



COUNCIL STAFF REPORT

CITY COUNCIL of SALT LAKE CITY

TO: City Council Members

FROM: Brian Fullmer
Policy Analyst

DATE: November 10, 2022

RE: 1518, 1530, 1540, 1546 South Main Street, 1515 South Richards Street
Zoning Map and Master Plan Amendments, Alley Vacation
PLNPCM2021-001191 and PLNPCM2022-00065/-00086

Item Schedule:

Briefing: November 10, 2022

Set Date: November 10, 2022

Public Hearing: December 6, 2022

Potential Action: December 13, 2022

STAFF NOTE

The *Ballpark Station Area Plan* was adopted by the Council after these petitions were submitted. That plan overrides the *Central Community Master Plan* for the area, so the Council will not need to act on petition PLNPCM2022-00065 to amend the *Central Community Master Plan* future land use map.

The Council will be briefed about a proposal to amend the zoning map and master plan for parcels at 1518, 1530, 1540, 1546 South Main Street, and 1515 South Richards Street in City Council District Five, from CC (Corridor Commercial) and R-1/5,000 (single-family residential) to FB-UN2 (Form Based Urban Neighborhood). A request to change the Central Community Master Plan future land use map from Community Commercial to High Mixed-Use is also proposed. In addition, a request to vacate a City-owned alley that runs through the properties is included in the proposal. (See image below.)

The petitioner's intent is to consolidate the seven parcels (some parcels share the same address), and the alley into one larger (approximately 2 acre) parcel with FB-UN2 zoning to develop a mixed-use development on the site. No specific site development proposal has been submitted as of the writing of this report.

Two duplexes and two single-family homes would be removed for a total loss of six housing units as part of the proposal. Replacement of the housing units was the option selected for housing loss mitigation as discussed in Consideration 4 below.



These proposals were reviewed by the Planning Commission at its July 27, 2022 meeting and a public hearing was held at which five people spoke. Some comments were supportive of redeveloping the area and closing the alley. Concerns expressed included the size of the proposed development is out of scale for the neighborhood and would impact the area, particularly those who live adjacent to the property; changing the zoning from prevalent existing Corridor Commercial zoning of properties fronting Main Street in the area; additional rental units will not benefit the already predominately renter occupied neighborhood; and concern for residents who would be displaced when existing housing is removed.

The Commission closed the hearing and voted unanimously to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council with the following conditions:

1. Housing removed from the site must be replaced.
2. Vacated alley property be integrated into the future development.
3. Rezoned parcels must be consolidated through the appropriate process.



Goal of the briefing: Review the proposed zoning and future land use map amendments, determine if the Council supports moving forward with the proposal.

POLICY QUESTIONS

1. The Council may wish to ask if any units in the proposed building will be affordable, and at what percentage of AMI.
2. The Council may wish to ask if current residents of the properties will be assisted with relocation.
3. The Council may wish to ask the developer for the anticipated mix of rental units in the proposed development.

4. The petitioner expressed a willingness to provide “ample” off-street parking in the proposed development. The Council may wish to ask what parking ratios are being considered and if the petitioner is amenable to including this in a development agreement.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

The Council is only being asked to consider rezoning the property, amend the future land use map, and vacate the alley. No formal site plan has been submitted to the City nor is it within the scope of the Council’s authority to review the plans. Because zoning of a property can outlast the life of a building, any rezoning application should be considered on the merits of changing the zoning of that property, not simply based on a potential project.

KEY CONSIDERATIONS

Planning staff identified six key considerations related to the proposal which are found on pages 3-9 of the Planning Commission staff report and summarized below. For the complete analysis, please see the staff report.

Consideration 1-Compliance with City Goals, Policies and Plans

The *Central Community Master Plan* (2005) is the current relevant plan for this area. The Plan’s future land use map shows the properties fronting Main Street, and the motel as “Community Commercial.” The property fronting Richards Street is listed as “Medium Density Residential.”

