**COMMENTS 1807 SOUTH 1900 EAST ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT**

**From:** Liz <   
**Date:** December 18, 2019 at 2:34:37 PM MST  
**To:** [linda.mitchell@slcgov.com](mailto:linda.mitchell@slcgov.com), [Minnestotaute76@gmail.com](mailto:Minnestotaute76@gmail.com)  
**Subject:** **ADU 1807 South 1900 East  PLNPCM2019-01065**

Regarding:  
Notice of Application  
Conditional Use for a Detached Accessory Dwelling Unit  
1807 South 1900 East  
  
As adjacent landowners directly east of proposed ADU, we adamantly oppose approval of, and even consideration for ADU at said address.  
  
Current uses for 1807 S 1900 E already include an accessory unit.  This unit contributes to on street parking issues in the neighborhood, especially a problem with snow removal.  
  
The proposed ADU plan of 2 storeys does not conform to city requirements, does not provide minimum 10 foot setbacks, does not provide additional parking, and would be adjacent to our living/sleeping area.  
  
We feel these factors would impact us considerably, both in life style as well as market value.  Living quarters and associated noise, parking, odor, etc. for ADU would be closer to our house than to the neighbors multi-dwelling “primary residence” of 1807 South 1900 East.  
  
Thank you. Liz Josephson and Mike Becker

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **From:** Liz  **Date:** December 19, 2019 at 9:45:42 AM MST **To:** [minnesotaute76@gmail.com](mailto:minnesotaute76@gmail.com), [linda.mitchell@slcgov.com](mailto:linda.mitchell@slcgov.com) **Subject:** **PLNPCM2019-01065**  ﻿Attached is a scale drawing of our residence with proposed ADU at Klinker residence. We will be unavailable Jan 7 thru 22.  Please contact us if we can meet at your office, or here on site. Thank you  Dear Judi:  I went over to 1807 S and 1900 East and happened to run into the next door neighbors who are opposed to the ADU. They are understandably upset as it will be very close to their house. Because the ADU house is on a corner lot the back yard which is next to the side of the neighboring house is considered a side yard. It does not seem to be a very large lot and it has a shed and garage and other stuff which makes it look smaller. It will be a pretty substantial ADU with 2 stories. The neighbors also said she already has a tenant. |  |  |

﻿

Landon/Linda,

My name is Chris Lewe and I recently received a notice that an adjoining property has requested to construct an Accessory Dwelling Unit.  I am the homeowner of 1805 S 1900 E, just north of the 1807 property where Susan Klinker is proposing building a 2 story ADU.  You were both listed on the neighborhood notice as being able to provide more information.  I have several questions and concerns with the proposal that I have outlined below:

* This homeowner has been renting out her basement for the last 5 years.  Looking at the ADU supplemental information on the SLC website, it looks like you can only have 1 ADU per property.  I would assume a basement rental with segregated access would qualify as an ADU, so I am curious if that was disclosed in the permit application process.  If so, is there a supplemental project to remove the basement apartment?  How does the city ensure that she is not subletting multiple ADUs on her property?  How many rental units can you have in this zoning district before this would be classified as a commercial business?
* The proposed site plan looks like there will be a secluded patio immediately behind the ADU and adjoining my south property line.  I have two young children that frequently play in my back yard.  With no ability to vet potential tenants I am worried that this would present a liability with disrespectful occupants.  Moreover, the short term nature of rental properties creates an insecurity regarding who will be watching my children as they play.
* I am concerned that the ADU will be used for short term rentals.  How will the city prevent this from becoming an AirBnB or VRBO?  This is a quiet family neighborhood and not conducive to the rotating caravan of party goers that these rentals attract.  While the homeowner does live on the property, she frequently travels and there is no confidence that she would be present to police such behavior.
* The proposed site plan lists this as a two story ADU, even though the main home on the property and all other adjoining homes in the neighborhood are single story.  How is this suitable for the neighborhood?  Shouldn't the main home, at a minimum be a two story, before proposing to build a two story ADU adjacent to the home?
* The letter mentioned a city council meeting to review the matter, when and where is that planned to occur?

