

September 8, 2022



TO: Salt Lake City Planning Commission  
From: Judi Short, Vice Chair and Land Use Chair  
Sugar House Community Council  
RE: Accessory Dwelling Unit Updates

I cannot find that I wrote a letter to you when the changes were first proposed earlier this year. We have had this on our Land Use and Zoning Committee at least twice, since the changes were proposed, and I have had many conversations and emails about this topic.

In general, I think the ADUs that are actually completed are not causing any problems. You have acknowledged that you didn't get as many of these completed as you were expecting, and think that is because the requirements were too onerous, or expensive (referring to the sewer and water hookups, or the filing fee). And it is clear that none of the finished ADUs are what we would call affordable housing, even though that was your hope. We are not fond of the shipping containers being used now, we would expect that ADU's would be in the style and materials that the main house is made of.

We have met many Sugar House residents, and heard their comments, as each of our ADUs was reviewed. Objections mostly have to do with a perceived loss of privacy or proximity to their own dwelling, because there is an extra dwelling in the back yard. And now, you want to remove the conditional use requirement that has allowed extra scrutiny and study of these units. We understand it takes a great deal of staff time, but it also results in a better product. Perhaps the permit counter staff are now well-versed in what is needed to build such a dwelling and have it fit into the neighborhood, and this won't be a problem going forward.

We think your idea to activate the alleys is well-intentioned. However, the city does not do anything to make this an acceptable option, because they don't maintain the city-owned alleys. Lighting at the rear of the ADU should be required, whether or not there is an entrance on the alley side, and motion lights required, just for alley safety. Nefarious activities are ever present in the alleys, and the idea that someone is watching, or there is light to shine on those activities is a positive step. I don't see why these parcels cannot be encouraged to put a parking space next to the ADU from the alley. There could still be a fence to block access and view of the car, with a garage door type opener to use when the car approaches the driveway. Gravel could be acceptable; we don't need a concrete driveway. The fences need to be 6' in height, which is what is now allowed.

Parking is an issue. The city is acting like everyone is going to walk or ride their bike, or walk three blocks to a bus stop, which might happen for some tenants. But older tenants, or those who work at night, aren't going to do that, they want an automobile. And the city pretends there is plenty of parking on the street, which there isn't. You need to emphasize that providing a parking place on the parcel provides some benefit, like an actual place to park within two blocks. What about reducing the city fee if a parking place is included.

We think the window requirements are acceptable. The owner occupancy for one unit is not negotiable. Everyone thinks that is the only way to go. We all live in neighborhoods where we can tell the rental houses from the owner occupants, the rental homes look terrible, not maintained, weeds everywhere, etc. Short term rentals should NOT be allowed. The penalties are not enough, current violators just pay their fine and continue to offer short term rentals. What is that about? Making them condos achieves nothing. We like the fact that an effort will be made to not have lighting shining in the neighbor's yards. That is one of the most frequent complaints.

The city does little to enforce its own ordinances. It is up to the neighbors to complain and complain, and complain again. It shouldn't be that way. The city should care about its neighborhoods. It is not evidenced now. These ADUs do not benefit the neighborhoods, only the property owner. The neighborhood gets more automobiles, more noise and more density.

To provide more affordable housing, what can be done to help home owners to get loans to build an ADU that help make an affordable ADU? The city should benefit from these, not just the developer. The city readily says the developers have asked for these changes. We don't need to be catering to them.

Enclosures - Comments from Sugar House Residents

## SH Comments ADU Update 2022

### ADUs

I watched the webinar about ADU financing on Friday and came away wondering whether the new approach of by-right/OTC will move the needle, after all. Two things:

1. ADUs are expensive—not a trivial matter to make them affordable for the occupant and profitable for the owner.
2. Financing is difficult—(most) mortgage bankers and appraisers don't know how to handle them.

Seems like I heard somewhere that the City's new approach was in response to slow uptake in the present regulatory environment with CUP, etc. Maybe that's not actually the problem...? Does the City have data that shows this new approach will be effective?

With the mitigation we have discussed, it seems like a decent approach, to me—just unsure about the impact... David Ailkire



**Sugar House Community Council** <[wordpress@sugarhousecouncil.org](mailto:wordpress@sugarhousecouncil.org)> (1 hour ago)

to me

From: Lynn Schwarz <[lsbx101@gmail.com](mailto:lsbx101@gmail.com)>  
Subject: [ADU Ordinance Updates]

### Message Body:

The purpose of an ADU Ordinance should be to balance the mitigation of the negative impacts of the ADU on the neighbors with the rights of the property owner, the key word being balance. Several of the proposed changes are problematic, to say the least.

