including removing the owner occupancy requirement. Change is tough but it's not the 1980s anymore and we need more density in our neighborhoods. Dave Brach Cari Pinkowski
3/20/2023 14:52	Jeffrey Stevens 1/2	Comments to Proposed Amendment related to ADUs and Petition No. PLNPCM2022-00475	<p>Unfortunately I will be out of town and unable to attend the public hearing on the amendments proposed in response to Petition No. PLNPCM2022-00475 pertaining to accessory dwelling unit regulations. Please accept and consider these comments. I have been a resident of SLC for 30 years. SLC has some wonderful residential neighborhoods. I understand the affordable housing concern which is a problem that has existed in many urban areas for decades, but seems to be a growing issue within the last decade for SLC. This is a stubborn problem with no clear solution, therefore, any proposed solutions should be undertaken with due consideration that the proposed solutions do not negatively impact the aspects of the city that are working and successful, like the existing flourishing and vibrant neighborhoods, especially when the ultimate probability of success of these proposed solutions are unknown and likely low. I appreciate the work that has gone into the proposed amendments to temper them from some of the proposals that were under consideration. The following are some specific thoughts I would like to share with the council: 1. Neighborhood Specificity. Overlaying the same ADU regulations on all neighborhoods seems to present a high risk of doing more harm than good to a number of the unique neighborhoods that are a remarkable asset to the SLC. I suggest adopting a process to develop ADU regulations that better tailored to specific neighborhoods to take into account their unique attributes. 2. Setbacks. I suggest keeping the current setbacks to reduce the risk of negative impacts to neighbors of shading and noise. The addition of another dwelling unit with 2 - 3 bedrooms close to an existing SFR will certainly alter the environment for the neighboring SFR and may do so to such an extent to cause current residents to move from their existing residence. 3. Parking. I suggest keeping the current parking requirements, especially in the older neighborhoods where much of the properties were constructed without off-street parking. People living in SLC will be car owners, notwithstanding alternative modes of transportation. Even if not used every day, ADU residents will need a place to put their vehicles, which will likely be 1 per inhabitant. Many of the older neighborhoods already do not have sufficient on-street parking for the current residents. Bringing more vehicles to these neighborhoods will negatively impact the current residents. At a minimum, I would remove the exception for 1/4 mi. from a bike lane. There are many bike lanes that appear to be established but then later neglected, like 800 east and 600 east for example. Unlike a bike path, many bike lanes do not provide a meaningful transportation alternative, and neither provide a reasonable alternative in the winter. Similarly, the exception for transit stops should be limited to Trax stops, and not bus stops. Rider numbers on buses are not robust in SLC on most routes, and being close to a bus stop provides little, if any, reliable indication that a resident will not own and park a vehicle.</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/20/2023 14:52	Jeffrey Stevens 2/2	CONTINUED!! Comments to Proposed Amendment related to ADUs and Petition No. PLNPCM2022-00475	<p>4. Ownership requirement. I appreciate that the amendments retain an ownership requirement. This is essential to ensure that ADUs are not a gateway to corporate or investor property owners pricing individuals out of the housing market. I suggest removing duplexes from the exception to the ownership requirement.</p> <p>Duplexes are often located amongst SFRs. Adding another rental unit to a duplex will certainly put these properties out of reach of individual home buyers and into the exclusive ownership of corporate and investor owners. Owner-occupied duplexes offer a good entry into the housing market for individuals, and owner-occupied duplexes would be eligible for ADUs. However, adding the right to append a third, sizeable, rental unit to a duplex will likely remove the owner-occupied duplex option for individuals. Individuals will not be able to compete with corporate or investor owners that will pay based on the cash flow generated from three units. Unlike corporate and investor purchasers, individual home-owners will be stretched to obtain the financing just to buy the duplex, they will not have the resources or the credit to compile enough money to both purchase the duplex and build an ADU. This will put the individual home-owner at an insurmountable disadvantage to obtain this housing type. Thank you for your consideration. Jeffrey Stevens Avenues Resident.</p>
