

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

First Name	Last Name	Email	Your Comments for the Planning Commission
Tyler	McConnell	tyler.mcconnell@gmail.com	I really dont appreciate this project nor the way it has been pushed through during a time that most people are not paying attention.  If this goes through, it sets a precedent that will harm the community. If we allow this building to breach the current height limit, when will it stop? The community will be slowly eliminated as skyscraper after skyscraper takes the place of our local small houses and small community feel.  In the short term, creating the building will turn the corner of 1100 e and 2100 s into an unusable area. The sheer amount of construction that will take place will displace most of the small businesses that sugarhouse is known for. Residents, tourists, college students and people from all over will have a harder time getting to and finding parking in the area for well over 5 years as the demo, laying of the foundation in a pit and then construction of another major building. I strongly urge for this building NOT to be allowed to exist.
Sue	Watson	fromsue2u@gmail.com	So fed up with all of the rezoning changes and allowing overbuilding of large apartment complexes in the Sugar House business District. The "Wells Fargo Building" rezoning request of way over the top and a very bad mistake. A high rise building does not fit into the scale of current surroundings. There is already a "narrow the roads" construction project underway at the corner of 2100 South and 1100 East which is going to make traffic patterns in this area more congested and dense highrise housing will further agravate the situation. Our business is directly across the street from this proposed project where a large high rise will hide any view of the sky from our shop windows, shadow the sidewalks making them more likely to be slippery when wet, and increase our utility bills since we would probably could no longer use natural daylight sun in our offices. All buildings located north of 2100 South from 1200 to 1000 East are comprised of small businesses where street scape has well kept retro charm and are less than two stories in height. Transit is not nearby, ice could fall from the rooftop and cause injury to pedestrians, and with not enough parking already for proposed rezoning, this building should not be approved.
Breanne	Clement	breannemclement@gmail.com	I attended the Sugarhouse Council meeting tonight. I live and own my home on 1048 Ramona Ave. i was apalled to see the plans presented by the developers and am completely opposed to changing the city ordinance to allowing a 300+ ft tall building in downtown Sugarhouse. The developers should be required to build with in the current height regulations as those regulations were implemented to preserve the integrity and character of Sugarhouse. Sugarhouse does not need a highrise with 400 unaffordable, unattractive apartments. Changing the ordinance will lead to more developers wanting to do the same thing. I didnt hear one compelling reason from developers on why this is necessary and how it will benefit our community. Please do what you can to protect Sugarhouse!
Kaye	Stackpole	ktyme4u@gmail.com	VOTE NO ON HARBOR BAY REQUEST. Do not approve the rezoning of the Wells Fargo Parcel to Harbor Bay for an additional heights build due to the lack of infrastructure and growing density of the area. Sugarhouse can keep its unique atmosphere and community WITHOUT out of state developers. The greed of the Sugarhouse and Salt Lake Councils desire for additional tax dollars is ruining the area and making it less desirable to live in.Parking is nonexistent, walking is dangerous and there are not adequate police patrols for the area to monitor and stop crime of all types.
Alexis	Switenko	aswitenko@hotmail.com	We do not want a skyscraper in our neighborhood. In no way does the new construction that they propose, knit into the fabric of our community. I echo the concerns and voices who spoke up at the meeting!
Zachary	England	zachary.england@gmail.com	I support zoning to encourage greater density and greater height in Sugarhouse. Vertical development is more resource-efficient than other development models. More housing availability will favor downward price pressure and foster affordability. Density will make our neighborhoods more urban and vibrant. For our city to continue to grow we must disabuse ourselves of the myopic notion that current homeowners are the only constituents who matter in zoning decisions.
Dejan	Eskic	dejan.eskic@gmail.com	Fully support this project. As we reduce traffic access to the area we need more poplution to support the retail around the area. This will be a positive impact on the area

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Peter	Andrews	forpetesake@gmail.com	Although I am a resident of the Liberty Wells neighborhood, I drive past this project and frequent the surrounding businesses daily. Admittedly, this project will have impacts, much as the current road construction does. However, I am an enthusiastic supporter of the proposed zoning change as this will allow for one of, if not the most transformative construction projects the city has ever seen to move forward. The type and scale of construction the developer is proposing is unmatched in the U.S. and very sustainable from a carbon sequestration standpoint compared to steel and concrete. Additionally, the mass timber technique allows for architectural flexibility in the project's exterior and interior design. To help meet the current and future housing needs of this area, not to mention the anticipated return of the Olympic games in 2034, this is the time (and The Place) for a project of this magnitude!
Corey	Wilkey	coreywilkey@gmail.com	I fully support the rezone and the proposed height of this new building. The city is growing and its unreasonable to require that developers never be allowed to make changes to the zoning. Inflation, intredy rates, peoperty values all are changing and rising and the nunbers dont pan out without adding additknal height. Additionally, we need the housing. We need the units. And we need to encourage people to use transit as much as possible. Increasing density is the best way to face ALL of the problems our city faces.
David	Adams	david@osnews.com	I support density, especially in our urbanized zones. SLC needs housing of all kinds. I am in favor of the proposed rezone.
Michael	Eccleston	michael.eccleston@gmail.com	You cant stop progress. The best you can hope for is thoughtful change. This project seems to have good intentions for the community. Dont let a few NIMBYs ruin progress in slc.
Lou Ann	Donahue	lmgdonahue@msn.com	Please consider and vote against the rezoning of Sugar House at the old Wells Fargo Building. This will not only diminish the charm of Sugar House but will eliminate many of our lovely local business and may even effect some of our long time residents leaving the Sugar House area. It will raise costs so that many of the local businesses will not be able to maintain their business in the Sugar House area. It will not be affordable housing. The building plans do not fit our Sugar House charm and who will want to visit Sugar House if it is nothing but a huge building on the corner with no local businesses and restaurants because no one can afford them. The traffic will also suffer. We hardly have room as it is. Thank you for your consideration!
Ann	Hopkins	ahopkins1124@yahoo.com	So many thoughts... Just turned 73, I haven't owed a vehicle in over 5 years, I find SH very walkable. It used to be transit exceptional, until all the construction, everywhere. I hope our community county and the city council stick by their guns and DO NOT grant a rezoning. Harbor Bay knew when they purchased the property what the building codes were. They purchased anyway knowing they would get a pass from the powers that be. We need to stand up to all the developers and not let them ruin the charm and 'neighborhood' of SH. Also, why can't the facade of the building fit in to the rest of the developments. Up and down 1100 E & 2100 S also, both old & new have brick as the main matrial in combo with others. Some brick is painted, but it's still the 'brick look'. That, at least, would fit in with other buildings in the area.
William (Bill)	Brass	bbrassslc@gmail.com	I have lived in Salt Lake City for forty years and the last 34 years in Sugar House. In that time we have seen our community change from a small town atmosphere to a megopolis with high rise apartment buidlings, choking traffic, no parking for locals, poor water pressure, crime, etc.,etc. Now we are being presented with this plan to further destrpy what little remains of our quint community by introducing a structure that has no place in this community. We do not need an even greater high rise sticking out like a sore thumb, blocking the sun for dozens of businesses and home owners. The current zoning was very clear when the new owners of this property purchased the Wells Fargo Building, Sugar House has a master plan, nothing in this proposal fits into either of those statements. Take your ideas downtown where they belong and leave us to live with our current miserable situation. Stop treating us like idiots by proposing this will have lower rents for local vendors on the main floor. If you can't lower the rent for them within the current zoning law then find some other use for your main floor space. We are not children, we fully understand that if this happens it will open the door to more such structures and then our belovd Sugar House will cease to exist and Salt Lake City will have a second downtown highrise district. At what cost? Bulldozing existing neighborhoods to allow for greater traffic flow and parking? There is no parking now because of all the highrise apartment dwellers parking on the street. This will further erode the ability to shop in Sugar House. NO,NO,NO please do not approve this project!!!

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Thomas	Quam	thomquamguitar@gmail.com	I support a project that is designed and built meeting current zoning requirements. I don't support the project I saw on at the 12/6 meeting. I believe SH cannot and should not continue to allow the types of changes being proposed.....we are already busting at the seams and we have not even felt the impacts of the current apartments under construction being at capacity. If approved, it would set off a precedence of no return dramatically changing SH forever. Think about all the local shops that remain north of 21st south- the stakes would be much higher for those property owners to sell out because developers can sweeten the pot and build much taller then currently allowed. SH would become like downtown SLC. Its time to give SH a break!!
Paul	Ketzle	pketzle@yahoo.com	As a Sugar House homeowner and long-time resident, I am absolutely opposed to this proposal. The height is excessive and completely out-of-character for our business district. Housing is a necessity, but this proposal disregards the character of the district and doesn't serve either the needs or interests of our community. For all of the work that has been done to revitalize this area, this development proposal would undermine much of that, pushing our community in a direction that would destroy much of the personality that makes Sugar House such a distinct and unique neighborhood in favor of a generic and excessive structure like you could find most anywhere. There is no particular appeal in creating a neighborhood that is dwarfed by such excessively large structures. This project should absolutely be rejected.
Jim	Frazer	jfrazerart@gmail.com	Please don't allow this increased height rezoning. Sugarhouse streets are already feeling a bit like canyons with the recent developments. Is it possible to decide that maintaining some of the Sugarhouse character that people love and attracts them here is worth something? Look across the street from Wells Fargo on 11th east and notice the used book shop, the vintage store, or right next door to the north, the Soup Kitchen. These and many other similar small businesses are all that's left of what was Sugarhouse only a few years ago. Wells Fargo could afford to move into the ground floor of one of the new developments, but these small unique businesses will not be able to afford the rent in similar developments. Having such a tall building looming across from them seems to emphasize even more that their days are numbered. The proposed height of this new building really belongs downtown where taller heights are required. Please let Sugarhouse remain uniquely Sugarhouse.
Gayle	Hadfield	gahadfield@yahoo.com	The Wells Fargo proposed multi story building is just too much. Our sugarhouse plaze is close enough to a cement canyon NOW. Please do not make it worse with this large and unsightly structure. No matter how many plants are added to the balconies it is still and un necessary and unpleasent giant that would sit in a very critical place in our plaza. 3 stories/4stories is already too much. Please turn this proposal AWAY ! And the added traffic on 2100 and 1100 will be ghastly for walkers, bikers and drivers. A BIG NO
Brenda	Sherwood	bren.sherwood@gmail.com	Please stop the high rise complexes in Sugarhouse. Increase in population in small parcel only increases traffic and if we have concerns about drought and lack of snow lets not keep building. I already avoid this area as much as possible with the other 2100 S construction. Miss the "feel" of the old Sugarhouse!!
Jason	Brower	dev.jason.brower@gmail.com	Hi. I own a house 1 and 1/2 blocks from the old Wells Fargo site. I want to voice my support for the rezone. The business district is the perfect place to build upwards, and frankly, I would rather see projects like this that fit a lot into a relatively small footprint instead of the giant apartment complexes that span entire city blocks with one boring, monolithic facade.
Lukas	Keele	swimlukask@gmail.com	I oppose the rezoning of the old wells fargo building. The infrastructure surrounding the building (the roads and street access points) is not fit to accommodate such a dense population.

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Chris	Longhurst	chris.longhurst@gmail.com	<p>With regard to the desire to re-zone the Wells Fargo parcel to allow a 305ft building height:          (1) The height is not in keeping with Sugarhouse. It will cut off sunlight (and solar energy production) for businesses and homes north of the building, who have made a significant investment in green energy. Having that investment nullified by a tall tower is poor corporate citizenship and invites lawsuits.          (2) The Sugarmont fire proved that SLCFD do not have the room to put ladder trucks in the area to deal with a tall building fire, and that the city does not have the required water pressure to even reach the top of a 70ft apartment complex.          (3) The rough plan presented so far indicates 800 or more residents at the new property. Try as we might to be less car-dependent, the reality is that this will add more vehicles to that area, which in turn increases traffic slowdowns and pollution (as only 1% of owners will statistically have EVs), which makes the area LESS safe and walkable.          (4) The amount of glass on the south and west sides of the buildings will present significant solar glare issues, depending on the time of the day. As the glass will most likely be a high UV reflective rated glass, this will potentially create reflected heat glare "heat rays" (eg. 20 Fenchurch Street/London, Aria hotel/Las Vegas)          (5) When questioned about what their plan would be should the re-zoning permit be denied, the developers had no good answer. Therefore it can be implied that they will either sell up and leave, or (and there is precedent for this) approach the legislature and try to force the permit through against the will of the people.          (6) Even IF the developers are allowed the full 305ft, the cost of that parcel and construction mean that there still will not be any affordable units, per the Code Section 35A-8-2201: "the ability of a household to occupy a housing unit paying no more than 30% of the household's income for gross housing costs, including utilities."          (7) While farming is undoubtedly the major water user in the state, we cannot simply deny that adding more and more people will inevitably contribute further to the looming water crisis. EVERY new housing project MUST be viewed through the lens of a dwindling water supply.</p>
matt	heinig	mattheinig@gmail.com	<p>I am against the modification of our current zoning restrictions. The culture and character of the Sugar house neighborhood is one of a smaller, more localized look and feel. We are outdoors oriented people and we like to see our mountains, we like to see the blue sky, and we like to feel the sun. The Sugar House zoning ordinances in place now reflect that and even push it a little further than most residents would prefer. If you cannot get the density needed with a 10 story building, than the building does not belong in sugar house. Buildings over 10 stories belong downtown, not in the suburbs.</p>
Ann	Hopkins	ahopkins1124@yahoo.com	<p>At the December meeting Dan Whalen from Harbor Bay Developers admitted that when purchased, they were aware of the height restrictions. I would like to know in what closed door meetings and with who, were they told they would get a variance. Also, are they asking 'the public' for 305'/21 stories to get us all extremely upset then 'concede' to 15 (?) stories to placate the neighborhood? I believe 105', the current restriction should be enforced. I also think that their entire building design is awful.</p>
Cynthia	Spigle	clsrbs@gmail.com	<p>I am writing to speak out against granting the zoning change requested, thereby allowing the construction of an up to 305' tower. Reasons are many, 1) traffic increases will be horrific thereby making pedestrian travel even more hazardous than now. Their application states that this development is in concert with the Sugarhouse Master Plan tenets, but this is false. 2) There are some vague statements about keeping affordable rents on the ground floor for local businesses and affordable apartments in the tower. Neither will be true and cannot be enforced by the city planners, as we have found out over and over again. 3) A tower like this is completely out of sync with the rest of Sugarhouse area buildings (both appearance and height). This rezoning would destroy the remaining bits of charm and inviting character we are trying to preserve. If one building lot is given a pass, then why wouldn't we allow the 2nd, 3rd, etc to follow this pattern of extravagant big city towers in the midst of Sugarhouse. 4) Mass transit is a key underpinning to this request. The S Line that they tout is woefully inadequate to shoulder this burden of need for increased mass transit. 5) Use of Mass Timber is the major reason given for the zoning change. The jury is still very much out as to the real sustainability and carbon reductions from this material. Many aspects of the sustainability chain are left out of their computations.</p>
Tim	Trautman	ltnobody@mac.com	<p>To Whom It May Concern:          I am firmly against any increase in zoning height for the old wells fargo parcel. Sugar House has enough buildings already much less one that is 21-stories - nearly triple of neighboring buildings. I don't think the need for more apartments/condos justifies this height increase as hundreds of new apartments are coming on line soon in the area. And the surrounding streets are already at maximum capacity for vehicles. Please deny the zoning variance.</p>

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Janeen	Brazier	jeb8746@gmail.com	I don't think our quaint community can handle any more traffic, it is so busy now that I avoid going into SugarHouse . I am sickened that Wells Fargo sold the property to another outside company, knowing they could care less about our community...shame on the greedy people!
Jim	Muldoon	jimmuldoon@comcast.net	Its time for some real denisty in the area. This would be a signature development in sugarhouse. Urban density is much needed. Would add to the walkability of the area.
Hugh	Garner	hcgarnier@comcast.net	I believe most residents of Sugar House prefer the current zoning, which keeps most buildings under about nine stories in height. The proposed project will set a precedent that will have the potential to drastically change the current makeup of the neighborhood. If the developers want to build to 22 or 30 stories, please encourage them to go downtown, where that sort of zoning is already in place and seems to be encouraged.  The developers have said that they want their new building to be "iconic" and to be "part of the fabric of the neighborhood". Their proposed building will be neither. Instead of iconic it will be notorious and instead of being part of the neighborhood's fabric, it will dramatically change that fabric, as well as changing a lot of what many of us cherish about living in the area. Thank you.
Aaron	Phillips	atphil@gmail.com	I oppose this proposed change. I think a high-rise in this area would further destroy what remains of Sugarhouse's historic value and charm.
Kristy	Phillips	kristym.phillips@gmail.com	I disagree with the rezone. Not only will the character of Sugar House be affected, it will also bring horrible traffic and more water usage when we have no water. We have 4 or 5 big buildings going up so, it can hardly be argued we are in a housing crisis. This is just a chance for the builders/devopers to make more money at the expense of the character of Sugar House. I strongly oppose the redeveloping of the old Wells Fargo.
Jill	Quam	jillthomquam@yahoo.com	I am against rezoning to allow for the skyscraper proposed for the old Wells Fargo parcel. I believe it sets a dangerous and unfortunate precedent to allow taller buildings that will not only change the character of our community, but also obstruct views and sunlight for existing residents and business owners. An important characteristic when buying or even renting a place to live is the quality of light - you notice it first thing upon entering a space. This proposed building would forever diminish that quality for neighboring properties, and the precedent would allow the same to happen elsewhere around our neighborhoods. Additionally, the proposed building would add numbers of people and vehicles far beyond what the area can support, as our streets and other infrastructures are already beyond capacity. I agree that increased density is important for managing SLC's growing population, but this building doesn't belong in Sugarhouse. Sugarhouse has already endured more than our share of construction dust, noise, traffic inconveniences and even fires. Many high-density dwellings have already filled in most open spaces between existing buildings. We've had enough! Add density where it makes sense...downtown!
Eric	Steele	e.steele@gmail.com	Good evening! I would like to let the Council know my opinions of the proposed re-zoning of the old Wells Fargo parcel. I am not in favor of allowing for re-zoning of this area to allow for a building height increase to this extent. I am not opposed to this being a multi-use building with units on top of businesses, but the height increase is just too much for the area. The Sugarhouse downtown area should be a "human scaled" area instead of just being a second SLC Downtown. Surrounding buildings currently abide by the 105 foot maximum height, which allows for a human scale city. Sugarhouse has the charm it currently has because of its scale. It is poor planning in general to zone cities in a manner that has allowed for downtown areas to have massively tall buildings only to have the rest of the city be single-family homes. SLC is making improvements in this sense (such as allowing for 4-plexes in all residential areas), but this proposal is a step backwards. Once we set the precident that developers can build to 240ft or taller, we will see more new developments in this area try to do the same, and will hurt the asthetics and general feel of Sugarhouse. Additionally, a building this tall (even at 240 feet) will shade my house in the mornings at certain times of the year. If more buildings like this are built, many homes in this area will be shaded for even longer periods of the year. As someone who is looking to get solar panels (and has several neighbors with solar panels) installed in the near future, this will directly harm solar production in the area. The proposed zoning change is not something that we should allow. If we want to change zoning heights in the area, it should be respectful to the people living around it, as well as the other businesses in the area already abiding to a height restriction less than half of the proposed building (and 1/3rd of the zoning change). I would love to have more businesses, event centers, etc., in the area. I love living in a walkable area. However, I am not wanting to live next to a new downtown with 240+ foot tall buildings. Please keep Sugarhouse at a human scale! Thank you. Eric Steele