Planning staff found the following *Central Community Master Plan* policies and statements applicable to this proposal:

- RLU (Residential Land Use)-1.3- Restrict high-density residential growth to Downtown, East Downtown, TOD areas and Gateway.
- RLU-1.5 - Use residential mixed uses zones to provide residential land uses with supportive retail, service and commercial uses.
- Mixed Use Policy – RLU-4.0 - Encourage mixed use development that provides residents with a commercial and institutional component while maintaining the residential character of the neighborhood.
- Mixed Use Policy – RLU-4.2 – Support small mixed use development on the corners of major streets that does not have significant adverse impact on the residential neighborhood.
- Commercial land use policy CLU-1.4 – High Density Mixed Use – Target areas adjacent to light rail station in the downtown area for higher intensity commercial use and medium to high density housing.
- Ensure that new development is compatible with existing neighborhood in terms of scale, character, and density.

It is Planning’s opinion that the proposal is supported by some *Central Community Master Plan* policies and statements, while others do not.

The *Ballpark Station Area Plan* is in draft form and has not been adopted. The draft Plan has been discussed with the community and references to it were included in some comments to Planning. The subject petitions may meet some elements of the Ballpark Station Area Plan while not meeting others. It is worth noting since no specific development proposal has been submitted, and the Plan has not been adopted, it is not possible to determine if the petitions would comply.

Plan Salt Lake (2015) outlines an overall vision of sustainable growth and development in the city. Included in the Plan is a recommendation to develop a mix of uses needed to accommodate responsible growth. New development scale and character compatibility with the existing neighborhood is also a consideration.

Planning staff stated

“The proposed development is supported by general principles and initiatives found in Plan Salt Lake. It would provide additional housing options within a walkable neighborhood with commercial services served by convenient transit opportunities.”

It is Planning staff’s opinion the proposal is in line with *Growing SLC: A Five-Year Housing Plan – 2018-2022* (2017), which calls for providing more housing units and housing variety in the neighborhood.

Consideration 2-Neighborhood Compatibility & Anticipated Impacts

Neighborhood compatibility and impacts from new development are important considerations when reviewing zoning changes. The applicant stated they intend to remove the motel and other structures on the subject parcels. As noted above, no specific site plan has been submitted and the property could potentially be developed with other uses allowed under the FB-UN2 zoning designation.

Existing CC zoning would allow buildings up to 30 feet by right, and up to 45 feet through Design Review. The proposed FB-UN2 zoning would allow buildings up to 50 feet tall if zoning standards are met. It is worth noting the petitioner originally included a request additional height up to 65 feet on the parcels. That request was withdrawn following community and staff feedback.

Additional standards including glass percentages, building materials and ground floor uses in the FB-UN2 zoning district are not required in CC zoning. When abutting single-family residential zoning, FB-UN2 zoning requires added upper floor step backs to lessen impact to lower scale adjacent development. CC zoning does not include this requirement. (These standards are included in the Zoning District Comparison table found on pages 8-10 below.)

Planning staff found the proposed FB-UN2 zoning designation would not create additional impacts to the neighborhood beyond existing zoning if the properties were redeveloped.

Consideration 3-Consideration of Alternate Zoning Districts

Planning staff reviewed the R-MU-45 zoning district as a potential alternative to the requested FB-UN2. It has similar characteristics as FB-UN2 including a maximum height of 45 feet which is why they selected it for comparison. Development standards for the ground floor and upper floor step backs are also included under R-MU-45, but not in the current CC zoning district. (See Zoning District Comparison below.)

A key difference between FB-UN2 and R-MU-45 is parking requirements. FB-UN2 does not require off-street parking. The petitioner stated they intend to provide adequate parking and are amenable to a development agreement including that requirement.

In its review, Planning found more of the allowed uses in R-MU-45 are conditional rather than permitted, which would require additional processes when reviewing a development proposal. Other zoning districts allow both residential and mixed-use developments, with varying height and other requirements.

Planning staff did not recommend consideration of alternate zoning districts.

Consideration 4-Housing Loss Mitigation Requirements

When considering petitions for zoning changes that permit nonresidential land uses on property that includes residential dwelling units, *Salt Lake City Code* requires a City approved housing loss mitigation plan. The subject petition proposes to remove six existing housing units. Additional housing units are proposed, but a plan is required as FB-UN2 zoning allows nonresidential uses.

Mitigating housing loss may include providing replacement housing or paying a fee to the City's housing trust fund based on the difference between the housing value and replacement cost of building new units. For deteriorated housing, not caused by deliberate indifference by the property owner, a flat fee may be paid by the petitioner to the City's housing trust fund.

A plan satisfying the mitigation requirement by providing replacement housing was submitted. This plan was evaluated and approved by the Community and Neighborhoods Department Director. The Council has the option to work with the petitioner to include replacement housing units as part of a development agreement.

