

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
7/12/2023 10:52	Landon Kraczek	thanks for funding the arts.	<p>Dear Ana Valdemoros, I am writing to express my sincere gratitude to the City Council for funding the Arts Council, which supported my art project, Busking Bus theater company. Through this project, we provide a platform for a variety of arts, magicians to pop singers, cellists to acting troupes, to perform in our public spaces, bringing art to everyone in our community. Your financial support has been instrumental in making this initiative a reality. The funding provided by the City Arts Council has allowed us to create an inclusive and accessible platform for artists to showcase their talents. We believe that art should be for everyone, and by performing in public spaces, we can reach a wider audience and break down barriers to artistic engagement. Thanks to your investment, we have been able to organize more than 15 performances that captivate and inspire individuals from all walks of life. We are midway through our season, and we have already been seen by over 2000 people in Salt Lake City and more than 3000 in SLC county. Your investment has also made it possible to make much needed improvements to our platform. Which now has a robust sound system that allows more people to hear and understand the performance even from a distance. Allowing us to reach larger audiences and those hard of hearing. I want to express my gratitude for the City Council's recognition of the importance of making art accessible to the community. Your support not only benefits individual artists but also contributes to the cultural vibrancy of our city. Through the Busking Bus theater company, we are fostering a deeper appreciation for the arts and creating shared experiences that bring joy and inspiration to our residents. Once again, I extend my heartfelt appreciation to the City Council for your invaluable support. Your funding has helped us make a significant impact in our community, and we are dedicated to maximizing the benefits of your investment. I will keep you informed of our performances and the positive impact they have on our community. Thank you for your ongoing commitment to the arts and for helping us bring art to everyone in our city. With deep gratitude, Landon Kraczek Owner/Operator of Busking Bus Theatre.</p>
7/12/2023 11:21	Shanlee Nielson	zoning	<p>THE LAND YOUR WANTING TO REZONE INTO A HOSPITAL IS MY FAMILYS LAND. FIND A DIFFERENT SPOT TO MESS UP. I DONT HAVE A VEHICLE RIGHT NOW BUT LATER TODAY I WILL BE THERE. STOP TRYNG TO MESS WITH MY FAMILS STUFF AND TAKE IT FROM ME BEFORE I HAVE A CHANCE!</p>
7/12/2023 13:41	Nancy Saxton	buisness licensing	<p>in light of the supreme court desision allowing buisnesses to discriminate to whomever they will serve. I would like to inquire and propose that SLC require "signage" to be displaid prominently at entrance of a brick & mortar buisness location, to clearly state that the owners intend to discriminate in their services. I would also request that any Online business doing buisness with a SLC buisness licnese also clearly state the same on all writen materials. Please consider including spacifics to the group or individuals being refused service or services. Thank you for your consideration.</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
7/12/2023 13:54	Corby Booth	(EXTERNAL) Safe Side Streets 2	<p>Dear City Council Members, I am writing to you as a concerned resident of District 7 to seek your support for the implementation of the CIP Safe Side Streets Part 2. Our community has come together to study the baseline issues in our area, analyze the data and hot spots, and now we are seeking additional support to implement the wonderful ideas we have developed. Our neighborhood, spanning a 12-block area from 900E to 1100E and Garfield to 2100 S., is committed to working in partnership with the city to address the growing challenges posed by traffic on the main corridors of Sugar House. Our proposed plan is fully aligned with the principles of LIVEABLE STREETS and the Sugar House Master Plan, making us a model for the rest of the city. We are eager to serve as a laboratory for change. As the city experiences significant growth, we look to you as leaders to help ensure our safety. The recent Highland Improvements, 2100S Build, and the 900E revision have already impacted our community, and we are concerned about the effects on our daily lives, particularly with the safety of our children. Our study results indicate that we are currently facing the second-worst traffic conditions in our district, highlighting the urgent need for attention and action. We are not seeking elaborate or expensive solutions but rather affordable and practical measures that can be targeted to have the greatest impact without adversely affecting our neighboring streets. We are fully committed to making our streets safer and more enjoyable for everyone, and we sincerely request your assistance in achieving this goal. To finalize our CIP, we are seeking funding in