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Anne	Beecroft	atbeecroft@gmail.com	I feel it would be a bad idea to allow the requested zoning change or to allow amendment of the Sugarhouse Master Plan so that a developer can build a building so much taller than any of the surrounding buildings. The reasons stated in the request are not strong enough to warrant such a drastic change in zoning. What is the point of having a masterplan if it is allowed to be amended in a drastic way because a developer wants to build something very different than outlined in the Masterplan? Such a tall structure would definitely change the character of downtown Sugarhouse and the surrounding neighborhood where I live and walk. Please say no to this drastic zoning change request and say no to amending the Sugarhouse Master plan. Thank you for the work you do. Anne Beecroft
Kristen	Carter	krissyblueeyes@hotmail.com	No one wants another high rise in Sugarhouse.
Jeff	Laver	cjefflaver@gmail.com	Sugar House already is zoned for density—the Wells Fargo proposal is just too much. Buildings of the proposed height belong downtown.
Daniel	Bentley	danbentley66@hotmail.com	If the height limit is raised, Sugar house will be torn down and rebuilt. We already have a water crisis with the dwindling lake and threat of arsenic dust. This isn't good for Utah, the only reason to do this is so that out of towners can swoop in and make a fast buck. STOP THEM, unless you're on the take...and then don't.
Frances	Hays	frances.hays@cbrealty.com	We will be coming together as a neighborhood to protest this rezone. We are done with all this over development in our small community. The increase in traffic has ruined our streets surrounding these apt buildings etc. We understand the need to develop but in a responsible manner. How about some green space.. All this building has thrown all the traffic down in our neighborhoods. Now a multi story building.....not going to happen on our watch. We will be coming together with all the neighbors and protesting this rezone. After three years we finally got speed bumps on our streets making our area safer for walking, biking but this is insane to even think this is a responsible way to move forward. When will enough be enough???
Paul	Adams	murraypatch@msn.com	Can you PLEASE give my neighborhood some well earned rest. PLEASE dont allow this to move forward until we know the full impact of all the other high density buildings you've permitted in this neighborhood. Some are not completed and others have not even started construction yet. Planning Commission, let this neighborhood rest for a few years and give it time to grow into all the drastic changes you've already allowed. The constant construction disruptions for years now and the ever increasing condensed population has made life for my family and neighbors stressed and unhappy. This new proposal feels like a kick in the groin when we're already laying on the concrete. If you're feeling keen to approve this proposal, may I please challenge you to approve this types of building in your own neighborhood. I'd love to share the wealth you, your family, and your neighbors.
Brittany	Baker	brittanybakerslc@gmail.com	I currently live in Sugar House on Simpson Avenue. Hearing about the proposal of rezoning for a 34 story building seems absolutely absurd, considering we have no infrastructure in place to support this kind of occupancy in such a densely populated small neighborhood. Please do not pass this rezoning.
Janiece	Pompa	pompa_j@ed.uth.edu	Hi - I am against this proposal. Allowing buildings up to 305' tall plus their required adjacent parking garages will change the character of Sugarhouse. We do not need skyscrapers in this part of town that will contribute to the overpopulation and air pollution in this area. Unrestrained growth brings problems that our quiet residential areas do not need. We need to carefully consider the consequences of this kind of rezoning and push back against developers who only seen an opportunity to make a profit from every square inch of land that is available.
Noelle	Isakson	runningfast95@msn.com	No re zoning. We live here, work here. 2100 South is going to be narrowed. That intersection is already a huge mess. Traffic in Sugarhouse is horrible. Construction is everywhere. Building for walk you all call walking communities should have no parking. All of these buildings included hundreds of parking stall. Our air already sucks. Stop. Sugarhouse is not downtown which has been greatly diminished because more housing more cars more streets narrowed. Why narrow streets if you will be adding more traffic? My property taxes continue to increase, yet my neighborhood continues to be diminished

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Barbara	Elieson	blelieson@gmail.com	My concerns are that the proposed height changes will continue to change the density of an area that does not have the road infrastructure to support it. The city is so determined to apply traffic calming measures to this area which makes traffic lanes narrower, limits on street parking and accessibility to area businesses. Downtown SLC is currently overbuilt for multifamily units and provides studio, single bedroom units with about 10-15 % 2 bedroom units. Calling them family units is a misnomer. Not too many families can or want to fit in a 2 bedroom unit. (And we wonder why schools are closing) I'm also concerned that this projected change is looking a bit far into the future. Has any one thought how much is too much? When to we get to the point that people don't want to live in Sugar House or more to the point can't afford to live here? We used to have apartment units that students and young families could afford to rent. No more. As more of the smaller apartment units are flipped, less and less people can afford them. Please be careful and listen to your constituents. As you can tell, I am opposed to this rezone. Thanks for letting me rant.
Tracy	Altman	tracyaltman@hotmail.com	This area cannot handle an influx of traffic in the amount proposed by this building and rezoning. The Sugarhouse area is a unique landscape within Salt Lake City, and already has difficulties with parking and traffic vs. pedestrians and bikes. Please consider the fact that this type of structure would not only impose a drastic increase on the traffic in the area, but would take away from what Sugarhouse appears to be promoting--a unique neighborhood with businesses and restaurants that can be easily accessed. I shop and do business in this area several times a week. I use the Wells Fargo bank. This type of building and increased congestion will definitely deter me from doing business or shopping in this area.
Marcia	Hansen	hansen5200@msn.com	Sugarhouse is not an appropriate area for a high-rise building. One it's not in keeping with the current environment. Two we don't streets to accommodate the traffic that such a building would create. Currently Sugar House streets, i e 2100 south and 1100 east which border this propesd high rise, are being re engineered to be narrower roads with bicycle lanes. We already have plenty of new housing developments in the area, so there's no need for this high-rise. Please dont allow tjis high rise Please protect sugarhouse
Sue	Watson	fromsue2u@gmail.com	So very angry with the council and whomever else is responsible for allowing all of the zoning changes for buildings in sugar house. A sky scraper type structure is too tall and will unporportunatly over tower other buildings nearby. A tall building such as this would restrict sunlight from nearby businesses, walking sidewalks, and resident housing nearby. Sugarhouse already has a traffic issue and allowing more rentals in this area (upward) drastically adds to the congestion. We have a business across the street from this proposed site AND witnessed the safety issues that occurred when nearby apartment recently caught on fire where evacuation of the area was needed; street width was already an issue to safely remove nearby residents. It is an ethical issue; quit trying to turn sugar house into a "downtown" environment.
Elizabeth	Lyle	buffylyle@yahoo.com	Me along with fellow suagerhouse residence urge you to not allow for this proposal to go through. We need to keep the residential zoning in tac that protects out vibrant and historic areas that make SLC so unique. Allowing additional expansion esp of this size is a hazzard to the residence and will forever change the landscape that is so special and needed in SLC. Please do the right thing as us the people who live here are not in support of this.
Charlene	Owens	charlene.m.owens@gmail.com	Horrible idea! This area is already extremely congested and just getting worse as the city chokes or eliminates travel lanes in it's non-stop war on cars/drivers.  High rises are fine for downtown...or continue them down the blighted areas of State Street. The roads there are much better able to handle the influx of residents/workers/shoppers.

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Victoria	Brinton	vbrinton@hotmail.com	<p>Why must Sugar House become a high density, high income enclave? Why does the planning committee think that people in the West are going to give up their cars? &lt;br /&gt;right now high income apts are over built. Building managers are giving all sort of incentive to get people into their projects. Why add to the overage. The amount of "low cost" apt that are promised is basically a joke. building all those high rises in sugar house is just making it an enclave where only those who live or work there can access it. the roads and parking aren't conducive to "outsiders" venturing in. Sugar House has already lost businesses and I am sure this over building will mean more will relocate.&lt;br /&gt;With the road narrowing and "traffic calming" crammimg more people in is basically asking for major conjestion. And the proposal of just 90% of the apt having only one parking space is insane. No one is giving up cars. And unless the occupant is single there will be two cars. With the price of the apartments, the occupants won't be able to shop at Whole Foods (whole paycheck) and will need a car to get to the nearest grocery or the least expensive. I spent two years hauling food home on a bus and it is miserable. As for any shopping, Sugar House doesn't have it all and public transport won't get you to Costco. I really can't understand this dream of everyone walking and cycling wherever they want to get what they need. I am 70 years old and in reasonably good health. I walk by neighborhood to friends but I don't see me walking or cycling for groceries. I honestly think that what is happening to Sugar House is biased against the aged. I wish I knew a lawyer that would take the case. &lt;br /&gt;Instead of making Sugar House a rabbit warren that only those who live in the warren can access, let's make it a place for ALL to drive into to shop and eat, walk or use the library.</p>
Angela	Trumbo	angie.e.trumbo@gmail.com	<p>Hello,&lt;br /&gt;I live a couple of blocks down the street from the proposed location for this rezoning and work in the field of avian conservation. I am opposed to the added height allowance being proposed. A structure of such height would pose additional risk to the local bird populations in our community. I hope that the council takes the safety of our local wildlife into consideration when considering this proposal. For any new construction on that property, I ask that bird safety measures be put in place prevent collisions.</p>
Gabrielle	Roh	elbowfork@gmail.com	<p>This is a PRIME example of the corruption going on in Utah. There is not ONE resident that wants a 300 foot tall building in Sugarhouse. &lt;br /&gt;But the CORRUPT council members including Mendenhall will IGNORE everyone that says no and ONLY listen to their bank accounts. SHAME ON ALL OF YOU!! There are PLENTY of properties downtown. They've done their best to DESTROY Sugarhouse with all of the high rise apartments - once again NEVER listening to the residents. THIS will be another SAD legacy left behind by Sugarhouse "leadership." CORRUPT CORRUPT CORRUPT &lt;br /&gt;I am a Wells Fargo customer. I urge EVERYONE who is a Wells Fargo customer to YANK their money out!!!</p>
Devin	Zander	devinzander@outlook.com	<p>I am writing in the support of the rezone of the Wells Fargo property. As a renter in Sugar House, I am blessed with close proximity to parks, Parley's Trail, the S-Line streetcar, and many other ammenities. It is my wish that more people are able to experience life in a Sugar House resident as I have for the past 23 years. Over the last 10 years we have seen development explode in the area. In my opinion, it has made the area much more vibrant and pleasant to be in. I love seeing everyone walking around with their dogs or biking around with their kids. The height is not a concern of mine, and I think we should allow buildings as tall as the market will support. I would also welcome the ground floor retail to replace the bank. If we are serious about climate change, allowing developments such as this will help mitigate sprawl and reduce emissions, with more people being able to live closer to their jobs, enabling a car-free or car-lite lifestyle.</p>
Aaron	Crowder	aaron.crowder@gmail.com	<p>I think it would be a travesty to not rezone and allow the proposed construction!</p>
Robyn	Young	youngrobyn53@gmail.com	<p>Do not do it ! We have already lived through Mendenhals crappy Sugarhouse "I can make Sugarhouse into something great " plan and it sucks!!&lt;br /&gt;Try asking the residents of Suagrhouse and see how they reply!!!!</p>
wanda	gayle	wgayle@sisna.com	<p>I am a 40-year-long resident of Sugar House and have seen my small and unique village pillaged by developers. I am unequivocally opposed to language that adds a new zone to the SH master plan. I am unequivocally opposed to the proposed development that wants to replace an out-of-place and poorly designed space (Wells Fargo building) with a new 300' structure that is even more wildly out of place and inappropriate for the neighborhood. The intent of the proposal that Harbor Bay wishes upon Sugar House is a twisted effort to get something the neighborhood does not want. Despite promises by the company to "take back input in earnest," as a representative said recently, it is a hoax that this is good for Sugar House, and should not be understood as reality. Thank you.</p>



## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Virgia	Shearer	meborga@gmail.com	What are you thinking? All Sugarhouse needs are more buildings. I have lived in Sugarhouse for over 45 years and am sickened by the area anymore. I avoid 21st South and 11th East like the plague because its so crowded and inconvenient to shop. It seems like the Council isnt planning at all, but becoming greedy. Its become more and more difficult to live here
Scott	Woolsey	swoolsey@gmail.com	This is an unnecessary, wholly unneeded project thst would not only not add to the community, but destroy much if its beauty, utility, and heritage. I encourage you to deny this rezoning request immediately.
Sylvia	Torti	torti.sylvia@gmail.com	I am 100% opposed to this project. This would not add value to our community, but would, in fact, detract from our historical corner. Please do not approve this.
Diane	Stewart	diane@dianetalks.com	Please do not allow the zoning to be further changed allowing for an unacceptably tall building in the Sugarhouse area. It would be tragic. We would lose tremendous amounts of sunlight, lose views of the mountains, gain unmanageable amounts of traffic, and wreck the feel of Sugarhouse further. Enough damage has already been done.
Dale	Southard	dale.southard@gmail.com	I understand their proposal was for 30+ stories, yet at the meeting they discussed just over 20 stories. Seems to be a big disconnect and makes their pitch seem suspect. But in any case, even 20 stories seems too much for 2024. Maybe in 2044
Mattie	Casey	mcasey13mt@gmail.com	Over recent years the Sugarhouse community has seen and continues to see a large number of high rise apartment/condo buildings being constructed. Our neighborhood is beginning to look more like downtown which is not what anyone moves to this neighborhood for. We have plenty of new high rise buildings in the area and do not need yet another especially when the city doesn't see it fit to also put into place additional grocery/liquor stores to accommodate this influx of living units. Sugarhouse is charming because of the small local buisnesses, walkability, and local art community. Let's not ruin it with yet another destruction to our skyline and view of the Wasatch front.
David	Carlson	dcwifeaggro@gmail.com	I love this plan and fully support the re-zone. The idea of "keep sugar house the way it was" seems to be coming most from people living in apartment buildings that wouldn't even exist if we previously "kept sugar house the way it is".
Lynn	Lonardo	6lonardos@gmail.com	Ive been in Sugarhouse over 23 years. I do not want tall buildings taking over our neighborhood!!! Its bad enough with all the apartments around here which will make traffic horrendous when completed!! NO to many story buildings at the Wells Fargo location or anywhete else in Sugarhouse!!!!
Carol	Clayton	carolinslc@aol.com	It's hard to believe that this proposal is even being seriously considered at all. This project has no place in the area in which it is proposed. I expect this proposal to be shut down resoundingly. Sugarhouse is not the place for these buildings. And don't we already have enough empty tall buildings all over Salt Lake? Please carry out the will of the people who currently live in Sugarhouse by voting NO on this proposal.
Kim	Paturzo	paturzok@yahoo.com	I've lived in the neighborhood of 1800 South 1000 East for 27 years. I purchased a home in the same area in 2017. The neighborhood has changed dramatically in a short amount of time as we all know. Sugar House is a charming and cherished town that could potentially become washed out. Please do not allow 300' buildings in this area. If this zoning passes when will it stop? I ask you... When will it stop? That is not the neighborhood I'd want to live in. It's not the neighborhood I have chosen to live in.   Thank you, Kim Paturzo
PAULA	BRALEY	paulabraley@yahoo.com	Sugarhouse does not have the infrastructure to support the increased traffic of a building the size of the one being proposed. Buildings of this size should be limited to areas that have parking structures and streets with multiple lanes/turn lanes to handle cars pulling in/out of those parking structures. Eleventh East is not designed for buildings and traffic of this scale. Pretending occupants wont drive cars does not serve this community. Also, developers of any scale should be assesed impact fees for all of the increased community burden, interruption and/or negative impact in accessibility to existing businesses, expansion of public services, and damage their construction does to existing infrastructure. The community should be provided reports and uodates on the fees assessed, collected, and the use of those impact fees.
Ramiro	Flores	ramiroflo@gmail.com	Last Soring at a Land Use fot the Wells Fargo space meeting, there was a public opinion group questionnaire with the proposed development. This is a 11 X 17" document an I am inquiring if these will still be accepted to submit with the developer?
Brenda	Koga	bnkoga@live.com	I am not in favor of this rezoning request, since it opens the door for buildings to be close to 10 stories high. I feel that would ruin what little character is left of the sugarhouse neighborhood. I feel we have too many apartment/condos being squeezed into small Spaces and what once was a great place to live, is turning into a highly populated area without regard for proper infrastructure and Traffic concerns. I am tired of developers coming in putting up big complexes and then just patching up the street while we the taxpayers have to pay for the mess they leave behind.

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Sheila	ODriscoll	sheilakodriscoll@gmail.com	<p>My letter is in regard to the rezone proposal requested by the developers who have purchased the Wells Fargo Building on the corner of 1100 East and 2100 South in the Sugar House Business District.&lt;br /&gt;NO to Rezone!!!!&lt;br /&gt;There is absolutely no positive in any part of this proposal to enhance the SHBD and certainly not the abutting and adjacent residential properties and small businesses located there!&lt;br /&gt;Stop the overdevelopment of this neighborhood business district now.&lt;br /&gt;I served as a trustee on the Sugar House Community Council for 20 years. In the last ten years since I retired from representing the Dilworth District we have continually seen the southwest block of the business district over built and completely turned into a slot canyon of concrete, cinder block and mortar.&lt;br /&gt;No view of the mountains is visible on Highland Drive anymore.&lt;br /&gt;Sugar House Business District is not downtown SLC. It is NOT Portland, OR. It is not Chicago or Cleveland.&lt;br /&gt;Those who are proposing to erect a 21 story apartment and street level business structure on the corner where the Wells Fargo building sits have one objective in mind ... to make money for themselves at the expense of the &lt;br /&gt;well established community that already exists.&lt;br /&gt;One block has already been destroyed. Do Not let it happen on the north side of 2100 south!&lt;br /&gt;The developers knew what they were buying when they purchased this parcel. &lt;br /&gt;They can repurpose the building under current zoning.&lt;br /&gt;They can sit on it and do nothing.&lt;br /&gt;They can sell it.&lt;br /&gt;Do Not Rezone this parcel to accomodate a 21 story building that is completely out of line with this well established neighborhood!!!&lt;br /&gt;The destruction of the SHBD needs to stop, now.&lt;br /&gt;This community deserves a better plan than this!&lt;br /&gt;Regards,&lt;br /&gt;Sheila O'Driscoll</p>
Jennifer	Girten	jgirten@comcast.net	<p>I oppose changing the zoning to include a sustainable district as proposed. While a sustainable LEED building is desireable, mass timber production doesn't do much to improve air quality in SLC. Suggesting a building this height allows more people to live and work in Sugarhouse, thus reducing single occupancy car travel is disingenious, since all the residents in a buuilding that tall can't work in Sugarhouse. It does not increase diversity in housing since there are multiple new commercial/residential developments increasing density already in play. I agree with their words that it increaseses the "intensity" of the density in the area - which is NOT consistent with the character of Sugarhouse. I am not opposed to anything sustainable but the current Master plan seems to balance maintaining the character of Sugarhouse and future development needs adequately.</p>
Mallory	Platt	malplatt@gmail.com	<p>As an architect, I understand the need for growth and progress. There are many benefits to this proposal. I am okay with this parcel being rezoned as residential. It makes sense with the trends we see moving forward. As a reidence of Sugarhouse, the monstrous nature of the proposed project is not acceptable. Adding a 34 story residential unit will ruin the uniqueness of Sugarhouse. The reason Sugarhouse is such a desireable place to live is because it has a mix of urban and suburban without being downtown. A residential unit of this size belongs downtown. Sugarhouse is already congested and adding this additional traffic with make downtown Sugarhouse unpassable. Adding a smaller residential tower will bring the people to the center of the city as desired while maintaining the quaint nature of what Sugarhouse has become to be known for. Please consider what impact this will have on the current residents of Sugarhouse. Rezone to residential, yes. Approval of residential high rise, no!</p>
Owen	Phillips	obphillips@gmail.com	<p>I do not support the proposed rezoning of Old Wells Fargo Parcel. I live and work in Sugar House. Rezoning the downtown Sugar House zone to include high rise residential will not help solve any issues currently facing Sugar House. This will not help relieve conjection, it will increase it by adding potentially thousands of new residents within an area suffering from lack of street, residential and business parking. Additionally, the continued construction in Sugar House has harmed businesses as parking and accessibility remain constrained because of nearly 3 years of street construction. A high rise is the exact opposite of the Sugar House community.</p>
Phyllis	Hansen	phyllis.hansen78@gmail.com	<p>I am extremely concerned about the many high-rise, multi-use structures being allowed in such a congested area in Sugarhouse. I can't find strong enough words to say how I feel that the full effects of the increase in these structures will not be realized until they have been completed or in advancement, which will be too late to stop. How sad I am that the congestion is already such a detriment to our peaceful and pleasant neighborhood. For me to travel around Sugarhouse is now a huge deterrent because of the current overcrowded streets. I am truely baffled how the city planners can possibly approve such an onslaught of over-building. Please don't give in to whatever motives are pushing this proposed rezoning and high-rise development. Sincerely, Phyllis</p>

