




CITY COUNCIL TRANSMITTAL


Lisa Shaffer (May 11, 2023 15:15 MDT)

Lisa Shaffer, Chief Administrative Officer

Date Received: 05/11/2023

Date sent to Council: 05/11/2023

TO: Salt Lake City Council
Darin Mano, Chair

DATE: May 11, 2023

FROM: Blake Thomas, Director, Department of Community & Neighborhoods



SUBJECT: 1782 S 1600 E Zoning Map and Master Plan Amendment

STAFF CONTACT: Kelsey Lindquist, Planning Manager, 801-535-7930

DOCUMENT TYPE: Ordinance - No ordinance requested due to Planning Commission's negative recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION: That the City Council follow the recommendation of the Planning Commission and deny the requested zoning map and master plan amendment.

BUDGET IMPACT: None

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:

The applicant is requesting to amend the zoning map and the Sugar House Plan Future Land Use Map for the property located at 1782 S. 1600 E., which is approximately .1743 acres (7,592 square feet) in size. The proposal involves two requests: (1) to amend the Sugar House Future Land Use Map from Low Density Residential (5-10 dwelling units per acre) to Medium Density Residential (8-20 dwelling units per acre) and (2) to amend the zoning map designation from R-1/7000 (Single Family Residential) to SR-3 (Special Development Pattern Residential) zoning district. The map and plan amendment are necessary to accommodate a single-family structure on the subject property. The applicant identified SR-3 zoning due to the reduced lot width and side yard setbacks required for a detached single-family structure.



Zoning Map of the Subject Neighborhood

The subject property is an illegal lot created through a nonapproved 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 from 2020, outlines the history of the property. The determination relied on the prior Board of Adjustment decisions that identified the subject property as part of 1572 E Blaine Avenue. The full Administrative Interpretation can be accessed in the provided link, below. The applicant appealed the Administrative Interpretation to the Appeals Hearing Officer. The Appeals Hearing Officer agreed that the lot was illegally subdivided and upheld the Administrative Interpretation. The Appeals Hearing Officer decision can be accessed in the provided link, below. Due to the outcome of the Appeals Hearing, the applicant determined that the alternative route is to amend the zoning map and future land use map in order to pursue the construction of a single-family residence. It should be noted that the requested amendments do not legalize the subdivision of the subject property, nor make this property a buildable lot.

The applicable adopted plans include Plan Salt Lake, Sugar House Plan and Growing SLC. The plans are generally in conflict with the proposed amendments. 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. Plan Salt Lake includes initiatives and goals to increase housing units. With that said, the proposed amendments include developing an illegally subdivided parcel in an existing neighborhood. The increase in density will promote a dwelling unit on the property that functions as a rear yard with challenging access.

PUBLIC PROCESS:

February 24, 2023 – The Sugar House Community Council was sent the 45-day required notice for recognized community organizations.

February 24, 2023 – Property owners and residents within 300 feet of the development were provided early notification of the proposal.

April 17, 2023 – Applicant and staff attended the Sugar House Land Use Committee meeting.

Planning Commission Hearing and Recommendation

On April 26, 2023 the Planning Commission reviewed the proposal and held a public hearing. The following are some of the key topics that were discussed. This is a summary only. The full public hearing can viewed at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HNxTNHAKz34> beginning at 1:03.

- Concerns with compatibility in the neighborhood.
- Lack of current affordability of the existing rental housing.
- Concerns of impacts to the neighboring property owners.
- History of the property is in conflict with the proposal.
- Requests that Salt Lake City require a consolidation to limit future requests.
- Concerns with fire safety, due to the narrow access.
- Support for the rezone for an additional unit.
- A developed property is better than a vacant property.
- The lot is illegal and shouldn't be buildable.
- Concerns with the precedent.
- The legality of the lot shouldn't impact whether it's buildable.
- It's understandable that the current owners wouldn't understand the items recorded on title.
- Can the City afford to enforce rules that limit whether a property owner can building a home?

The Planning Commission ultimately forwarded a negative recommendation with a 6-5 vote in favor of denial. The Planning Commission minutes are accessible in the link, below.

Administrative Interpretation Records

- a) Administrative Interpretation published September 9, 2020 (Click to Access)
- b) Appeal of Administrative Interpretation published December 22, 2020 (Click to Access)

Planning Commission (PC) Records

- a) PC Agenda of April 26, 2023 (Click to Access)

- b) [PC Minutes of April 26, 2023 \(Click to Access\)](#)
- c) [Planning Commission Staff Report of April 26, 2023 \(Click to Access Report\)](#)

EXHIBITS:

- 1) Project Chronology
- 2) Notice of City Council Public Hearing
- 3) Original Petition
- 4) Comments Received After Publication of PC Staff Report

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- 1) Project Chronology
- 2) Notice of City Council Public Hearing
- 3) Original Petition
- 4) Comments Received After Publication of PC Staff Report

1. Project Chronology

PROJECT CHRONOLOGY

PETITIONS:

PLNPCM2022-01138 & PLNPCM2022-01139

December 5, 2022

Petitions submitted

January 30, 2023

Assigned to Liz Hart

February 24, 2023

Routed for review.

February 24, 2023

Notice sent to the Sugar House Community Council.

February 24, 2023

Notice sent to property owners and tenants within 300 feet of the property.

April 17, 2023

Applicant and staff attended the Sugar House Land Use Committee Meeting.

April 26, 2023

Planning Commission Public Hearing

2. Notice of City Council Public Hearing

NOTICE OF CITY COUNCIL HEARING

The Salt Lake City Council is considering the following petitions: PLNPCM2022-01138 & PLNPCM2022-01139 – Blaine Properties LLC is requesting to amend the Sugar House Master Plan Future Land Use Map and the Zoning Map for 1782 S 1600 E. The amendments are sought for the purpose of eventually legalizing the property in order to construct a single-family dwelling.

- A. Zoning Map Amendment (PLNPCM2022-01138): The applicant is seeking to rezone the property from R-1/7000 (Single-Family Residential) to SR-3 (Special Development Residential).
- B. Master Plan Amendment (PLNPCM2022-01139): The applicant is seeking to amend the Sugar House Future Land Use Map from Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential.

No development plans have been submitted at this time. The properties are within Council District 7, represented by Amy Fowler.

As part of their study, the City Council is holding an advertised public hearing to receive comments regarding the petition. During the hearing, anyone desiring to address the City Council concerning this issue will be given an opportunity to speak. The Council may consider adopting the ordinance the same night of the public hearing. The hearing will be held:

DATE:

TIME: 7:00 pm

PLACE: Electronic and in-person options.
451 South State Street, Room 326, Salt Lake City, Utah

**** This meeting will be held via electronic means, while also providing for an in-person opportunity to attend or participate in the hearing at the City and County Building, located at 451 South State Street, Room 326, Salt Lake City, Utah. For more information, including**

WebEx connection information, please visit www.slc.gov/council/virtual-meetings.

Comments

may also be provided by calling the 24-Hour comment line at (801) 535-7654 or sending an email to council.comments@slcgov.com. All comments received through any source are shared with the Council and added to the public record.

If you have any questions relating to this proposal or would like to review the file, please call Kelsey Lindquist at 385-226-7227 between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday,

or via e-mail at Kelsey.lindquist@slcgov.com. The application details can be accessed at <https://citizenportal.slcgov.com/>, by selecting the “planning” tab and entering the petition numbers: PLNPCM2022-01138 & PLNPCM2022-01139.

People with disabilities may make requests for reasonable accommodation, which may include alternate formats, interpreters, and other auxiliary aids and services. Please make requests at least two business days in advance. To make a request, please contact the City Council Office at council.comments@slcgov.com, (801)535-7600, or relay service 711.



Zoning Amendment

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING

☐ Amend the text of the Zoning Ordinance ☒ Amend the Zoning Map

OFFICE USE ONLY

Received By:

Date Received:

Project #:

Name or Section/s of Zoning Amendment:

PLEASE PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION

Address of Subject Property (or Area):

1782 S 1600 E, Salt Lake City, UT 84105

Name of Applicant:

Blaine Properties, LLC

Phone:

Address of Applicant:

3440 S 3650 E, Salt Lake City, UT 84109

E-mail of Applicant:

Cell/Fax:

Applicant's Interest in Subject Property:

☒ Owner ☐ Contractor ☐ Architect ☐ Other:

Name of Property Owner (if different from applicant):

E-mail of Property Owner:

Phone:

Please note that additional information may be required by the project planner to ensure adequate information is provided for staff analysis. All information required for staff analysis will be copied and made public, including professional architectural or engineering drawings, for the purposes of public review by any interested party.

AVAILABLE CONSULTATION

If you have any questions regarding the requirements of this application, please contact Salt Lake City Planning Counter at zoning@slcgov.com prior to submitting the application.

REQUIRED FEE

Map Amendment: \$1,142 filing fee, plus \$121 per acre (excess of one acre), plus additional public notice fee.

Text Amendment: \$1,142 filing fee, plus additional public notice fee.

Public noticing fees will be assessed after the application is submitted.

SIGNATURE

➔ If applicable, a notarized statement of consent authorizing applicant to act as an agent will be required.