3/20/2023 14:53	David Tanner	ADU's	<p>It seems to me that in your haste to align yourself's with the developers realtors, contractors and those that contribute for your elections you have lost sight of the very people you were elected to represent. I wonder what purpose the zoning serves when the people buying into any community are looking at the various zoning restrictions. They look at schools neighborhoods upkeep of the houses. Local business's churches all the things that are meaningful when buying into a community. My house is an investment and as such I expect to have the zoning enforced not changed at a whim. Example Ivory homes in the Aves. Why were you so in a hurry to satisfy Ivory over the interests of the entire Avenues community. It was an orchestrated show so you could satiate your own conscience. You are now moving to disregard more of the zoning that was put in place by previous councils rules and regulations that were put in place to protect residents from the very thing you are proposing. It is after all ALL ABOUT THE MONEY. In the Aves when the streets are being torn up for utilities (which they will). They are dated and I see people digging up their plumbing all the time. That should tell you that the piping under the streets are out dated and need replacing. Are the contractors going to be held responsible for the replacement? When you add more demand it will fail. I will attend the 7 PM meeting, why I don't know. The last one I went to the members sat at the tables and were on their phones or visiting all the time people were addressing the committee. At this one please have them turned off and pay attention to the owners. Respect the owners by paying attention. They feel it is important. Thanks</p>
3/20/2023 14:58	Michael McFadden	Proposed ADU rule changes	<p>I write you to suggest separating the owner-occupancy rule from the other suggested changes. The footprint of my post-war Sugar House home is only about 800 square feet on the quarter-acre lot. The current sizing rules make an ADU unworkable even though there is ample land for one. Owner-occupancy is, no doubt, a difficult issue. Regardless, we need more flexibility concerning building footprints and setbacks. Thank you for your time</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/20/2023 16:31	Kelly Stevens 1/2	ADU's	<p>Hello, I am unable to attend the meeting on March 21. Here are my thoughts: I have lived in the Avenues for 25 years and love it. I own a single family home and two tri-plexes. I keep my rents low and am very careful to keep the peace with my neighbors living near my triplexes. I understand affordable housing is an issue and appreciate the work that has gone into the proposed amendments to help fix the problem. 1. Setbacks. I suggest keeping the current setbacks to reduce the risk of negative impacts to neighbors of shading and noise. The addition of another dwelling unit with 2 - 3 bedrooms close to an existing SFR will certainly alter the environment for the neighboring SFR and may do so to such an extent to cause current residents to move from their existing residence. 2. Parking. I suggest keeping the current parking requirements, especially in the older neighborhoods where much of the properties were constructed without off-street parking. People living in SLC will be car owners, notwithstanding alternative modes of transportation. Even if not used every day, ADU residents will need a place to put their vehicles, which will likely be 1 per inhabitant. Many of the older neighborhoods already do not have sufficient on-street parking for the current residents. Bringing more vehicles to these neighborhoods will negatively impact the current residents. At a minimum, I would remove the exception for 1/4 mi. from a bike lane. There are many bike lanes that appear to be established but later neglected, like 800 east and 600 east for example. Unlike a bike path, many bike lanes do not provide a meaningful transportation alternative. Similarly, the exception for transit stops should be limited to Trax stops, and not bus stops. Rider numbers on buses are not robust in SLC on most routes and being close to the bus stop provides very little, if any, reliable indication that a resident will not own and park a vehicle. 