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Jennifer	Stout	jennifer.stout7@gmail.com	Please consider the surrounding infrastructure. It simply cannot accommodate the number of residents and vehicles this would bring to the area.  People already avoid the area because of the traffic and lack of parking, this would only add to that frustration and hurt local businesses.  I moved Sugarhouse 13 years ago because of the charm of the local businesses and the eccentric vibe. While the changes have been hard to watch over the recent years I have come to terms that the city is growing and I do in fact like the proximity of businesses to me but I do not see how this project would add anything to the area except an eye sore and traffic.  This will hurt Sugarhouse and the community that calls this area home.  Thank you for your time and consideration of denying this rezone proposal.
Melissa	Gaddis	mmgaddis055@gmail.com	As a local architect, I dont feel like rezoning to allow this height fits in a neighborhood like Sugarhouse. It would stick out like a sore thumb. The shadowing from the building would create a less friendly walkable 2100 S. I also feel the roads arent really equipped for the size and scale of the proposed residential building. Any building of that height should be integrated with the height and streets of central downtown and not here. Part of the charm of Sugarhouse is small scale building shops and at most mid-size multi-family. I dont have a problem with mass-timber building or sustainability requirments for the zone. The height should just not be allowed to get that high. I also dont necessarily see a good plan to activate the street with the open space at the bottom of the residential tower proposed. Just currently an open undefined space. How would a project like this really be contributing to the fabric of 21st? Most of the intial concept design seems out of place and looks to have not examined it's surroundings to integrate seamlessly.
Koby	Elias	koby.elias@gmail.com	Sugarhouse needs the density. I am in support of this project. It's architectually interesting, and will add much needed housing to the neighborhood. I am a local small business owner and sugarhouse resident. Cities need to change and adapt or they desiccate and die. Sugarhouse is going through a period of transition from a suburban neighborhood to an urban one, we need to lean into this transition and do it right rather than resist it. We shouldn't fight the density, we should fight for transit, and pedestrian infrastructure to adapt to it.
Martha	Tinker	martha.tinker@gmail.com	Sugarhouse is not downtown. A building of the height desired will transform this neighborhood into another manufactured burst of corporate deveoloment. Please preserve exosting height limits and find appropriately zoned larcls in the city for these types of towers.
Breklyn	Morgan	breklynsteed@hotmail.com	Do not put a high rise in sugarhouse and change the charming small neighborhood feel. We already have too much traffic from all the housing units being built. No more big buildings in sugarhouse!
Joni	Koncar	joni.greenwell@gmail.com	I am opposed to the rezoning for the old wells fargo building. Sugar House is a quaint neighborhood, and this building will be a sore thumb in the neighborhood. It's much too big for a small family area. Plus 2100s is extremely congested and this will only increase the problem.
Rebekah	Newman	bekah632000@yahoo.com	NO! Absolutely do not rezone the height of this parcel! I walk, bike, and drive by this parcel daily, and this is not an acceptable change. We are in the middle of reconstructing highland and 21st south to prioritize livable, walkable, bikable, safer streets, and this high rise building would be in direct opposition to that priority. The traffic and infrastructure at an intersection that will soon be two lanes in each direction cannot handle a high monstrosity or the population that it would contain. This is already the heart of sugarhouse, and the population and current traffic flow is at it's max. Historical and cultural elements of all that is valuable in the sugarhouse neighborhood would also be irreparably lost.
Ashley	Mendoza	ashley.mendoza2@gmail.com	Absolutely not. Skyscrapers do not belong in Sugarhouse. Such buildings need to be consolidated to the downtown area. Please do not destroy Sugarhouse!!
Jennifer	Hicks	sunboxstudio@gmail.com	This rezoning change would only open the door to unsustainable growth, buildings that unfairly block the sun to parts if the neighborhood, traffic nightmares - and many mire negatives. 100% against this! - sugarhouse home owner
Jenny	Walsh	jennywalsh@hey.com	I'm thrilled that higher density housing is being planned. I love the design and structural plan to build a timber frame high rise! I know change is tough, but this seems like a great addition to the "downtown" part of Sugarhouse. I look forward to hearing how the developers plan to address concerns around affordable housing, parking and density of traffic, and how this will effect homes to the immediate north of this structure. I also look forward to hearing about how this will support small businesses (or not) with main level shopping, and if there will be public green spaces to add charm.
stephen	dibble	sdibble@xmission.com	A high rise building on the corner of 2100 S and 1100 east is an overkill. This is not Brooklyn with all of the mass transit options available.
Rebekah	Cassidy	bcassidy1220@gmail.com	No. This is not the place for it. Dont destroy sugarhouse anymore !

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Dylan	Martinez	dylanmartinez1997@gmail.com	I believe the best way to lower housing cost is to up the housing supply in order to meet the ever growing demand for housing in Salt Lake City. That is why I 100% support the proposed rezoning to allow the building of 400 new homes in Sugarhouse. I believe dense housing to support walkable communities is exactly what is needed in Salt Lake City!
Jennifer	Jensen	jrjensen1@gmail.com	This building should absolutely not happen. It will stick out like a sore thumb, be an eye sore to the neighborhood, and diminish the charm of Sugarhouse for all the residents that chose to settle down here. There are zoning restrictions for a reason. Please don't allow this to be built!
Cory	Ward	cw3147@hotmail.com	About a year ago, I moved into the Irving Heights Apartments on 1200 E. After graduating, I chose to come to the Sugarhouse downtown area because of its urban feel and walkable environment with access to frequent transit. It is one of the few places in Utah where it is possible to live comfortably without a car. I have access to services, grocery stores, parks, and countless restaurants within a 10-minute walk. I continue to live without a car in part out of lack of financial resources and in part due to the ease I've been able to live in sugarhouse without one. I am excited by the upcoming improvements to the neighborhood, and I wish that more neighbors would get out of their cars to enjoy the neighborhood. I suspect that when Irving heights was built decades ago, the seven-story building did not fit into the street with single family homes. However, I am glad that it has allowed me and my neighbors to be part of the sugarhouse community by providing a place for young adults to find an affordable place to begin in sugarhouse. I support increased building heights in the Sugarhouse business district. I think Sugarhouse is a welcoming community that can accommodate more people living here. Although the apartments in the Wells Fargo Building site are not likely to be affordable for people in my position, I am hopeful that more housing units in the area can help fill the demand of the area. The addition of more units will lessen the demand for more affordable units like mine and hopefully help keep them affordable. It is worth the risk of more traffic in the short term if it can attract more residents who drive less in the long term. Being a young resident in Sugarhouse can be intimidating when long-time and wealthy residents exert most of their political power. I fear they are trying to guard the value of their homes while closing the door shut on people like me. I believe developments like this increase value for everyone. I just ask that you keep in mind the residents like me when making choices that affect the livability of those just starting out their adult lives. While the height of this building won't fix everything, decisions like these are part of the key to a bright future.
Daniel	Walsh	djosephwalsh@gmail.com	The proposed building is a fantastic addition to Sugarhouse. We need more housing to combat high housing costs. Also creating a high density, walkable neighborhood in the heart of Sugarhouse will make the area a fantastic place to live.
Amanda	Bearden	amandagracebearden@gmail.com	I live just down the road to this proposed rezone. I applaud the developers for proposing a mass-timber building, close-ish to transit that brings more housing to our city. I think it's essential to build sustainably, add density where it belongs, and to get creative with current zoning to help solve our housing crisis. That being said, I would be hesitant to grant the zone change due to the maximum allowed height of the CSHBD-SUS zone. This proposed building will not fit into the fabric of the existing community, zone, and surrounding zones. With interest rates decreasing, the development costs are sure to come down and make a mass-timber building pencil easier at the current 105' maximum allowable height. I would love to see a mass-timber tower come to Sugarhouse, but not at the allowable height of the CSHBD-SUS zone. I believe there is a compromise to be found with the developer and the city's goals. Thank you for your time!
Kim	Allard	keallard@msn.com	Landowners are free to do what they want within the zoning restrictions at the time of purchase. Attempting to sell this zoning change is a joke. Some people abhor how Sugarhouse has changed. I support it, but I do not support this request to change zoning to allow taller buildings in the Sugarhouse area.
Wenda	Stoker	wstoker@msn.com	I am against rezoning this parcel.
Matt	Gray	mattgrayslc@gmail.com	This is among the best places in the entire valley for residential density. Access to daily needs by foot and public transportation do not get much better than this site. It will not ruin the neighborhood but rather will enable more neighbors. I do not live in Sugar House but I have visited businesses there for three decades, and I support the rezone.
Alexa	Dowdall	lexid.323@gmail.com	The roads around this area cannot physically handle the volume of vehicles that would accompany 400 units. Without better access to transit this plan is insane. The potholes and road damage along 1100 E is constant. Please do not add more dense housing into this zone without seriously improving access to public transit.

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

kathy	henley	henleyk518@gmail.com	not long ago i was at slc city council meeting. the city council members were being ambushed with rezone requests and were lamenting the lack of a salt lake valley-wide master plan to help them envision our future. from a bird's eye view, letting a developer pop up a double the size sky scraper way out in sugarhouse is sky scraper sprawl and ruins the skyline. just like the development at entrance to emigration canyon ruin the skyline. the skyline is salt lake county real estate's most valuable asset. let the builder find a property downtown for their vision and cap the height of buildings in sugarhouse forever. it will preserve maximum property value for EVERYONE. letting wells fargo put up a sky scraper in sugarhouse only maximizes property value for wells fargo.
Heidi	Asbrand	heidiasbrand@gmail.com	Please do not allow the rezoning of the Wells Fargo parcel to allow the increased height bonus they are requesting. It would be an eye-sore and such a design is not remotely in line with the look, feel, and spirit of Sugar House. We do not need to replicate the downtown vibe with a massive tower in the heart of our district unlike anything that surrounds it. The ten-story/100-foot buildings that have gone up recently (Legacy Village, etc) are already a significant height increase to the area and in my opinion should be the cap.  It is actually my hope that you do not allow the rezoning for residential at all, as there have been so many housing units going up and congestion is a real problem. But if it must change, please do not allow the height bonus and keep Sugar House's character unique from downtown. Thank you for your consideration.
Lynne	Olson	lynneolson@msn.com	On behalf of his client, HBV SLC, Jason Boal is requesting a zoning map and text amendment for the property at 1095 E 2100 South., and a master plan amendment to support that change. Mr. Boal suggests that the size and density of the project being proposed is compatible with the existing form and function of the Sugar House Business District.  This assertion is preposterous, considering that the 21st South/1100 East intersection boasts four of the oldest and most cherished historic sites in downtown Sugar House. The tallest, the Sterling Furniture building, was built in 1910. The Antique Shoppe is virtually unchanged since its construction in 1912, a single story building with a rich and colorful history. The west edge of the proposed construction site is the location of the Jordan and Salt Lake City canal, built by pioneers in 1882. It continues to serve the water needs of residents who depend on it to water their gardens and lawns. Any interruption to that service, especially during the current drought, would be devastating.  The building on the west side of the alley that covers the canal is the original Sugar House Lumber Company store and warehouse. The northern segment of the building is easily identified in photographs from 1914 as the livery stable for the company's stock. The building has been in continuous use since that time, and recently has been remodeled as a restaurant and pub. One-hundred-forty-one structures were identified in a 2007 Reconnaissance Survey of the Business District as historic structures and resources. Tragically, some have been lost since then due to attempts like this one to capitalize on the unique, authentically historic character of the SHBD. This must not be allowed to continue.  Please help us protect the integrity of the existing form and function of the Sugar House Business District, and help us continue to cherish this as "The Sweetest Place on Earth."
Andrea	Jimmie	andie_311@hotmail.com	Absolutely no. What is the purpose or need for such a large, tall building? 2100s and 1100 east is all ready a cluster and heavy traffic and heavy with footed traffic. People fly through that intersection. Absolutely no. The people who are for this are people who dont live in the area. No no no no no no no times 1000.
colin	strasser	cstrasser@gmail.com	I have strong reservations against setting up a new zoning specifically for this type of construction that is new and unproven. There will surely be consequences negative and positive for this type of wood construction. The full ramifications of creating a new zoning encouraging this type of construction are unknown. This is not a strategy for responsible future zoning at this time. I support the increase in height but not with the proposed zoning requirements being passed. Forward to other developments to reach the same height. Please reject this project in its current proposal.
Michelle	Montmorency	montaloia@aol.com	Do not allow for a zoning change to the Wells Fargo parcel! Adding the increase in height will destroy the sugarhouse vibe that is part of our history. It will make the corner dark with shading of the sun that many of us need during these winter months. Keep the height at the initially requested. Do not allow this increase to go through!
Laura	Livnat	laura.livnat@gmail.com	This project should not be approved. Driving in this area is already too challenging with the narrow streets and parking is difficult. The shadow from the building will put many homes in the dark forever. We dont need another giant residential building, there are many apartmwns in the area. The current 105 foot limit should be strictly enforced. You didnt let the others build to 300 feet, why should this one get to break the regulations? And finally, a quick estimate shows none of these apartments will be affordable. There is no benefit to the neighborhood or residents. Please deny this project.

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

George	Chapman	gechapman2@gmail.com	<p>Issues on proposed Wells Fargo Building proposal            Construction will have to stop all traffic on 1100E. and one lane of traffic on 21st S. including sidewalks on 1100E. and 21st S. (on the north side). It would also block the McClelland Trail.            Due to the lack of fire rules for mass timber high rises, higher sprinkler requirements and water storage on the roof would be needed. There is no space for a ladder truck on 1100 E.            Sewer, water and storm water utilities would need to be upgraded for the area at a cost of up to \$20 million (and 21st S. would need to be torn up again for higher capacity utilities - after the in process utility upgrades).            It is next to a leaking canal and the main earthquake fault and should require significant higher earthquake standards since such a tall building could block 21st S. and 1100 E. after an earthquake.            The present interest rates would indicate a limit of 2 to 3 stories for financially viable projects.            Construction would require adjacent properties and parking (that could include new Fiddler's and other properties) and significantly impact and destroy nearby businesses since SLC has a habit of allowing construction to stop pedestrian traffic.            Bottom line, this will destroy the rest of the small businesses on 1100 East.            This project should be immediately stopped by SLC Public Utilities due to the obvious inadequacy of local sewer, water and storm facilities. Fire Department should stop it due to firefighting inadequacy and earthquake susceptibility. SLC Business Development should stop it due to potential destruction of many small businesses on 1100 East and 2100 South (between 1000 E. and 1200 E.).</p>
Amy	Jameson	amy@aplusworks.com	<p>I'm very concerned about the proposed plan to erect a 300+ foot apartment complex on the site of the old Wells Fargo Building. This type of building is outside of the Master Plan for our area, and it will bring in far too many residents to what is already an overcrowded area with terrible traffic issues. 11th East is a tiny street and there's no way it can accommodate such a development. Not to mention the fire hazard it presents for everyone in that area. The fire department struggled to put out a fire on a 76 foot building - there's no way they could manage a serious fire in a 300 foot building!            Sugarhouse is a delightful place because of its small businesses and local character. When we allow developers to create unaffordable high-end condos on every open square inch of the neighborhood, we are destroying all the things that we as residents love about the neighborhood. We have a serious homelessness problem in Salt Lake, and what we need is affordable housing for the next generation of Sugarhouse residents - my kids are all older teenagers, and I have a hard time imagining how they will ever be able to afford to live in Salt Lake City once they become adults, which makes me incredibly sad. Please vote "NO" to this development that only enriches outside interests and does nothing good for the Sugarhouse neighborhood.</p>
Jennifer	Mallory	jennifer.m.mallory@gmail.com	<p>I have reviewed the rezoning request of the current location of the Wells Fargo building on 2100 S and 1100 E. I live directly one block to the North of this parcel in question. Overall, I am concerned that Salt Lake and SugarHouse are not on the same page as far as development.            Specifically, how the city will allow such a huge influx in residents while AT THE SAME TIME restricting the infrastructure that feeds into it, that the future residents will use to get there. I am of course referencing the traffic "easement" planned for 2100 S, that will cause a deliberate bottleneck on the street right before the proposed massive complex will be located.            This also will be an upscale development. The cost will not be cheap, based off of the design. It touts that it will be a unique build with high-quality materials. This means that the people who live there will be well-off and afford their own vehicles. Rich people do not take public transportation, let's be real. That means that right at the point where the city is causing a chokepoint there will be a huge increase in traffic at that very location.            Additionally, the city removed the right turn lane on 1100 E turning right onto 2100 S. This also causes backed up traffic, right at the point where the plans have the entrance and exit to the parking. Additionally, the planners have a drop-off / pick up point RIGHT AT THE LOCATION where the city removed the right-hand turn lane.            Am I to understand that the city removed this access from the public only to have it incorporated in a privatized luxury building?            I object to the rezoning of this parcel for many reasons, but specifically because the city has intentionally restricted the surrounding infrastructure, making such a large building impossible to seamlessly incorporate into the neighborhood. This is too large of a project for this parcel, for this neighborhood, and the city needs to reevaluate showing massive residential complexes into the very space they are restricting traffic to. You cannot have it both ways.            I object to this rezoning, and object to the planners to use what was once community access (the right-hand turn lane on 100 E) to be used in a private building, regardless of height or zoning.</p>

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Joshua	Cook	joshcook@yahoo.com	This is a catastrophically terrible idea! This will utterly change the look, feel and accessibility of Sugarhouse!   There is not enough parking in the area. There is already way too much street traffic.   Traffic will dramitically increase in residential neighborhoods. Furthermore, the will inevitably try to access this building via Parkway Avenue creating undesireable noise, and congestion.  This project is WAY too big and unsightly for this neighborhood.   THERE WILL BE NO COMING BACK FROM THIS! IF THIS IS APPROVED YOU WILL HAVE A FLOOD OF REQUESTS FOR MORE REZONING AND WITHIN 10 years this will be a mini-downtown Without access!
Jean	Daly	jeandalyk9@gmail.com	Please join the majority of Sugar House residents and not allow this high rise to be built in Sugar House. Our infrastructure could not handle the extra traffic and we do not have sufficient public transportation available. As we have already learned, we do not have sufficient water pressure to fight a fire in a building of this height.  Delivery trucks for any commercial properties on the ground level will block traffic and/or not be able to fit in the side alleys. Thank you for your time and please vote no. Jean Daly
Gary	MacGlaughlin	19paxson52@gmail.com	While i am not opposed to change or development in Sugar House, any new building should be appropriate to the neighborhood. What is currently being proposed for the Wells Fargo site isnt, in my opinion, an appropriate addition to our current neighborhood. Of what benefit would such a project be and for whom? Certainly the out of state developer who has no real stake in our neighborhood, but who else? A housing development on that corner would be acceptable if it were consistant with the surrounding architecture heights. Allowing a skyscraper type building would only set a precedent for more of the same which will effectively and forever compromise much of what makes this area unique and of value to those of us who live and work in SugarHouse. Thank you fro the oppertunity to express my views on this matter. GPM
Michelle	McLaren	michellemslc@gmail.com	Why is this even being considered? This is not just a little beyond what the current code allows. This is not better for the community this is better for the developer and once again i ask myself who is protecting Sugarhouse? We dont need a skyscraper in Sugarhouse, its not inline with the master plan and its not inline with the community needs. This company should have purchased one of the empty parking lots in downtown SLC, not a corner of Sugarhouse.
Matthew	Monahan	matt@kaijucode.com	I am a pro-density resident of Sugarh House. I love the density of many european cities, with their tightly packed 3-5 story buildings. I dont think I'm alone in loving that level of, what some call, "mid-level", density. The proposed Well's Fargo rezone is not only incompatible with that, seeing as it is a single extremely high-density point, but it is also a threat to a more sustainable, long term, increase in density.  If this project goes through, despite the clear opposition from the community, it will be destructive for future, responsible, development in several ways:  - It will show that the communities where these projects are proposed have little to no say in their approval, meaning people will grow cynical and disengaged. - It will, as I stated before, actually make the area less comfortable and inviting, hence less walkable. - It will be used in the future against proposals for other increases in density, rightly so, because it will have been such a debacle.
Bill	Rice	br@billriceimages.com	As a resident of Sugarhouse, I am opposed to changing the zoning of the Wells Fargo parcel to allow structures higher than 10 storeys. In addition to being an eyesore and changing the character of the neighborhood, Sugarhouse simply does not have the transportation infrastructure to accommodate it. We barely have the transportation infrastructure to handle what we have now, let alone what all of the additional apartment/condo units will bring that are already under construction.