Signature of Owner or Agent:

Date:

12/5/2022

Stephanie Poulos-Arasi

dotloop verified
12/05/22 11:50 AM
MST
LVRK-BCFG-CF9K-JDRK

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RESPONSIBILITY

This is to certify that I am making an application for the described action by the City and that I am responsible for complying with all City requirements with regard to this request. This application will be processed under the name provided below. By signing the application, I am acknowledging that I have read and understood the instructions provided by Salt Lake City for processing this application. The documents and/or information I have submitted are true and correct to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the documents provided are considered public records and may be made available to the public. I understand that my application will not be processed until the application is deemed complete by the assigned planner from the Planning Division. I acknowledge that a complete application includes all of the required submittal requirements and provided documents comply with all applicable requirements for the specific applications. I understand that the Planning Division will provide, in writing, a list of deficiencies that must be satisfied for this application to be complete and it is the responsibility of the applicant to provide the missing or corrected information. I will keep myself informed of the deadlines for submission of material and the progress of this application. I understand that a staff report will be made available for my review prior to any public hearings or public meetings. This report will be on file and available at the Planning Division and posted on the Division website when it has been finalized.

APPLICANT SIGNATURE	
Name of Applicant: Blaine Properties, LLC	Application Type: Zoning Map Amendment
Mailing Address: 3440 S 3650 E, Salt Lake City, UT 84109	
Email: [REDACTED]	Phone: [REDACTED]
Signature: <i>Stephanie Poulos-Arasi</i> <small>dotloop verified 12/05/22 11:50 AM MST AIUC-YTHY-YZDP-XAKM</small>	Date: 12/5/2022

AFFIRMATION OF SUFFICIENT INTEREST

I hereby affirm that I am the fee title owner of the below described property or that I have written authorization from the owner to pursue the described action.

FEE TITLE OWNER SIGNATURE	
Legal Description of Subject Property: <small>BEG 152 FT S FR NE COR BLK 3, PROGRESS HEIGHTS SECOND ADD; W61.25 FT; N 2 FT; W 122.5 FT; S 131.35 FT; E 33.75 FT; N 110.32 FT; E 150 FT; N 20 FT, M OR L TO BEG, TOGETHER WITH 1/2 VACATED ALLEY ABUTTING ON S 4608-0466 6558-2952 6558-2954 6932-247 705</small>	
Name of Owner: Blaine Properties, LLC	
Mailing Address: 3440 S 3650 E, Salt Lake City, UT 84109	Street Address: 3440 S 3650 E, Salt Lake City, UT 84109
Signature: <i>Stephanie Poulos-Arasi</i> <small>dotloop verified 12/05/22 11:31 AM MST ZLHY-HYAY-UOLH-CBMZ</small>	Date: 12/5/2022

The following shall be provided if the name of the applicant is different than the name of the property owner:

1. If you are not the fee owner attach a copy of your authorization to pursue this action provided by the fee owner.
2. If a corporation is fee titleholder, attach copy of the resolution of the Board of Directors authorizing the action.
3. If a joint venture or partnership is the fee owner, attach a copy of agreement authorizing this action on behalf of the joint venture or partnership
4. If a Home Owner's Association is the applicant than the representative/president must attach a notarized letter stating they have notified the owners of the proposed application. A vote should be taken prior to the submittal and a statement of the outcome provided to the City along with the statement that the vote meets the requirements set forth in the CC&Rs.

Be advised that knowingly making a false, written statement to a government entity is a crime under Utah Code Chapter 76-8, Part 5. Salt Lake City will refer for prosecution any knowingly false representations made pertaining to the applicant's interest in the property that is the subject of this application.

SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

Staff Review

1. **Project Description** (please electronically attach additional sheets. See [Section 21A.50](#) for the Amendments ordinance.)

☐

A statement declaring the purpose for the amendment.

☐

A description of the proposed use of the property being rezoned.

☐

List the reasons why the present zoning may not be appropriate for the area.

☐

Is the request amending the Zoning Map?
If so, please list the parcel numbers to be changed.

☐

Is the request amending the text of the Zoning Ordinance?
If so, please include language and the reference to the Zoning Ordinance to be changed.

WHERE TO FILE THE COMPLETE APPLICATION

Apply online through the [Citizen Access Portal](#). There is a [step-by-step guide](#) to learn how to submit online.

INCOMPLETE APPLICATIONS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED



I acknowledge that Salt Lake City requires the items above to be submitted before my application can be processed. I understand that Planning will not accept my application unless all of the following items are included in the submittal package.



Master Plan Amendment

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING

☐ Amend the text of the Master Plan ☒ Amend the Land Use Map

OFFICE USE ONLY

Received By:

Date Received:

Project #:

Name of Master Plan Amendment:

PLEASE PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION

Address of Subject Property (or Area):

1782 S 1600 E, Salt Lake City, UT 84105

Name of Applicant:

Blaine Properties, LLC

Phone:

Address of Applicant:

3440 S 3650 E, Salt Lake City, UT 84105

E-mail of Applicant:

Cell/Fax:

Applicant's Interest in Subject Property:

☒ Owner ☐ Contractor ☐ Architect ☐ Other:

Name of Property Owner (if different from applicant):

E-mail of Property Owner:

Phone:

Please note that additional information may be required by the project planner to ensure adequate information is provided for staff analysis. All information required for staff analysis will be copied and made public, including professional architectural or engineering drawings, for the purposes of public review by any interested party.

AVAILABLE CONSULTATION

Planners are available for consultation prior to submitting this application. Please email zoning@slcgov.com if you have any questions regarding the requirements of this application.

REQUIRED FEE

Filing fee of \$1070 plus \$121 per acre in excess of one acre.

Plus, additional fee for mailed public notices. Mailing fees will be assessed after application is submitted.

SIGNATURE

➔ If applicable, a notarized statement of consent authorizing applicant to act as an agent will be required.

Signature of Owner or Agent:

Date:

Stephanie Poulos-Arrasi

dotloop verified
12/05/22 11:26 AM MST
5GOL-RX3-E7GQ-DMHS

12/5/2022

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RESPONSIBILITY

This is to certify that I am making an application for the described action by the City and that I am responsible for complying with all City requirements with regard to this request. This application will be processed under the name provided below. By signing the application, I am acknowledging that I have read and understood the instructions provided by Salt Lake City for processing this application. The documents and/or information I have submitted are true and correct to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the documents provided are considered public records and may be made available to the public. I understand that my application will not be processed until the application is deemed complete by the assigned planner from the Planning Division. I acknowledge that a complete application includes all of the required submittal requirements and provided documents comply with all applicable requirements for the specific applications. I understand that the Planning Division will provide, in writing, a list of deficiencies that must be satisfied for this application to be complete and it is the responsibility of the applicant to provide the missing or corrected information. I will keep myself informed of the deadlines for submission of material and the progress of this application. I understand that a staff report will be made available for my review prior to any public hearings or public meetings. This report will be on file and available at the Planning Division and posted on the Division website when it has been finalized.

APPLICANT SIGNATURE	
Name of Applicant: Blaine Properties, LLC	Application Type: Master Plan Amendent
Mailing Address: 3440 S 3650 E, Salt Lake City, UT 84105	
Email: [REDACTED]	Phone: [REDACTED]
Signature: <i>Stephanie Poulos-Arasi</i> <small>dotloop verified 12/05/22 11:26 AM MST WB3H-DTAT-RK96-OBAN</small>	Date: 12/5/2022

AFFIRMATION OF SUFFICIENT INTEREST

I hereby affirm that I am the fee title owner of the below described property or that I have written authorization from the owner to pursue the described action.

FEE TITLE OWNER SIGNATURE

Legal Description of Subject Property: BEG 152 FT S FR NE COR BLK 3, PROGRESS HEIGHTS SECOND ADD; W61.25 FT; N 2 FT; W 122.5 FT; S 131.35 FT; E 33.75 FT; N 110.32 FT; E 150 FT; N 20 FT, M OR L TO BEG, TOGETHER WITH 1/2 VACATED ALLEY ABUTTING ON S 4608-0466 6558-2952 6558-2954 6932-247 705	
Name of Owner: Blaine Properties, LLC	
Mailing Address: 3440 S 3650 E, Salt Lake City, UT 84105	Street Address: 3440 S 3650 E, Salt Lake City, UT 84105
Signature: <i>Stephanie Poulos-Arasi</i> <small>dotloop verified 12/05/22 11:26 AM MST IKDX-YY6R-NGBT-7FH3</small>	Date: 12/5/2022

The following shall be provided if the name of the applicant is different than the name of the property owner:

1. If you are not the fee owner attach a copy of your authorization to pursue this action provided by the fee owner.
2. If a corporation is fee titleholder, attach copy of the resolution of the Board of Directors authorizing the action.
3. If a joint venture or partnership is the fee owner, attach a copy of agreement authorizing this action on behalf of the joint venture or partnership
4. If a Home Owner's Association is the applicant than the representative/president must attach a notarized letter stating they have notified the owners of the proposed application. A vote should be taken prior to the submittal and a statement of the outcome provided to the City along with the statement that the vote meets the requirements set forth in the CC&Rs.

Be advised that knowingly making a false, written statement to a government entity is a crime under Utah Code Chapter 76-8, Part 5. Salt Lake City will refer for prosecution any knowingly false representations made pertaining to the applicant's interest in the property that is the subject of this application.

SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

Staff Review

1. Project Description (please attach additional sheets electronically.)

- | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Describe the proposed master plan amendment. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | A statement declaring the purpose for the amendment. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Declare why the present master plan requires amending. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Is the request amending the Land Use Map?
If so, please list the parcel numbers to be changed. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Is the request amending the text of the master plan?
If so, please include exact language to be changed. |

WHERE TO FILE THE COMPLETE APPLICATION

Apply online through the [Citizen Access Portal](#). There is a [step-by-step guide](#) to learn how to submit online.