the amount of \$150,000. This budget will cover Traffic Calming Design and Construction costs amounting to \$115,232.63, as well as Design and Engineering Fees of \$34,767.37, which will be utilized by the Engineering Division. This investment will go a long way in enhancing the safety and livability of our neighborhood. We urge you to support our cause and help us cross the funding finish line. By allocating the necessary funds, you will contribute significantly to the well-being of our community, especially the younger generation who deserve a safe environment to grow and thrive. Thank you for considering our request and for your dedication to serving our city. We are confident that, with your support, we can build a safer and happier community. Please do not hesitate to reach out to me if you require any further information or if there are any questions you may have. Yours sincerely, Corby W. Booth</p>
7/13/2023 8:59	Michael Baker	CIP StoryMap Lacks Key Information	<p>howdy, thank you for the informative CIP storymap summarizing improvements. It is difficult to provide informed feedback if we dont know the proposed cost of each improvment. for example, "complete street improvements" (an imporrant concept that i'm glad we are implementing) can have a huge range of potential costs/improvments. at least provide a range of costs so we can understand the order of magnitude of each cost (ie <\$10k. \$10-100k, \$100-500k, \$500k-\$1m, etc). also a percentage breakdown of the CIP by district would help show transparency and equity between different areas. also, for places like Jackson Park improvements, I like the idea in theory, however, it's tricky since that park is particularly popular with the homeless community. some information about programmatic improvements (ie rangers, HOST interventions) could help show that improvmenets can be enjoyed by the whole community. fencing the playground is great but im not sure families want to step over used needles or get hassled on their way to enjoy it. Thank you!</p>
7/13/2023 16:46	Patrick Lechtenberger	Salt Lake City - Environmental (and Humanitarian and Economic) Time Bomb?	<p>Dear City Council, My wife and I, along with our two children, want to move to Salt Lake City. I work in technology and she's in healthcare. We would add value to the local community and economy. But we're concerned that the Great Salt Lake will dry up and we'll be breathing toxic dust. Sources... • CNN: Great Salt Lake will disappear in 5 years without massive 'emergency rescue,' scientists say • The Guardian: 'Last nail in the coffin': Utah's Great Salt Lake on verge of collapse. • New York Times: As the Great Salt Lake Dries Up, Utah Faces an 'Environmental Nuclear Bomb' Is it true 73% of the lake has dried up? And, is it true that it may be gone in a few years? And, is it true toxic dust, will blow into Salt Lake City making life there unsustainable? If all true what are the plans to refill the lake and keep the city safe? Best regards, Patrick Lechtenberger</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
7/14/2023 12:42	Rich Vosepka	Housing Issue - 142% Rent Hike	<p>Hello Councilman Wharton, This is your neighbor Rich Vosepka, a longtime resident of your district, at the corner of 6th Ave. and C Street. I've lived here, in my basement apartment, for more than 13 years. There are four other units in this old building, and we rent from a local couple who owns the place. Earlier this year, the building owners, who are in their late 70s now I believe, decided they were ready to be done being landlords and signed on with a property management company. Then the troubles began. It started with a barrage of demands and purported new fees from the property management company (Concept Property Management). These demands and fees were not compliant with the existing month-to-month lease, and after pleading with the property owner (Kathleen and Alan Zeitlin), the owners told the property management company to knock it off and comply with the existing lease. But it didn't stop. Next demand was a notice, that I received in late June, that my rent would increase in September by 142 percent. My current rent, \$600, is obviously a bargain in this market, but a rent hike to \$1,399, plus a new and unavoidable "fee" of \$57 for water and garbage service is going to create another homeless Veteran in our community. Even if I could afford the rent hike, I wouldn't pay it. This dumpy basement apartment is not worth that much in any market. Further, the property management company has not performed any maintenance or upgrades to my unit since they took over back in January that would justify such an increase. Obviously, the property owners and management company have the right to take this action. My month-to-month lease requires only 30 days' notice of termination, and they provided more than double that. They could have kicked us all out in February if they'd wanted to. But the greed that I see evident in my personal case here, and in our rental housing market in general, is causing me