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Emliy	Potts	emily@sugarhousecoffee.com	<p>I want to express my deep concerns &amp; reservations regarding the proposed rezone of 1095 E 2100 S. As a long-standing member of the SugarHouse community, I am invested in the well-being and future of our neighborhood. The proposed map amendment to increase in zoning height to 300'+, is troubling and does not align with the community values and planning.&lt;br /&gt;Current zoning height of 105' is more than sufficient for our community. SugarHouse lacks the necessary infrastructure to support a building exceeding this height. The proposed structure will undoubtedly have a direct impact on surrounding businesses/residents. The potential increase in traffic, poses a significant concern, as our streets are already strained and may not handle such a drastic surge effectively.&lt;br /&gt;I am particularly concerned by the potential risks associated with fires, especially after the challenges faced during the fire in 2023. We must prioritize the safety and well-being of our community, and approving a building of this magnitude without adequate planning for emergency situations is irresponsible.&lt;br /&gt;The impact of construction on surrounding businesses cannot be ignored. The Harbor Bay building, as proposed, offers no affordable housing or commercial space. This is deeply troubling, especially considering the recent closure of more than 17 businesses in Sugar House. Half a parking space per unit is unrealistic, fails to address the transportation needs of our community.&lt;br /&gt;A recent survey at Sugar House Coffee revealed that over 70% of customers drive to our small businesses, only 18% renting an apartment in SugarHouse. This data highlights that SugarHouse is a destination, people are being priced out of the neighborhood. Constructing 400 luxury units is unsustainable for SugarHouse.&lt;br /&gt;I urge the Community Council to focus on preserving the integrity of SugarHouse rather than catering to developments that only a select few can afford. Instead of approving a 300'+ tall building, let us explore alternatives with more affordable housing that will attract residents keen on supporting our local businesses.&lt;br /&gt;It is essential to consider the strain on utilities that a 300'+ tall building would place on our community. Approving such a project sets a precedent that may encourage future developers to propose similar skyscrapers without adequate consideration for our neighborhood's infrastructure limitations.&lt;br /&gt;I kindly request you reconsider and halt the proposed project. Let us work together to preserve the unique character of SugarHouse and prioritize the needs of our community over excessive development.</p>
Eric	Fortney	eafortney2@gmail.com	<p>I'm a local homeowner and father living in Sugarhouse and look forward to an ambitious plan for this prime piece of land. It's only with density that we get the kind of streetlife that Sugarhouse is known for and building up is the most efficient to add density, especially in such a prime location. I hope the originally proposed tower can get approval.</p>
Jim	Frazer	jfrazerart@gmail.com	<p>The proposed project will not do what the developers say it will, actually more the opposite. For instance, the petition on behalf of the developer HBV SLC states:&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;On page 2, that their project will "alleviate housing instability and create a sustainable, mixed-use, mixed-income neighborhood". &lt;br /&gt;The rents in Sugarhouse are some of the highest per square foot in Salt Lake City. Building more high-end housing will not encourage a mixed-income neighborhood. &lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;On page 4, that "The rezone will ensure the Sugar House neighborhood continues to be distinctive, while providing a specific focus on "sustainability and livability"&lt;br /&gt;a) a skyscraper-type building will not be in harmony with the distinctive nature of Sugarhouse, instead it will make it seem more like downtown.&lt;br /&gt;b) the emphasis on the use of mass timber as a "sustainable" building material is pure greenwash. We are talking here about the sustainability of the ambiance of the neighborhood, not about the relative effects of various building materials on the earth in general. &lt;br /&gt;c) a development that is out of character with the intimate scale of the neighborhood will lessen livability, not add to it.&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;These guys are just pushing the limits as hard as they can to see what they can get away with. They are putting us, the residents of the neighborhood, in the position of having to organize opposition to a project that is clearly out of harmony with the surrounding area and should be denied out of hand. Recently, the Planning Commission voted to deny a developer's request to build a project at 250 S 200 East because it was not tall enough. They should similarly deny this request because it is too tall. They have come up with this new zoning idea, with all its supposedly attractive claims, simply to try to push through an extravagant vision that would be better suited for a different location.</p>
Nancy	Ivy	nancylivy@hotmail.com	<p>I have lived in sugarhouse for 17 years. I beg the city council not to change zoning to allow yet another tall building. Sugarhouse has lost its unique character it had before all these developers were given zoning changes. We have lost far too much. Please, please, say NO!</p>
Cecelia	Jones	gizmogato@aol.com	<p>Please do not rezone so the building can be taller than it is zoned for now.&lt;br /&gt;Sugarhouse has been changed so much we do not need any rezoning to allow taller buildings.</p>



## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Aubrey	Atkinson	aubreyatkinso@gmail.com	<p>This project is too big. I understand the need for growth however, my street and home near Fairmont park is now surrounded by housing complexes and a few of them are not even finished yet. The complexes very near this project that are complete are not anywhere near capacity.  Also, this is the west. People have cars, like driving their cars, having freedom to go where and when they want and do not take transit as it is not convenient enough for day to day use.  Sugarhouse is losing the charm of a place where people lived in homes and chatted with their neighbors. Big, rather, huge housing complexes like this kill that vibe.  It is worrisome it feels our leaders appear more driven by monetary gains than connection and community livelihood. A massive project like this along the busiest and most congested road (2100S) is not helping people want to live here. Parking and shopping and getting around is tricky enough.  Build housing. Fine. Add businesses, fine.  Just not like this.  Thank you</p>
Christopher	Shope	clshope@yahoo.com	<p>I just attended the 1/31/24 discussion at Highland High and wanted to provide an alternative viewpoint to the very vocal, loud, and disrespectful majority. I believe we all should have a choice in this decision and not be swayed by the guy talking under his breath and swearing at the presenters.  SLC is a growing city and Sugarhouse is the ruby of the ring. This comes with a desire to live here and a preference to keep it as it has always been. Unfortunately, these are contradicting options. Every year we see changes in canyon travel, housing, increased interest in sports teams, a new airport, and many other things that change the landscape and life. In Europe, population density is generally focused with large plazas, great large residences, shopping, and restaurants. This is exactly what makes Sugarhouse appealing; the local availability of options all within walking or biking distance.  While adjacent homeowners have a valid reason to be discouraged due to increased density, large building shadows, parking, increased traffic and other concerns, I would personally love the proximity. Being adjacent to the Sugarhouse business district inevitably comes with tradeoffs. It is expected that Zone 1 would grow and be developed and redeveloped. There are many parking spots available in Zone 1 within easy walking distance (just not adjacent). The multiple vendor market approach in the Wells Fargo building proposal is very appealing and much needed in Sugarhouse. There are several foodhalls in the city but not in Sugarhouse. There are many exceptional food halls and markets including Revival Food Hall Chicago, Chelsea Market New York and many others.  Finally, by allowing the increased proposed height, many additional benefits would be provided including: a wider sidewalk plaza, affordable housing retail space, sustainable construction, and beauty of the structure. We all push laws, rules, and regulations like not stopping at stop signs, speeding, not stopping for pedestrians, and developers are no different. If the inevitable growth of Zone 1 will eventually happen, why not have a caring, beautiful, well conceived idea to move in the right direction.  Warmest regards,  Christopher L Shope  12 year Sugarhouse resident</p>
Nancy	McPheeters	nancynwmgardens@gmail.com	<p>Please don't change the rezoning for the Wells Fargo corner. We have enough tall buildings in the Sugarhouse area! Sugarhouse has already changed enough!!!</p>
Jill	Stephenson	stephenson.jill@gmail.com	<p>I do not support rezoning of this parcel to exceed current height restrictions. We have lost much of sugarhouse's charm that is the heart of what we love about the community. It is the council's responsibility and duty to work for the citizens of this community and not heed to the whims of real estate developers.</p>

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Sue	Watson	fromsue2u@gmail.com	<p>"Gubbi Gubbi" is a phrase that needs to be said and enforced more often to those who buy parcels of land in Sugar House then want to rezone, especially those companies who do not reside here. The true meaning is "No"; origin is Aboriginal. Why say NO? Because this project is not consistent with the goals and objectives of this specific mapped area its nearby community. I attended the meeting at Highland High last night, 1/31/2024, where OBJECTIONS to this zoning change and proposed building were made very clear (exception: two persons who rented in Sugar House and moved around alot). Builders were not completely honest, very misleading, and I lost all respect for them; not proven trustworthy or honorable. (1) Shadowing caused by this building will change afternoons for those who now exist (work, drive, walk, or live) near 1100 East as brought out in the meeting but was hidden fact by developer presentation. (2) parking is a problem in the 1100 East area today and with additional proposed units, including businesses that only have "1 parking space per 1000 square feet" per documentation is not adequate. (3) the roads on 2100 so and on 1100 east are planned to be narrowed soon and not adequate for additional condensed housing. (4) this area is a beloved business district and feel it is important to keep the area viable with BUSINESSES instead of packed in residential; please dont change zoning. (5) safety is an upmost concern, especially as I witnessed the recent apartment unit on fire last year, the displaced people huddled in blankets from nearby buildings, fire trucks that could not navigate in the area as hot ambers from the fire were falling three + blocks away, businesses displaced or went under. Changes in Height restrictions in this area are a threat to the safety of others and access paths were not adequate for prior fire so why should a larger structure be allowed? (6) our business is across the street from this parcel which will block our sun, cause havic with parking and street access for our customers, please listen to those directly impacted by this and are truly against this building height and zoning, especially out of staters requesting this change. (7) council members and officials please listen to local businesses and residents and learn to say Gubbu Gubbi and heIIIII No!</p>
Carolyn Richards	Barney	carolyn627@comcast.net	<p>My dad, John Richards and my grandfather, Willard Richards are rolling in their graves right now. My Grandpa was one of the original owners of Granite Furniture and original planners of sugar House. He loved being a part of its growth, but not a 26 story building on the corner. The traffic is bad enough, the streets are narrow and can't handle too much more, and there is no parking. Why&lt;br /&gt;are you even thinking about destorying a quaint little town, with a New York skyscaper. It wasn't meant to be something like that. It makes me sick.&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;Please let's not allow this to happen.</p>
Mark	Richardson	dokie67@hotmail.com	<p>I support the rezoning. I oppose the people, usually the ones screaming loudly about doing more for affordable housing, who support restrictive zoning. Restrictive zoning, as well as oppressive permitting, impact and other fees and taxes drive up housing costs by increasing costs to builders and developers as well as by restricting supply. These NIMBY's need to open their eyes. This is a commercial area with large buildings already existent. I support more. I also support more liberal zoning for ADU's and multi-tenant structures such as duplexes and fourplexes. The first step to creating affordable housing is for government to get out of the way. The reason most developers no longer build 900 square foot cottages like the one i live in is because of the large government imposed costs a builder must incur before he ever breaks ground.</p>

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Bob	Watson	utahbaseball@msn.com	Thank you Sugar House Community Council for providing the community the opportunity to learn more and provide feedback regarding the proposed reuse of the Wells Fargo Property on the corner of 2100 South and 1100 East. The presentation was inadequate in answering the questions from residents primarily because it was just a bunch of fluff with presenters saying there were unknowns and not concrete. Many pictures and designs from other areas with most showing setbacks from road and lush green surroundings. Most pictures in Sugar House represented newer buildings and not the rich history of what makes this area special. I am opposed to the proposed zoning changes because they would negatively change the character, change the balance in architecture, and knock out of place in the Sugar House business district. I am opposed to the proposed zoning changes because building this highrise building, higher than any other building in Sugar House, disrupts the skyline PLUS there are too many unknowns about the water table on this specific plot of land that has a canal just nextdoor or possibly runs underneath this parcel so I think it is imperative that an ecological study is done immediately before any plans are determined. Please do not allow another building to go up in Sugar House that continues to be under construction for 5+ years. Zoning should NOT be changed to accommodate a building that is yet to exist, instead the builders should select the land based upon existing zoning regulations. There needs to be a hard stop on the continuation of buildings going up where plans contribute to change. For example, it is public knowledge that the "under construction" building that caught fire in Sugar House last year had changed their architectural proposed plans and had removed one of the two initially required fire lanes. SHCC and SLCC please stand firm and do the right thing for the Sugar House and DO NOT allow the zoning changes to encroach into the only piece of original business district architecture left in Sugar House.
Daniel	Teed	dcteed@gmail.com	I fully support upzoning salt lake city as much as possible. Increasing density is the only counter to endless urban sprawl and ever-widening freeways. Please upzone and build a healthy city!
Anthony	Teramana	anthonyteramana@gmail.com	Please support this rezone for the not-too-distant future Sugarhouse that will exist in a Utah with over double today's population. The Harbor Bay proposal is a particularly unique investment that the city should be welcoming with open arms. The CBD, where development like this has typically been confined to, is incredibly valuable from both a tax revenue and cultural standpoint - it is amazing that there is such robust, organic demand for this type of development in Sugarhouse simultaneously. This is really an amazing opportunity and it would be a complete tragedy to force a 5-1 cookie cutter apartment building on such a prominent corner. I am asking you to ignore the angries and the naysayers, they would be against anything here that wasn't a new chain store + drive thru anyway. This will set the tone that downtown Sugarhouse will remain important well into the future and stand out from new urban-ish neighborhoods like downtown Millcreek or South Salt Lake.
Matt	Laury	mattlaury88@gmail.com	I am all for more housing but the size and commotion this proposal would cause could not be overcome. Were already on a radical effort to revamp 2100 and will be in the same place again in 3 years to deal with the aftermath of this proposal. I am strongly against this building. We do not need luxury high rises, we need affordable housing.
Suzanne	Eskenazi	abandon72@gmail.com	I am against the requested re-zoning of the area where the old Wells Fargo was. There is already too much congestion - especially at that corner - and allowing such a zone change so the developer can get their plans through is the wrong choice.
Mary	McConaughy	metmccona@gmail.com	I object to the proposed development on the Wells Fargo Parcel. The height of the proposal is my major objection. It is about 3 times the height of the current zoning and does not conform to the Sugarhouse master plan. I do appreciate the developer trying to be sensitive to the community interests but a building that mass will just be an eyesore. Any building needs to blend with the community. Also - when, not if, we have an earthquake it will add to the danger from falling buildings and fires we will experience.
Nancy	Ivy	nancyivy@hotmail.com	Please, city council, follow your mission statement. It will be a travesty if you approve the zoning request allowing a cascade of highrise buildings in our already high density town. We are all wondering what kind of quiet boardroom agreements took place before you brought this to the community for their input. Please review your mission. *****The mission of the SHCC is to involve citizens in identifying issues, plans and projects that enhance the beauty, safety, vibrancy, and human-scale character of Sugar House neighborhoods, business, and historical and natural resources.



## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Michele	Tagger	micheletagger@gmail.com	I live near East Liberty Park and walk to SH to do grocery shopping (and to bank at WF) several times a week. I never drive there anymore as it has become so congested. As I walk through the once quaint neighborhood I am struck by the noise, the congestion, the never-ending building (The Sugarhouse Apts will go on forever), the lack of sunlight, the road repair that makes walking dangerous (there are literally holes on sidewalks at 11th & 21). I've lived here for 10 years and that area is unrecognizable. But at least there are no skyscrapers!! Why would an out-of-state developer buy this property without the necessary zoning in place?? It seems to many of us in the community that this deal has already been made without public input and that these meetings and comments are just to appease the community. Most of the apartments in the area have huge "LEASING" signs. So is this project really necessary to relieve the "housing shortage"? Will there be low income and affordable rental prices? And if this high rise is allowed and the zoning is changed will that mean future projects will also be allowed to build high rises? I am totally opposed to this monstrous project which will further add to congestion and completely change this neighborhood. I can only imagine what it will be like there while the construction goes on for years. And will these developers contribute to the infrastructure? Will they repair the damage to the roads that inevitably will occur during construction? Please, listen to the community. There seems to be very little support for this project from the people that actually live here, work here, shop here, go to restaurants. Many of the local businesses have already suffered from Covid, endless construction, street redesign, etc. If we wanted to live amongst high rises we would move downtown, but we don't because we like our neighborhood. NO SKYSCRAPERS IN SUGARHOUSE!!
Teresa	Prior	teresaprior@comcast.net	Please do NOT allow this project/rezoning.
Breanne	Clement	breannemclement@gmail.com	I oppose the proposed rezoning for the old Wells Fargo parcel. The developers said the additional height will allow for 400 units instead of 300 units. I'm sure there are other options to get 100 residential units in Sugarhouse that aligns with the current zoning requirements and does not place such a burden and loss of sunlight on our current residents and businesses. Making exception to the current zoning is a slippery slope that I don't think we should slide down. Please do the right thing and do not recommend the rezoning. I implore you to trust and support current residents and businesses instead of out of state developers.
Carol	Garner	carol@acmebookworks.com	I am adamantly against the rezoning of the Wells Fargo Parcel. The request to rezone the Wells Fargo parcel to allow a building over the current zoned height of 105 feet would drastically alter the area, not for the better. The developers were aware of the zoning when they purchased the parcel and should be held to the zoning that is in place. There are far too many negative aspects that would result from allowing this change and far too few positive ones. The character of the neighborhood would be forever altered, benefitting only the developers, not the residents of Sugar House.
Larry	Wright	larry1756@hotmail.com	I'm against the rezoning amendment. The idea that a 1.22 acre property could support 400 units does not fit in with the Sugar House Master Plan. The data doesn't support the idea that higher density will increase public transportation. The majority of the jobs in Sugar House are in the service industry. The development of all the apartments has failed to make them affordable to the majority of workers in Sugar House. Sugar House used to be a destination now it is a place to avoid. With the years of construction and lack of parking, the local businesses are dwindling. They can only survive with customers coming from outside the Sugar House area. Local businesses are being priced out of the new retail space. To lower congestion and encourage the use of public transportation, the City, UTA and the developers should share the price a Public transit passes for each resident in the high density apartments already built. The developer has been misleading the community about this project. Even the concepts don't show the building correct. The high rise portion is not a rectangle structure; it's an L-shaped. Please do not approve this zoning change. Thanks Larry Wright
Alyssa	Hickman Grove	hickmangrove@msn.com	The character of Sugar House is still somewhat quaint and charming, although that is changing, as there are already too many tall condominium and apartment buildings being built in our neighborhood. The proposed building for the Wells Fargo Bank site is too tall and will stress the neighborhood's infrastructure far too much. The rezoning must not happen.
Kyle	Bergsma	kyle.john.bergsm@gmail.com	I support the rezoning of the parcel of land. To those who argue about traffic, construction will be the same impacting road closures as if it were a 5-over-1. The density is helpful for local businesses once the building is complete, and the proximity to a Trax station for the S-line provides public transportation options, as well as the UTA busses.   This building is surely the first of plenty to come. Why not allow it now and set the rules/zoning vs. have others appear and have to deal with this same problem all over again?