3. Ownership requirement. I appreciate that the amendments retain an ownership requirement. This is essential to ensure that ADUs are not a gateway to corporate or investor property owners pricing individuals out of the housing market. I suggest removing duplexes from the exception to the ownership requirement. Duplexes are often located amongst SFRs. Adding another rental unit to a duplex will certainly put these properties out of reach of individual home buyers and into the exclusive ownership of corporate and investor owners. Owner-occupied duplexes offer a good entry into the housing market for individuals, and owner-occupied duplexes would be eligible for ADUs. However, adding the right to append a third, sizable, rental unit to the duplex will very likely remove the owner-occupied duplex option for individuals. They will not be able to compete with corporate or investor owners that will pay based on the cash flow generated from three units. Unlike corporate and investor purchasers, individual home-owners will be stretched to obtain the financing just to buy the duplex, they will not have the resources or the credit to compile enough money to both purchase the duplex and build an ADU.</p>
3/20/2023 16:31	Kelly Stevens 2/2	CONTINUED!! ADU's	<p>This will put the individual home-owner at an insurmountable disadvantage to obtain this housing type. 4. Institutional investors will outcompete private owners trying to buy properties. In Phoenix one company owns 3000 properties to rent out. The American dream can not compete with these purchasers. 5. Prices will be driven up by corporate investors who will rent them out at higher rates with an eye for the bottom line not for a healthy happy neighborhood. My best. Kelly Stevens</p>
3/20/2023 16:33	Jim BROWN	Accessory Dwelling Units	<p>Dear Council Why would you think ADU's would be beneficial to any neighborhood. I have lived within the zoning regulations in this city for many, many years and have never seen anything more ridiculous than this other than proposals by Ivory homes. All this will do is crowd the existing neighborhoods and ultimately reduce my property value and destroy my privacy. I did not sign up for this change in my neighborhood. Lets just limit the growth so we dont become another overcrowded undesirable city like may others around the country. Quality not quantity for hell sakes. I insist you do away completely with this proposal! Sincerly Jim & Kim brown</p>
3/21/2023 13:42	Cathy Cunningham	ADUs in Local Historic Districts	<p>Hello, Please support (or continue to support) that ADUs in Local Historic Districts and pending Local Historic Districts should follow ALL Salt Lake City's existing Historic Districts building guidelines, requirements, inspections. and approvals. Cathy Cunningham District 6</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
3/21/2023 13:43	Skyler Peterson	Northpoint Small Area Plan	Dear Salt Lake City Council Members, I'm writing to you in hopes of you approving the Northpoint Small Area Plan tomorrow. As a long time real estate agent in Salt Lake City, I could go on and on about the benefits of industrial warehousing on the economy and the end consumer (your constituents). Without digressing further, I ask you to please finally put this matter to rest tomorrow and vote to approve the Northpoint Small Area Plan. Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, Skyler Peterson,
3/21/2023 13:45	Nigel Swaby	Comments on ADU Ordinance - Fairpark CC	Please see the attached letter concerning the ADU ordinance. Regards, Nigel Swaby ** Attachment 3
3/21/2023 13:47	Douglas Rollins	ADUs in Local Historic Districts	I believe that present Salt Lake City Historic District building guidelines, requirements, inspections, and approvals should apply to ADUs in existing and pending Local Historic Districts. I welcome your support. Doug Rollins
3/21/2023 17:10	Constance Crompton	ADU	Density does not equal affordability. Proposed changes will create an open season for developers in/out of state and easy access for parents wishing to buy/build and relocate students to avoid out-of-state tuition. These situations will not enrich or provide stability for our old neighborhood. Increasing size specifications will infringe on light, fresh air and privacy, a social contract we made when we invested in our homes (all sizes, shapes etc). Our narrow streets are not desired for traffic congestion. Please consider these concerns, yes even fears