some awful anxiety. Where are we supposed to go? I have a decent job -- but I can't live here anymore! I've lived in Salt Lake City for 22 years and have made a diligent working commitment to this community every day of it. I am now staring homelessness squarely in the face and dealing with the fact that a city that has felt like home for so long ain't going to be my home after September. I realize our laws around here stack the deck strongly in favor of the landlords, but is there nothing the City Council can do about the companies that operate and profit here? Yes, I am aware that the Veterans Administration has resources to help homeless vets. But the only reason I'm facing homelessness is the greed of these landlords and property management companies. I shouldn't be price-gouged like this, and neither should the taxpayers. Help! Regards, Rich</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
7/14/2023 13:32	Frances Hays 1/2	(EXTERNAL) SAFE SIDE STREETS SUGARHOUSE / D7	<p>Good Morning, I am a resident of District 7 in the Sugarhouse area and have been for 35 years. We are asking for your support on the CIP Safe Side Streets Part 2 Project. For the past two plus years we have been working diligently towards safer streets in our community. With the massive amounts of construction building multi units in such a small neighborhood in downtown Sugarhouse it has made congestion incredibly busy. And to note the apartments and condo's going up are not even half occupied yet. Driver's are not waiting for the long lines going north and south on 900 East and 1100 East and on 2100 South so they cut down our residential streets for a quick fix. I live on the corner of 1000 East and Ramona Ave. We have cars on the hour traveling down 10th East at a high rate of speed. They have to be going at least 40 MPH most of them. And down the smaller side streets on Ramona and Hollywood Ave close to that. With the McClelland trail we have lots of cyclists and so many neighbors walking their kids on bikes and strollers. It has become so unsafe. Drivers running stop sign east and west and if they were to hit a speeding car on 10th it would send cars up into our lots not to mention losing their lives. We have had several cars hit over the years and a pregnant mother hit with her 2 year old in a stroller where she was killed. We want to feel safe in our neighborhoods. The over development has been awful. We want our streets safe again. We all have put so much time and effort into helping make this happen and so desperately need help. This summer they installed big temporary concrete circular barriers in the intersections and up and down Ramona and Hollywood Ave. And over night the traffic was forced to slow down. It was truly amazing to watch. But come September they will be removed due to snow plows. We are working toward speed bumps now for a more permanent solution. We are a 12 block area from 900 East-1100 East and Garfield to 2100 South and we are committed to partnering to reduce speeds and counts of traffic as the main corridors of Sugarhouse grow. Our plan is aligned with LIVEABLE STREETS and the Sugarhouse Master Plan. We are a model for the rest of the city and we are okay to be a laboratory for change. You are leading the growth and we ask for your support to remain safe and keep our streets walking and biking friendly. We want to be a walking friendly area as it once was. We have the results of our study, and we are the second worst area of traffic in our district, and we desperately need attention. We do not want to wait as our kids are little and the daily worries that it brings as they are out playing and on their bikes with our pets. We are interested in affordable, simple solutions, targeted to the places it will make the best impact and not hurt our neighbor streets. We are ready to make our streets safer and happier.</p>
7/14/2023 13:32	Frances Hays 2/2	CONTINUED!! (EXTERNAL) SAFE SIDE STREETS SUGARHOUSE / D7	<p>Please help us accomplish this. Please fund to finalize our CIP. Help us get over the funding finish line!! Budget for a 12 block area: Traffic Calming and Construction \$115,232.63. Design and Engineering Fees (Engineer Division) \$34,767.37. Total \$150,000.00 Please consider our requests and help make our community safe again. It's only going to get worse with the construction nearing it's completion point. We appreciate your consideration in this important request. Thank you for all your time and efforts put forth on a daily basis to make our communities a better place to live. We appreciate you all immensely. And Sarah Young....welcome. We are excited to get to know you and you start your journey in our District as our representative. Regards Frances Hays</p>
7/14/2023 15:56	Lisa Hampis	Needing a place to stay	<p>Hello, My name is Lisa Hampis and I am in need of the place to satyed. I've lost all of my family and all of my belonging got taken away. I have been living outside for over 2 years on the wheelchair and I'm on the ssn. I've apply for the SLC housing but the list is so long and I've been waiting long enough that I have to sleep outside in the cold. I heard you have a Tiny home that being build. is there anyway you can help me to get one. I'm getting so frustatrate and I have no family. please contact me back at my phone number. Thank you.</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