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Patrick	Hays	patrickhays@msn.com	<p>I am not sure that the developers brought their best game to this meeting. They were caught bending the truth several times and were caught. No one believes them and they can't be trusted. Matt brought up a very good point. He brought up their shadow map and how that affects the people on Hollywood and their sunlight in the winter. Well their maps were completed for the summer months. They were caught misguiding people. They are all alike. They brought up that it won't be that different from the Wells Fargo building that was there employing and servicing 150 people. &lt;br /&gt;Another lie. They weren't there all at once. Not like 400 units will be times 2 cars each. Another lie. And that doesn't include all the apartments yet to be rented. They should talk to the owners in that area. Business is down because people avoid the area now because of lack of parking and it's so crowded. People won't get stuck in that mess. And the businesses come and go. Check out the vacant stores now before you add more. We are so over the city allowing all this building to go on and on and we are the recipients of the disaster they are promoting. They are money hungry people that don't care about anything else but putting money in their pockets. Help us put a stop to this building madness. It is affecting our every day lives and no one cares. We have had several cars in the past hit at our intersection traveling at a high rate of speed mad because of the inconvenience of all the traffic. They have overturned, come up into our yard and done damage, people in the cars hurt...it's all a joke. And you can prevent some of this by putting an end to all this development. You do it once you won't be able to stop the train. We need our elected officials to listen to the people of our neighborhoods. We are going to fight this with everything we have. So get ready for a fight.</p>
Richard	Knickerbocker	r.knickerbocker@gmail.com	<p>There are many reasons for which I feel that the rezoning request brought forth by the developer of the old Wells Fargo parcel should not be approved. The proposal is asking that the existing building height of 105 feet currently in place be changed so that a building more than twice that height can be placed on the parcel of land. The SH Community Council has been visited several times by the developer and over the course of these visits, I have come to believe that we are not being given a true picture of their plans regarding this project. I feel that presentations (especially the most recent, shared with our citizens on January 31st) have been put together in a misleading manner. In this recent presentation, the developer presented a list of what he feels are nine of our neighborhood concerns regarding the project. As believe the most problematic of these concerns are: Shadows, which he seemed to make light of, not truly showing the negative impact shadowing will have on surrounding commercial and residential areas; Traffic, which will be negatively impacted during the construction (constantly ongoing in SH) and thereafter with the influx of the property's occupants; Neighborhood Character, which I believe will be destroyed with the presence of a monstrosity being built on our busiest downtown intersection; Local Retail, which will be priced at the market rate (as shown in one of their slides), a rate already difficult for local business to thrive and remain in our business district; and Affordability, which I believe will not be the case for either residences or commercial space in a building of the magnitude planned here. Aside from that, questions arose during the evening regarding access by fire equipment in the event of a problem in upper floors of such a building. I also feel strongly that allowing the proposed change for this parcel will necessitate the approval for similar proposals in future developments as other parcels inevitably become available for development in our neighborhood. The developers in this case do not live here and are not in tune with our neighborhood and the desires of our local citizens. Remember, we are not Chicago, San Francisco, New York, Atlanta, or even downtown Salt Lake City. I implore you to reject this rezoning request in order to save our downtown Sugarhouse.</p>

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Eric	Steele	e.steele@gmail.com	<p>Hello! I had written some comments previously, but I would like to update my comments a little bit after the Sugarhouse Council Meeting which took place at the end of January.&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;In general, I support a denser downtown Sugarhouse. I would like to encourage taller, mixed use buildings as well as mixed use spaces. With this proposal of the 240ft rezoning, there are two key issues I would like to discuss.&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;1. Salt Lake City / Sugarhouse Council should have a master plan of what they want Sugarhouse to be turned into. Having an out-of-state developer create the proposal for what this neighborhood should look like is not acceptable. This kind of rezoning proposed by developers is very clear as the proposal only lists CSHBD-SUS as able to allow for this new height requirement. I am all for sustainable building practices, but it's a bit strange for a developer that produces large sustainable buildings to allow this height only for other similar buildings. This seems to be a direct result of allowing developers to manage city zoning, rather than the city council. How many other developers will actually meet this sustainable building practice, or is this new requirement going to reduce the amount of developers bidding for properties in this area?&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;I would encourage Salt Lake City and the Sugarhouse Council to develop the Sugarhouse Neighborhood's Master Plan. If this is to become the new downtown, please act like it and plan the area accordingly. Do not allow our zoning rules and requirements to be dictated by outside developers.&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;2. As far as the building's height is concerned, 240 feet seems to be too tall for this area, especially with the height of existing buildings. The developers said only 30% of the land is able to be developed. Allowing for these one-off buildings spread out from each other to reach 240 feet while the other buildings in the area (which will remain) which are 105 feet or shorter will be visually unappealing.&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;I would request that the height of the buildings be reduced to approximately 175 feet, rather than the 240 foot allowable height. 175 feet allows for more than just the typical 5-over-1 apartment complexes to be built, and would fit in with the height of the existing buildings in the area much better.&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;Thank you!&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;Eric Steele</p>
Glenda	Cotter	glenda.cotter@icloud.com	<p>Being a long-time resident of Sugar House, I'd like to register my opposition to the proposed rezoning of the Wells Fargo parcel. More housing is needed and a building in scale to the area would be fine, but the proposed building is TOO Large for the neighborhood and the existing infrastructure. Again: I'M OPPOSED TO THIS REZONING PROPOSAL.</p>
MARY	BRETT	brettsynergy@centurylink.net	<p>I went to the Highland High meeting w/ an open mind to hear about the various proposals re: sustainability and the height rezoning for the old Wells Fargo building and surrounding district rezoning. After careful pondering, I have decided I am AGAINST the proposed changes.&lt;br /&gt;While the proposed building, itself, was quite beautiful, I was struck by how drastic the height increases to 3x (305') the current height (105') zoning was for not just this parcel, but the whole business district. The architects presented this as inevitable density change. I now realize how this is really about changing the whole character of this Sugarhouse business district to be a second downtown skyscraper area. NO, IT IS NOT INEVITABLE, and, it was clear from the meeting that this was not what 99% of the speakers wanted.&lt;br /&gt;Most notable points from the comments at the meeting:&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;1) New housing proposed is not affordable and current apartment structures in the area have high vacancy rates. This rezoning is not going to solve our housing and high rental problems. (I might reconsider my stance against this if 1/3 of every new apartment project is made to be affordable housing. Now that would make a real impact.)&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;2) Current residents are not supporting the local businesses there and most of their business is coming from people driving there. Old businesses are leaving &amp; new businesses are folding left and right. Nobody is doing any research to see if this "walkability" model is really working. From the residents' perspective, it's not working.&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;3) Everyone is experiencing construction and traffic fatigue and that's not going to get better, that's only going to get worse. People are avoiding the entire area like the plague. I shudder to think what tripling the height of new building construction, especially at Highland and 21st S will do. I don't think the patient will survive the surgery.&lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;Mainly, if the new housing is not affordable, we are trashing our lovely district for nothing. Thank you. Mary A. Brett</p>

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Jeff	Grathwohl	jeffg971@gmail.com	I attended the Harbor Bay presentation Jan 31. It's a very nice building by itself, but to begin with, what is this term sustainable and how does it apply to the proposed 21-story structure. Something to do with mass timber? A variance for 21 stories is just the camel's nose in the tent: unsustainable, unlivable for the entire district. Ever since the Sugar Hole, we've been told to be grateful for all this development. It will be worth the inconvenience! The inconvenience is going on 15 years, and this rezone promises another 15. Successful businesses are moving out; dwelling units are not affordable; it is not any more walkable; and it is now undriveable. I don't see any plan in operation. For example, how many businesses are still operative on McLelland below 21st, the ones that opened after the Granite block was developed? I have lived in SH for 32 years. While I do not expect Sugar House to be preserved in amber, I do resent the veiled threat from the nice Harbor Bay people that if we don't accept their "gracious" spire we'll end up with another 21st & 21st ugliness. The only way they can make money, they say, is reach for the stars (though they were well aware of the current height restriction of 105' when they bought). None of them plans to live here. If this is approved, we'll see many more such requests, all of which will also be granted with a shrug--but the district will be sustainable...
Tim	Hatch	timshatch@aol.com	I appreciate development that advances the needs of the community. As proposed, the rezone of the old wells fargo property will hurt the sugarhouse community. The project mass, look and feel dont fit. Traffic will worse. Please do all within yuir power to oppose. Regards, Tim Hatch
Karen	Schaaf	kalenali@hotmail.com	I attended January 31, 2024 meeting and appreciated the presentation of developer and his architects to explain their vision developing the old Wells Fargo building property. Their plan is progressive but really doesn't fit the community of Sugar House. Their skyscraper design would be more appropriate in downtown Salt Lake City not our Sugar House Community. We don't need to be or want to be another downtown. Our present zone height is enough. Our community is already packed with apartments and we have lost the charm of being a unique "mini" city that brought me here to live 44 years ago. I could walk to shops, library, etc. from my apartment on Elizabeth Street. Now I own a house in the area and work along 1100 East. Traffic has increased with development, street lanes have been reduced which impacts traffic congestion. Wells Fargo property design has some great multi-use suggestions which would enhance the Sugar House business district but the excessive height would not. There is a saying I learned in design school, "Less is more" (Mies van der Rohe) Perhaps that thought should apply to this request asking to change the zoning to build "more." These past few years of construction with more to come, has effected the desire to make Sugar House a destination. Please keep the existing zone height in place. Give Sugar House community opportunity to regain some of its charm & appeal by keeping our portion of skyline minimal. We can welcome development that meets our "master plan." We live here, we pay taxes here, this is our home and community. Please don't allow developers who don't know or understand our community dictate what is best for us. Thank you for opportunity to express concerns for future of my neighborhood. Please take our comments seriously in your deliberation.
Travis	Straw	travisstraw@gmail.com	Please no more high density, we are already so crowded here in Sugarhouse. Its becoming an area I try and avoid instead of one that I like to visit. No no no
Miriam	Bugden	miriam.bugden@gmail.com	Thank you for listening to and considering resident comments. Our air quality and watter issues cannot sustain the traffic and consumption that will be associated with this development. Can't we use the existing structure to house air quality and water science industries?
Lori	Komlos	lorikomlos18@gmail.com	After attending Wasatch Hollow Community Council meeting in January, I heard of this proposed request for zoning variance. I strongly oppose building to this height that would not fit in the Sugarhouse neighborhood nor be consistant to the character of this historical area. To exceed the height of the adjacent apartments would detract from a consistant flow of structures. Please reject this zoning request. Thank you.
Jocelyn	Young	youngjocelyn@hotmail.com	Do not rezone the old Wells Fargo Bank parcel to a commercial district with a high-rise and new zoning. The area is already a nightmare between traffic, walkability and the darkness of the area. Small business owners cannot make it. When we bought our property in Sugarhouse we loved the walkabilty of going to restaurants, small businesses, etc. Now the traffic is horrible, we avoid Sugarhouse like everyone else. Let these developers take over the Fairmont Park housing development that YOU approved, that has been a disaster. Please keep the end of sugarhouse walkable and feel like a real town.



## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Steve	Kirkegaard	kirk41856@gmail.com	As a Sugarhouse resident of 37 years, I'm writing to strongly oppose the rezone application for the Old Wells Fargo parcel. My main concern is the proposed height of 240ft (20+ stories). This isn't fitting in with the neighborhood. The current zoning height restriction of 105ft is sufficient - other builders have successfully built with the current zoning. I don't want our business district to look like downtown, and think this rezoning would just be the start down that road.  My second concern is the impact this will have on traffic and parking on the surrounding area. The circulation of public transport into and out of the business district, as well as circulating within the business district will be further stressed by the number of apartments proposed.  I have other concerns, but will close with this - the proposed rezoning does not fit in with the Sugar House Master plan, nor residents desire for a walkable business district, and a skyline unimpeded by a structure 240ft in height. Steve Kirkegaard Sugar House Community Council member
Shawn	Thompson	shawnto72@gmail.com	This proposed project is an example of corporate greed and lack of respect for the community. As a small business owner in SugarHouse I am outraged that a project of this scale has gotten this far in the planning process. The residents near this proposed project would be blocked from sunlight most of the day, infrastructure can barely maintain the current traffic in the area, and the last thing that this area needs is another highrise apartment building. I hope the city council does what is right for the community and insist on modifications to this project to align with current building codes or better yet veto the whole project. Letting this project happen is opening the window for others to come in and do the same. Support the community and dont let this happen!
Jane	Arhart	janehart22@gmail.com	I am opposed to any rezoning od Old Wells Fargo parcel. I have lived in Sugarhouse area for 48 years and do not want high rises.
Suzanne	Stensaas	suzanne.stensaas@hsc.utah.edu	I add my voive as dist 7 resident opposed to the rezone. Excellent reasons have been given so no need to repeat. I add my voice.
Richard	Knickerbocker	r.knickerbocker@gmail.com	After attending the Sugar House Community Council meeting last night I decided I need to send this addendum to a comment I had previously sent regarding the Old Wells Fargo Parcel.   Two important items were brought to my attention last night: 1. It was pointed out that the fire department is involved with the design, planning, building and enforcement of laws when it comes to projects such as the one proposed for this site. I originally expressed concern about the potential problem of a building of the proposed height in the event of a upper-level disaster. My concern was not meant as a slight to the fine men and women of the SLC fire department who have this responsibility. It was simply a concern I had expressed, not knowing the amount of involvement the fire department has in seeing a project such as this through its completion. Hats off to those who keep our community safe.  2. It was pointed out that the developer of this site has brought forth two requests for City Council consideration. One that the project be allowed to proceed with a height variance. A second requesting a zoning change, creating a section of Sugar House as a "Sustainable Zone," which will always allow other developers to make height variation requests such as the one for this project. We do not wish to see this happen in our neighborhood. I had mentioned in my first comment the fear that allowing the variance for this projocet would likely lead to others. This "Sustainable Zone" request guarantees this will happen. This request must be denied.   I ask once more ... please deny the variance requests being brought forth for this and future projects. This building would be more than double the height of anything in our area, and would cause numerous, substantial problems during its construction and occupancy.
Sylvia	Wilcox	syl.jo.wil@gmail.com	We don't need more high rise housing!! The huge complex where the fire was isn't even finished! Where are all the cars going to go with the narrow streets? Mixed housing? How does a family live there or anyone with children? Will there be any open space within the acreage for people with dogs or wiht children who need a play area? There should be. And Fairmont park isn't the whole answer. Homeless people hang out there. There should be an interior green space of some kind. And keep the development set back from the sidewalk. The whole area is getting to be suffocating!
Barbara	Reineke	bpr1371@gmail.com	I do not think we need another HUGE  Building in Sugarhouse. Please rethink this proposal. Thank you!

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Kindra	Fehr	kindrafehr@gmail.com	<p>I am writing in regards to to proposed zoning change on the site of the Wells Fargo building. &lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;I have had an art studio at the Rockwood since 1999. When I moved in, there was no plaza and plenty of parking both in front of the building as well as street parking on 2100 south and McClelland. I teach classes out of my studio and over the years the number of students who attend has slowly decreased. Initially when all these apartments were being built, we thought it would be beneficial to our business, more student possibilities and more art sales. However, I have yet to see this. Thus, the rezoning to accommodate even more of what has, in my opinion, not been a good thing, is unconscionable. I look at the height of the current buildings around me where there once were none and to imagine yet another one at double that height or almost 3X's that height (as was originally proposed) is saddening. The shift to the skyline, all those new cars and traffic (especially when the road is being narrowed to one lane which I personally don't agree with either) the shadow cast of such a large structure, all simply do not make sense to me. This company purchased the lot knowing the limits and to try to change them after the fact just seems deceitful. &lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;I have watched so many businesses fail in this neighborhood. Even though I work there, I avoid going when I don't have to. It's too hard to get through and there is guaranteed no parking to be found. Half the parking from McClelland has been taken away for big cement spaces which seriously has affected my work and business. Other cement structures in the street for bike lanes has also been dangerous. I have a friend who has lived in the neighborhood for decades who, while riding her bike, suddenly came upon one of these and crashed shattering her shoulder. These cement blocks are hurting the very people they are supposed to protect. I have almost hit them myself while driving. Adding more floors of living to an already congested neighborhood will not (based on experience) bring in more business to us. I feel that whoever is planning these "upgrades and modernizations" of Sugar House does not live or work here. &lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;I strongly oppose these zoning changes.</p>
Jeffrey	Campbell	mcintyre.campbell@comcast.net	<p>Approving this project would only serve to inform the public that their opinions mean nothing to those who are using their elected positions to enrich themselves and friends. What ever happened to real public servants?</p>
Jim	Muldoon	jimmuldoon@comcast.net	<p>Its time to realize that urban density is needed we cannot continue with sprawl. Seems a well thought out plan with very sustainable architecture. Allow this to happen</p>
Stephanie	Marthakis	marthakis@comcast.net	<p>Dear SLC Planning Commission: Please DO NOT APPROVE the rezoning of the Wells Fargo parcel in Sugar House. A 305 foot building is not the answer to our housing woes, and it would officially ruin what people love about this quaint business district. There are already several new multifamily developments in the vicinity, and the congestion is worse than ever. There are plenty of other locations along State Street that would be a better fit for a building of this size. Appoving a project like this disregards the true needs of the immediate area and would mark the end of a beloved, historical neighborhood.</p>
Kathryn	Lindquist	kathryn.lindquist74@gmail.com	<p>Please do not ruin the light for neighbors and ruin the ambiance of the Sugarhouse downtown by allowing a building any higher than the current code. Driving is already difficult, but that isn't as important as maintaining a welcoming neighborhood feel of mixed use. People need southern and eastern light for their landscapes and well-being.</p>