LON A. JENKINS
[REDACTED]
Salt Lake City, Utah 84103
801-661-5414

ATTACHMENT 2

March 17, 2023

Re: Proposed Revisions to ADU Ordinance

Salt Lake City Council
(council.comments@slcgov.com)

Dear City Council Members:

I wish to voice my strong opposition to any revision to Salt Lake City's Accessory Dwelling Unit ("ADU") ordinance which would remove or eliminate the owner occupancy requirement. I am a resident of Salt Lake City's Avenues neighborhood and I am convinced that the elimination of the owner occupancy requirement will accomplish little more than destroying the character of many Salt Lake City neighborhood and, indeed, diminish the quality of life enjoyed by many Salt Lake City residents. As you have no doubt heard from many opponents to the proposed measure, the net effect of eliminating the owner occupancy requirement will likely be to encourage and incentivize investors and developers of all types (institutional and otherwise) to purchase property (presently developed or undeveloped) for the construction of ADUs which will lead to an explosion of what essentially will be non-owner occupied duplexes. This cannot be the intent nor can it be tolerated. In addition, to incentivize investors to purchase properties may well have the effect of **increasing** the price of real estate and pricing out of the market even more potential home purchasers. Again, it is difficult to believe that you desire that outcome.

Certainly, there exists a housing shortage in Salt Lake City and solutions must be formulated. However, as City leaders, you are charged with advancing policies and solutions which must be viewed through a long-term lens, not a quick "band-aid." That is what leadership requires. A knee-jerk reaction to solving an immediate problem by creating long-term problems is not a strategy which should be employed by effective leaders. Rather, solving difficult, pressing problems requires careful and thoughtful deliberation and planning by our elected leaders. We expect nothing less. Please keep your obligations to the City and its residents in mind as you consider any changes to the existing ADU ordinance.

And please do not think that this is an issue which would only impact east side residents and it is they who are voicing the loudest opposition. Indeed, residents of Salt Lake City's west side may be most acutely impacted negatively by the elimination of the owner occupant requirement. Property on Salt Lake City's west side is generally less expensive and investors and developers may have even greater incentive to purchase less expensive property in those locations and to construct non-owner occupied ADUs. In fact, a proliferation of investor owned ADUs would only serve to oust potential west side home buyers from the housing market due to increased housing prices and to destroy the character of cherished west side neighborhoods. All residents of Salt Lake City – west side and east side alike – deserve a far more thoughtful, careful approach to addressing Salt Lake City's housing shortage than a short-sighted attempt to eliminate the ADU ordinance's owner occupancy requirement. I urge you to consider these comments as well as the comments of many other opponents as you consider revisions to the ADU ordinance.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,


Lon A. Jenkins

cc: Chris Wharton (chris.wharton@slcgov.com)

Fairpark Community Council

Nigel Swaby

Chair

PO BOX 10092

Salt Lake City, UT 84116

(801)634-4950

nigelswaby@yahoo.com

Salt Lake City Corp

451 S State St.

Salt Lake City, UT 84111

March 17, 2023

Salt Lake City Council

Attn: Chair Darin Mano

We are writing to you to express our concern about the accessory dwelling unit (ADU) ordinance you are currently considering changing. At our February meeting we had the benefit of listening to three council members discuss the proposal. The biggest concern was removing the occupancy requirement. Fairpark Community Council sits in the heart of the most affordable homes in the City. We fear investors hoping to capitalize on the new ADU ordinance would increase competition for home buyers seeking to live in the home and drive up home prices to a completely unsustainable level.

As Chair of this council, I'm often approached by neighbors about aggressive mailers and phone calls from investors seeking to buy homes in the community. I get several of them myself each week. For some of my older neighbors, they are fearful of these marketing tactics. Removing the owner occupancy provision would only embolden investors to market to our community more.

We are supportive of the other elements of the ADU ordinance and hope you can find a way to lower the City's fees and provide financing so more members of the community can take advantage of the opportunity. At our February meeting which had over 20 people in attendance in person and online, we unanimously agreed we want the ordinance to require owner occupancy. We are also opposed to any sort of automatic revocation of the requirement in the future. Investors will still compete if they know they can get a guaranteed extra unit in the near future.

Sincerely,

Nigel Swaby