7/17/2023 9:46	Anthony Arrasi	Rezone at 1782	<p>Hi Julee, My name is Anthony Arrasi and I'm proposing to build a modest single-family home on my vacant lot at 1782 S 1600 E in District 7. My intent is to live in the proposed home and become a Sugar House resident. This item is scheduled for the City Council on Tuesday, July 18th. My understanding is that the new Council Member for District 7 will be sworn in tonight. Once the council member is chosen, would you be able to assist me in setting up a brief meeting with he or she to discuss my proposal? I look forward to hearing from you.</p> <p>Thank you! Anthony</p>
7/17/2023 10:29	Christina Burnley	Liberty Park/D5	<p>. I just looked out my window and counted 28 people on the block camping outside of my house. People have been trespassing on my property, trying to camp on my yard, and conduct suspicious activity. I feel unsafe and scared to go to sleep at night. I am worried if nothing gets done, it will only continue to get worse. Last week there were roughly 15 or so people outside of my house, and now 13 more. If I need to move, I will, but myself and my neighbors are growing more worried by the day. We need help.</p>
7/17/2023 10:56	Denise Dubek	Petition/D5 *Attachement	<p>Dear Salt Lake City Council members, I am asking you to please read the attached letter regarding the petition to rezone or amend the current property located at 1782 S. 1600 E. SLC. You made a decision on this property just three months ago, and I implore you to keep that decision in tact. Sincerely, Denise Dubek</p>
7/17/2023 10:59	Rebecca W Davis	Comments on SH Master Plan Map	<p>I am strongly opposed to the requested Rezone Amendment from R1-7000 to SR-3 and Sugar House Neighborhood Plan Amendment for the property located at 1782 S 1600 E. The Salt Lake City Planning Division recommended that the Salt Lake City Planning Commission forward a negative recommendation to the City Council regarding these amendments which it has done. I urge the Salt Lake City Council to follow these actions and deny the requested applications to rezone the property and to amend the Sugar House Plan. The Staff Report states that it would be difficult to fit more than 1 single family home on the property given its configuration. Therefore, it makes no sense to change the zoning from R-1/7000 to SR-3. Also, the lot is an illegal lot created through a non-approved subdivision by a previous owner. Under the R-1/7000 zoning, the property could potentially be developed subject to a Planned Development, Preliminary Subdivision Amendment and Final Plat. The current R1-7000 zoning allows for single family homes and duplexes which exist in this low-density residential area. Approving the rezone amendments for SR-3 zoning would allow for medium-density housing to be built on this lot which can't accommodate more than 1 single family home. This lot doesn't meet the goals in the Sugar House Plan for flag lot standards or in-fill. Also, the property doesn't meet the intent of the location parameters for medium density classification in the Sugar House Future Land Use Map. The requested rezone amendment applications should be denied. Thank you. Rebecca W Davis</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
7/17/2023 16:23	Denise Dubek 1/2	Attached letter regarding petitions: PLNPCM2022-1138, PLNPCM2022-1139 **same attachment as above	<p>Dispute over request to change or rezone existing property from Denise Dubek July 12, 2023 To the Members of Salt Lake City Council Dear Council members, I am writing regarding the petition by Blaine Properties to amend and rezone the properties PLNPCM202201138 & PLNPCM2022-1139. My name is Denise Dubek. I own one of the homes directly to the east of the above mentioned properties. I was comforted and I commend the decision made by the City Council last April to deny the requested changes. The decision the council made at that time was wise and prudent and the ethical thing to do to support and preserve the integrity of Sugarhouse and this particular section of the city. I understand that the current owner of the mentioned property is unwilling to accept your previous ruling, because we as property owners are once again defending our neighborhood. According to the report I read and re read, below are some of the points of interest that clearly support your decision not to make changes to rezone or amend the current residential map. • The Appeals Hearing Officer agreed that the lot was illegally subdivided and upheld the Administrative Interpretation. The subject property is an illegal lot created through a non approved subdivision. This means that a prior property owner recorded deeds subdividing the property without ensuring the property met the