INCOMPLETE APPLICATIONS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED



I acknowledge that Salt Lake City requires the items above to be submitted before my application can be processed.
I understand that Planning will not accept my application unless all of the following items are included in the submittal package.

Property Identification

The subject parcel is a .17-acre property located at 1782 South 1600 East (the “Subject Property”) owned by Blaine Properties LLC (the “Applicant”). The Property is what would commonly be referred to as a “flag lot” in that its frontage (on 1600 east) is long and narrow with a more substantial rectangular portion at its southeast. The Property is recognized by the Salt Lake County Recorder’s Office as Parcel 16163280240000.

While identified as a distinct parcel in County records, Salt Lake City does not recognize the Property as such. The Subject Property is adjacent to another property owned by the Applicant (the “Blaine Property”). The Blaine Property is a .21-acre lot with a duplex. For purposes of land-use designation Salt Lake City considers the Subject Property and the Blaine Property to be one cohesive lot. Both Properties are depicted in *Figure 1*.



Figure 1: Salt Lake County Parcel Map.

The Subject Property Highlighted in Yellow. The Blaine Property Highlighted in Red.

Whether using the City’s designation as one unitary lot or the county’s designation as two distinct lots, it is clear the Subject Property is uniquely configured and irregular in the neighborhood.

The Master Plan Amendment (“MPA”) and Zoning Map Amendment (“ZMA”) applications are expressly for the parameters of the Subject Property and do not include the Blaine Property.

Existing Uses and Conditions

The Subject Property currently has three predominant uses: **1)** It houses a 750 sqft shade structure and roughly half of a 1300 sqft accessory garage (the remaining garage footprint is located within the Blaine Property lot¹), **2)** It is used by residents of the Blaine Property to access the accessory garage, and **3)** it is used as a vehicular access to another adjacent lot's accessory garage² (1580 E Blaine Avenue).

Harkening to the “Flag Lot” descriptor, the “pole” is asphalted for vehicular passage and the “flag” contains the shade structure and is otherwise vacant and sodded.

Purpose for the Amendment

The MPA and ZMA are being proposed to provide a higher and better use for the Subject Property than is currently existing or could feasibly be arranged under the current R-1-7000 designation.

The Subject Property is currently used for vehicular storage, accessing parking stalls, and quite frankly not much else. The vacant portion of the lot is unused by the owner or its tenants and its value as “open space” is negligible, in that it is surrounded by private properties and built features.

The location, size, and shape of the Subject Property lends itself well for the construction of a modest single-family home. A small home on the lot would provide the applicant an opportunity to transform this unused space to one that shelters and houses one new family unit in a beautiful existing neighborhood.

Though the applicant's proposal is modest and reasonable on a property of this size and location, the execution of such a goal has been set back by various impediments in the city process and barriers created by zoning and master plan regulations.

History of Impediments and Current Zoning Barriers

The Subject Property is certainly unique and unprecedented within the area. Its current configuration is the result of a long history starting in 1919 when the original Progressive Heights subdivision was subdivided. In 1951 Progressive Heights was further subdivided which created three unique lots now known as 1572, 1580, and 1586 Blaine Avenue. Following the latest subdivision, the Subject Lot was issued a distinct Parcel Number in the same year.

From 1951-1957, the Subject Lot was left vacant. On May 22nd, 1957, the Subject Lot was forfeited to Salt Lake County pursuant to a tax sale for failure to pay property taxes.

In 1977, Salt Lake County sold the Subject Property under its separate Parcel #1616328024 to the then-owners of 1572 Blaine Avenue, namely, David T. and Dorothy L. Cates. In 1985 the Cates' applied to build a garage on the Blaine Property to be used for the Duplex on the same property. The garage was ultimately built straddling the common property line of the Subject Property and the Blaine Property. There is no evidence that the Cates intended to merge the properties together by this encroachment.

¹ The overlapping nature of the accessory garage structure's footprint has been identified as a reason the City considers the Subject Property and the Blaine Property to be “merged” as a unitary lot.

² There is no formal easement on record for this access. However, the Applicant does not contest this access, nor would a re-zone or subsequent development hinder this access. In the event a plat amendment is recorded the applicant would be in favor of memorializing the access as a recorded easement.

In 1999, the then-owner Mark Huber applied for and received a permit to build a small single-family home on the Subject Lot. Within a week of being issued the building permit, neighbors upset about a new home being constructed adjacent to them, complained to the City, and requested a stop work order. The city subsequently issued the stop work order to review if the Subject Property was legally buildable. The Zoning Administrator reviewed the Subject Property specifications and zoning ordinances and determined that the Subject Property did not legally exist and first introduced the notion that the Subject Property and the Blaine Property were one lot.

Huber then appealed the Zoning Administrator's decision to the Board of Adjustments (the "BOA"). In the July 19th, 1999 hearing, a contingent of neighbors who were opposed to the building of a home on the Subject Property were represented by an attorney. The attorney introduced the idea of a "lot merger" having occurred with the previous construction of the detached garage. After other public comment from neighbors opposed to any development, the BOA unanimously voted to uphold the administrative decision, not to recognize the Subject Property as an independent lot, and to restrict any development of a new single-family dwelling.

To memorialize the BOA's decision an Abstract of Findings and Order was recorded over the property to notice that the Subject Property "is not an independent lot and may not be developed with a new single-family dwelling". This ruling by the BOA has since become a barrier to reimagining the Subject Property's land-use and highest and best use.

After the ruling Huber ceased his efforts to develop the Subject Property and did not submit an appeal to the BOA's decision. Eventually, on February 25th, 2014 both the Blaine Property and the Subject Property were purchased by the applicant.

Like Huber, the applicant recognized the Subject Property as an ideal opportunity for the development of a humble single-family home structure. The applicant reached out to Salt Lake City Planning Department to explore the possibility of seeking a land-use redesignation. It was at this point where the applicant became aware of the history of the site and the BOA decision of 1999. In an effort to unwind the decision the applicant requested an Administrative Interpretation to determine whether the Subject Property is a legal complying parcel and a buildable lot.

On September 9th, 2020 staff determined that they were unable to evaluate whether the BOA made a legal or correct decision. Given that the BOA decision of 1999 was never appealed by Huber, staff found that the decision remains in effect and that the property could not be developed independently.

On September 18th, 2020 the applicant submitted an Appeal of Decision before Planning and Zoning arguing that the BOA decision 1) should be available for review and appeal and 2) that the BOA decision was legally incorrect. This appeal went before the Salt Lake City Land Use Appeals Hearing Officer who on December 22nd, 2020 issued his ruling to uphold the decision of the September 9th, 2020 Administrative interpretation.

In his ruling the Hearing Officer was sympathetic to the first issue argued by the applicant, namely, that the 1999 BOA decision could be challenged and plausibly overturned. The officer also questioned his authority to overturn a decision by a BOA (that no longer exists).

With the latest land-use decision rendered the applicant reached out to city planning staff to see what processes exist to revisit and petition the "non-developable" status of the Subject Property. Two options

were given 1) Appeal the decision to the Third District Court, or 2) Submit a MPA and ZMA to rezone the subject property.

The applicant has elected to pursue option two with this application for MPA and ZMA. If this petition is granted the applicant will be required to submit a Planned Development (“PD”) and Preliminary Subdivision application before any development of the Subject Property. The applicant understands that the PD application could be run concurrently with the MPA and ZMA, however, due to monetary constraints, the applicant is electing to only petition the MPA and ZMA at this time.

Description of the Proposed Use of the Property

The property is tucked inside a typical single-family and two-family neighborhood. While lots in the neighborhood more or less conform to Low Density Residential R-1-7 zone characteristics there is a variety of housing types and massing in the area. The property is best suited for a small-scale single-family residence.

While no design decisions have been made the property is of ample size to provide space for a small footprint custom or modular home structure.

Reasons why the Present Zoning is not Appropriate for the Area

The applicant does not dispute that the R-1-7 zone is appropriate for the area at large. For the vast majority of the neighborhood blocks the dimensional standards have efficiently distributed properties with a proper balance of living spaces and open spaces. The R-1-7 has proven to be a value to the community as a rule, but it is desperately lacking in usability for exceptions.

The Progress Heights Second Addition subdivision is more than 70 years old, and its current lot configuration has changed immensely since its initial subdivision. While the plat has never been formally amended, lots have been combined and a midblock alleys have been vacated in what surprisingly has resulted in a fairly typical neighborhood residential pattern.



Figure 2: Portion of Progress Heights Second Addition Plat contrasted with current site condition.

The only exception to a typical lot in the plat is the Subject Lot. Its peculiar historical circumstances have left this as the only “flag lot” and only “un-developable” building lot in the entire Progress Heights Second Addition Plat.

Exceptions like this lot can be found in various historical neighborhoods throughout the city where development occurred before processes were more formalized and zoning as stringent. Where these unique parcels are of adequate size and dimension, they should not be blocked perpetually from development, but should rather be granted thoughtful consideration to see how they can be developed to their highest and best use while maintaining general neighborhood character.

Thankfully the applicant has identified a city zoning designation that seems to address this exact exceptional situation. The SR-3 special pattern residential provides for lot, bulk and use regulations, including a variety of housing types, in scale with the character of development located within the interior portions of city blocks. This zone has been used liberally in the city to provide land-use to uniquely located properties where use of the surrounding zoning restrictions would render a site undevelopable.



Figure 3: SR-3 Interior Block Examples Shown in Yellow

The SR-3 is a designation that recognizes that unique properties should be given unique considerations and that “spot zoning” is not a pejorative but rather a tool for land-use efficiency. SR-3 is definitionally a different zone than its surrounding properties for the purpose of dealing with distinctive site location.

