



November 20, 2024

TO: Salt Lake City Planning Commission

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

1935 South 900 East Planned Development

We reviewed the application for this Planned Development at our October SHCC Land Use and Zoning meeting. Colin Strasser was there to explain his drawings and what he is trying to do. He has a very large .42 of an acre. The lot is 183' deep and 99' wide. We applaud his effort to add two more owner-occupied homes to the neighborhood, but will these really be livable? We didn't have any negative comments at our meeting, but we realized we had not distributed flyers to nearby houses. The planner gets comments from the postcards the nearby properties receive, but the community doesn't get to see them until the staff report goes out, which is weeks after our 45-day deadline. After we put flyers out, we immediately started to learn of the concerns of the neighbors. While the homes surrounding these parcels are small one-story bungalows, these look to be 25' or more (the drawings aren't very clear). To get a garage for two cars in each new home, the maneuvering for each car to get into the garage and then back down the driveway or maneuver to turn the car around will be interesting. 900 East is a very busy street, we wonder what sort of impact will 6 cars a day have? This is within a few feet of a bus stop.

The existing home is on the west lot, and he wants to build two huge houses on the east side, and divide that into two lots., or back yard. There is a 24'8" driveway on the south. Mr. Strasser has been living in the front house, but ultimately, these would be three privately owned homes on this parcel. The existing house appears to be almost all garage, and a door on the east side to exit the garage. That door would have to be removed, otherwise cars would be on the other homes driveway. Clearly some things would have to be modified to make this all work.

There seem to be some discrepancies in information. The drawings show 5' setbacks on the rear parcels, yet a neighbor says the garage would be 1' from his fence. We applaud his effort to provide two parking places for each home and the extra parking on the south side of the driveway. Do the neighboring homes lose privacy in their back yard?

We are not convinced that by making this a planned development, this be a better product. It seems like many of the usual requirements would have to be waived. To turn these into two homes instead of three, seems much more palatable. The existing two-story garage could remain, with a room upstairs that becomes part of the second house, and the rest of the second house is just one story on the east side. That way the neighbors won't lose their private back yard, and the lot wouldn't be filled with mostly driveway materials

We think Mr Strasser should take another look at this proposal. More isn't always better.

First Name	Last Name	Email	Your Comments for the Planning Commission	Your Street Address
Rebecca	Davis	rdavis2655@gmail.com	I am not in favor of this proposal. Adding two houses to the property would require reduced rear yard setbacks that would negatively impact the neighboring houses east of the property. This PUD as presently designed isn't compatible with the rest of the neighborhood which consists of mostly 1-story bungalow style single family homes.	1564 E BLAINE AVE
Lindsey	Brack-Howard	lindseybrack@hotmail.com	I've looked over the plans for the current structure being proposed that will run along our existing fence line. This is a large structure, and it will really box in our already small backyard space. With a two-story house running the whole of our fence line, it will limit the sunlight that our yard receives. It will block our mountain views from our yard as well. Also, our privacy will be very limited with a home and its windows looking into our backyard. I'm also concerned about the added traffic that this will put on our already congested street of 900 East. I understand this neighboring property is large and could accommodate some small ADUs in the back, but these proposed structures are just too large and will devalue our space and our property.	1921 S 900 E
Malika	Fitz	malikagood@yahoo.com	We received the notice for the 900 East Collective-Planned Development project at 1935 South and have some concerns regarding the request. While we generally support the addition of more single-family housing in the area, the fact that 2 additional homes are being requested on the subdivided property seems like too much. Perhaps the addition of one home, with a sizable yard and distance from other dwellings, would be a better solution in the space. Also, the fact that 2 homes would require modifications for so many of the requirements for single-family homes, makes us worried that they will not be as desirable to potential home buyers or renters. In addition, 900 East is already extremely congested at that intersection and the additional units, with no access to the street except through a shared driveway, will create more congestion. We also realize that the size and height of the additional homes will create less than ideal conditions for the current backyards adjacent to the property and would be an obvious eyesore to us and all the neighbors surrounding the property. Thank you for taking the time to consider our comments. Sincerely, Malika and Michael Fitz	933 E Hollywood Ave
Nick	Howard	nickrh81@gmail.com	I live directly to the North of this proposed property. I am strongly against the sub division of this property in it's current form. Along with the fact that there is not acquitted parking for the size of homes that are being proposed, I am also concerned about noise and light pollution disrupting the interior of this neighborhood. On a personal level, being next door to this and having the back of lot 3, 5 feet off my fence line will destroy my privacy and cripple the little amount of sunlight I get into my backyard. I also fear it will diminish my property value. I do not believe these are the kinds of homes that Sugarhouse needs in this area, if lots are to be sub divided they should be used for affordable housing such as ADU's, or smaller 1-2 bedroom rentals.	1921 S. 900 E. Salt Lake City Ut. 84105
Geniel	Kent	geniel.kent@gmail.com	I feel it is too much for this lot and too much behind my house, the noise and loss of privacy. 9th east does not need more houses, already crowded	
Adrienne	White	adrienne@housegenealogy.us	I support the initiative to create more housing in Sugar House, particularly since the developer aims to promote home ownership opportunities. However, I have concerns about the height and design of the two proposed properties. Most of the surrounding homes are single-story or one-and-a-half-story structures, contributing to the historic character of the neighborhood. The modern design and two-story height of these new homes may not harmonize with the existing architectural context and could significantly alter the area's aesthetic. Ensuring new developments are compatible with the neighborhood's historic charm is essential for preserving its unique character.	
Richard	Knickerbocker	r.knickerbocker@gmail.com	I feel this project should be allowed by the Planning Commission to move ahead.	