Consideration 5-Alley Vacation Request

As discussed above, an alley vacation is part of the petitioner's proposal. The subject alley is approximately 250 feet long and 16 feet wide. The alley is said to be blocked for most of its length and is being used for parking and storage.

Alley vacation requests receive three phases of review, as outlined in section 14.52.030 *Salt Lake City Code* (see pages 11-13 below). Those phases include an administrative determination of completeness; a public hearing, including a recommendation from the Planning Commission; and a public hearing before the City Council.

Salt Lake City Code requires alley vacations meet at least one of the following policy considerations:

A-Lack of Use, B-Public Safety, C-Urban Design, or D-Community Purpose. Urban Design and Public Safety are the factors for this request. The petitioner believes the alley is not a positive urban design element and would be better used as part of their proposed development. They also believe the alley contributes to crime in the area. SLCPD officers reportedly discussed in community meetings the motel and alley are problem areas in the area, though no reports have been provided detailing the alley's contribution to crime.

Alley vacations are also required to include a petition with signatures of at least 75% of abutting property owners indicating support of the proposed vacation. The petitioner received signatures from six of the eight abutting property owners. There was no opposition to the alley vacation expressed by those who didn't sign the petition.

City Department Review

During City department and division review of the petitions, the Engineering Division expressed opposition to the alley vacation, stating "SLC Engineering does not support the proposed alley vacation. The power runs down the alley on both sides (with the transformers) and it appears that underground utilities may also exist. They are parking vehicles in the alley currently."

Public Utilities provided comments saying it does not have utility lines in the subject alley. They noted private water and sewer lines likely are within the alley, but those are owned by the petitioner.

No objections or concerns were received from other responding City departments or divisions.

Analysis of Factors

Pages 50-52 of the Planning Commission staff report outlines zoning map amendment standards that should be considered as the Council reviews this proposal. The standards and findings are summarized below. Please see the Planning Commission staff report for additional information.

Factor	Finding
Whether a proposed map amendment is consistent with the purposes, goals, objectives, and policies of the city as stated through its various adopted planning documents.	<i>Complies</i>
Whether a proposed map amendment furthers the specific purpose statements of the zoning ordinance.	<i>Complies</i>
The extent to which a proposed map amendment will affect adjacent properties	<i>Complies</i>
Whether a proposed map amendment is consistent with the purposes and provisions of any applicable overlay zoning districts which may impose additional standards.	<i>Not applicable (not within any zoning overlays)</i>
The adequacy of public facilities and services intended to serve the subject property, including, but not limited to, roadways, parks and recreational facilities, police and fire protection, schools, stormwater drainage systems, water supplies, and wastewater and refuse collection.	<i>Complies</i>

Pages 53-55 of the Planning Commission staff report includes an analysis of factors City Code requires the Planning Commission to consider for alley vacations (Section 14.52.030 B *Salt Lake City Code*). In addition to the information above, other factors are summarized below. Planning staff found the proposed alley vacation complies with the factors below. For the complete analysis, please refer to the staff report.

- **City Code required analysis:** The City Police Department, Fire Department, Transportation Division and all other relevant City departments and divisions have no reasonable objection to the proposed disposition of the property.

Finding: *Planning staff believes it complies.* As noted above, City Engineering objected to the alley vacation. Other City departments and divisions had no issues with the proposal or did not provide comments. (Department review comments are found in Attachment H (page 95 of the Planning Commission staff report).) Planning staff stated “The Engineering Department does not support the request while Public Utilities has no objections. Part of the objections of Engineering concerned the possible location of utilities underground in the alley. Public Utilities indicated that there may be some water lines but did not have concerns. Since the site consists of multiple parcels to be combined, the issue of utilities and any required relocation will be dealt with on an individual development proposal under consideration.”

- **City Code required analysis:** The petition meets at least one of the policy considerations for closure, vacation or abandonment of City owned alleys (Lack of Use, Public Safety, Urban Design, Community Purpose).

Finding: *Complies.* Planning staff determined the proposed alley vacation satisfies the Urban Design and Public Safety policy considerations.