Because the property is located midblock in a flagging composition it is petitioned that the lot be reclassified. The request is to amend the Future Land Use Map from Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential. Along with this, the requested zone change is from R-1-7000 to that of the SR-3 zone.

Consistency with City Objectives

Salt Lake City has made significant commitments to providing a broad array of responses to the housing shortage crisis. City master plans such as *Plan Salt Lake* and *Growing SLC: A Five Year Plan* have clearly established objectives to increase housing where it makes sense and can be of minimal impact to the community.

Plan Salt Lake specifically supports, “Promot(ing) infill and redevelopment of underutilized land” (PSL pg.19), “Increas(ing) the number of medium density housing types and options” and “Enabl(ing) moderate density increases within existing neighborhoods where appropriate” (PSL pg. 21).

By designating the property SR-3, a medium density zone, a property that has been restricted for development can be made viable to build a modest single-family home.

Growing SLC seems to be speaking directly to the subject property when it reads “Apart from traditional infill ordinances, responding to the unusual age, form, and shape of housing stock should be addressed and leveraged to add incremental density...” (GSL pg. 19) *Growing SLC* specifically addresses small courtyard cottages and bungalows as “Missing Middle Housing” and prioritizes “finding a place for these (missing middle housing) types throughout the city...”.

This petition is in line with *Growing SLC* in “finding a place” for missing middle housing. Small infill opportunities such as that presented by the Subject Property should be considered individually to see if they can responsibly include more housing or development otherwise. The city’s current objectives are to eliminate certain barriers that have historically and reflexively been put upon properties that don’t fit neatly into usual neighborhood characteristics. “Exacerbating the housing crisis are local barriers to housing development. These barriers, such as density limitations, prohibitions on different types of housing, and other development regulations, have contributed in part to a general supply deficit and economic segregation” (GSL pg. 11).

Conclusion

Even a cursory review of the site conditions of the Subject Property indicate that it is clearly an appropriate site for a modest single-family residence. It is only in review of the existing zoning designation and the recorded Abstract of Findings that anyone would consider this lot “un-buildable”. To step back and consider this logic is to find that there are no physical and practical constraints but only legal and definitional constraints.

The history of the Abstract of Findings shows that the reasons for the barrier to development were not only supported by but wholly introduced by an attorney representing a NIMBY contingent. The language that is memorialized in the Abstract of Findings has for many years obstructed any commonsense development of this infill lot.

Fortunately, there is a method to restore a commonsense and higher and better use for the property. That is to redesignate the lot to the SR-3 zone. The zone recognizes that unique properties can be dealt with more nuance than would otherwise be available by simple consultation of the surrounding zoning limitations.

The applicant recognizes that one new infill cottage home will have negligible effects on the housing crisis. However, it will also have no real negative effects on the neighborhood that it finds itself in. Rather it will provide one new home that can house one more family and be of an immense value to those who will one day live in it.

The applicant implores the Planning Staff and the Planning Commission to consider this Petition to redesignate the Subject Property from R-1-7000 to SR-3.

EXHIBIT

- Public Comments in support of development on Subject Property from December 10th, 2020 Appeal of a Decision Hearing

From: [REDACTED]
To: Lindquist, Kelsey
Subject: (EXTERNAL) comment for appeal hearing 1782 S. 1600 East
Date: Tuesday, December 8, 2020 9:09:42 PM

Please enter my comments into the appeal hearing for the property at 1782 S. 1600 E. in Salt Lake City.

Salt Lake City has determined that this is not a legal complying lot and therefore a single-family detached dwelling could not be built on it. SLC is using outdated zoning rules from 20+ years ago which is restricting the applicant in making better use of this space for new affordable housing. Statewide we are down at least 50,000 units of affordable housing and at this point in time we have less than 900 properties for sale on the WFRMLS in Salt Lake County and we are in an extreme housing crisis that is not going to get better as more people move to Utah than leave.

It is my belief that the applicant and her plans for the site are stellar and completely reasonable and will not adversely affect the surrounding properties in any way and the change/addition of this plan will add diversity and affordability. The NIMBY mindset cannot exist when people can't afford to buy homes and live in the neighborhoods where their parents abide and where they may want to send their children to school. Portland's City Council has thrown out single family zoning altogether due to the extreme housing crisis in Oregon and the lack of affordable housing opportunities.

I fully support the applicant and her plan for this property. I've sold thousands of homes in this valley and served for 8 years as a Planning and Zoning Commissioner and Chair of that Commission. I see nothing that upsets the cart in her intentions and hope that SLC sees this application as a chance to update old regulations that inhibit growth and diversity in our neighborhoods.

	<p>Babs De Lay Principal Broker/Owner 37 years 801.201.8824 babs@urbanutah.com member Salt Lake AND Washington County Boards of REALTORS Historic Landmarks Commissioner, SLC Secretary, Utah Girl Scout Council Board</p>	<p>Upstairs at the Gateway 102 S. Rio Grande St. Salt Lake City, Ut 84101</p> 
---	---	---

From: scott mikkelsen
To: Lindquist, Kelsey
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Appeal Hearing for 1572 East Blaine and 1782 South 1600 East
Date: Thursday, December 10, 2020 10:45:34 AM

To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing this email regarding the appeal of the Administrative Interpretation PLNZAD2020-00585 and the two parcels located at 1572 E Blaine Ave and 1782 S 1600 E. I have known the property owner and her family for over two decades and the negative comments about their dishonesty and desire to be sneaky and deceitful couldn't be falser. The owner and her family are people of faith and integrity and I'm disappointed that some would imply otherwise. The family has been deeply rooted into the Salt Lake Valley for generations and share the same concerns that other residents of the community have. It's no secret that housing values have skyrocketed and that the need for affordable housing has existed for a long time. What the property owner is asking for is no different than what most of us would do for our children if we could. Young adults were out priced of the Sugar House community a long time ago and the property owner's desire is to provide an affordable way for her son to construct a home of his own so that he might be able to establish his own roots and raise a family in a community so sought after. He desires the same things that others have mention in their comments of opposition. It appears that the follow up pertaining to anything in the past was lacking from the City or the past owner and it was all well before the current owner purchased the property.

I just recently retired from Salt Lake City after 33 years. The current Zoning Ordinance was adopted in April of 1995. During my career and since the adoption of the current ordinance the land use needs of the City have constantly been changing requiring amendments and even new types of land uses. Regulations have been adopted that allow for smaller infill lots to be developed, for reduce off street parking requirements in multi-family buildings in the 9th & 9th area and to allow for ADU's in areas with single family zones just to name a few. I would hear the opposition to the changes often and the concerns expressed in opposition to this appeal are the same that citizens express in other communities. There are no single-family homes constructed in Salt Lake City without off street parking so it's unfair to complain about any on street parking problems as reason for any denial. Because Salt Lake City is a metropolitan area the sky is well lit throughout the valley and star gazing or mountain view obstructions should be given no consideration. We all appreciate both, but we chose to live in the City. Right now, the parcel is just a vacant lot and not so-called "open space". I own property at 954 S 800 E and I can look in any direction and find lots throughout the area that at one time were too narrow or too small to be developed. Now, because of amendments to the current Zoning Ordinance single family homes are being constructed. The vacant lots prior to the changes just created blight and always had the potential for attracting the wrong element such as the homeless camps that usually always create a big nuisance. After

operation Rio Grande Street the tents and camps were no longer along 500 West. Instead, they popped up on vacant lots throughout, including next to the SLC Country Club. **I'm in favor of allowing the property owner to develop the parcel.** Not just because she's a friend but also because it would be in-line with the City's desire for more affordable housing and a single-family home would be an improvement over a vacant parcel.

Respectfully,

Scott Mikkelsen

Kelsey Lindquist
C/O Salt Lake City Planning Department
Kelsey.lindquist@slcgov.com

Dear Ms. Lindquist,

This letter/email is in support of the appeal dated December 4th, 2020 by Stephanie Aarrasi to allow the property historically a separate parcel from her duplex property to be utilized fully.

Having been involved in Salt Lake City planning issues for over fifty years as a member of the Salt Lake City Red Lining committee under Ted Wilson, on the Historic Landmarks Committee for a number of years, on the Sugar House Community Council for many years its chair and the chair of the POST committee, vice chair of the Sugar House Park Authority, as well as the chair of the Downtown Preservation and Development Committee formed by Mayor Wilson to research and protect historic properties in the central downtown area and the committee that did the rezoning of much of the Salt Lake I have some background in this subject.

I have lived in the Sugar House and Avenues areas for over 50 years. I have watched the neighborhoods change (sometimes for the better but other times not).

This property should be developed for the following reasons:

- It is a viable lot in its own right;
 - Development would remove a weedy blight from the neighborhood;
 - There have been many exceptions to the various “carved in stone” ordinances over the years;
 - Right up the street from this property is the Cottages development. The neighbors fought tooth and nail to stop that development because it was “too narrow” to build on and the lots would overlook adjacent neighbors’ properties. The neighborhood now have greater value and no weedy eye sore to see.
 - On the corner of 23rd East and Clayborne there was a .05 Acre piece of property,
 - **Parcel # 16271290020000** owned by the County that all the adjoining neighbors complained. The County sold the property and even though it was an uneven, triangular piece, gave permission to build the home still standing there.
 - **We allow accessory buildings on most residential properties now. Many of those have the same issues as this appeal has and yet because they come under different guidelines they are allowed.**
-
- **The center of Sugar House is a testament to the changes the City has allowed to the Sugar House Master Plan.**

I could add to the above list but go back in my files. I did not know of this appeal until today and I have no further time now.