COMMENTS 1935 SOUTH 900 EAST

The main house is almost all garage. It was renovated about 10 years ago to have four garage spots in the main house and two more in the detached garage. Crazy – figured it was some car-enthusiast. To put in the two additional houses they would easily justify taking down the detached garage since the main house has a garage (though the front facing garage is an anomaly in itself – but already approved). There is room in the back for the two additional houses – though this would be more efficient as a duplex since you don't have the separation requirements. The neighboring houses are not very close – the back facing houses have long back yards and the two side lots have garages abutting the new lot locations. I don't see them putting up a huge resistance. But they might – the 1921 S (north-side neighbor) has a nice backyard which would be effected if the new houses were two story, which I presume they would be – though the main house is only single story.

There is justification for the shared driveway (normally not endorsed by SLC) because the neighbors to the north share a driveway. One question will be who will own the driveway – not the main house any longer but shared between the two new lots. So the lots will be very odd shaped and it's not clear if the main house would have the normal lot separation expectation from the driveway.

I think one weird thing will be that the main house's garage has double-fronted doors – meaning you can drive through the garage doors ou see from the front, to the back yard. (I saw this during construction). But if the back yard is now separated into the two new lots, then the driveway would open onto their yards. That would be weird.

We're not being asked whether we want to live there – only if they can make an attempt to subdivide and develop. I'd like to know the % acreage of the current lot and the proposed divisions.

Heidi Schubert

Your Comments for the Planning Commission

Your Street Address

1921 S. 900 E. Salt Lake City Ut. 84105

Mallika Filtz <mallikafiltz@gmail.com>

Fri, Nov 15, 8:32 PM (16 hours ago)

Dear Ms. Short,

Below are the comments that I have already submitted to Andy Hulka at the Planning Division, as well as to the webform on the Sugarhouse Community Council website.

We received the notice for the 900 East Collective-Planned Development project at 1935 South and have some concerns regarding the request.

While we generally support the addition of more single-family housing in the area, the fact that 2 additional homes are being requested on the subdivided property seems like too much. Perhaps the addition of one home, with a sizable yard and distance from other dwellings, would be a better solution in the space. Also, the fact that 2 homes would require modifications for so many of the requirements for single-family homes, makes us worried that they will not be as desirable to potential home buyers or renters. In addition, 900 East is already extremely congested at that intersection and the additional units, with no access to the street except through a shared

driveway, will create more congestion. We also realize that the size and height of the additional homes will create less than ideal conditions for the current backyards adjacent to the property and would be an obvious eyesore to us and all the neighbors surrounding the property. Thank you for taking the time to consider our comments.

Sincerely,
Mallika and Michael Filtz
933 E Hollywood Ave.