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Jeannine	Young	jeannineyoung@icloud.com	<p>I have attended the meetings where Harbor Bay developers have presented their plans for the Wells Fargo property. The information presented has not reduced my concerns about the proposal regarding the following:  Height – A building is 200 or 305 feet tall will be a focal point for miles in all directions . At present, Sugar House has some semblance of charm and intimacy remaining. Once a building of this size is approved it would just be a matter of time before other buildings of similar heights are approved and the Sugar House we know, will no longer exist. Also there will be never ending years of construction, detours and traffic jams which will negatively impact the existing local businesses.   The developers have not shown an illustration of how the proposed height compares with the present buildings in Sugar House. I believe this to be intentional and find it deceptive.  A community gathering place – I don't believe a large retail place under the proposed building to be an asset, where are shoppers supposed to park? My friends who live outside Sugar House tell me they don't consider coming to Sugar House because of the constant construction, the traffic problems and lack of parking.  Shadows -the architects' explanation of the shadows fell short when his illustration showed the shadows at their shortest distance during the summer solstice. The homes to the north of the building will lack sunlight they have been accustomed to-living in a shadow most of the year. I would be furious if the sunlight were taken from my yard and house.  Last of all, the developers justified the increased in height because they need to make a profit on their investment . They knew the height restriction when they bought the property.   If they made an assumption, that they could change the zoning, and it turns out that's not true, they need to bear the consequences of their poor judgment .  Jeannine Young</p>
Brian	Hanni	brian.hanni@gmail.com	<p>We are opposed to this rezoning request. The height is way too tall for the location.</p>
Patricia	Wesson	wessonwrks@aol.com	<p>The approval of a 305' tall building in the heart of Sugarhouse is an abhorrent consideration. I moved to the Sugarhouse area for what was once a funky area of family owned businesses. It has now morphed into "Any Town USA." To construct a sunblocking behemoth outside of downtown Salt Lake City is an idea concentrated on making money for developers. They do not care about the quality of life for those of us who live here and I am tired of the city I loved being sold to the highest bidder. The legislators ignore public concern and wishes and do what is financially best for them or thier family and friends.</p>
Kerry	Lehtinen	lehtinenkerry@gmail.com	<p>Sugarhouse was a wonderful area. Soon we will be saying "where did Sugarhouse go?" There are plenty of tall buildings there now, limit height to whatever is the tallest standing building. Let's put more "Planning" into your decisions.</p>
Gabrielle	Roh	elbowfork@gmail.com	<p>SHAME ON YOU ALL! Another perfect example of greed over constituents. There is NOTHING in this project that would improve Sugarhouse. NOTHING!!! It will only set precedent for more ugly high rises towering over a lovely small town.</p>
Debbie	Mayo	dancerindesert@yahoo.com	<p>There was an excellent article in Utah Stories magazine, <a href="https://utahstories.com/2024/02/305-feet-tall-residential-project-to-be-built-in-sugar-house/">https://utahstories.com/2024/02/305-feet-tall-residential-project-to-be-built-in-sugar-house/</a>, that includes some photos taken with a drone of the Wells Fargo building as it currently stands. They then ran the drone up to 305 ft and took another photo as well as one with the drone at 105ft. This gives you a clear prospective of the height differences for the proposed building and how it might affect the neighborhood. It is as if you are at the top of the building and looking north to the neighborhood. One thing that clearly stands out in the photo from 105 ft is that the building utilized by Sugarhouse Pub has a rooftop that is completely covered in solar panels. If the new building is built at either height, their solar panels will be completely shaded and most likely have their efficiency reduced by up to 40%. I would have to guess there are also other buildings and houses in the area that will have this same problem. I don't know what the policy is regarding solar panels but it is perhaps something to be considered here. People spend a lot of money on their panels and it would not go over well if they ended up in the shade all of the time because of a large building built after they installed their panels. These pictures absolutely show that 305 ft is just way too high to be in Sugarhouse. It will completely change the Sugarhouse vibe, create a huge shadow for the surrounding homes and businesses, cause an even bigger traffic mess and not solve the affordable housing issue at all. Please reject this zoning change.</p>
Kathryn	Dixon	claritycoach@me.com	<p>As a 26 year resident of Sugar House, I WHOLEHEARTEDLY OPPOSE the rezoning of the Old Wells Fargo Parcel to build a 30 story commercial building! This will permanently change the natural lighting of the area, darkening many businesses and nearby residential homes. It will also increase traffic in an area already overly congested with cars, construction, and wildly deteriorating roadways. I cannot fathom how anyone can see this proposal as beneficial to any SLC residents.</p>

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Agnes	Greenhall	aglet1817@yahoo.com	Zoning change should not be permitted for building in the Sugar House business district. Current zoning is adequate for this community to suffer. Any variance permitting additional building height is detrimental to the streetscape, risking a zone of permanent shade & gloom along the east side of the parcel in winter months. Narrow street on 1100 East, north of Highland, is inconsistent with any plan to increase private vehicle use of the already congested road/ intersection with 2100 South. Current experience with traffic diversions at this intersection show that vehicle traffic trying to avoid current congestion simply displaces traffic to small, neighborhood streets. This presents risks to pedestrian/ bicycle traffic in these residential areas Thank you for conveying my disapproval of this request.
Garry	Navas	gnav72@yahoo.com	As a long time resident of this area I, and my family, are highly opposed to the building of a massive sky scraper in this already highly congested area. Even with the supposed road improvements, our infrastructure in Sugarhouse cannot handle ANOTHER MAJOR apartment structure. Not only will this block any views to the mountains, it potentially puts thousands of more people in this already congested area. The apartments across the street already stress this VERY DENSELY populated area. Vote NO on this proposal.
Lynn	Schwarz	lsbx101@gmail.com	Ending parentheses in the next to the last sentence is missing.
Erin	Coleman Serrano	ecolemancruz@yahoo.com	As a former resident who currently works in the neighborhood, my comment is to limit zoning to the 105' height limit. Anything higher will drastically change the unique character of the neighborhood from an accessible and thriving urban community--we don't want another downtown SLC that feels cold and empty. We want a neighborhood where neighbors see and know each other, where history and innovation exist at a human level, where economic and environmental sustainability thrives.
Steve	Bunker	bunker.steve@gmail.com	I am absolutely opposed to this entire project as it is currently proposed for that corner in the Sugar House business district. No exemption should be made to this developer to build that high in what was once the best part of the city. If they want to build there, they can build something no higher than 105 feet (which is honestly still too tall for that area). I have lived a mile away in Liberty Wells now for over 25 years and Sugar House was my "go to" place for grocery shopping, eating out, and my other shopping needs for the first 15 years of living here. It was what I loved about my location that I had such a great business area close by that checked off all my needs. Within the last 10 years, Sugar House has now been totally destroyed and is basically dead to me and many other nearby residents. It's ugly, impossible to navigate, and has literally erased everything that was great about it. I now actively avoid it at all costs and rarely if ever shop there and definitely never drive on any of the roads intersecting the intersection where this monstrosity is proposed. The brakes need to be put on EVERYTHING that is happening in Sugar House to save it from totally being unusable and stopping all the gross overdevelopment that is happening. The damage has already been done to this area that we will never get back, so this would be a good first step in reigning in the greedy developers that just want to squeeze as much money out of the parcels as possible and leave the area with garbage architecture and overcrowding that will be a scar on the neighborhood for the next 50 to 100 years. Use some sanity and reject this madness and any future growth that hastens Sugar House's demise even more.
Calvan	North	peewee102@gmail.com	Sugarhouse has gotten so dense and the traffic so difficult that I am sure I'm not the only suburban Salt Laker who avoids it whenever possible. Developers can get approval for anything they want, and the city is becoming unliveable. The damage happens even more quickly when the developers are out of state since they have no connections to the valley and care about nothing but quick profits. This project is a coffin nail for Sugarhouse.
Erin	Bowers	erinhbowers@gmail.com	I agree with all of the potential problems listed in the article that this project would create if allowed to build over current zoning code for height in Sugarhouse. Its just wrong in every way to allow the developer to exceed the height requirement. The area is already over built and incredibly congested. This project does nothing for the esthetics and history of the area. Surely they can build according to existing code instead of according to greed. In what way does the project "encourage" use of public transportation, walking and cycling? I dont think so. It encourages even more ridiculous traffic congestion, parking issues, shade, and inequity toward existing neighbors and businesses. The rezoning request should not be allowed.
Joh	Stewart	phoenixsilverky@yahoo.com	What good are "caps" in SLC if they are always contested. They are there for a reason. There should be no debate. The age old excuse if "bringing more business" should NOT be the primary directive. The company involved in this should know better (from Irvine) Fortunately Irvine has more guts than slc planning commission to preserve quality of life ( & no 300 foot shadows!) Its sheet insanity to even consider violating caps in Sugarhouse.

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Patricia	Lake	brucelake@comcast.net	I grew up in Sugarhouse just south of 21st South on Highland Drive. Sugarhouse has already been ruined, but really, a 300 foot high building on the corner of 21st South and 11th East! How could you even think of it? It would overshadow EVERYTHING around it. And would it be something beautiful to look at? Most probably not. I wish money did not have to be the deciding factor in every decision. Think broader and deeper, please. Don't allow developers from outside our areas to come in, do their ugly thing, and then leave, never having to live with the consequences of what they have done - just counting their profits.
Matt	Sweney	mattsweney@gmail.com	This project is out of scale with surrounding area and should not be pursued. The congestion and overdevelopment would not draw me to the area, it would repel me.
Samantha	Wilkinson	samantha4homes@gmail.com	I am a real estate professional, so I understand the need for housing, and the ideas for growth. But as a Salt Lake resident for over 3 decades I have seen a lot of growth, on many sides of the spectrum. The fact that this is being proposed in light of Sugarhouse's most recent failure; the building located on Highland Drive that was constructed not to code, to the point where when it was on fire, the firetrucks could not even access it. And then is now being reconstructed, with the practical knowledge that the building is and never was built up to code, is a little bit astounding. City officials should know that the roads cannot handle any high density housing in this area as there is already struggles being in this area, and many people are beginning to avoid it if they can, this is not due to any lack of amenities in the area, but the fact that it has become difficult to traverse. This is not only over ambitious but unintelligent. City officials should be protecting Salt Lake City, it's residents, and it's values. We should not be taking money and doing spot rezoning for investors from other states, who have no idea about our culture, our towns, or why our zoning is the way that it is.
Karen	Carter	rkcarter1@comcast.net	Do not approve the zoning changes which would allow the Chicago group to build a highrise at 21st So. 1100 East.
Doug	Murray	slc@nowalls.com	I'm amazed that this is even being considered. 1100 East is one narrow lane each direction and already very crowded. 2100 is also very crowded and soon to be one lane. Even a building within the current 10 storey limit will have a huge impact on crowding and traffic. Say "NO" to this ridiculous proposal.
Aria	Hancock	aria.hancock.art@gmail.com	To whom it may concern, My name is Aria Hancock. I work at Commerce and Craft in Sugar House. My mom has an art studio in the Rockwood Studios building on Monument Plaza. I frequent Sugar House often because of these reasons as well as because of the many unique small businesses in the area. I do not support or agree with making the proposed building project higher than the rest of the buildings. Firstly because Sugar House has a zoning of 105 feet. Incoming developers should not have the ability to change this, there needs to be consistent regulation in place. Secondly, Sugar House is already rife with construction, we don't need to add more than necessary. Sugar House is a home for many businesses who rely on customer access. Places have already been forced to close due to the construction, my favorite restaurant Pizza Volta shut down due to the intrusive construction severely limiting customer parking and access to it. I worry about more places closing down due to the ongoing construction, let alone the construction that building something of this magnitude would require. In addition, parking and traffic are also major issues in Sugar House. There is little parking available, and what is available is often time-limited or specific to one location only, and many businesses do not have their own parking. The traffic is also abysmal, I have sometimes avoided going to Sugar House solely because I didn't want to deal with the traffic. I am one person but I imagine others have had similar thoughts, which further decreases Sugar House customers. Adding 400 units would only increase these traffic and parking problems, further injuring local stores and overall making Sugar House a less ideal place to visit for potential customers and possibly even renters for the apartments going up around the area. I encourage you to rethink this building project, as it is at risk of damaging local stores, restaurants, and possibly even your own business if it makes the area a less ideal place for potential renters to live. As someone who works in and frequents Sugar House often, I want the many unique locations in it to prosper, and I want to actually WANT to go to Sugar House. The current construction, and the possibility of even more intrusive construction, makes me dread going there. Thank you for your time.
Karen	Carter	rkcarter1@comcast.net	Tell the developers to live within the current zoning laws or sell the parcel and go back to Chicago.
Gil	Dammond	gdammond@hotmail.com	There are already too many oversized buildings on Highland near 21st S. The walkability and traffic in this area is destroying Sugarhouse. Restaurants have closed on Highland and once the other buildings are finished, traffic will be unmanageable. My wife and I are 100% opposed to yet another oversized building on Highland

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Kelly	Stevens	kellyqstevens@gmail.com	Opposed to the super talk buikding. Very simple. You know all the reasons.
D	Eichers	dallas@bhhsutah.com	Building more sustainably should already be a goal/requirement for new projects. Why should the city give height bonuses in order to build sustainably? Seems like perhaps the developer overpaid for the land and now wants to get additional height to make money on the project at the expense of changing the feel over Sugar House and altering view sheds forever. We should maintain a relatively strict maximum height and if a developer wants more they should consider developing in downtown SLC not Sugar House.
Melissa	Clyne	melclyne@gmail.com	<p>We request Council District D7, represented by Sarah Young, the SHCC, and the Salt Lake City Planning Commission, deny Harbor Bay Ventures' (HBV) Petitions: PLNPCM2023-00960 &amp; PLNPCM2023-00961.</p> <p>HBV's rezoning requests disregard the Sugar House Community Master Plan's (SHCMP) "stated reiteration of a direction for the Sugar House Business District that promotes a vibrant character compatible with the historical character of the area."</p> <p>We see constant discussion, "new statements of purpose," and reclassifications of the Sugar House Business District and area map to accommodate developer rezoning petitions. These occur despite community outcry. All decision-makers showed no regard for surrounding land use designations as agreed upon and adopted in the 2005 SHCMP. Many instances smack favoritism toward a particular landowner or developer.</p> <p>Sugar House is under assault -- spot zoning? We are aware of "consultants" actively protecting the interests of developers, not the residents!</p> <p>Upon attending the HBV recent presentation (2/7/24), we understand:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the petitions are made without a legally defensible connection between SHCMP land use planning and zoning;</li> <li>• there were no traffic impact, site-line, or environmental impact studies applied before making these petitions;</li> <li>• HPV used the most favorable shadow pattern (solstice) to dissuade neighbor discontent over the building's height;</li> <li>• SLC's current multi-family vacancy rate does not support a need for this rent-only development.</li> </ul> <p>Moreover, "words matter." HPV mistakenly emphasizes the property of "being sustainable" (e.g., "climate-change acceptability") through its proposed use of "mass timber construction." The SHCMP did not intend nor adopt this use of "sustain" and "sustainable" cited here:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop ... a sustainable, attractive, harmonious, and pedestrian-oriented community emphasizing "sustainable neighborhoods."</li> <li>• Programs that support neighborhoods with infrastructure, parks, trails, ... to sustain the quality of life in the neighborhoods.</li> <li>• Sustain a housing stock that can support families with children ... which supports the long-term sustainability of neighborhoods.</li> <li>• As well SHCMP's many references to "sustaining small business," which development, fires, road closures/repairs, vagrancy, and congestion avoidance continue to hinder.</li> </ul> <p>It is inconceivable that any reasonable planning commission could agree to this fishy HPV project--the harbinger for FIVE "Practically Able To Be Developed [CSHBD1 District]" projects!</p> <p>Once lauded as a "Best city 'hood" by Sunset magazine, Sugar House stands on the precipice of destruction, consumed by an illogical land use pattern and greedy underpinnings.</p> <p>How much longer must the cries of the taxed, non-transient community go unheard?</p>
Aidan	Loughney	loughneyaidan@gmail.com	I support the proposed rezoning of the wells fargo parcel for housing. While, I do understand the worries about the height and the increase in traffic it would result in, there is a housing crisis and Salt Lake is in need of dense new construction to keep up with the demand for housing. There should perhaps be consideration to reducing the height lower than 21 stories. However if presented with only a yes or no option, it would be a yes.
Chloe	Garner	cmgarner@outlook.com	Building a structure significantly larger than the existing neighborhood buildings will not benefit the community in Sugar House. Especially during winter months, the reduced sun due to the shade of the large building will negatively impact the neighborhood. Sugar House is already a busy community and adding a significant number of new residences will overcrowd the already busy neighborhood. As a resident of Sugar House, I value the existing community and do not want to see it impacted by such a large structure that will be the result of a rezone.
Joel	Barber	joeljunk2@yahoo.com	Let's please just stick to our existing Master Plan. If we're going to consider a special exception for a single developer, their plan would need to be pretty awesome and the units affordable, but as I understand it they haven't submitted a detailed plan, and what they have shared is not even good, let alone awesome.

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Jan	Lundeberg	janlundeberg1@gmail.com	I would like to comment on the idea of building a 21 ft tall apartment building on the site of the current Wells Fargo building on the corner of 21st South and 1100 East. Common sense would  indicate that it wouldn't be a sound idea just for the fact of it being a block and a half from a major fault line. That is not my only concern. Another concern is the impact it will have on the skyline. It so rediculously higher than any other structure around it that it doesn't even make any kind of sense. My next concern is the impact on the traffic in the area which is already overloaded with vehicles. Understandibly we do need more housing( or so "they" say we do) but a glut of units with a structure this size is not the answer. We need to keep Sugarhouse more charming and not "uptown chic" Thank you!
Jordan	Fletcher	jordan.fletcher7@gmail.com	This is a great idea and we need to move forward with this plan. We need to be more concious of our land use and buold denser mixed use communities
Dixie	Oyler	beader1952@yahoo.com	I have been a resident homeowner in Sugarhouse for over 30 years. While I understand more buildings are normal as cities grow, what has been occurring in Sugarhouse borders on insanity to me. It seems as though developers have been given free reign to build apartment complexes on nearly every plot of land that becomes available. For those of us (taxpayers) who have lived here for DECADES, it is extremely disheartening and sometimes horrifying to see that development has been given so much leeway. Traffic has become an absolute nightmare..And yet the apartment building continues. The developers don't live here and dont have to face the everyday consequences of too many cars!!!! am begging you to not allow this monstrosity of a skyscraper to be built in the heart of my city! We are not New York City nor should we aspire to be. This will set a precedent that will destroy and forever change the beauty and quaintness that is Sugarhouse. This type of tall building is unnecessary and unwanted!! am praying you listen to those of us who live and shop here. We do not want to become a city of skyscrapers! Please VETO this ridiculous proposed height and if absolutely necessary take the height way down! Compromise is possible. Please HEAR us! Thank you
Bryan	Hull	bryan@bryanhull.com	Rezone is a great idea! Build the 240' tower!
Bailey	Nordquist	baileynordquist234@gmail.com	I was lead to this page via the Salt Lake Trib article '21 story apartment building too tall, neighbors say' and I would just like to say that I think TALLER apartment buildings instead of sprawling 5-over-1s all over the valley is an EXCELLENT idea. The lack of vertical height and subsequent reduced units is the major complaint I have when I see new developments around the valley. In addition, sugarhouse is an incredibly convinient area to live for students due to its proximity to two major colleges and the University of Utah has had long standing issues providing housing to it's upperclass students. I have no doubt that a 21-story building with ample units available will draw in many of these students, including myself, as finding stable, affordable housing close to the U is more stressful than paying my actual tuition
Chris	H	sketrts@hotmail.com	Im in favor of the rezone request let them build the biggest housing structure possible
Justin	Dhondt	jdhondt@gmail.com	Don't start a precedent that allows high rise building in the area. Traffic is already a nightmare.
Jacob	Bashford	jacobbashfordspam@gmail.com	I believe with the continued growth of sugar house, planning for the future is necessary. Sugar House is no longer a small neighborhood, it is urbanizing quickly. The rezone of the Wells Fargo Parcel to allow for a 20+ story building, while seemingly a drastic increase in regular form for the area, can actually serve to offset the amount of development going on in the area for awhile. 10 to 20 years from now, this scale of building may be the norm for the neighborhood. I support the rezone, so long as work continues to improve traffic flow, pedestrian connectivity and transit connections in the neighborhood.
James	Stevenson	james.sharpsteen@gmail.com	I fully support this proposal.  Study after study has shown that new, dense construction is essential to offset rising housing costs in places like SLC that are facing acute shortages, because it relieves demand that is otherwise placed on the existing housing stock (the recent stabilization of rent in Minneapolis after upzoning is a great illustration of this effect). Sugarhouse is excellently positioned to accommodate this, as it has great access to public transit and an array of amenities and entertainment options. Our neighborhood prides itself on its inclusivity - using onerous regulations on development to prevent the arrival of more neighbors would amount to closing the door behind us. I hope the council will approve this development.