zoning requirements for a subdivision and without a subdivision amendment. The property history which is extensively discussed in a published administrative interpretation • If the amendments are approved, the proposed development would require a planned development process for a building without street frontage, and reduced lot width. Additionally, a preliminary subdivision amendment and final plat amendment will be required to legalize the subdivision. • Preserve the existing privacy of the surrounding properties to the extent possible; and Support new structures of a similar scale that incorporate the desirable architectural design features common throughout the neighborhood. • Discussion: The Sugar House Plan designated the properties as Low Density Residential to preserve and protect the older low density single-family neighborhoods. Medium Density Residential should primarily be located near collector streets, mixed-use/higher density neighborhoods, as well as near the neighborhood commercial zoning and business district. The plan amendment generally does not align with the goals or policy statements within the Sugar House Plan. Additionally, the R-1/7000 zoning designation does align with the current designation found on the future land use map at 6 dwelling units per acre. Additionally, the applicant claims that the property is a flag lot.</p>
7/17/2023 16:23	Denise Dubek 2/2	CONTINUED!! Attached letter regarding petitions: PLNPCM2022 -1138, PLNPCM2022-1139 **same attachment as above	<p>As noted above in the body of the report, the property doesn't comply with the zoning regulations associated with flag lots. Staff included the policy statements from the Sugar House Plan which address flag lots. These policy statements also do not support this amendment. I can only assume when Stephanie Arrasi purchased this "illegal" and unusual piece of land, she had hoped to capitalize by getting the property rezoned. Because of her real estate back ground most of her supporters are also in the business to make money through real estate. Most of us homeowners in this area just want to maintain the integrity of this neighborhood and stay in our homes as long as we are able. We agree with the previous decision made by you our elected City Council members. I plead with you to once again deny any proposed changes to our current neighborhood. Sincerely, Denise Dubek</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
7/17/2023 16:25	Peter DeWeerd	PLNPCM2022-01138 &PLNCPCM2022-01139 Map and Plan Amendment for 1782 S 1600 E.	Dear Council Members, We live at REDACTED, and have attended meetings, and have reviewed the 61 page Staff Report prepared by Kelsey Lindquist dated April 20, 2023. We have lived here since 2009. We are proud members of the greater SLC community, we work hard, and we pay our taxes. In regards to: PLNPCM2022-01138 &PLNCPCM2022-01139 Map and Plan Amendment for 1782 S 1600 E: The subject property is an illegal lot created through a non-approved subdivision . The proposed master plan amendment is not consistent with adopted City policies, and the proposed zoning amendment does not meet the applicable factors for consideration. I request that the city council follow the recommendations of the planning staff and not approve the above mentioned amendments. Sincerely, Pete DeWeerd
7/17/2023 16:29	Devin Asher Vernick	Fleet Block Rezone	Hi, As a homeowner and resident of the Central Ninth neighborhood, I kindly ask that the council do what is in its power to prevent or reduce the building of further high-density market-rate housing. The neighborhood desperately needs green space. Thank you for listening. Devin Vernick
7/18/2023 12:00	Kaitlin Wilson	SLC Police Brutality Murals	Hello, Due to illness in my family, I'm unable to attend the formal meeting for this agenda. I want to make sure my comments are taken into consideration as well. These murals not only help to keep these victims of police brutality alive through memory, they remind us that there are changes that desperately need to be made so we have an equitable justice system. I will be deeply disappointed if the decision is made to essentially erase the history of police brutality instead of learning and growing from it. Thank you for your consideration, Kaitlin Wilson

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