ROBERT A. BASS
1912 South Lincoln Street
Salt Lake City, Utah 84105
bassra726@yahoo.com

RE: 1935 South 900 East, Salt Lake City, Utah 84105 (the "Subject Parcel");
Planned
Development PLNPCM2024-00943 (900 East Collective Planned
Development)
(the "Planned Development Application"); Subdivision Application
PLNSUB2024-01146 (900 East Collective – Preliminary Plat) (the
"Subdivision
Application," and along with the Planned Development Application, the
"Proposal")

Dear Mr. Hulka:

This letter is in response to an invitation for public input to the referenced Proposal and serves as an objection to Mr. Cummett's application (on behalf of Strasser Organization Inc.) (the "Applicant") for approval to subdivide and develop an existing .42 acre parcel in Sugar House, the result of which would be the creation of two flag lots to the rear of an existing 9,878 square feet single family home. If approved as proposed, three single-family homes, with an aggregate of over 18,000 square feet of living space along with related improvements to accommodate such expansion of the use of the property, would be on the existing .42 acre parcel. I own a home located about 100 feet from the Subject Parcel. Please accept this letter as an expression of my opposition to the proposed Planned Development (the "Proposal"). In support of the Proposal, the Applicant, with reference to Chapter 21A.55 of the City's Code of Ordinances, argues that the Proposal meets four criteria: (i) Preservation, (ii) Needed Housing, (iii) Neighborhood Compatibility, and (iv) Master Plan Compatibility. The Proposal,

however, provides scant evidence of achievement of such criteria and otherwise falls well short of the Code's Planned Development requirements. Section 21A.55.050 of the Code provides that a planned development application must "provide written or graphic evidence demonstrating compliance with" seven enumerated standards. As outlined below, the Proposal fails to meet the requirements of Section 21A.55.050 and, therefore, should be denied.

Page 2 of 4

Objection to Planned Development PLNPCM2024-00943; and Subdivision Application PLNSUB2024-01146

1. Planned Development Objectives Standard

Section 21A.55.010 of the Code highlights that the City's planned development process "seeks to achieve" one or more of six listed objectives. In its Proposal, the Proposal asserts that the subdivision will achieve two of those objectives – "Preservation" and "Needed Housing."

Preservation

Here, the Applicant asserts that the Proposal achieves the preservation objective under Section 21A.55.010.B.1 because there is no plan to alter or destroy the existing single-family home. In outlining the City's objectives, the Code refers to "historic preservation." The Proposal, however, does not implicate the City's historic preservation objective. The existing home, while pleasing to the eye and a well-kept Sugar House property, is not in the category of structures contemplated under Code that are "architecturally and/or historically" significant or that otherwise "contribute to the character of the City." In this case, that the existing structure may remain unaltered is not determinative of this objective. Were the preservation objective otherwise applicable here, notwithstanding the lack of historical significance of the existing structure, the Proposal also fails to achieve the objective in Section 21A.55.010.B.2 because the Proposal contemplates a significant change in the character of the parcel by carving it into two flag lots for development of two additional homes. That alteration does nothing to enhance

or significantly contribute to the character of the Sugar House neighborhood or the Subject Parcel; rather, it negatively alters the property as compared to other parcels in the neighborhood. Accordingly, the Proposal fails to achieve the City's historic preservation objective.

Needed Housing

The Applicant also argues that the Proposal results in an "increase" in housing stock and, therefore, achieves the objective stated in Section 21A.55.010.C. The Proposal's attempt to meet this objective misses the point. Section 21A.55.010.C of the Code speaks to the importance of "affordable housing or types of housing that helps achieve the City's housing goals and policies." None of the planned development objectives in Chapter 21A.55 refer to housing inventory or housing stock. The Proposal make no showing of affordability and, therefore, it does nothing to advance the City's affordable housing objective. Accordingly, the Commission should find that the Proposal fails to demonstrate compliance with the Planned Development Objective Standard.