- **City Code required analysis:** The petition must not deny sole access or required off-street parking to any adjacent property.
Finding: *Complies.* Vacating the alley would not impact parking or sole access to any property.
- **City Code required analysis:** The petition will not result in any property being landlocked.
Finding: *Complies.* No property would be landlocked because of this alley vacation request.
- **City Code required analysis:** The disposition of the alley property will not result in a use which is otherwise contrary to the policies of the City, including applicable master plans and other adopted statements of policy which address, but are not limited to, mid-block walkways, pedestrian paths, trails, and alternative transportation uses.
Finding: Closing the alley will not result in uses that are contrary to any City policy.
- **City Code required analysis:** No opposing abutting property owner intends to build a garage requiring access from the property, or has made application for a building permit, or if such a permit has been issued, construction has been completed within 12 months of issuance of the building permit.
Finding: *Complies.* No abutting property owners expressed opposition to the proposed alley vacation.
- **City Code required analysis:** The petition furthers the City preference for disposing of an entire alley, rather than a small segment of it.
Finding: *Complies.* The alley does not pass fully through the block between Andrew Avenue and Van Buren. Planning stated, “Since there is no continuation to the alley, for all intents and purposes this remaining segment would act as an “entire alley” so this factor has been met.”
- **City Code required analysis:** The alley property is not necessary for actual or potential rear access to residences or for accessory uses.
Finding: *Complies.* The alley is not necessary for rear access to residences.

It is Planning staff’s opinion that the proposed alley vacation generally meets the policy considerations and factors for alley vacations. They noted the Engineering Division is opposed to the request, but those objections did not consider redevelopment of the site which will likely remove or relocate utilities on the site.

Consideration 6-Public Input and Concerns

Most comments received by the Planning Division regarding the proposal are in opposition to the rezoning. Many people expressed frustration with the existing motel and other properties that are included in this proposal creating neighborhood issues, and a desire for change. Concern with the proposed building’s height and scale, along with resulting neighborhood impacts are the primary reasons people expressed for their opposition. The Ballpark Community Council sent a letter to Planning staff outlining its opposition to the proposed zoning amendments, and support of the alley vacation. This letter and other written comments received prior to the Planning Commission public hearing are found on pages 57-94 of the Planning Commission staff report. Comments received by Planning following the Planning Commission staff report was published are found on pages 65-87 of the Administration’s transmittal.

ZONING COMPARISON

CC and R-1/5,000 vs. Proposed FB-UN2

The following table is found on pages 46-49 of the Planning Commission staff report. It is included here for convenience.

Parameter	CC Zone (Existing)	R-1/5,000 (Existing)	FB-UN2 (Proposed)
-----------	-----------------------	-------------------------	----------------------

Allowed Uses	Multi-family and mixed-use developments, gas stations, alcohol uses, animal cremation, art gallery, food production, various commercial retail and service uses, assisted living and support uses, boarding house, funeral home, crematoriums, motel uses, offices, school uses, commercial parking, recreation, storage uses, movie theater, automobile sales, service, repairs and rentals among others.	Mostly single-family detached uses. Multifamily and commercial uses are not allowed. Some government and municipal and school uses allowed as conditional.	Dwellings to include single, multi-family and others, mixed use developments, alcohol uses, various commercial retail and service uses, assisted living and support uses, assisted living and support uses, boarding house, funeral home, clinic and medical uses, motel uses, offices, school uses and others.
Maximum Building Height	30-feet by right 45-feet through Design Review	28-feet to ridge for pitched roofs or 20-feet for flat roofed buildings.	50-feet for a multifamily or mixed-use form. A variety of other uses are allowed and the height limit varies. In the absence of a specific development proposal, the applicant could build any of the allowed uses under the new zoning if it were to be approved.
Front/Corner/Side/Rear Yard Setbacks	Front and corner side yards: 15 feet Interior side: None Rear yard: 10 feet	Front: The minimum depth of the front yard for all principal buildings shall be equal to the average of the front yards of existing buildings within the block face. Interior side: Corner lots – 4- feet Interior side for Interior lots – 4 feet on one side and 10 feet on the other. Rear yard: 25% of lot depth or 20-feet, whichever is less.	No minimum on front and corner side. Maximum 10 feet. Side: 15-feet along a side property line that that abuts a residential zoning district less than 35- feet otherwise none. Rear: Minimum 20 feet along rear adjacent to residential less than 35-feet.
Required Build to Line	Not applicable	Not applicable	Minimum of 50% of street facing facade shall be built to the minimum setback line
Upper Lever Step Back	None required	Not applicable	Buildings shall be stepped back 1 additional foot for every foot of building height above 30' along a side or rear