I support this appeal.

Thank You for Your Time
Grace Sperry
2654 S. 1300 East
Salt Lake City, UT 84106

December 8, 2020

Mr. Anthony Arrasi
Realtor, Berkshire Hathaway
HomeServices Utah Properties
6340 South 3000 East, Suite 600
Salt Lake City, Utah 84121

Dear Anthony,

You have contacted me and asked for my recollection of a 1999 Board of Adjustment land use decision that involved a property situated at 1572 East Blaine Avenue in Salt Lake City. I understand that, today, you own that property and also the adjacent property to the north with the address 1782 South 1600 East.

This case was 21 years ago. My memory of the Board's action on the property at 1782 South 1600 East is a bit dim. I am unsure if I actually voted on the determination. The Chair would not vote on a case unless needed to constitute a quorum and to conduct the public's business as posted.

I served 11½ years on the Board of Adjustment for Salt Lake City from February 1, 1990 until September 1, 2001. I then served nine years on the City's Planning Commission until June 8, 2010. During the last 8½ years on the Board of Adjustment, I served as the Chair. I was Chair in 1999 when the matter you referenced came before the Board.

The Board would meet every three weeks – on average – during the years I served on the Board. Members considered an average of 10 cases each meeting. In total, each year, members heard well over 100 cases. And during my 11½ years on the Board, I considered over 1,000 cases.

The Board was primarily concerned with land use disputes and decisions. Members voted on questions involving conditional uses and special exceptions as well as decisions made by a hearing officer.

This 1999 case involved the land use question of an interpretation of a "merger" involving two existing structures and adjacent properties – one at the 1782 South 1600 address, and the other a property at 1572 Blaine Avenue. Seemingly, each property would have (as you have indicated) separate legal descriptions and separate tax ID numbers.

Good people can disagree on interpretations on questions of land use. When in doubt, Board members would vote to uphold the staff report and the presentation of planning staff. As I have said, I joined the Board in 1990, and I do not have knowledge of Board of Adjustment decisions prior to that year.

I understand that you are now the owner of the property in question, and that you have inherited a 1999 decision that may constitute a governmental hardship that is no longer justifiable under the City's 2020 evolving standards for development in existing neighborhoods.

I understand that you are petitioning to have the Board's decision on this property re-opened. This is understandable. You have the legal right to do so, and the City's general plan for increasing residential development in existing neighborhoods has changed significantly in the past two decades.

I would encourage you to confer with Planning Division staff members. Seemingly, the question I would ask is: If you, as the property owner, were to remove the accessory structure that appears to connect the two properties, then would there no longer constitute a questionable "lot merger?"

Given changing circumstances and evolving Salt Lake City Government land use standards and the City's general plan for increased population growth in existing neighborhoods, I am in total support of your effort to have this matter re-opened.

Good luck to you.

Sincerely,

Tim Chambless



From: ayyoob abbaszadeh
To: Lindquist, Kelsey
Subject: (EXTERNAL) Regarding 1782 south 1600 east property
Date: Tuesday, December 8, 2020 6:49:55 PM

To Whom It May Concern,

My name is Ayyoob Abbaszadeh, and I live on 1916 S 1600 E. I was walking around the neighborhood the other day and noticed a sign on 1600 E for an appeal meeting pertaining to the property at 1782 S 1600 E. I went home to review both the staff report and the applicants appeal information. After reading both, it is my opinion that the Planning Division should work with the applicant to accommodate a home on the lot, whether that be allowing the property owner to go through the rezone process if necessary, or granting a conditional use permit. I'm an engineer, and have worked on many new homes over the years. As a Sugar House resident, there's no question that we need more types of affordable housing in this area instead of large apartment buildings and other projects. It seems to me that the applicant's intent most probably is consistent with the city's master plan of developing infill lots for more housing. I love the idea of having a home on this property and think it would increase the neighborhood's value. I hope the hearing officer will take into consideration the needs of SLC's increasing population and our low home inventory when making a decision.

Regards

Ayyoob Abbaszadeh

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

December 10, 2020

Kelsey Lindquist
Senior Planner
Salt Lake City Planning Division

RE: Petition Number PLNAPP2020-00725

Ms. Lindquist,

I am writing in support of the referenced petition. I am a neighbor and landowner residing at 1487 South 1600 East, having lived at this location for over 31 years.

It is my understanding that the intended development and use of this property as a single family residence conforms to neighborhood standards and would meet the current goals of Salt Lake City in that it would add additional low cost housing in an area where there is a high demand for such.

Please register this letter in support of the Appeal. I will attend the virtual Appeals Hearing this evening.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Phillip S. Floer".

1487 South 1600 East

Salt Lake City, Utah 84105



Anthony Arrasi

1782 S 1600 E - Arrasi Lot

MICHAEL WOLFE

Thu, Mar 18, 2021 at 9:32 PM

To: Anthony Arrasi

To Whom it may concern:

I spent some time today with Anthony and Stepheni Arrasi today, in order to assess the feasibility of them building a new home on their vacant lot in Sugarhouse. I have lived in Salt Lake City my entire life and have been in Sugarhouse 15 years. I believe that the project they are proposing is worthwhile and possess little to no impact on the Neighborhood. The lot is plenty large to accommodate a home of 1500 to 2000 feet. The lots around the subject property are deep and open. The existing structures could be incorporated into a project in such a way as to not alter views of surrounding neighbors. Infill housing of this nature is needed in the area. A home on this lot would be welcomed in Sugarhouse.

Michael K Wolfe
Downtown Self Storage Inc President
1538 Downingtown Ave
Salt Lake City Ut. 84105

March 18, 2021

To whom it may concern;

I'm writing to enter my comments into the appeal hearing for the property located at 1782 South 1600 East in Salt Lake City.

I own an investment property about a third a mile north on 1600 East and have been a Realtor for almost 30 years.

I support the property owner's petition to build a reasonable-sized, single-family home the flag-lot they own.

Looking at the property it seems like a logical thing to do. We are greatly in need of additional housing and need far fewer non-food-producing plots that require costly irrigation and maintenance.

The family has invested, and paid taxes in, this area for a long time and they're really just looking to have each other nearby. I think that particular behavior should be supported whenever possible and natural.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Melanie Soules
Principal Broker
Hard-Working Homes





Anthony Arrasi [REDACTED]

Fwd: letter**Polly** [REDACTED]

To: Anthony Arrasi [REDACTED]

Sat, Mar 20, 2021 at 10:31 AM

Begin forwarded message:

From: [REDACTED]**Subject:** 1782 South 1600 East SLC, Ut**Date:** March 20, 2021 at 9:57:16 AM MDT**To:** [REDACTED]

Good afternoon,

My name is Tab Cornelison, I am in favor of Salt Lake City approving the Arrasi family's plan to build a home on this site. It seems to me that building a house is far better than allowing weeds to grow on this property. I own a house on the 1600 block of Wilson Ave. There is certainly a housing shortage for this type of home and I feel that building a home on this site would be a welcome addition to the neighborhood. So with this idea, granting this approval is a positive thing for the neighborhood and for property values in the surrounding areas.

Thank you.

Tab

Tab Cornelison | Senior Vice President
CBRE | Office Properties
222 South Main Street, 4th Floor | Salt Lake City, UT 84101
T 801 869 8037 | F 801 869 8080 | C 801 597 5552
tab.cornelison@cbre.com | www.cbre.com/tab.cornelison

-
Connect with me on [LinkedIn](#) [Twitter](#)

Follow CBRE: [Facebook](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Google+](#)

-
-
[Click here to visit our team website](#)

Follow CBRE: [Facebook](#) | [@cbre](#) | [Google+](#)



Anthony Arrasi <aarrasi@gmail.com>

1782 S 1600 E**Kosmo Androulidakis/Pacific/Brenntag** [REDACTED]

Wed, Apr 7, 2021 at 4:15 PM

To: Anthony Arrasi [REDACTED]

Cc: Kosmo Androulidakis/Pacific/Brenntag <[REDACTED]>

From: Kosmo Androulidakis/Pacific/Brenntag [REDACTED]**Sent:** Wednesday, April 7, 2021 4:09 PM**To:** Anthony Arrasi <aarrasi@gmail.com>**Subject:** RE: [EXTERNAL]1782 S 1600 E

To Whom it may concern,

As a property owner in Sugarhouse in the 15th and 15th area, I want to make a few comments regarding the property located at 1782 S. 1600 E in SLC, Utah. I support the property owner's plans to build on this lot. It is suitable for building a single family home on it. In addition, we are in a housing crises with hardly any inventory on the market due to the influx of people moving to our state. I feel that building a home on the lot is better than leaving it vacant and would be welcome in the Sugarhouse neighborhood. It just make sense to allow the Arrasi family to build a home on this site.

Kosmo Androulidakis**Account Manager****Brenntag Pacific Inc.**

2334 West Directors Row

Salt Lake City, UT 84104

Cell: 801-550-0652

Phone: 801-975-1770

ConnectingChemistry



Anthony Arrasi [REDACTED]

Arrasi empty lot

1 message

Dale Aramaki [REDACTED]

Wed, Apr 7, 2021 at 2:04 PM

To: [REDACTED]

To whom it may concern,

My name is Dale Aramaki and I am in favor of Salt Lake City allowing the Arrasi's to build a family home in the vacant Sugarhouse lot. As someone who owns two homes in Sugarhouse and two businesses I know the Arrasi's newest addition to Sugarhouse would be a welcomed one. It is a better image to have another family home in the neighborhood that will positively contribute to the community than an empty lot.