Thank you for your consideration on the above concerns.  I moved my family here specifically for the residential family neighborhood.  While I understand the drive for additional housing, approving this project would only provide an economic benefit for the homeowner while asking the surrounding neighborhood to bear all of the negative external costs.  To be a viable community, the city should be supporting its young family residents.  Adding single rental units to established residential plots will only continue to entice young families like ours to move to the surrounding suburbs.  There are plenty of blighted urban areas in the city that could benefit from renewal through additional apartment units.  The city should not be looking to supplant its current thriving single family areas with rental units to address a perceived housing crisis.  I look forward to hearing from you.

Thanks,

Chris Lewe

**From:** Gail Phelps <   
**Date:** December 27, 2019 at 1:38:42 PM MST  
**To**   
**Subject:** **PLNPCM2019-01065 Conditional Use**  
I have received notice of a proposed project at 1807 South 1900 East. My husband and I have lived at 1831 South 1900 East for nearly 30 years.  Neighbors to our South have both built huge garages/lofts over the years, as a result, our view of the mountains is blocked and our privacy in our backyard is compromised. The thought of a two story building being built further diminishes our views (to the North) and looks into our backyard. We purchased this home on a quiet street and over the years my quiet street has become a speeders main drag. Additional traffic and on street parking needs only adds to the feeling of living on a busy street. For these reasons, we, Walt and Gail Phelps, do not support the proposed project.  
Sent from my iPad

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **From:** David Morris <  **Date:** December 24, 2019 at 1:29:27 AM MST **To:**  **Subject:** **Accessory Dwelling Unit 1807 south 1900 east SLC, Utah**  ﻿Linda and Landon  I am a property owner that lives 2 doors north of the proposed ADU on 1900 east.  I live at 1793 south 1900 east had have for over 24 years.  I see no need for the property change at 1807 south.  This would add to traffic and car parking; and add to an existing problem on Downington Ave.  Currently there is much congestion on the corner of Downington and 1900 east and this will add to the problem.  I bought into this neighborhood years ago with the appeal of the tree lined streets and the charm of the homes and neighborhood.  This outbuilding,  visible from the street would be an eye sore and not fit into the identity of the neighborhood.  I also feel for the the Beckers that live in the home just east of the proposed construction.  This is a two story building the as they look out of their west window will now see a wall of the structure.  Another issue I have is that the property owner already have tenants living in the basement and this will add to the number of individuals living, driving automobiles , parking and using the infrastructure of the neighborhood.  Also my neighbor that lives between myself and Susan had asked for her permission to build a fence and was told no to a fence.  Currently there is a large hedge between their properties and what was wanted was to secure the backyard for their children.  She said no that that request and now wants this large outbuilding visible to all the walk and drive down Downington Ave.  I would hope that you will reconsider the request and help the whole of that community and our property values; instead of ONE property owner.  The Beckers who again live just east of the proposal have been here for 30 or more years, great neighbors and I feel will be taken advantage of with this.  I think they should have the most say in this given they will have a two story building feet away from their existing home.  I would hope you will take this opinion into consideration.  I am available and any time to answer additional questions.  Thank you,  Dave Morris  1793 South 1900 East |  |

**From:** Liz <   
**Date:** January 9, 2020 at 11:47:21 AM EST  
**To:**    
**Subject:** **Klinker ADU PLNPCM2019-01065**

To all Planning Departments, Staff, Commissioners:  
  
We are writing in regard to the proposed ADU by Susan Klinker at 1807 South 1900 East, PLNPCM2019-01065.  
  
Ms. Klinker already has an ADU in her primary residence.  This unit currently uses on street parking.  
  
Our primary residence at 1921 East Downington would be the most negatively impacted home in the neighborhood.  
  