			property line adjacent to FBUN1 or any residential zoning district that has a maximum building height of 35' or less, unless the building is set back from the property line 45' or more.
Buffer Yard	Required if abutting single-family residential. Specific landscaping requirements and trees are required.	Not applicable	No specific buffer required but a 20-foot rear yard is required and upper building step backs are required when located adjacent to residential.
Lot Size	Minimum 10,000 SF	5,000 SF but cannot exceed 7,000 SF	4,000 SF
Minimum Lot Width	75 feet	Not specified	30 feet
Landscaped Yards	15-feet required on all front and corner side yards. Additional landscaping required is if additional building height is allowed.	Required yards must all be maintained as landscaped yards.	Open Space Area: A minimum of ten percent (10%) of the lot area must be open space area which may include landscaped yards, patio, dining areas, common balconies, rooftop gardens, and other similar outdoor living spaces.
Off-street Parking & Loading (21A.44.030)	The CC zone requires the following for multi-family uses: 2 parking spaces for each dwelling unit containing 2 or more bedrooms 1 parking space for 1 bedroom and efficiency dwelling 1/2 parking space for single room occupancy dwellings (600 square foot maximum) Additional parking will be required for the commercial aspects of the project. This varies depending on the use.	Two parking spaces for each single-family residence. Additional spaces required for other uses when allowed.	No parking minimum specified or required.
General Design Standards: • Ground floor uses • Percentage glass • Building materials • Entrance Requirements	No general design standards or requirements if building to 30-feet. If requesting Design Review,	None specified for commercial or multi-family as they are not allowed.	Ground floor uses required • 60% of ground floor facing façade must be glass

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balconies • Open space requirements 	<p>additional elements may be requested.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15% on all upper floors on street facing facades. • 70% of any street facing building facade must be clad in high quality, durable, natural materials • Specific entrance requirements based on building type. • Balconies required on all street-facing units • Open Space Required: A minimum of ten percent (10%) of the lot area must be open space area.
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

PROJECT CHRONOLOGY

- November 19, 2021-Petition for zoning map and accompanying text amendment received by Planning Division.
- February 1, 2022-Petitions for the master plan amendment and alley vacation received by Planning Division.

Petitions assigned to David Gellner, Senior Planner.

- February 9, 2022-Information about petitions sent to Ballpark Community Council and Midtown District Community Council. 45-day recognized organization input and comment period begins. Online open house period begins.

Early notification sent to property owners and residents within 300 feet of the project site providing information about the proposal and how to give public input.

- March 3, 2022-Planning staff attended an online meeting of the Ballpark Community Council.
- March 30, 2022-45-day public comment period for recognized organizations ended.
- May 15, 2022-Applicant made changes to the original request which included a text amendment to allow additional building height on these properties. The text amendment portion of the application was withdrawn by the applicant.
- May 23, 2022-Notice sent to the Ballpark Community Council and all property owners and residents within 300 feet of the development informing them of changes to the proposal, specifically that the text amendment request allowing additional building height was withdrawn by the applicant.

- July 14, 2022-Public notice posted on City and State websites and sent via the Planning listserv for the July 27, 2022 Planning Commission meeting. Public hearing notice mailed.

Public hearing notice posted on properties.

- July 27, 2022-Planning Commission public hearing. The Planning Commission voted unanimously in favor of forwarding a positive recommendation to the City Council for the

proposed master plan and zoning map amendments, and alley vacation.

- August 23, 2022-Ordinance requested from Attorney's Office.
- September 6, 2022-Planning received signed ordinance from the Attorney's Office.
- September 21, 2022-Transmittal received in City Council Office.

Salt Lake City Code for Alley Vacation

The process for closing or vacating a City-owned alley is outlined in Section 14.52 *Salt Lake City Code*.

14.52.010: DISPOSITION OF CITY'S PROPERTY INTEREST IN ALLEYS:

The city supports the legal disposition of Salt Lake City's real property interests, in whole or in part, with regard to city owned alleys, subject to the substantive and procedural requirements set forth herein.