Dale Aramaki owner
Uptown Service station

--

Dale Aramaki

Owner
Uptown Service LLC
2276 East 2100 South
Salt Lake City, Utah 84109
[REDACTED]

4. Public Comments Received After Staff Report Publication

From: [Grace Sperry](#)
To: [Lindquist, Kelsey](#)
Subject: (EXTERNAL) PLNPCM2022-01138 & PLNPCM2022-01139
Date: Wednesday, April 26, 2023 12:47:40 PM

Caution: This is an external email. Please be cautious when clicking links or opening attachments.

PLNPCM2022-01138 & PLNPCM2022-01139

Dear Kelsey and Elizabeth,

I had planned to attend this evening's meeting but due to a recent death in my family, will not be able to do so.

Therefore, I am writing to recommend that Anthony Arrassi's request to build a single family home on his property be approved.

I have watched over the years many unusual properties being approved for single family use or commercial use in the Westminster and Sugarhouse neighborhoods. A case in point would be the four homes recently built on the property at 2660 South Highland Drive. None of those homes are on more acreage than the Arrassi proposed home and all overlook the surrounding homes and all have very small driveways leading to the garages.

All those homes are now benefitting the neighborhood and raising the value of the properties in the area.

This new single family home would do likewise.

Please grant this request for permission to build a new single family home at 1782 S. 1600 East, Salt Lake City, UT .

Thank You,
Grace Sperry

Former Chair of the Sugar House Community Council and Former Chair of the Sugar House Community Council Land Use and Zoning Sub-Committee.

Grace Sperry



Realtor, Broker Associate, CRS, CIPS

Berkshire Hathaway HomeServices Utah Properties

Ph: 801-824-5019

Email: gracesperry@bhhsutah.com

This e-mail and any attachments are confidential and may be protected by legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of this e-mail or any attachment is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please



SLC NEIGHBORS
FOR MORE NEIGHBORS

Board of Directors

Adan Carillo

Alessandro Rigolon

Atticus Edwards

Christian Harrison

Jordan Atkin

Matthew Morriss

McCall Christensen

Rosa Bandeirinha

Staff

Turner Bitton

Executive Director

801-564-3860

turner@slcneighbors.org

April 24, 2023

Kelsey Lindquist
Senior Planner
Salt Lake City Planning Division

RE: Petition Number PLNAPP2020-00725

Dear Ms. Lindquist,

It is my pleasure to submit this letter on behalf of SLC Neighbors for More Neighbors. SLC Neighbors for More Neighbors is a network of Salt Lake City residents working for affordable housing for all income levels through policies that are pro-housing and pro-tenant.

We are writing in support of the proposed rezone request for the subject property.

We believe that this rezone request is illustrative of unfair and inconsistent application of land use policy to restrict access to desirable neighborhoods such as Sugarhouse. We believe that it is absurd to defer to a master plan established 22 years ago to dictate the future of a property that could provide much needed housing in a highly desirable area of the city.

We further believe that while the subject property is unique, it is deserving of a more valuable purpose than providing off street parking.

Salt Lake City's forthcoming Housing SLC plan and the Thriving in Place study provide two policy goals that we believe support the development of housing on this unique lot. Specifically:

1) Housing SLC Goal Alignment #1: Increase opportunities for homeownership and other wealth and equity building opportunities for low to moderate income households.

Based on the size of the subject property, the likelihood that the home constructed will be smaller means that it will likely be more affordable than other properties in the neighborhood. This provides an opportunity for lower income or first-time homebuyers to establish roots in the neighborhood. The construction of this type of infill housing promotes stability in the neighborhood and will make our whole city stronger.

2) Thriving in Place Alignment: Increase housing everywhere.

The subject property also aligns with the findings of the Thriving in Place study which found that housing of all kinds is needed citywide. The existing master plan for the area was written at a time with significantly less pressure in the housing market than there is today. We believe that the master plan is detached from



the current reality and that any reasonable reading of current city needs would indicate the need for infill housing such as this proposal. Most other master plans in the city call for infill housing and pointing to a document approved 22 years ago as a basis for a decision about future housing goals fails to address the significant need for more housing.

Furthermore, to continue to allow the subject property to languish with no valuable purpose harms the future of the neighborhood.

We encourage the Salt Lake City Planning Commission to forward a favorable recommendation to the Salt Lake City Council as a matter of fairness and reflecting the significant need for new housing in Salt Lake City. While this proposal will not solve Salt Lake City's housing crisis, it is indicative of how neighborhoods with significant resources can constrain the housing supply citywide resulting in areas with fewer resources bearing the brunt of a growing city.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Turner Bitton'.

Turner Bitton
Executive Director
SLC Neighbors for More Neighbors

NEOFITOS ARCHITECTS

April 25, 2023

Kelsey Lindquist
Salt Lake City Planning Division
451 S State St.
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Ms. Lindquist,

My name is Angelo Neofitos. I'm an architect and entrepreneur in Salt Lake City. I'd like to express my strong support for Anthony Arrasi's proposal located at 1782 South 1600 East. (PLNPCM2022-01138 & PLNCPCM2022-01139)

I like to keep up with development news in our city and when I heard about Anthony's proposal I was really intrigued by the challenge it poses to Salt Lake's ideas about development. This is a proposal that questions preconceptions and assumptions. Anthony's intentions define the spirit of Salt Lake City and our city's curiosity to break our notions of the past.

We are a city experiencing tremendous change. We're constantly hearing about rapid population growth, the lack of affordable housing and, most recently, about inflation taking over our daily lives. This is a moment in history where we have to become resourceful to survive. In 2014 the United States Environmental Protection Agency released a document titled "Smart Growth and Economic Success: Investing in Infill Development". In this document, the EPA explained the challenges and benefits it foresees facing infill land development in US cities. One of the challenges that the EPA describes is that, "Infill development can be challenging in cities with regulations that separate land uses and have requirements for parking and street width that were developed for spread-out suburban areas rather than city and town neighborhoods. Developers must get approval to deviate from zoning codes, a process that can be lengthy and add uncertainty and cost to the development process."

Salt Lake City cannot afford to let its citizens continue to struggle with antiquated zoning codes that promote notions and lifestyles of the past. By prescribing to zoning codes established over 25 years ago, Salt Lake City stands to encumber its future majority population. The EPA states that, "With the turn of the century, the first millennials entered their twenties and many sought their own home for the first time. As of 2012, this generation comprises the largest segment of the rental housing market. With over 80 million people born between 1978 and 1995, this age group is larger than the baby boom generation. It will continue to grow with new immigrants because most arrive as young adults, and it will eventually become the largest buying and renting cohort." Anthony is a member of this community and he wants to establish roots and become a homeowner in Salt Lake City, and contribute to everything our great city has to offer.

This is not a time to let infill lots with any potential go to waste. What we choose to do with our resources during these critical moment in our economy and history will define our future. Our city and citizens must be resourceful in a time when land has become very scarce. Salt Lake City needs to ask itself when and why, its current zoning codes were established; and can it afford to enforce stale codes which do not meet our citizens needs?

Sincerely,



-Evangelos Neofitos

Resource:

<https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/2014-06/documents/developer-infill-paper-508b.pdf>

COMMENTS 1782 E 1600 South Master Plan Amendment and Zoning Map Amendment

Dear Judy,

My wife and I live on the 1500 block of E. Blaine Avenue and we want to voice our opposition to any change to the zoning currently in place.

This means we are strongly opposed to changing the SR-3 zoning that would allow the current owner to build an additional home structure and / or an ADU. This zoning should stand: this property is one lot, not two, and further, setback and depth restrictions mean this is an unbuildable property.

The property is not zoned for these uses and never has been. We purchased our home on this street because we wanted to live in a less dense neighborhood. The current owner of 1782 South 1600 East is seeking to increase density at the expense of the neighbors and neighborhood solely to benefit her own pocketbook.

We've heard suggestions the owner wants to rezone to help 'increase the amount of affordable housing stock in the city'. You might ask her now much she charges for the rent on the ground floor unit of her duplex (it was \$2700 per month last year) and ask her how much she is going to charge for next year (it's \$2900 per month). Her previous tenant moved out because the rent became unaffordable. So, if she's really interested in providing affordable housing, she should be reducing the rent, not increasing it.

Further, if she is indeed committed to more affordable housing, you might ask if she has created a mother-in-law apartment in her existing single family home--her current legal residence, and if she plans to build an ADU in the backyard of her current legal residence. That would be a starting point, not trying to wring more dollars out of an existing property that is in no way a "home" for her--it's purely something she considers as a commercial opportunity.

Finally, this is the third time that this owner has sought to rezone the property, and the third time the neighbors have had to mobilize to speak out to prevent two or three houses being built on one lot. This is not a hardship case: it's purely an example of a selfish absentee landlord seeking to line her pockets at the expense of the neighbors who live in owner-occupied homes on Blaine Ave and on 1600 East.

Sincerely,

Hal Crimmel
Ingrid Weinbauer

PS--one clarification: We are 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.

Hal & Ingrid

Previously, we had sent you the following email, below, in italics. Let us add in new, additional comments here (in regular font).

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.

Currently, there is a duplex on the property. New rules allow for an ADU to be built on that property. Then, if the rezone is approved, creating a new lot, that property could also house a duplex and an ADU or a single-family home and an ADU. The potential for this much higher density development on what currently is one lot is completely out of character for the neighborhood.

It also sets a dangerous precedent. What if the other neighbors on the street, who have large lots, sell and the new owner(s) claim that two lots could be created out of one R-1 lot because, well, why not?

