**COMMENTS RMF-35 AND RMF-45 MERGER OF TWO ZONES**

After watching the recording of the Planning Commission meeting on February 12th I have to agree with everything that Amy Barry said about the issues with this consolidation.  My main concerns are because these changes include RMF35 zones that are scattered in and around single family homes and a 35’ to 45’ building is a definite disruption to the neighbors.  Using a broad brush that includes**all**RMF35 zoned properties needs further review and these “one-offs” need to be looked at in more detail.

I have a 32’ building (it’s a single family home, approx 5000 sq ft  that is only 4’ from the shared property line). The ground level is about 4’ above me and the house is 28’ tall.  The lot is .14 acres, the house has 3073 sq ft above grade (parcel number **16163540420000)** so I understand how a tall building with narrow setback affects a single family home.

1.  It feels very intrusive when its so big and so close

2.  It can see directly into my second story bedroom window from the kitchen & living room

3.  There is minimal green space on the entire lot and none directly behind me

4.  It generates lots of heat from the reinforced concrete front yard and the stucco walls

5.  It has cost me money to replace landscaping due to the increased shade and heat -  the outdoor lighting also causes issues with landscaping

6.  They can see into 8 backyards from their second floor so I’m not the only neighbor impacted

I had no choice about this being built, no notification that this was going to happen. I am involved with the SHCC Zoning Committee because of it (that’s the only positive to come from this building).  So I would ask - based on my experience - that you look at this more carefully and consider the existing residents and how those scattered RMF35 zoned areas could be  negatively impacted.  Remember that the neighbors of these new, potentially much taller buildings have to live with whatever is allowed and built without any consideration about how they are impacted and the costs to them…not just monetarily but also in the negative impact it could have on them being able to enjoy their property.

Thank you for your consideration and the opportunity to provide feedback.

Yvonne Martinez

Jerry Martinez

Active Projects: RMF-35 & RMF-45 Multi-Family Zoning District Merger  
First Name: Rebecca  
Last Name: Davis  
Email: [rdavis2655@gmail.com](mailto:rdavis2655@gmail.com)  
Your Comments for the Planning Commission: Proposed Zoning Merger of RMF-35 and RMF-45 Multi-Family Zones   
I am opposed to the proposed zoning merger of RMF-35 and RMF-45 Multi-Family Zones in Salt Lake City. This will lead to the loss of affordable housing in the RMF-35 zone areas of the city. Developers will purchase lots in the RMF-35 zones, tear down the existing small dwellings and build larger, taller buildings that have more units right next door to single family homes. The developers will need to charge market rental rates to cover their costs of purchasing the land that is very expensive and the costs of building a new multi-family dwelling. This proposed zoning merger will result in existing affordable housing stock being demolished in favor of larger, more expensive housing units. This plan won’t provide the missing middle housing that the City is seeking.  
Your Street Address: 1564 E BLAINE AVE

Active Projects: RMF-35 & RMF-45 Multi-Family Zoning District Merger  
First Name: Yvonne  
Last Name: Martinez  
Email: [ymart626@gmail.com](mailto:ymart626@gmail.com)  
Your Comments for the Planning Commission: I don't have a lot of these in my area but based on what I have seen around my neighborhood there are lots that could use this zoning, but the grade drops to the back so a tall building could affect the surrounding homes so please add something clarifying height if there is a grade difference. I have a 28' tall house with a 4' set back on a lot and a lot about 3-4 feet taller than mine so the height is actually about 31-32'. At just 4 feet away it's quite imposing, they can see into several back yards and into windows. Also, it can only be accessed via an alley, it is not on View Street but since the alley doesn't have a name then they had to use View Street. This can also be a problem, so it a home is built with only alley access, I think it should be named to give it an accurate address. I understand the issues and why the current zoning isn’t working and agree that this is something that should be addressed.  
Your Street Address: 1983 S View Street

Active Projects: RMF-35 & RMF-45 Multi-Family Zoning District Merger  
First Name: Heidi  
Last Name: Schubert  
Email: [heidi@biochem.utah.edu](mailto:heidi@biochem.utah.edu)  
Your Comments for the Planning Commission: I support the Planning Commission's changes to merge the RF-35 and RF-45 zones, while maintaining setback and landscaping expectations for different types of structures within those zones.  
Your Street Address: 831 Coatsville Ave

From: **Lynn Schwarz** <[lsbx101@gmail.com](mailto:lsbx101@gmail.com)>  
Date: Wed, Feb 26, 2025, 5:10 PM  
Subject: RMF-35 AND RMF-45 MERGER TEXT AMENDMENT  
To: Young, Sarah <[sarah.young@slcgov.com](mailto:sarah.young@slcgov.com)>, Mori, Julee <[Julee.Mori@slc.gov](mailto:Julee.Mori@slc.gov)>

This change is not necessary and will not accomplish what it is designed to do. It is mutually exclusive to materially change the character of a neighborhood by incentivizing " missing middle " construction and, at the same time, " retain neighborhood character and preserve existing units ".

1. You hope the new units will be " appropriately scaled and thoughtfully designed ", while providing bonuses that would have new projects tower over adjacent single family residences with a possible 55 ' height ( with an affordable component ).

2. Other bonuses, with no affordable component, but preserving an existing unit, reward jamming in projects such as sideways row houses.

3. Both the above projects are allowed to be built with laughably small side yard setbacks of 4' for smaller projects and 5' for multi-family projects, which could be 55' high.

4. Design standards require only 50% high quality building materials. Therefore, the remaining 50% can be low quality materials that we have seen do not last and look shabby in a relatively short time, which will certainly not enhance a neighborhood.

5. While the current philosophy of Salt Lake City regarding parking is that restricting supply reduces demand, we have seen that this does not occur. We have repeatedly seen neighborhoods overwhelmed with parking that is not acommodated on-site.

6. Probably the worst aspect of this proposed change is the lack of displacement mitigation if existing affordable units are replaced with market rate units. The units ripe for the use of this up-zoning are most likely the affordable ones that will be sacrificed and replaced with 3 or 4 market rate units, especially on smaller lots.

This is an unnecessary change, especially considering we are in the midst of the massive Zoning Consolidation and will soon be considering the upcoming R-1 Rezone. These will, it seems, also encourage the building of missing middle units.

Thea Brannon

This proposal is certainly in line with the city’s attempts to provide more housing, though whether developers will bite is another question. I think a mix of small developments such as those proposed would be a good idea, and would not ruin the feel of a single family house neighborhood. Provided, of course, that they are spread out and not clustered on one block or both sides of a street in the same block. There are some lovely examples of the cottage style development in town, which are very cozy, I think, and conducive to neighborliness. Parking, of course, is always the rub. We need evidence that previously built developments with minimal parking requirements, predicated on the idea that residents will take public transport, are working and not just a pipe dream.