14.52.020: POLICY CONSIDERATIONS FOR CLOSURE, VACATION OR ABANDONMENT OF CITY OWNED ALLEYS:

The city will not consider disposing of its interest in an alley, in whole or in part, unless it receives a petition in writing which demonstrates that the disposition satisfies at least one of the following policy considerations:

- A. **Lack Of Use:** The city's legal interest in the property appears of record or is reflected on an applicable plat; however, it is evident from an onsite inspection that the alley does not physically exist or has been materially blocked in a way that renders it unusable as a public right of way;
- B. **Public Safety:** The existence of the alley is substantially contributing to crime, unlawful activity, unsafe conditions, public health problems, or blight in the surrounding area;
- C. **Urban Design:** The continuation of the alley does not serve as a positive urban design element;
or
- D. **Community Purpose:** The petitioners are proposing to restrict the general public from use of the alley in favor of a community use, such as a neighborhood play area or garden. (Ord. 24-02 § 1, 2002)

14.52.030: PROCESSING PETITIONS:

There will be three (3) phases for processing petitions to dispose of city owned alleys under this section. Those phases include an administrative determination of completeness; a public hearing, including a recommendation from the Planning Commission; and a public hearing before the City Council.

- A. **Administrative Determination Of Completeness:** The city administration will determine whether or not the petition is complete according to the following requirements:
 - 1. The petition must bear the signatures of no less than seventy five percent (75%) of the neighbors owning property which abuts the subject alley property;
 - 2. The petition must identify which policy considerations discussed above support the petition;
 - 3. The petition must affirm that written notice has been given to all owners of property located in the block or blocks within which the subject alley property is located;

4. A signed statement that the applicant has met with and explained the proposal to the appropriate community organization entitled to receive notice pursuant to title 2, chapter 2.60 of this code; and
 5. The appropriate city processing fee shown on the Salt Lake City consolidated fee schedule has been paid.
- B. Public Hearing and Recommendation From The Planning Commission: Upon receipt of a complete petition, a public hearing shall be scheduled before the planning commission to consider the proposed disposition of the city owned alley property. Following the conclusion of the public hearing, the planning commission shall make a report and recommendation to the city council on the proposed disposition of the subject alley property. A positive recommendation should include an analysis of the following factors:
1. The city police department, fire department, transportation division, and all other relevant city departments and divisions have no reasonable objection to the proposed disposition of the property;
 2. The petition meets at least one of the policy considerations stated above;
 3. Granting the petition will not deny sole access or required off street parking to any property adjacent to the alley;
 4. Granting the petition will not result in any property being landlocked;
 5. Granting the petition will not result in a use of the alley property which is otherwise contrary to the policies of the city, including applicable master plans and other adopted statements of policy which address, but which are not limited to, mid-block walkways, pedestrian paths, trails, and alternative transportation uses;
 6. No opposing abutting property owner intends to build a garage requiring access from the property, or has made application for a building permit, or if such a permit has been issued, construction has been completed within twelve (12) months of issuance of the building permit;
 7. The petition furthers the city preference for disposing of an entire alley, rather than a small segment of it; and
 8. The alley property is not necessary for actual or potential rear access to residences or for accessory uses.
- C. Public Hearing Before The City Council: Upon receipt of the report and recommendation from the planning commission, the city council will consider the proposed petition for disposition of the subject alley property. After a public hearing to consider the matter, the city council will make a decision on the proposed petition based upon the factors identified above. (Ord. 58-13, 2013; Ord. 24-11, 2011)

14.52.040: METHOD OF DISPOSITION:

If the city council grants the petition, the city owned alley property will be disposed of as follows:

- A. Low Density Residential Areas: If the alley property abuts properties which are zoned for low density residential use, the alley will merely be vacated. For the purposes of this section, "low density residential use" shall mean properties which are zoned for single-family, duplex or twin home residential uses.

- B. High Density Residential Properties And Other Nonresidential Properties: If the alley abuts properties which are zoned for high density residential use or other nonresidential uses, the alley will be closed and abandoned, subject to payment to the city of the fair market value of that alley property, based upon the value added to the abutting properties.
- C. Mixed Zoning: If an alley abuts both low density residential properties and either high density residential properties or nonresidential properties, those portions which abut the low density residential properties shall be vacated, and the remainder shall be closed, abandoned and sold for fair market value. (Ord. 24-02 § 1, 2002)

14.52.050: PETITION FOR REVIEW:

Any party aggrieved by the decision of the city council as to the disposition of city owned alley property may file a petition for review of that decision within thirty (30) days after the city council's decision becomes final, in the 3rd district court.