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Seth	Brown	sthbrown4@gmail.com	I am in support of the proposed rezone. I believe that the elements of the rezone which require the use of sustainable materials, ensure public space and green space, and reject car oriented business will result in a development that will elevate central Sugarhouse. What is allowed by right will almost certainly result in another drab, standard, unapproachable apartment complex. What has been built in the surrounding area thus far has only minimally improved walkability and has not created enough public space to warrant the continuation of the status quo. I walk, dine, drink, and bike in the area several times each week. This rezone would do more to enliven the area than any developer has shown interest in executing in my lifetime.
Matthew	Givens	bottombass88@gmail.com	My wife and I are young professionals that live near Sugar House and have been patrons to many businesses there for more than a decade. We love SH and want to see it grow and thrive. We were unable to make the meeting last night but watched the developers' presentation online. Let this comment be representative of our <i>*emphatic*</i> support of what they are proposing for this site. The Sugar House business district is the perfect place for a dense, high-quality, retail-oriented building like this, and the developers have clearly put a lot of thought into it and made themselves available for dialogue in good faith. This building would make SH better, not worse, by widening the sidewalks, providing more housing, and offering accessible, high quality retail spaces at what is clearly SLC's second busiest commercial area. As competition steps up from places like Millcreek and Daybreak, local SH businesses stand to gain a lot with more residents walking the streets and spending money. Utahns complain loudly about ugly apartments being built everywhere, and then when a beautiful and unique building like this is proposed they go on to complain that a tall building like this will cause traffic and shadows and whatever else. The truth is that these people just don't want change and scrape the bottom of the barrel to find every reason they can to oppose it. They are chasing the past instead of looking to the future. Sugar House can be better, and this is a project that's a step in the right direction.
John	Davila	johnwdavila@outlook.com	Utah is growing fast and space is limited. Growing higher is the smartest move. While more can be done with public transit, a tower would make a lot of sense as this area is fairly walkable. With grocery stores, open space, and the S-line all very close to this intersection, the proposal is incredible smart. Please do not allow the vocal minority resist change for the majority and future generations.
paul	karpel	paulkarpel@yahoo.com	I wanted to voice support for development of this site. This is a focal point of the neighborhood and should have a building that rivals the size and retail/restaurant space south of 21st. I look forward to some unique design elements and fully support sugarhouse as a place for biking, walking and traffic reduction. I hope to see with the S-line extension parking options west of 9th are being explored to promote public transportation for people driving to the area. Sugarhouse has been changing since the turn of the century and this development is no different from booms in the 20s 60s 80s and so on. I'm sure the under 40 community largely supports the project. Since Alta Terra is focused on 'affordable' housing I don't see that as a priority for this site, we should be focused on creating a place that promotes local business and walkability. I do think 240 is high and concessions can, and likely will, be made to arrive around a more reasonable 210 (2x current). I do also hope to see a largely finished Sugarhouse by 2026 and think we're on our way to filling in the holes and moving in the direction laid out in the master plan. *Typed on my phone with no spell check*
Nelson	Neuberger	nelson.neuberger@gmail.com	Just. Say. No. There is no reason to approve this. Sugarhouse is already strained as is. This will help only over states developers buy their 5th vacation home. This does nothing for the people of Salt Lake City. This is not what we want. Since it's impossible to expand the road it sits on, 2100 south, it is impossible to add additional density. This will kill property values (homeowner hazard), people's wellbeing (health hazard), will kill house plants in properties surrounding it (environmental hazard), and take water that is not available (another environmental disaster) that is impossible to revert. If any council member approves this, this will stain your name forever.
Catherine	Free-Weeks	cathyfree@comcast.net	I live in Sugarhouse and this proposed building is COMPLETELY out of sync with our neighborhood. It belongs in downtown Salt Lake City, not in Sugarhouse. We do not want a monstrous skyscraper and all of the problems it will bring. Our streets are already clogged, and not just because of the never-ending construction. Plans now call for one lane in each direction through Sugarhouse, and these developers want to add more traffic pulling in and out of their over-sized apartment project on 2100 South and 1100 East? No thanks! We plan to fight this every step of the way. It's a very bad use of this space.



## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Susan	Murray	susan@nowalls.com	The project is entirely out of scale for the area with additional negative impact to area. Too tall, too many units. Are they trying to offer penthouse views of Sugarhouse Park from down the hill?  I request that zoning NOT be changed. All of the new buildings currently allowed and under construction are changing Sugarhouse entirely. It was never intended to be "downtown." Please leave that to the current downtown Salt Lake location and let Sugarhouse maintain SOME of it's former charm which developers have been so busy destroying with building apartments and/or retail on every possible square inch in the area. I've never dreamed of living in New York, please don't open the door for developers to build something like that in Sugarhouse. If you allow it for one developer then the race is on to join the skyscraper party. Please STOP the rezone change!
Bernice	Chavez	bcskybluepink@gmail.com	I oppose the 20 story building because of traffic is increasing with each apartment bldg and the narrowing of 2100 so.
Alex	Villegas	calex8011@gmail.com	Please consider up-zoning this landing. We need more density!
Susan	Hagen	altapowderpro@gmail.com	The Wells Fargo zoning proposal does not comply with SHCC mission to involve projects that enhance the beauty, safety & human scale for Sugarhouse. A complete impact analysis of resources requires to support this project should include roads, water, fire, police as well as other natural resources. The assessment should include who benefits from the project; citizens of SH or just rich developers.
Jill	Williamson	jw5.xyz5@gmail.com	Please. Don't allow this building to be located here. The shadow it shall cast in the winter will cause problems for snow, extra heating and lighting costs for residence and businesses. Where else in Salt Lake city is there an apartment building of this size?
Julia	Michels	michels.julia@gmail.com	This rezoning request should absolutely not be approved. It will change the character of Sugarhouse in a negative way, bring endless construction, and be an eyesore for residents. I bear the concern for more housing in the area, but this is not the solution. High rise buildings are for downtown, not the neighborhoods.
Irwan	B	irwanhadi@gmail.com	I strongly disagree with this proposal. First it is a slippery slope. If this parcel can be allowed, why not the other parcels. Second, with the process of reducing 21st south from 4 lanes, into two lanes, this will cause more traffic jam, and air pollution, unless as part of zoning requirement, it is stipulated that none of tenants of this new development can have car, and have to commute by other means. Third, this proposal will very negatively impact the neighboring residential properties, as they will have much lesser privacy. Fourth, this development does not solve any affordable housing issues, unless it is stipulated that at least 40% of the additional space will be dedicated for section 8 housing.
Hannah	Smith	hannahskyesmith@gmail.com	I have been a Salt Lake City resident for a number of years now and I have seen housing costs skyrocket. I wholeheartedly support the rezone for higher density residential use. The Sugarhouse 1100 E - Highland corridor is ripe for denser development, and I'd rather have a disproportionately large building that provides hundreds of people housing than have to breathe in the pollution from people commuting from the distant sprawl. Salt Lake City is growing and there is nothing that we locals can do to stop it, whether you welcome it or not. We have to start thinking about the best options to accommodate this growth. This necessitates more compact development for the sake of efficiency, affordability, building costs, and use of resources. I am excited to have more neighbors and to see Sugar House grow into a more vibrant urban core.
Robyn	Young	youngrobyn53@gmail.com	The answer is NO!!!!

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Debbie	Mayo	dancerindesert@yahoo.com	<p>There was a story on the news last night regarding a study that has found 5.2% (2797) more people in SL county moved out of the county than into it between Sept 22 to Aug 23. They found people are leaving because of affordability issues, congestion and living conditions. In light of these findings why should Harbor Bay be granted a zoning change to build a 22 story apartment building. These units are not needed. Already the current buildings in SH have vacancies and have to offer incentives for people to rent their units. We are also seeing remote workers that moved here during the pandemic now being called back to the office so they are having to leave SL as well. To be considered as well is the fact that The Sugar Alley Apt building is being rebuilt at its original 8 story height. This property is less than a full block from the Wells Fargo building. By the time it is completed there will be even less need for an extremely tall apt building. &lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;The other issue I would like to bring up is fire. When the Sugar Alley apt building caught fire, it burned for a week displacing hundreds for days and shutting down adjacent businesses for weeks. They are still feeling the impact of this fire a year later and some had to go out of business. This building was only 8 stories. If it was such a problem to fight this fire, how on earth will the fire dept be able to fight a fire in a 22 story building? If this 8 story fire had such a large impact, consider how big the impact would be from a fire in a 22 story building. &lt;br /&gt;&lt;br /&gt;Please stop trying to turn Sugarhouse into downtown Chicago or Cleveland! There are plenty of single family homes extremely close to this property. I am sure it is not proper to mingle 22 story buildings with single story houses in the same block. Leave the zoning as it is! We are losing the Sugarhouse we all know and love. It is turning into a traffic quagmire and a place I barely recognize.</p>
Shantel	Stoff	shantelstoff@gmail.com	<p>All. &lt;br /&gt;I have lived in sugarhouse for 4 decades. I was the GM for Fiddlers Elbow when it opened and for the next 4 years. Our family owns a home near Emerson Elementary, we have 2 children still at home. They are 9 and 11. We love riding our bikes around downtown Sugarhouse. We are Strongly Opposed to a zone change for the wells fargo property. The amount of damage a building of that height would do to the area is astounding. The density they are hoping to create will more than overwhelm the area. It will block the sun. It will allow high floor tenants to see into very private backyards. It will destroy the surrounding businesses for years during building. The roads are already almost not driveable. That includes biking! Also walking! It's dangerous now, imagine adding all of those additional residents and vehicles. The plan and all of the building in and around Sugarhouse has already altered the reasons we choose to build our community here in the first place. This will drive us away if successful at zone change. That height is not appropriate for our community. If you want hugg rise living, downtown SLC is your spot. Please leave zoning as it stands. I cannot afford any additional property tax that this will surely require as the roads/sidewalks/surrounding business cannot survive the construction and subsequent filling of requested height. &lt;br /&gt;Thank you d</p>
Timothy	Schomburg	etschomburg@gmail.com	<p>I now live in The Avenues. I grew up in Sugar House. What you people have done and continue to do to the Sugar House area is appalling. As a kid our first house was near the Villa Theatre. Then we moved near Highland High School. I graduated from that High School. I graduated from Westminster. When I got married the first time, our first house was also near Highland High School. Then I moved away and then moved back. What you have done to that area around the old Villa Theatre and the neighborhoods is just terrible. It appears to me that all of you in "power" in Salt Lake City government want a "New York City" type city. I suggest you all move to New York. Oh and what you continue to do to downtown is just . . . put up a high rise "box" wherever you can.</p>
Laura	Livnat	laura.livnat@gmail.com	<p>The height of the proposed building is out of character if the neighborhood. Some existing homes will be in darkness most or all of the day. The area is already congested, more cars will be very detrimental to access to existing businesses. Where will the water come from for this project? Will &lt;br /&gt;Taxpayers be on the hook for more police, fire and emergency services? The development should be approved with existing height restrictions of 105 feet and no more. All the other massive condo projects stuck to this height and they are fine.</p>
Ashton	Hagen	avhagen3@gmail.com	<p>I think this proposal is a great idea and wonderful opportunity for the sugarhouse community. This type of development in sugarhouse would help local businesses and ensure that the neighborhood remains vibrant and thriving. The space is a great place for housing, and even better, housing will replace an old bank, so nobody is displaced. A rezone of this kind would be a gamechanger in a good way for sugarhouse</p>
Lorna	Anderson	lornandrsn@yahoo.com	<p>Please, hell no!!!! We have already lost so much of the charm and low horizon of Sugarhouse, please keep it reasonable, there are better places for high rises.</p>
clare	valles	clarevalles@yahoo.com	<p>This is already a chaotic area, there are no pilces to enforce speeding on Foothill. Foothill village entries and exits are dangerous, children cannot cross safely across Foothill d/t dangerous drivers and you want to add more housing with additional cars entering and exiting on to foothill or 1300 south, a very blind intersection and family neighborhood? How many children need to suffer in this neighborhood before we see that it is too dense already?</p>

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Becky	Richards	uptownendo@hotmail.com	Seriously, the numerous reasons to not allow this out of state company to build this monstrosity of a building are do evident! Where is the Sugarhouse councils heads? Sugarhouse has already allowed overbuilding, future traffic issues, water issues, pollution, natural light issues and locals advoid this area due to overbuilding! It seems our wonderful, charming Sugarhouse has fallen into the hands of those wanting money and overpopulated greedy builders. What have you approved and why! Locals are saddened by the decisions of the council!
Mary	Roberts	mfjroberts@gmail.com	I am opposed to the rezone of the old Wells Fargo parcel in Sugarhouse. Allowing a 305 foot building in the neighborhood will stand out and not fit in with the surrounding community. I believe it will have a negative impact on businesses and possibly set a precedent for other buildings of similar heights to be constructed. Please do not allow this rezone to happen.
Kennedie	Starr	kennediestarr@gmail.com	Please support the request to enable the redevelopment of property at 1095 E 2100 S with a mixed use, multi- family building. Salt Lake City desparately needs more housing. We need denser builds that are near transit and other businesses and services. We need these types of builds appropriately built in multiple areas of Salt Lake City, including in Sugar House. This is an oppourtunity to generate a positive transformation to beenefit the entire community. Change is difficult, but unaffordability and a lack of sustainable, denser builds is even more difficult for our communities, especially in the long the run with our population growth. Please do the difficult and beneficial thing for our future.
Carol	Sperry	carolsperry@yahoo.com	Please vote against the rezoning proposal of the Old Wells Fargo Bldg. My concerns are the traffic which having that many new apartments added will create, and the size or height of the building which doesn't fit in the Sugarhouse area. Up to 305 ft is ridiculous. I travel 2100 S almost daily and traffic now is very congested. Please vote against.
Robyn	Young	youngrobyn53@gmail.com	NO NO WAY
Annabelle	Hutchinson	annabellehutch@gmail.com	I live in the Sugarflats apartment building in Sugarhouse. I'd love to see the space where the wells fargo is be transformed into apartments and businesses. It sounds great. Sugarhouse is only semi walkable neighborhoods in SLC - and i would love to see it grow with with apartments and businesses.
jennifer	jessup	greenjean41@gmail.com	This is way too tall of a building for this area! We must stop them!
Ashleigh	Hamilton	ashleigh.hamilton@gmail.com	The height of the behlding shoudk not be any higher than the buildings around it. I am opposed to thevrezoning of the land.
Emily	Lutz	emlutz@hotmail.com	No rezoning that allows more then 3-4 stories!
Kirk	Meyer	vkmeier59@gmail.com	No rezoning and no big business.
Tammie	Hannah Meyer	tammiejhannah@gmail.com	No rezoning! No new buildings! No buildings ever over 3 stories high!No Venture Bay Harbor!No any big business! Yes to Local! Yes to safe! Yes to manageable!
Anne	Gardiner	annebucc@gmail.com	Do not allow this rezone to occur and do not buikd a sky scraper in our beighborhood. Our streets and infrastructure cannot support this large of a building, people it additional cars. Our streets are small and natrow and are already a traffic jam. Do the right thing and do not allow this monstrous building to go up!
Yvonne	Martinez	ymart626@gmail.com	The rezoning of this parcel for a 305' building is WAY outside the Sugar House Master Plan. The issues with the traffic from 400 units added to the traffic already in that area will create gridlock. It will be MANY YEARS before any decent form of public transportation can reduce street traffic in that area.  The other issues around lights, shade, stress on the infrastucture, are also a concern. Based on the amount paid for the lot plus building costs, the rent there will be high and I dont see how thats going to help drive down rent.  If they get this rezone, it will set a precedent in the area and there is a distinct possibility that other buildings this size will be built in that area. Keep the tall buildings downtown where they belong.
James	Larsen	jamesb444@msn.com	Upzone all of Sugarhouse and add more transit!
Austin	Whitehead	maustinwhitehead@gmail.com	I'm in support of rezoning the old wells fargo parcel to allow for more density and housing
Blair	Hickman	hickman.blair@gmail.com	I moved here four years ago, and even then, I found the streets too small for the kind of development in this neighborhood. I cant fathom rezoning for high rises outside of downtown, what it would do to quality of life in this neighborhood. Please grow at an appropriate pace to infrastructure development
Derek	Beyer	derekbeyer42@yahoo.com	I am for this rezone. Density is great for sustanibility, revenue for the city, and a positive city culture.

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Jackson	Lewis	jacksonhlewis4@gmail.com	I fully support the move to rezone this wells fargo parcel to a bew tower. Sugar house will benefit greatly economically if the community embraces progress. This building will bring much needed housing to the area and will make the sugar house area a more desireable place to live.
Skye	Lukowski	skywardplqce@gmail.com	As a student I dont have money to drive everywhere so I only have access to the busses and biking. Building more mixed use buildings helps as i dont need to travel for for essentials to live. Walking across tens of roads to get groceries feels dangerous as cars never stop for me. This rezone would be another reason to continue living here after i graduate
Nick	Dunn	nicholasdunn@hotmail.com	Density is good. Upzoning is good. This proposal is a good use of the location.
Renee	Swanson	swanny5now@gmail.com	No. Just, no. Unless there is a minumum of two reserved parking spots per unit AND a ton of visitor parking this will create a parking nightmare in an already horrible parking situation. Further - the building is a monstrosity and will take away light/possible green space. Nope. The current apartment buildings are already a strain for Sugar house. Why add more?
Kaitlyn	Gibbs	kaitgibbs1@gmail.com	I oppose this proposal. This would destroy the character of Sugarhouse. There has already been such an extreme overhaul of the area, the character and small-town appeal that sugarhouse used to be known for is just hanging on by a thread. Keep the skyscrapers downtown!
Robyn	Young	youngrobyn53@gmail.com	No Never Wells Fargo does not deserve a place in Sugarhouse along with Mendenhall no to both!!!!
Jessica	Cain	jcain725@gmail.com	This size of a building would significantlt change the parcel and the surrounding enjoyment of the land. The additional height would impede views of the wasatch front, potentially changing the value of businesses and homes. The additional traffic from that size of a building would requiere even further changes to the neighborhood as the current infrastructure cannot support that. There would be additional traffic congestion and clogging of the streets near a largely residential space.
Han	Aldous	bylly.aldous@gmail.com	Please consider keeping the Sugarhouse charm, which is dimishing every year. We used to have a firework show and an art festival along Highland Drive. As a longtime resident, I miss those days. Sugarhouse used to have a tight knit community and I feel like we have lost that with much of the increasing construction the last few years. Millcreek, on the other hand, has tried to increase their community by building a nice common area for example, the ice rink. I feel like in sugarhouse, the priority is building housing. A high rise on a prominent corner of historic Sugar house will dimish the neighboring community. We have had to endure a lot of building in the last 5 to 10 years.
Larry.	Dean	j.laurence.dean@gmail.com	I am writing in opposition to the proposed redevelopment at the old Wells Fargo building on the corner of 2100 South and 1100 East. This proposal appears to be an effort by the developer to add another 'wooden' project to their portfolio. Sugarhouse does not need another high rise residential project. The area is already overbuilt. There are for lease signs everywhere meaning the existing residential building are not full. I believe the developer is trying to secure part of what seems to be a bottomless source of public funds to susidize developers in Salt Lake City. We need to stop or at the very least curtail the endless subsidizing of out of state developers. This is not what the residents of Salt Lake want.
Katherine	MacLeod	kmacleod@xmision.com	Hello,  This is my second comment written about the rezoning and use of the Wells Fargo parcel, as I want to make my opinion known. I'm sorry that I can't attend upcoming meetings in person. As I'm caring for my 98 year old mother much of this year, I'll be out of town.  To continue...I am extremely disappointed that our Sugarhouse community could continue to allow large apartment/condominium complexes to be built within the area. The changes that are going on are sold to us through the tone of "a housing crisis." But much of the building going on is primarily created for developers to make money off of hard working people. The apartment buildings going up have high rental prices with costly application and maintenance fees. The outcome of this construction, is of people living stacked on top of each other without a yard of any kind. I was raised in the cities of the east coast, and I understand firsthand how the kind of buildings that are being built now in Sugarhouse can negatively effect the lives of people. It's very hard to watch this kind of development being fostered in my neighborhood.  Sincerely, Katherine MacLeod
Carol	Hannah	p_s_woman@hotmail.com	NO to any rezoning of the Wells Fargo property .
Peggy	Clark	pclark3656@yahoo.com	Just wondering how many multi-family housing units you plan to stuff into Sugarhouse, with their 2 lane streets. There's a giant complex being built behind Patagonia. That area is turning into traffic gridlock. I believe we have enough housing units in Sugarhouse.
Robyn	Young	youngrobyn53@gmail.com	No my answer is No rezoning for a big Wells Fargo Building in Sugarhouse. Tell Mendenhall to get out of Sugarhouse!!!!!!!!!!!!