The proposed ADU does nothing to increase our property value, we strongly feel it would most certainly negatively impact our home’s worth.  We bought our home in 1991 because of the charm of the street.  One story homes, consistent side yard setbacks, etc.  The proposed unit fails to respect the appearance, scale  and use on Downington Avenue.  These homes are all one-story frontages, with minimum 20 foot separation from each other.  Additionally, all homes were built with bedrooms situated opposite drives, providing buffers to sleeping areas.  Kind of an original PUD back in the 1940s!  This configuration gives bedrooms approximately 55’ from adjacent homes.  The ADU proposed would land 14’ from our sleeping area.  Geez!  Additionally, the ADU would be over 30’ from Ms. Klinkers sleeping area, with her garage providing buffer to her living areas.   
  
We feel also that the reduction of sunlight, the increase in noise (usual door slamming, dogs barking, AC/heating unit, etc), the increase in smell (BBQ, etc), is unacceptable.  
  
After spending far too much of our time and effort researching this issue, some of our other concerns are as follows:  
Definition of ADU:  said primary residence ALREADY has an ADU, if it walks like, talks like...

Perhaps a tightening of regulations and further inspection by the Civil Enforcement     Officer would be a benefit throughout the city  
Proof of minimum 50% ownership of property  
Proximity to power poles and lines  
Snow shedding onto our property  
Corner lot setbacks  
Street parking  
Pet control

Thank you for your consideration. Mike and Liz Becker

From: Josh Stewart <   
Subject: 1807 S 1900 East ADU Website Feedback  
  
We live in downington - our street has become overwhelmingly filled with not only rentals but some on our street are running illegal Airbnb rentals.  
  
As a resident I already have reservations over the lack of permanent residents and the already negative effect on the neighborhood.  
  
I would not have reservations if this unit was like a home for an elderly relative or family member. But to add more rentals in this area would be a detriment to the safety of the children and perceived value of our neighborhood.

ADU: I don't think that property is suited for an ADU. The corner location and side yard as a back yard just does not seem like the ideal property layout. Especially after hearing from her neighbors. That being said, I don't think the city cares and will approve one anyways. So, in that case, I would say the owner focus on the 1 story design as a fair compromise (although I don't know why you'd want to piss off all your neighbors for the sake of a couple of hundred bucks every month).  Brandon Hill

Linda/Judi,

Thank you for your prompt responses over the holidays.  I did reach out to Julie on the status of the current basement ADU.  I have copied her on this email in case there is an update.  In reviewing the building plans in preparation for tomorrow's meeting I have some additional questions:

The plans list a second story window that will look down in to my backyard.  Will this window be a frosted type or clear pane?  It looks like it ties in to a bathroom, so I think the privacy provided by frosted glass would be appreciated on both sides.

On the site plans for backyard coverage, it does not list the current side yard garden shed sitting in the northeast corner.  Based on the ADU dimensions proposed, and its absence from the plans, I would assume it is being removed.  Can you please verify if this shed is removed as part of the project?  It currently serves as a privacy fence between the properties.  Its removal would necessitate the building of a new section of fence.  Is this included in the plans?  I would be happy to provide pictures if that would help, since it is not shown on the plans.

Moreover, there is only a privacy fence for a short section of the property, noted as existing fence in the site plans.  I would like to propose that if this permit is approved, that the privacy fence be extended for the duration of the property boundary as part of the conditional use.  Since the occupants of the ADU will have full access to the property, I would expect some form of privacy fence would be required to adequately screen and separate the adjoining properties as part of the approval criteria.