7/18/2023 12:03	Dan Killian	7/18 public hearing: 1782 S 1600 E Property (Strongly OPPOSED to Petitions)	<p>Dan, We are writing in regards to the public hearing scheduled for today, 7/18 regarding property 1782 S 1600 E (and Petitions PLNPCM202201138 & PLNPCM2022-01139). We previously spoke at the Planning Commission Meeting on 4/26/23. We are unable to be there this time to speak, but request that our voices be counted. We strongly ask that you agree with the Planning Division's NEGATIVE recommendation that Kelsey Lindquist prepared - and would like to reiterate what the Staff said about NOT approving this petition. • • • The proposal is NOT consistent with Plan Salt Lake or the Sugar House Plan. The • proposed master plan amendment is not consistent with adopted city policies, and the proposed zoning amendment does not meet the applicable factors for consideration. • • • • The property owner is requesting development rights on a portion of the property that was ILLEGALLY subdivided. • • • • The proposed map amendment would allow for medium density development, which would not be compatible with the existing • scale of the neighborhood. The properties within this neighborhood primarily consist of R-1/7000 • zoning. • As we are sure you will hear from our wonderful neighbors, this decision will have a drastic effect on our Sugar House neighborhood and we hope that the elected City Council representatives truly do listen to the voice of those most impacted by the decision. If this were approved, this would impact the homes that all of us worked so hard to own, all while following zoning laws. If the zoning amendment is approved then there could be at least four--and up to six rental units on a property the city currently considers to be one lot. We sympathize with Anthony and his goal of being a homeowner, as we just purchased our first home (finally at age 36 years) in October after planning and saving for years. Before purchasing the home, we did our research, confirmed plot lines, zoning regulations, and title information in order to fully understand what our hard earned money was buying. Moving from Chicago, where bungalows became two-flats, which then became three-flats, which then became three-flats + roof patio, blocking any hope of seeing downtown, we settled in Sugar House because the original charm remains and Utah's beautiful mountains can still be seen from our backyard. If we allow this to pass, this marks the beginning of irreversible change to our neighborhoods. Although the requesting party states he only wants a "single family home," there is no guarantee he will only build that. Once you allow one exception, more and more will come. Please protect our neighborhood. We FULLY support the need for affordable housing and the push for ADU allowances. However, as noted above, this petition violates Salt Lake and Sugarhouse plans and risks setting a precedent that could hurt this beautiful neighborhood and city. Thank you for your time. Meg Stopczynski and Dan Killian (neighbors down the street)</p>
7/18/2023 12:49	Brandi Tillman	District 4 -337 Park Development	<p>As a property owner in District 4. 337 Park needs capital improvements. I am excited and hopeful that the capital improvements will pass and the project will start sooner than later. I vote YES.</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
7/18/2023 12:58	Mark Baer	21st South / Proposal 424210	<p>At a minimum the 21st South project - proposal 424210 per your report - should, at a minimum, be put off while all of the other construction projects in the area are completed. The disruption to the area has already gone on for the better part of 20 years and this proposal simply perpetuates the never-ending construction - not to mention the never ending financial costs to businesses in the areas who, ironically, are collectively paying millions of dollars so the city can disrupte - and perhaps bankrupt - the same. And blocking off businesses will result in tax revenues tending down, which usually means higher rates which drives businesses futher toward insecurity and the downward cycle begins. The history of community demise is replete with examples. If/when you do decide to go forward with this project then at least there must be left turning lanes (which are already in the current plans - only sparringly in the current plan) at EVER intersection that has businesses on the corner / businesses who's ingress and egress will be effected (to say nothing of those individuals who life on every cross street). Anything less is a betrayal of the Council's obligation to treat everyone evenly and not pick winners and losers which, stated again, will impact your own. revenues which, in turn and in principle, are used to keep up the area over the long, long term.</p>
7/18/2023 15:12	Vicki Gorman	7/18 meeting Re:PLNPCM2022-01138 &PLNCP2022-01139	<p>Dear City Council Members, My husband and I are writing to express our strong opposition to the proposed rezone of 1782 S 1600 E (PLNPCM2022-01138 &PLNCP2022-01139). The current property owner is requesting amendments to the Sugar House Master Plan Future Land Use Map and the Zoning Map for the property at 1782 S 1600 E. We reside at REDACTED just adjacent on the southeast side of the property under review. We are extremely opposed to changing the zoning from R1/7000 Single Family Residential to SR-3 (Special Development Pattern Residential) Zoning District with a corresponding Master Plan change, because if the zoning amendment is approved then there could be at least four--and up to six rental units on a property the city currently considers to be one lot: 1572 E. Blaine Avenue in Salt Lake City. The rezone request conflicts with many of the parameters set forth in the Staff Report that was presented