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Lindsey	Manning	lindzeejane@yahoo.com	Do not build a skyscraper in sugarhouse. Sugarhouse used to be quaint and cozy and when I lived there in 2006 it was incredible. Now, it is impossible to get around because of the high density building. I go out of my way to not drive in sugarhouse because it does not have the infrastructure to support what they are building. Keep Sugarhouse's charm the way it is. Thanks.
Patrick	Hays	patrickhays@msn.com	Our community is really concerned with the continuing over development of our neighborhood. You can assured we will fight this with everything we have. We will begin collecting hundreds of signatures against your proposal. Has anyone taken a look at our increase in traffic lately and that is without the apartments buildings south of 2100 South being filled? It's a small community and very few lanes to accommodate all this traffic. It then directly drivers to cut through out small residential streets. So out of touch with our communities and our safety of our residents. Sugarhouse has tried to become a walking and biking community and how is this adding to this? As you develop our area you go come to your quiet streets. It's insane. We have worked three years on having speed bumps installed to slow drivers down flying through out streets not you want to add more traffic. Can you imagine what the traffic will be like when the apts are filled? And then add another 30 story building on that small imprint of a lot. These developers are crazy and we will fight like crazy. How about some greens space, a place people can take their dogs and kids and enjoy the area. This fight is not over!!!! Our community council better support us on this. We are done with all this mess!!!!
Lou Ann	Donahue	lmgdonahue@msn.com	This rezoning does NOT fit into Sugar House. It will not only be an eye sore, take away our sunshine, local small businesses, accessibility traffic wise but will destroy the charm of Sugar House. There are already so many housing projects going up that even established apartments are unable to attract occupants. Not withstanding the housing is not affordable. We have run out of room. The people who have bought this space will not support local businesses as they put their own restaurants etc in their projects. Please dont let this happen in our Sugar House! Thank you.
Theo	Schwartz	aschwartz.ames@gmail.com	Please do not rezone the wells fargo building area into an area that can have a skyscraper. It will really harm small businesses and does not belong in sugarhouse.
Leslie	Stewart	leslie_read@msn.com	Raising the height limit on the building in Sugarhouse is a disconcerting idea!!! The current traffic congestion at the corner of 1100 East and 2100 South is extremely problematic. Adding more housing units beyond the current zoning is irresponsible, when it comes to the preservation of the Sugarhouse neighborhood that we all have loved and watched deteriorate with all the multi unit buildings. A 305 ft building will increase the population causing congestion, affect the air quality, and increase crime. Please deny the application for rezoning!!!
C	Clark	saveearth27@yahoo.com	Do NOT allow rezoning for the Old Wells Fargo Parcel. Please heed the voice of your residents. Please prioritize citizens' needs over developers' money-grab. The proposed high-rise would be detrimental to Sugarhouse. Traffic is already problematic in this area. Will all these additional people, traffic will be untenable. And those who try to ride bikes will be squeezed out even more.  Parking is already a problem. These additional people will want much more parking. Where will they park?  Local businesses will be negatively affected because people from nearby areas who used to love shopping in Sugarhouse will not want to put up with the additional traffic and lack of parking. They will do their shopping elsewhere.  High-rise buildings have an overall negative impact on climate change. In this century, we need to take great care to reduce climate change, not exacerbate it. Such a tall building will make the streets colder, windier, and uglier. It is just plain depressing for the people who have to be there. Sugarhouse has long been a beloved community. If you allow rezoning in order to accommodate this tall building, you would be robbing us of a place we have loved. That is morally and ethically wrong.  Do NOT permit rezoning of the Old Well Fargo Parcel.
Leslie	Stone	lahstone@comcast.net	I am 100% opposed to the Rezoning of Old Wells Fargo...Sugarhouse is no place for a skyscraper and what is being proposed is completely inconsistent with the current, and the historical context of this unique neighborhood/area in SLC. All of the interchangeable multi-story apartment buildings that have been built in the area recently have eroded the rich historical feel of Sugarhouse. Adding a sky scraper would be the beginning of its end.
Bob	Jenkins	leostrats@hotmail.com	What you really want is ruin Sugarhouse and cash in. Vote NO
Ann	Smith	annsmith@yahoo.com	Please, no rezoning of the Wells Fargo building. Skyscrapers do not belong in Sugar House.
Nelson	Neuberger	nelson.neuberger@gmail.com	2100 S is already far overused as an outlet for traffic. Whats the solution? Prevent density increases in the coordidor. Sugarhouse is already abused for density, honelessness, water capacity, and street access. It will likely cost tens of millions to local taxpayers to remedy the long term impacts of this single building. We say NO to this.

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Caren	Beeman	carenbeeman@gmail.com	I am totally in opposition to this project. Our traffice is horrendous already. When we had the fire in Sugarhouse high rise it took days to get it under control. We are a small town, which cannot handle a building of this size. There are so many high rises already and we are having trouble keeping people safe. Many kids have almost died crossing streets, cars are breaking speed laws out of frustration with over extended traffic. I have lived here for forty years. I have watched the chases. Now you are making it dangerous for people with lack of intrastructure improvements to match the growth. Enough is enough! This new building is way over the top!
Ginny	Dehnert	gdehnert@xmission.com	Either youre evil stupid or greedy to engage in a proposal to install a tall building next to smaller buildings and homes/businesses. Where does all this madness come from? Is money ALWAYSs the route you go? City leaders are out of touch with the folks in my opinion. Stop the building in sugarhouse. Weve had enough!! Mayor Mendenhall, you are a disappointment as well as city council.
Todd	Schofield	todd.scho@yahoo.com	We as citizens of Sugar House would like the Sugar House Community Council to quit yanking our chains as if we have any kind of voice on how you are ruining our city. There is no way that a construction company would spend millions of dollars designing a building without the assurity that they will be successful in building it. They are paying off whomever, from the mayor to this council, but to be able to change zoning in such a short amount of time no to mention allowing this to happen, is indeed telling. The small business in this community will not survive your horrible road construction scheduling, not to mention road closures to allow these buildings to be constructed. Your committment and devotion should be to the businesses that have established Sugar House for what it is, not to some out of state construction company who doesn't care about destroying our community, but is only interested in filling their pockets, and by the looks of it yours also.
Todd	Schofield	todd.scho@yahoo.com	We as citizens of Sugar House would like the Sugar House Community Council to quit yanking our chains as if we have any kind of voice on how you are ruining our city. There is no way that a construction company would spend millions of dollars designing a building without the assurity that they will be successful in building it. They are paying off whomever, from the mayor to this council, but to be able to change zoning in such a short amount of time no to mention allowing this to happen, is indeed telling. The small business in this community will not survive your horrible road construction scheduling, not to mention road closures to allow these buildings to be constructed. Your committment and devotion should be to the businesses that have established Sugar House for what it is, not to some out of state construction company who doesn't care about destroying our community, but is only interested in filling their pockets, and by the looks of it yours also.
Jami	Zollinger	jamisuejones@comcast.net	Sugarhouse does not need any more non-affordable housing, condo, or apartment buildings. Our roads can't accomidate the traffic. We also don't need anything tall going in that location that will block our view of the mountais. Our roads are already congested and adding more condos or apartments will only add to the congestion and traffic that we don't have the space for.
Diana	Leaver	dgleaver@gmail.com	Please do not allow the rezoning of this property I do not support the building of 300 ft high building in this area.
Steve	Phillips	srphillips66@msn.com	Please no more tall high occupant housing in SugarHouse. There have been way too many of these eye sores built in this area over the last several years. SugarHouse has added so many people within a 10 square radius, the infrastructure can't support any more. These building ls have taken away from the charm of this area. Builders only care about how many rooms they cram into a building. Some of these horrible projects have taken several years to complete and are still causing a mess on our roads. No more!
Marie	Lane	lanekolmax2@gmail.com	My biggest concern is the parking. 90% is not ok it needs to 100% provided by the parking structure. As much as you may want to push people onto the street and into public transportation it will not be as much as you want. People are going to want to have their cars epecially during the winter since UTA does not believe in covered spots to wait for the bus nor do they get properly maintained when the snow arrives. Also, the parking needs to be free for the reaidents so that residents dont search for "free" parking on the streets because they are charged for parking at their resident. Most develpers are not living in these projects nor are they getting out of their cars it is only for the lower folks. Also what does this project do for the surrounding businesses? I have lived and loved sugarhouse for over 20 years and have grown in exhaustion of the constant construction. I am not suggesting that we do nothing ever or that we dont move forward however could we have a little time to adjust? It is this feeling that God forgive we ever have a moment to breathe or have a spot that is open or green. Thank you for listening to my thoughts and concerns

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Lynn	Schwarz	lsbx101@gmail.com	The balls on these guys. Sustaining their profits should be a better designation. How much did they pay for this? Also, will I live to see the day a developer can actually build to the Zoning -aside from the one on 9th East?
Heather	Santi	greekeggssl@gmail.com	I have been a resident of sugarhouse for over 25 years. I love sugarhouse, however the last several years have been riddled with over development with no regard to infrastructure. We do not need a skyscraper in the middle of our community. The atrocity that caught fire isn't even finished yet. The traffic that is now surrounding the area where this development is to take place is already a disaster. The businesses are suffering. The rents in these new spaces are too high. Bigger is not better for the community. I am sure it is better for the developers profit, but not for our community. I would rather see a homeless outreach space on that corner than a ugly skyscraper that houses 1200 or more residents. It has been disappointing to see what sugarhouse has become. It has lost its character and charm.
Isabel	Hill	isabelwittmeyerhill@gmail.com	I am a student at Westminster University and I'm very concerned about the implications of rezoning the old Wells Fargo plot. The proposed construction project will worsen traffic congestion, make business more difficult for locally owned small businesses, and raise the cost of living in this neighborhood. It is already costly to live here, and if this change occurs, many of my peers will be unable to afford living in the neighborhood where we study and work. Salt Lake does NOT need another downtown. Please block this proposal and protect the Sugarhouse neighborhood.
Andre	Orantes-Thomas	andreorantestomas@gmail.com	This is a great project for Sugarhouse. Residents need as much housing as possible. This type of density will spur more construction and help support surrounding business. We need more of this type of building throughout Salt Lake CITY. This will be a great improvement to the corner and the neighborhood. It will bring people close to where they actually want to live and create a more lively neighborhood that is vibrant the entire day. This is the type of construction we should be helping to make possible.
Carolyn	Fish	carolynfish77@gmail.com	My concerns about this proposal.  Out of scale with the neighborhood. Even the revision they presented is twice the height of what is already there. I get that we need more housing. But can't we do something within existing zoning or at least without such a drastic change? If heaven forbid we have a fire like the one down the street, is equipment to fight a fire in such a tall structure easily accessible?
Luis	Diaz-Mendoza	alfrocks@msn.com	Please proceed with rezoning. The future of SH depends on this. This could be the beginning of a truly walkable district. We can elevate sugar house!
Henry	Murray	henrybmurray@icloud.com	More density the better! We need more housing and urban density! A highrise would be great here!!!
Anthony	Teramana	anthonyteramana@gmail.com	It is very important to support the rezone of the Wells Fargo Parcel. That corner is deserving of something far more engaging and monumental. I am a recent Utah graduate and I plan to stay and live in Sugarhouse for a very long time - it should not be wasted on another 5-1 apartment building (which are not necessarily bad but not fitting of that parcel). This would be one of the tallest mass timber in the US if not the world and the street engagement is incredible. 100 years from now Sugarhouse will still be here and it will be better off for this rezone and eventually a small Sugarhouse skyline where downtown Sugarhouse is today. Preservation is important but so is progress and we need new infill housing (market rate or affordable), as studies have shown, to stabilize and slow rent growth. Please do not deny 100s of people homes because of people who could not even recognize the specifics of the project they are opposing. That Wells Fargo has terrible street engagement and is underutilized in the very heart of downtown Sugarhouse - there is no logical preservation argument with this building. I would love to see a large, urban-format store or couple of stores/restaurants at the base of an urban high rise. I have lived in the area for the past 5 years and frequently walk past the site and have actually had some friends who formerly worked at that Wells Fargo Branch. Do not let a small room full of people who oppose anything and everything shoot down what would be wonderful investment and amenity in our community.
Kerry	Hawkes	kerryh57@hotmail.com	Please stop the continued destruction of Sugarhouse. It has a rich history that is being systematically destroyed. It is becoming so dark and depressive there. Once you allow this, how will you justify not allowing it in the neighborhoods etc. Stop his in it's tracks. Suggest they move it to where there is open space and won't distract from the beauty of our neighborhood.

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Jeannine	Young	jeannineyoung@icloud.com	<p>I have lived in Sugar House since 1994. I am extremely concerned changing the zoning to permit a 200-300 feet high building would set a precedent. There are numerous vacant lots and small businesses on 21st south that will be sold in the future. It would just be a matter of time before the narrow streets of 21 South and perhaps Highland Drive are bordered with high rise buildings. Downtown has the advantage of wide streets to deal with the traffic of its large buildings. I especially feel concerned for the people who live in the blocks near and north of the proposed building. They've probably spent a good part of their life-savings and their time fixing their homes and their backyards, so that they can enjoy them. Putting a building of that height will block the sun and affect their privacy. I would like to see two large different colored balloons flying over the Wells Fargo building, one at 20 stories, and one at 30 stories. I don't believe it's possible to imagine the size or height of the proposed building. It was apparent to me in the meeting that there were no renderings that showed the height in comparison to the existing buildings. The charm and intimacy of Sugar House will surely be lost with the addition of one skyscraper with more to follow.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Jeannine Young</p>
Jonah	Flint	mossimail6@gmail.com	<p>Whether we like or not, the population is growing and if we want to avoid the pitfalls that befell cities like San Francisco, we need to build more housing options and fast. The Wells Fargo parcel falls directly in the middle of what could one day become a bustling downtown. With its proximity to transit and other business the time is now to change our city for the better and allow for more density and to build a liveable mixed use neighborhood. I fully support the rezoning and hope that more parcels follow soon.</p>
Nicholas	Lopez	nl33745@gmail.com	<p>I think it is a great idea to allow this amount of height and density in an area with this much transit and housing demand. These buildings are more sustainable than really anything we have now so it really would be a great icon for the city on a green development practice that we can be proud of.</p>



Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Your Street  
Address

928 E Bryan Ave

2023 South 1100  
East

1048 E Ramona  
Ave

1408 E Stratford  
Ave, SLC, UT 84106

979 Hollywood ave

754 E Ramona Ave

Laird Ave

Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

632 E Redondo Ave

2864 S West  
Temple

2322 S 2300 E

1045 east 2100  
south

2120 South  
Highland Drive Apt  
212 Salt Lake City  
Utah 84106

1869 S 1100 E

2228 S Wellington  
St.

Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

1035 east bryan  
ave

2280 Lake St., Salt  
Lake City, UT  
84106

1549 E Ramona  
Ave

1427 E  
Westminster Ave

1987 Parleys  
Canyon Blvd. sLc  
84106

1892 S Lincoln St

943 e Forest View  
Ave

Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

2166S 1800E

2000 s lake street

1869 South 1100  
East

1265 E Harrison  
Ave

1877 S 900 E

Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

1559 E. 1700 S.

1155 Westminster  
Avenue

1014 East Wilson  
Avenue

84106

1177 E Stratford  
Ave.

1035 E Bryan Ave,  
SLC UT 84105

1017 E Hollywood  
Ave

Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

916 Hollywood Avenue
1910 Mary Dott Way
1957 S 900 E
Hollywood
1915 South 1000 East
910 E. Simpson Ave.
932 e simpson Ave
2129 S. 1800 E.
1026 East Emerson

Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

1022 Downington  
Ave

1459 S 500 E SLC

1898 south 1000  
east

2023 So 1100 East

1360 E Sherman  
Ave SLC

1134 E Sherman  
Ave., SLC 84105

Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

741 E Emerson Ave SLC UT
1903 s 1100 e
3174 South Kenwood Street
2674 S 1800 E
2191 S McClelland St
1861 McClelland Street
1565 East Garfield



Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

1728 E Kensington Ave

1811 S 1100 E

1811 S 1100 E

1978 S 800 E

1978 S 800 E

1995 S Lake Street

2120 s highland dr  
slc ut 84105

1550 E Ramona Av

1410 S 2100 E

1822 South 1000 East

1412 S 500 E, Salt  
Lake City, UT  
84105

2354 Park St.

2534 Glenmare

Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

1888 S 1800 East

943 E Blaine Ave

920 Simpson Ave

2623 S Elizabeth  
Street Salt Lake  
City UT 84106

1337 E. Blaine Ave.

Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

2400 S Elizabeth St  
#6

2623 Elizabeth St,  
Salt Lake City, UT  
84106

2250 S Lake St

1467 E Ramona  
Ave

2242 S 1900 E

1737 wilson ave

1922 s 1200 e slc,  
ut 84105

Filmore Street

2464 Dearborn St.,  
SLC 84106

2011 S 700 E

2049 E Wilmington  
Ave

1730 windsor st

Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

68 B Street
Oneida Street
1963 S 1200 E
2011 S 700 E Salt Lake City 84105
2138 S Roberta Street
1156 E Warnock Ave
1156 E WARNOCK AVE
776 W Remington Way
790 E Harrison Ave

Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

The Vue

Simpson Ave.

1878 S Lincoln St

1100 e 1500 s

1935 S 900 E

1730 E Harrison  
Ave

1548 E 3150 S

Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

1186S 1100E

1737 E Logan  
Avenue

1158 Ramona Ave  
(a block north of  
this parcel)

Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

2461 S Highland Dr

1467 E Hollywood  
Ave

1139 E Garfield Ave

1942 S Lincoln St

1895 S 1000 E

762 E. Bryan  
Avenue, SLC

Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

2011 S 1100 E

2305 E Windsor St  
Salt Lake City

1549 E Ramona  
Ave

2516 So. Imperial  
St, slc, 84106

544 E Cleveland  
Ave



Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Simpson Ave

2128 E Wilson Ave,  
SLC UT 84108

1369 Wilson

1798 S 1700 E

Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

2023 South 1100  
East, SLC, Utah  
84106

1526 Garfield Ave.

17th S 900 E

Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

2023 South 1100  
East

715 E 300 S

1195 S 1100 E

919 Ramona  
Avenue

826 E. Garfield  
Avenue 84105

1068 E. Blaine Ave.

2516 So Imperial St

Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

1874 E Redondo  
Avenue

1977 S 800 E

Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

1364 S 1000 E

821 Kensington  
Ave

1048 E Ramona  
Ave

1014 Wilson Ave,  
SLC, 84105

1554 EAST BLAINE  
AVENUE

Wilson between  
10th East and 11th  
East

Around 2700 s  
1500 e

Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

1915 South 1000  
East

2512 e

Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

1017 E Hollywood  
Ave

1339 E Emerson  
Ave

1520 East Ramona  
Ave

Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

1520 E Ramona  
Ave

2455 S Wilshire Dr

1140 E Harrison  
Ave

2663 s 1800 e

1870 East Bryan  
Ave. SLC. 84108

1664 E. Emerson  
Ave.

2586 Elizabeth  
Street, #4



Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

1723 E Wilson Ave  
SLC, Ut 84108

1790 S 1100 E SLC,  
UT 84105 (Businee  
Address)

2117 Belaire Dr,  
84109

2460 lynwood dr

2512 Elizabeth St  
#6

2689 S IMPERIAL ST  
2427 East Emerson  
Avenue

Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

Rockwood Studios 1066 east 2100 south #20
2244 Emerson Avenue
1155 Westminster Avenue
Upper Sugarhouse
2253 Laird Way

Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

1961 S 1600 E

2204 S 800 E Salt  
Lake City, UT  
84106

1368 S 1000 E

1850 Yale Avenue.

3174 South  
Kenwood St.

2549 S.Glenmare  
St. SLC

1163 E  
Westminster Ave

Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

1817 lincoln st  Parway Ave 84106

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1



## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1

## Wells Fargo Comments as of March 1