Do I need to re-enter all of these comments on the project website, or are you compiling them for review?    Thanks, Chris

Judi/Linda,

Thank you for the opportunity to learn more about the ADU project last evening.  I have some additional comments from the discussion:

I wanted to provide some additional details around what Susan is referring to as her proposed "green screen."  Given that by her own admission there will be multiple renters throughout the main home and also the ADU, it is imperative that the city require a privacy divider between the surrounding properties.  Her reliance on landscaping will not be acceptable.  In the attached photos, you can see what she referenced as her "green screen" and "beautification" projects during her opening statement.  The large trees shown are mostly dead at eye level and tangled up in her electrical service.  While the future fire source is not relevant to this project, it does provide some context to her vision of a "green screen."  The door shown is where She and her current tenants enter and exit the premises, clearly within full view from my kitchen window and close proximity to my driveway.  The unkempt landscaping provides no privacy and the legacy metal fence is only around 2.5 feet tall.  It can easily be stepped over by any adult or medium size dog.  Given the unchecked amount of unrelated adults, their guests, and pets that will be canvassing the property on a regular basis, this will present a security and privacy risk to my children who frequently ride their bikes up and down the driveway.  She confirmed that all tenants will have unrestricted access to her entire property, so I would like to request a privacy fence for the entire length of her north property boundary as part of the conditional use.  I hope the city will recognize the need for a privacy barrier as she is clearly going to operate her residence as a multi family high density property with short term temporary residents.  This is distinctly different than the single family character of the neighborhood, which is the reason why we moved here.

Additionally, her plan to not place a fence where the garden shed currently sits is completely unacceptable.  She has a dog that roams her property and this will become an issue on day 1 of the project if it is approved.  Relying only on landscaping is another safety and security risk to my property, and a major liability for her since it will not prevent her multiple residents, their guests, and pets from roaming into my backyard where my children frequently play.

She seemed non-committal about an opaque window on the back of the second story plan.  The detailed plans show this window between a toilet and walk-in shower.  How would this be acceptable?  I do not want to see her tenants during their bathroom routines, nor do my children.  This is another issue created by the two story structure proposal.

An additional plan for a 1 story unit was handed out.  Is this also being reviewed now or will that be a separate process?  Should we submit comments for that plan also?  It is confusing that she is requesting a permit with multiple plans.  How will we know which design is actually being proposed and reviewed?

I have heard that the only man supporting ADUs was a former council member, Soren Simonsen, who supports the ADU legislation, does not live in the neighborhood impacted by this project, and has an economic interest as an architect designing these structures.  It would appear that this is a conflict of interest and I request his comments be omitted.  It is sad that he has to show up to council meetings to be the only supporter for a bad idea.

From the discussion, the property owner kept referencing how none of these plans were what she wanted due to the limitations of a corner lot.  It seems that she recognizes that this is not a good application for an ADU, but is trying to force it anyway.  With the opposition of all the surrounding homes, I hope the city will recognize that this is not a good use of the ADU concept, especially given that she already operates a de facto ADU out of her basement.  By approving this project, the city would be green lighting a multi family triplex in the middle of single family residential neighborhood.

Thanks, Chris Lewe



ADU: I don't think that property is suited for an ADU. The corner location and side yard as a back yard just does not seem like the ideal property layout. Especially after hearing from her neighbors. That being said, I don't think the city cares and will approve one anyways. So, in that case, I would say the owner focus on the 1 story design as a fair compromise (although I don't know why you'd want to piss off all your neighbors for the sake of a couple of hundred bucks every month).  Brandon Hill

I was very angry to hear that 2 story ADU's will be allowed.  It upsets me even more that renters are not only going to be living in the ADU (comment made that the two story would be more inline with a couple and possibly children) and are intending to use on-street parking not only for renters in the house but also for the ADU. So, with owner, her son, renter in the house, plus possibly two tenants in ADU this could mean up to 5 cars tied to one property which will defiantly clog up the street parking, making it a nightmare on garbage day and for snow plows clearing the roads.

I also thought that ADU's were being allowed to creat affordable housing solutions but all that I keep hearing is that the dwellings are being built to create extra income for the homeowner.

I am going to get with some of my realtor friends to see why they think that ADU's increase property values in the area.  I do not think this is true.  I have asked around and everyone that I have spoken to said that if they were looking to buy a house that any house with an ADU Nextdoor would be a big "no". Sue Watson