The current owner of 1572 E Blaine seems intent on negatively impacting the quality of life for the seven neighbors whose property abuts the lot in question. No one wants the rezone. Zoning exists to preserve the stability of neighborhoods.

The planning commission should consider whether the desire of one property owner, who lives in Olympus Cove, to rezone a lot historically zoned as one lot should be allowed, as it will open the door to potentially create a small rental village **at the expense of those living in owner-occupied homes, who are united in their opposition to the rezone.**

Sincerely,
Hal Crimmel
Ingrid Weinbauer

To Whom it May Concern,

I am writing this letter in support of the Arrasi family to build a modest home on the vacant lot of 1782 South 1600 East. As a lifelong resident of Wasatch Hollow, I can attest to the fact that this is a wonderful place to call home. The community is close-knit, the schools are excellent, and the amenities are plentiful. However, I also understand that the cost of living in this neighborhood has become increasingly expensive over the years. These increasing costs along with the scarcity of buildable land has made Wasatch Hollow, Progressive Heights and a majority of Sugarhouse become very difficult for many people to afford.

As someone who inherited my childhood home and was fortunate enough to avoid the rising costs of living in the area, I understand how difficult it can be to find affordable housing in our community. This is why I fully support the proposed plan for the subject property. By doing so, the Arrasi family is not only creating an affordable home for their children but also providing an opportunity for others to potentially live in this neighborhood in the future.

Lastly, from my discussions with the Arrasi family, I understand the home will be proportional in size to the lot, and the building design will compliment the surrounding homes using materials and colors that will blend in with the neighborhood. Furthermore, they have assured me that they will be mindful of the potential impact that the construction may have on the local environment, and will take steps to mitigate any negative effects. A modest home would not only provide an opportunity for affordable housing, but it would also help to maintain the character and charm of our neighborhood. Overall I believe a new home built will be a greater asset to the neighborhood than an unusable vacant lot.

I want to express my support for the proposed project and wish the Arrasi family all the best with their plans. If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to reach out to me.

Sincerely,

Marley Bramble

Wasatch Hollow Community Council Second Vice Chair

Agentia Jan Thomas

04-19-23

Judy our concern is the width of the alley way for the access of emergency vehicles.

According to existing standards, we understand the width is to be 22 foot wide, however the existing driveway entrance is only 19 foot 11 inches. This could limit the access for fire trucks, if the zoning is changed to SR3 and a house is built on the lot.

Also adding a house or an AUD adds to the weekly issues of garbage pickup, where will the cans go in front of the Blaine Ave address?

Another concern we have due to the ALLEYWAY being our access to our property for over 65 years the number of cars which will be going in and out at all hours.

And in closing, we thought that a plan of what Blaine LLC is wanting to build on the lot would be shown. But all we have been told is it will be a modest home. From that description the zoning should not be amended to SR3.

Thank you for all the many hours you work for the neighbor hoods in Sugarhouse.

Regards,

Dean and Jan Thomas
1580 Blaine Ave.

Rebecca Davis

Wed, Apr 19, 9:50 PM (12
hours ago)

I am strongly opposed to the requested rezone from R1-7000 to SR-3 for the property located at 1782 S 1600 E. I own and live in the home west of this property - 1564 E Blaine. If the rezone is approved, the oversized garage that straddles the property line dividing 1572 E Blaine and 1782 S 1600 E will be demolished. That will create the problem of light pollution that will affect me and other neighbors to the west of me. The level of the rear of the 1572 E Blaine Ave lot was raised when the oversized garage was built. Lights from vehicles coming west down the driveway from 1600 East and turning north on the lot for parking will shine onto my back porch, into my living room, kitchen and backyard. The vehicle lights will illuminate four properties that slope downhill to the west from my property.

The requested rezone is not in keeping with the character of the neighborhood. The application for zoning amendment references language from *Plan Salt Lake* "Increas(ing) the number of medium density housing types and options" (PSL pg. 19) and "Enabl(ing) moderate density increases within existing neighborhoods where appropriate" (PSL pg. 21). Potentially adding two ADUs and another duplex does not reflect a moderate density increase in housing. Potentially adding two ADUs and another duplex is not a "small infill opportunity" as described in the Zoning Amendment when it references Growing SLC - A Five Year Housing Plan 2018-2022.

This is a neighborhood of single family homes, several duplexes and a fourplex located at the bottom of Blaine Avenue next to 1500 E. Rezoning this one property as SR-3 sets a precedent that could negatively change the character of the neighborhood. As current owners sell their properties, new owners could request zoning changes from R1-7000 to build multiple dwellings on existing lots. Our neighborhood would never be the same. Its character would be destroyed. It would be a mistake to open the door to this possibility by approving the application for rezone to SR-3 at 1782 S 1600 E.

Rebecca Davis
1564 E Blaine Ave
SLC UT 84105
[REDACTED]

Wed, Apr 19, 9:55 PM (12
hours ago)

Judi,

The proposed change in zoning will impact seven homes that this plot of land touches. We bought our home two years ago, our understanding at that time was that the property to our back was a single lot, and if fitted in with the surrounding homes. There was maintained grass and a patio area for use by the occupants. During our two years in our property there have been multiple parties and BBQ's in the patio area, with music late into the night. To say in the application that this is an undeveloped lot is inaccurate, there are facilities in place and they are used by the occupants.

The application claims that the neighborhood has changed immensely. But in reality that claim is baseless if you consider the block on which they are planning to build. As the application clearly shows all the homes are built on large lots with facilities like garages, patio's, vegetable gardens and grass. This applies equally to 1782 S 1600 E.

I oppose the application as written. There is no plan on what the developer would do if the change in zoning was approved. There is also adequate provision within the current city ordinance that would allow the developer to expand the use of the land and meet the objectives of the application to provide an additional single family unit, with access from 1600 E.

Regards,

Simon Harrison
1569 E Downington Avenue, Salt Lake City, UT 84105
Telephone [REDACTED]
Sent from my iPad Pro

Denise Dubek [REDACTED]

Wed, Apr 19, 10:06 PM (12
hours ago)

to [REDACTED]

Hello Judi,

I am writing about the request by Blaine properties to re zone 1782 S. 1600 E. to SR-3.

I urge the city to consider why this request is causing some stress and safety concerns for me and by the current neighborhood.

As I have researched the request, I feel strongly that this potential change could create many safety hazards. The current driveway that leads to the property is too narrow for a large firetruck to drive down. General driveway standards in residential districts according to SLC.gov website regarding residential driveways, should have an approach of six (6) feet from abutting property lines and ten (10) feet from street corner property lines. In front and corner side yards, driveway approach widths shall not exceed twenty two (22) feet in SR-1 and SR-3 residential districts.

This driveway doesn't meet this criteria.

Due to the close proximity of the current homes in this neighborhood, a fire could easily spread to one of our homes, before a firetruck could get down the narrow, unmarked driveway.

Also, where would trash bins get placed for pick up?

The request to rezone and create an unwanted dwelling to be built in the middle of our current properties is just a bad consideration.

I strongly oppose the request to rezone this property.

Thank you for your understanding and for your willingness to consider my concern.

Regards,

Denise Dubek

Property Owner

1792 S. 1600 E.

SLC, Utah 84105



Elena Kondrashova [REDACTED]

Wed, Apr 19, 10:08 PM (12
hours ago)

to me

To Whom it May Concern,

As relatively new Sugar House residents whose backyard backs directly to the Subject Property we were surprised to find out that there was a possibility of a separate lot existing in such an unusual and constrained configuration. The area in question seemed to be an organic extension of the Blaine Property and the two combined fit quite well with the neighborhood's general layout.

It is precisely this neighborhood's unique characteristics that made Sugar House an attractive home for our family. This is a place with strong community ties, respectful, family friendly environment, modest home sizes and great historical heritage. All of the above are potentially threatened by the unscrupulous buildout. In fact, the applicant states the parcel should be developed to the "highest and best use while maintaining general neighborhood character." We believe this is pertinent and already achievable through existing regulations that allow for construction of an accessory dwelling unit on the Subject Property. This view aligns well with the referenced Five Year Plan that seeks to increase housing while minimizing impact to the community. It is our experience that the immediate community is deeply troubled by the proposed amendment, concerned about the lack of concrete construction plans and potential profit prioritization above all else.

Without definitive information on the subsequent construction post potential zoning changes we oppose the amendment.

Regards,

Elena Kondrashova & Simon Harrison

1569 E Downington Ave,

Salt Lake City, UT 84105

andrea jimmie [REDACTED]

Wed, Apr 19, 10:51 PM (11
hours ago)

to Judi.Short

To Whom It May Concern,

I have many concerns and issues regarding the possibility of rezoning the property but my biggest concern is a Firehazard. If there was an ADU what would happen if there was ever a fire? With the recent fire on 1100east and considering all the people who were forced to leave their homes, what would happen if something like that happened? There is not enough room for a fire truck and paramedic to come down that small side street and turn around safely. If the property is rezoned, the possibility of 6 rental units and people driving down the small street where my child plays, rides her bike, and walks her dog is a huge concern. Our neighborhood won't be safe anymore. There are too many unsafe people in the world and the government does nothing to protect our children. I had plans to live in this house for a long time and I never in my wildest dreams would have thought there could be a house or duplex built in my back yard, in between my home and the neighbors. I would no longer feel safe letting my child outside for the fact of the safety of playing outside is not safe due to possible traffic and the simple fact of privacy. It gives me anxiety and stresses me out with the possibility of having to move if that is approved. I'm a single mom and never had plans on moving out of this house.