2. Master Plan Compatibility Standard

The Proposal argues that the Planned Development meets this standard by developing an underutilized portion of Subject Parcel. Subdividing a parcel to create flag lots is a controversial approach to land development. According to the Sugar House Community Master Plan, flag lot development "has been used in Sugar House in limited areas." The Proposal's assertion that it achieves the Master Plan Compatibility Standard is conclusory. The Proposal points only to density considerations in support of meeting this standard and provides no other written or graphic support

Page 3 of 4

Objection to Planned Development PLNPCM2024-00943; and Subdivision Application PLNSUB2024-01146

for its argument. For, example, there is no showing that the Planned Development will "preserve the existing privacy of the surrounding properties" or provide for "new structures that incorporate the desirable architectural design features common throughout the neighborhood." Nor has the

Proposal provided written or graphic evidence demonstrating compliance with the stated policies of planned developments in the Sugar House Community Master Plan. Accordingly, the Commission should find that the Proposal fails to demonstrate compliance with the Master Plan Compatibility Standard.

3. Design and Compatibility Standard

The Proposal focuses on density and reduction of lot size for achieving this standard. The emphasis on density ignores the fact that this subdivision will create two flag lots resulting in a development that is incompatible with the block on which the Subject Parcel is located (bounded by 900 E, Ramona Avenue, Lincoln Street, and Hollywood Avenue) and the neighborhood. As observed in the Sugar House Community Master Plan, flaglots are un common in Sugar House.

As such, the Proposal does not improve or enhance the character of the Subject Parcel or the neighborhood and will only create an outlier parcel.

Under Section 21A.55.050, the Code enumerates seven considerations for determining if a proposed planned development complies with the Design and Compatibility Standard. Other than its reference to density, the Proposal presents no further evidence supporting those seven considerations. Notably, the Proposal ignores the consideration of whether the building setbacks, as reduced under the Proposal, will allow for meeting the Design and Compatibility Standards under subpart C.3 of Section 21A.55.050.

Accordingly, the Commission should find that the Proposal fails to demonstrate compliance with the Design and Compatibility Standard.

4. Landscaping Standard

The Proposal offers no written or graphical evidence showing compliance. Accordingly, the Commission should find that the Proposal fails to demonstrate compliance with the Landscaping Standard.

5. Mobility Standard

The Proposal offers no written or graphical evidence showing compliance. Accordingly, the Commission should find that the Proposal fails to demonstrate compliance with the Mobility Standard.

6. Existing Site Features Standard

The Proposal offers no written or graphical evidence showing compliance. Accordingly, the Commission should find that the Proposal fails to demonstrate compliance with the Existing Site Features Standard.

7. Utilities Standard

The Proposal offers no written or graphical evidence showing compliance. Accordingly, the Commission should find that the Proposal fails to demonstrate compliance with the Utilities Standard.

In conclusion, the Commission should find that under Section 21A.55.050 of the Code, the Applicant has failed to provide the commission with “written or graphic evidence demonstrating compliance with the ... standards” set for in such section and will not achieve the City’s planned development goals. On that basis, I urge you to deny the Proposal. Thank you for the opportunity to present the foregoing to the Commission.

Sincerely yours,

-S-

Robert A. Bass

Cc: Judi Short (via email: judi.short@gmail.com)

1935 S 900 E

Lynn Schwarz <lsbx101@gmail.com>

Fri, Nov 15, 2024 at 10:42 AM

To: Judi Short <judi.short@gmail.com>, Rebecca Davis rdavis2655@gmail.com

Following is my letter re the infill proposal.

This letter is in regard to PLNPCM2024-00943 at 1935 South 900 East.

I am not in favor of this proposal because the houses are out of scale with the neighboring houses and the reduced rear yard setbacks put a massive 2 story house too close to the neighboring houses.

While Salt Lake City is eager to utilize larger lots for infill development, this proposal is exactly why residents object to the concept. While single story bungalow style infill houses, with the required rear 20 foot setback would resolve my concerns, that is not what is proposed. The developer states that these houses are compatible with the neighborhood. That is clearly not the case as the neighborhood is made up almost exclusively of 1 story bungalows. Also, to compare a 2 story, 3600 square foot house with a garage on a neighboring lot to justify the reduced rear setback is disingenuous at best. The proposed style of the infill houses is also not in any way compatible with the neighborhood as they are very boxy, and modern with stucco and wood siding. The neighborhood houses are predominantly 1 story brick bungalows and these would stick out like a sore thumb.

While the preservation of the existing house is laudable, the rest of the proposal should not be considered as a proper infill development. This PUD should be turned down in its present form.