by Kelsey Lindquist at the April 26, 2023 Planning Commission meeting. Such as: Existing Land Use Designation The majority of the residential land uses in Sugar House consist of single-family dwellings on lots typically between 5,000 and 8,000 square feet. These low-density residential areas are interspersed with duplexes and a few multiple-family dwellings. It is desirable to preserve and protect the dominant, single-family character of these neighborhoods by holding the density between five and ten (5-10) dwelling units per acre. Examples of zoning districts that support this density range are R-1/7000, R- 1/5000, R-2 and RMF-30. Additionally, I ask the Council Members to also consider the parameters for Flag lots as outlined below: Flag Lots Specific policies that address flag lots include the following: • Explore the feasibility of maintaining interior block areas for use as parks and community gardens. • Support more restrictive standards for Flag Lots or planned developments. • Approve Flag Lots only if it is demonstrated that negative impacts can be minimized or avoided.* • Preserve the existing privacy of the surrounding properties to the extent possible These Flag Lots policies are the most important to me and my neighbors. *Please consider all the negative impacts that are stated in this message and the many others you have received from the concerned neighbors! Additionally, if this rezone is approved, it sets a dangerous precedent that will forever threaten the character of Sugarhouse and other such communities that house primarily single family/owner occupied homes, the safety of its residents and tranquility of the neighborhood. No one wants the rezone. Zoning exists to preserve the stability of neighborhoods. We request that the city council follow the recommendations of the Salt Lake City planning staff and not approve the proposed amendments to the Sugar House Master Plan. Thank you for time, attention to this issue and service to our community. Sincerely, Victoria Gorman and Gregory Karr</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
7/18/2023 15:13	Andrea Jimmie	PLNPCM2002-01138 & PLNPCM2002-01139	<p>Dear Council members, I am writing in regard to the petition on Blaine Properties to amend and rezone the properties PLNPCM202201138 & PLNPCM2022-1139. I am writing to express my deep concern and opposition to the rezoning of the property in our cherished residential area. As a longstanding resident of this neighborhood, I feel compelled to voice my objections and highlight the potential negative impact this development may have on our community. First and foremost, our residential area has been cherished for its peaceful and serene environment, where families can raise their children in a safe and secure setting. The proposed rezoning threatens to disrupt this delicate balance. It may lead to overcrowding, strain on local resources, and increased traffic congestion, along with parking issues that would be jeopardizing the quality of life for the existing residents. In addition to the impact on the residents, the proposed rezoning may also have ecological consequences. Clearing such areas for construction purposes would not only result in the loss of valuable natural habitats but also exacerbate environmental concerns such as air pollution and stormwater management. Furthermore, rezoning the property is not in harmony with the architectural character and aesthetic appeal of our neighborhood. Our community takes pride in its unique charm, characterized by single-family homes, well-maintained gardens, and a sense of unity among residents. The proposed rezoning of the property would not only disrupt the visual appeal but also potentially increase property taxes and insurance for existing homeowners. I urge you to carefully consider the concerns raised by the residents of this neighborhood and explore alternative solutions. It is essential to prioritize sustainable development that aligns with the needs and values of the community, rather than focusing solely on short-term gains. I plead with you to once again deny any proposed changes to our current neighborhood. Sincerely, Andrea Jimmie</p>
7/18/2023 15:14	Leverett Woodruff	Comment on Fleet Block proposed rezone	<p>Good afternoon, I have reviewed the Mayor's Office proposal regarding the Fleet Block zoning and disposition strategy, and would like to offer the following comment. I have previously written to comment that the Administration and Council should prioritize the wishes of the families whose loved ones are portrayed in the Fleet Block murals when it comes to any redevelopment of this property. I want to reiterate how important it is that these families guide the redevelopment process. As noted in the most recent communication from the Mayor's Office, the city vacated Fleet Block in 2010 and left it with various levels of environmental contamination. It was the families and loved ones of those portrayed in the murals who restored the site to beneficial use for the community by painting the murals, planting garden