Do me a favor and walk into your back yard and imagine a duplex or building with multiple people living in that building living there. Ask yourself if that is something you would okay with and want for your neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Andrea Jimmie
1600 east resident

Larry Wright

Wed, Apr 19, 10:52 PM (11
hours ago)

to me

Dear Judi

I met with Anthony Arrasi and Stephanie Arrasi (property owners requesting the zoning change to SR-3) this afternoon with Camille Thorpe to review their development plans for the lot. The purpose of the meeting was to gather information about future development and to discuss possible negative effects development would have to the neighbors. This lot shares property lines with seven property owners. We walked the property and talked about the height allowable for structures and the impact on the neighbors. We reviewed the setbacks for a structure and how that would affect the neighbors. We covered all the impacts that the neighbors has concerns about. I measured a tree up to 20' to provide a visual reference point for the neighbors so that they could imagine a structure at least that height overlooking their backyards.

Anthony did not have a development plan established yet because of the expense, not even a hand drawing of the proposal of a single-family home showing some type of design features. Is it 1 or 2 stories? Is the plan for it to be a modern type home, bungalow, or a cottage style? I had no information to take back to the neighbors other than Anthony wants to build a modest single-family home. Anthony told us that, one way or another, a structure will be built on the property. It will be either a single-family home or a 1000 sq.foot ADU. The neighbors have a choice on which one.

The city has deemed that this lot is one lot. Since the Arrasis provided no development plan to evaluate, I request that the planning committee deny the zoning request to change the current zoning from R-1-700 to SR-3.

The city recently made changes to allow an ADU on a lot with a duplex already in place; this will adversely affect the neighbors. My property is two doors west of the lot in question, and its value will go down. So will the property values of all seven adjacent neighbors. Just because the city makes it possible to build an ADU on your property doesn't make it the right thing to do.

Thanks

Larry Wright

Ann Wright [REDACTED]

Wed, Apr 19, 11:03 PM (11
hours ago)

to [REDACTED]

Dear Judi,

In regard to the property at 1782 S 1600 E, I would like to state that I oppose rezoning to SR-3. Because of the number of neighbors impacted by any development of this lot, I believe that an SR-3 zoning would give the property owners carte blanche to overdevelop the lot. This entire block is zoned R-1-7000, and anything that occurs on this property should reflect that. There should be more restrictions, not fewer, especially in regard to height specifications. Between this lot and the neighboring lot (to the west) there is a grade change 2 to 4 feet. Please consider the impact of a two story building with minimal setbacks upon that neighbor, not to mention the six other neighbors sharing property lines with the lot in question.

To zone the property in question SR-3 would create the potential for future abuse in the event that the lot is resold. It could be developed any way the owner chose. Legally speaking, the lot could accommodate a duplex and an ADU. But that does not make it right. If you were to come walk the lot you could easily imagine the adverse impact of that sort of development on the adjacent homeowners. Please walk in our shoes.

The following pattern keeps occurring in our city as the development boom continues: the developer makes a verbal commitment to honor a request for a height restriction, or a setback, a "modest bungalow or cottage," but when the construction starts these commitments are abandoned. Suddenly, in a neighborhood of single-story dwellings, footings for a two-story structure appear, and the resulting structure throws shade on gardens, violates privacy, obstructs views, and lowers property values.

Surely, the people who live in the neighborhood should have some say in the changes imposed on them by investors.

Thank you,

Ann Wright

Dina D [REDACTED]

Dear Judi,

My name is Dina DeWeerd and I reside at 1548 East Blaine Avenue. I am two blocks west of the proposed lot to be rezoned. My husband and I searched for three years for a great neighborhood, close to our jobs to raise our family. As we searched we saw an undesirable trend of investors buying and stacking as many homes possible on what was originally a single family lot. We chose not to purchase there.

We were drawn to the charm of Sugarhouse and the R1-7000 zoning was a major factor in our decision to purchase this home in 2009 as we were no longer looking for a high density living situation.

I am opposing the request to re-zone 1781 South 1600 East for the following reasons:

The request to rezone one lot, is not keeping with the character of the neighborhood that is zoned entirely RI-7000.

The request to rezone, in hopes of building another home behind an investment property does not keep with the character of the neighborhood. Also, this lot has been declared unbuildable by the city in the past.

The potential now for ADU's to be added to the existing investment property and proposed new home, would not represent a moderate density increase in this area.

May I ask you to please listen to the voices of the people who LIVE here and who's daily lives will be affected by the decisions of one owner who does not live in the neighborhood?

Thank you for your time, Dina DeWeerd

camille thorpe

1:39 AM (8 hours ago)

to [REDACTED], Larry, Rebecca

(Thank you, Judi =)

Rezone request to SR-3 **1782 S. 1600 Ea**

Camille Thorpe **1784 S. 1600 Ea**

Thank you for your consideration,

If this were a simple case of “NIMBYISM”, the only owner who could claim it would be – me. My address is **1784 So. 1600 East** and this is IN my backyard. But as you can also see there are concerns from seven (7) other neighbors who would be adversely impacted by a change to SR-3, and touching this lot, too. NIMBY is beyond all our backyards and becomes a question of dangerous precedent-setting for other neighborhoods in Sugarhouse.

I encourage the Planning Commission and City Council to not approve this zoning change. Normally zoning changes are for an area, not just for one unique spot.

Our neighborhood is not opposed to more neighbors. But we are opposed to having this small, unique lot setting precedence for the broader community. And what would the legal definition of a “modest bungalow” be anyway? That unknown factor of what could be built (and added upon) at **1782 S. 1600 East** is another reason this neighborhood does not want a SR-3 zoning change. Another reason I am opposed to rezoning here is because it will require so many variance requests that there would be very little chance for governance on any changes.

Both of the two-story structures Anthony has talked about are too tall. The ground has already been raised 4-feet. A one-story structure might be a solid compromise indicating that the owners have heard their neighbors, understood the neighborhood place, and appreciate that their current desires could detract from what makes Sugarhouse Sugarhouse. #Not keeping with the character of the neighborhood.

This zone change proposal could have long lasting effects on those who live here, and determine who will choose to live here, or not.

Kind regards,

Camille Thorpe | [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

8:30 AM (1 hour ago)

to me

Hi Judi –

A few thoughts...

+++

The applicant has not provided enough information about his intentions to enable his neighbors or the SHCC to form an opinion about the merits of the project.

At our meeting on April 17, it became clear that neighbors were uncertain about plans for shared driveway easements, disposition of a large garage that crosses proposed new lot lines, and buildable area/setback/height requirements on the L-shaped lot that the applicant wishes to create.

We recommend that the applicant:

1. Defer his review with the Planning Commission
2. Create a site plan of his vision for the two lots that meets the requirements of the proposed R3 zoning
3. Discuss this site plan with neighbors
4. Return to SHCC LUZ for further discussion

Judi,

As a neighbor in close proximity to the subject property, I am voicing my opposition to the proposed Zoning change for several reasons. The 4,815 sf lot is odd-shaped and a large portion would be un-buildable due to access constraints. With a width of



April 19, 2023

TO: Salt Lake City Planning Commission

FROM: Judi Short, First Vice Chair and Land Use Chair
Sugar House Community Council

RE: PLNPCM2022-01083 and PLNPCM2022-01139

We received a request for a Zoning Map and Master Plan Amendment for the parcel at 1782 South 1600 East. The property owner anticipates building a single-family dwelling on the property. The property is currently zoned R 1/7000 (Single Family Residential) and they wish to change it to SR-3 (Special Development Pattern Residential).

This was one of five items on the SHCC Land Use Agenda April 17, with many people in attendance, approximately 6 from this neighborhood, including the petitioner. If the property is rezoned, then the petitioner can begin to design a building(s), which may or may not need to come back through the Planning Commission.

We all know we have a group of housing plans coming before the Planning Commission and City Council which are intended to make it easier to develop additional housing for the citizens of Salt Lake City. This lot has been declared unbuildable twice before, but with the new SR-3 zone, may be able to fit in a dwelling of some sort. Part of the problem is the strange shape of the lot, and the difficulty of figuring out how to place a dwelling, while still having adequate access for fire and other neighbors who use either of these “alleys” to access their property. The current duplex on the parcel is not affordable, according to the neighbors, and they know building a new building will be very expensive, so the new units, whether it is one home or an ADU or a duplex, will by definition not be affordable. You can read the attached comments for more information about what exists on the lot currently, including a very large garage (24' x 56' according to the Salt Lake County Assessor) that is quite tall right on the property line, that is not well-maintained.

There is a lot of animosity from the neighbors about this long-standing problem, and it seems they have not been able to communicate with the petitioners. We recommend that you have two options. Either you deny this request, or ask that the petitioner to develop plans with drawings and sign a development agreement that spells exactly what they will build in terms of one building or two, height and dimensions, and location on the parcel, before this goes to the City Council. We think this should include something that says what the rental cap will be, so as to meet the city's goals of building more affordable housing. In addition you need to get the fire department to sign off on whether the driveways are adequate for them to get in and fight a fire.

fewer than 47 feet, the required SR-3 setbacks would further limit construction. This would create a very different yard for the proposed dwelling, compared to the neighborhood at large.

I do have additional concerns over emergency vehicle access with the narrow driveway, and a sharp turn to access the proposed dwelling. Especially during winters with high snowfall...There's nowhere to put the shoveled snow.

Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions.

Thank you for your public service.

Craig

Craig Schriber

1532 E. Blaine Ave, SLC 84105