boxes before each mural, and installing benches and resource boxes for food, water, and other necessities for unsheltered Salt Lake citizens. It is these families and their community who continually maintain the site by mowing, weeding, and picking up trash. They do this because the site is a sacred space of healing for them and of outreach to our neighbors experiencing homelessness. I urge you to listen to the input of these families about the future of Fleet Block. Any redevelopment must prioritize saving the murals. They should be the main feature of the public space proposed for the site. I also urge that any housing proposed for the site be required to be deeply affordable, or affordable to Utahns whose incomes do not exceed 30% of Area Median Income. Far too often, what is called "affordable housing" is not affordable to most of those who need it. The solution to homelessness is housing, and if we want this site to benefit the community, there are few more beneficial or urgent projects than housing our neighbors who need it most. The Administration's update states that the City will "involve underrepresented communities in the development process" for Fleet Block. The City has a responsibility to include the Murals families on any committees or other bodies that make decisions going forward. Please give these families the voice they are owed, because they uplifted this space to honor their loved ones whose lives were lost to state-sanctioned violence. Thank you. Levy Woodruff</p>

July 12, 2023

To the Members of Salt Lake City Council

Dear Council members,

I am writing regarding the petition by Blaine Properties to amend and rezone the properties PLNPCM202201138 & PLNPCM2022-1139.

My name is Denise Dubek. I own one of the homes directly to the east of the above mentioned properties. I was comforted and I commend the decision made by the City Council last April to deny the requested changes. The decision the council made at that time was wise and prudent and the ethical thing to do to support and preserve the integrity of Sugarhouse and this particular section of the city. I understand that the current owner of the mentioned property is unwilling to accept your previous ruling, because we as property owners are once again defending our neighborhood.

According to the report I read and re read, below are some of the points of interest that clearly support your decision not to make changes to rezone or amend the current residential map.

- The Appeals Hearing Officer agreed that the lot was illegally subdivided and upheld the Administrative Interpretation. The subject property is an illegal lot created through a non approved subdivision. This means that a prior property owner recorded deeds subdividing the property without ensuring the property met the zoning requirements for a subdivision and without a subdivision amendment. The property history which is extensively discussed in a published administrative interpretation
- If the amendments are approved, the proposed development would require a planned development process for a building without street frontage, and reduced lot width. Additionally, a preliminary subdivision amendment and final plat amendment will be required to legalize the subdivision.
- Preserve the existing privacy of the surrounding properties to the extent possible; and Support new structures of a similar scale that incorporate the desirable architectural design features common throughout the neighborhood.
- Discussion: The Sugar House Plan designated the properties as Low Density Residential to preserve and protect the older low density single-family neighborhoods. Medium Density Residential should primarily be located near collector streets, mixed-use/higher density neighborhoods, as well as near the neighborhood commercial zoning and business district. The plan amendment generally does not align with the goals or policy statements within the Sugar House Plan. Additionally, the R-1/7000 zoning designation does align with the current designation found on the future land use map at 6 dwelling units per acre. Additionally, the applicant claims that the property is a flag lot. As noted above in the body of the report, the property doesn't comply with the zoning regulations associated with flag lots. Staff included the policy statements from the Sugar House Plan which address flag lots. These policy statements also do not support this amendment.

I can only assume when Stephanie Arrasi purchased this "illegal" and unusual piece of land, she had hoped to capitalize by getting the property rezoned. Because of her real estate back ground most of her

supporters are also in the business to make money through real estate. Most of us homeowners in this area just want to maintain the integrity of this neighborhood and stay in our homes as long as we are able. We agree with the previous decision made by you our elected City Council members.

I plead with you to once again deny any proposed changes to our current neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Denise Dubek