1. Changing from a conditional to permitted use removes the ability of neighbors to bring up particular circumstances that might require consideration of special conditions requiring some different accommodations to a project. One size will now fit all.
2. Removal of the owner occupancy requirement is arguably one of the worst ideas. The "problem" of a possible early lease termination due to a change in ownership is easily handled by a requirement to let the lease run to completion. This is a problem to be borne by the owner as they have enjoyed the benefits of an ADU. This is how changes of ownership of multiple dwellings are handled in many cities. This removal would also give investors a free hand to the detriment of neighborhood stability.
3. The idea of condo ownership also brings complications of changes in ownership. Would lots have to be subdivided to be sold separately?
4. Setback decreases do nothing to mitigate negative impacts on neighbors. They clearly make things worse, particularly with noise and lighting issues. A 3 foot rear and side property line setback for 1 story and a 5 foot rear and side property line setback for 2 stories is clearly not enough. ( Table line 246 ).
5. 17 feet is high enough. There is no necessity for a 24 foot height, even with a minimal



increase in required setbacks. Heights may also be allowed as high as the principal dwelling's underlying zone ( lines 248-264 ).

6. The requirement for off-street parking is essentially eliminated, consistent with SLC's fantasy that people who live near transit will not have cars. This elimination will exacerbate many areas' parking issues.

7. Requiring alley facing ADUs to have a primary entrance on the alley is a safety issue, as is the 4 foot fence height limit.

8. While it seems that there is a gross floor area limit of 720 sq. ft., there is a large exception. If the ADU is in a dual use accessory dwelling, the only floor area counted is the ADU area. This means a single story garage/ADU can have an unlimited floor area as long as the ADU is less than 720 sq. ft. Also, the ADU may exceed 720 sq. ft. if the building is located entirely within the buildable area of the lot and the property complies with the maximum building coverage requirements of the underlying zone.

These changes need to be completely rethought. Lynn Schwarz

---

ADUs are not a solution to this City's affordable housing problems. Only 30 were built in 3 years of this City opening the door to them. The solution is to allow housing in areas that this City tries to stop housing in, especially on the tens of thousands of acres on the westside that is underutilized. The City makes every excuse possible then every once in a while makes an exception to allow housing where a few months before, they said no. The International Center could and should be allowed to have housing but the City contended that the Airport wouldn't allow it but that is not true and recently allowed it in the same zone on the other side (the Airport INN).

ADUs cost around \$100,000 and, despite the potential negative impact on utilities and services (sewer, water, electricity, storm, gas, fire and police, parks and streets), the City's use of impact fees is questionable due to City and Legislative decisions. Our streets and utilities, especially water and sewer were designed with a certain density in mind and increasing that density could have serious negative and costly impacts on residents (sewer backups, pollution, lack of water pressure).

ADUs in this plan will constitute the new monster homes since the decrease in setbacks and the potential increase in higher windows into adjacent yards will increase hate and discontent in neighborhoods that were supposed to be stable and encourage community and neighborliness (respect).

This City also is unable to enforce effectively the nuisance and noise and business and short term rental ordinances and encouraging ADUs will make it worse. This City has a bad habit of ignoring maintenance when allowing or building projects. Enforcement is this plan's lack of maintenance.

So, this ADU plan should not be approved due to lack of enforcement mechanisms, lack of recognizing street and utility limitations and discouraging stable and long term residential neighborhoods. The Planning Commission should not approve this ADU

plan and suggest that the City remove the limitations on housing on the westside of the City.

**Sugar House Community Council** <[wordpress@sugarhousecouncil.org](mailto:wordpress@sugarhousecouncil.org)> (2 hours ago)

to me

From: Yvonne Martinez <[ymart626@gmail.com](mailto:ymart626@gmail.com)>  
Subject: [ADU Ordinance Updates]

Message Body:

The biggest issue I have with the ADU changes is the possibility that the Owner Occupied requirement would be taken away. The quality of our community depends on how the property is maintained - current rentals in my neighborhood are all mostly shabby and weedy. Even with record rents and profits!

I would also like to see some requirements on the quality of material used, also not allowing shipping containers and low quality manufactured homes.

Other issues I've experienced with recent builds in my neighborhood are around setbacks and height- the closer to the property line the lower the height

Lighting "infringement" is only enforced if it hits your main house and not when it encroaches into the yard. This encroachment still affects the ability of the surrounding neighbors enjoyment and use of their property. - especially when lights are extremely bright and on dawn to dusk.

Consider ways that assist ADUs being built, especially on larger lots. Subsidized loans with lower interest rates, property tax credits, lease plans from architects to help offset that cost and also control design of units.

Can the City provide data and information from other cities that have had success or failures in adopting ADU policies? It feels like they make decisions in a vacuum sometimes, so sharing research or success/failures in other locales may ease some of the concerns of citizens when making huge changes like these.

Thank you,  
From: DAYNA MCKEE <[dmckee3313@gmail.com](mailto:dmckee3313@gmail.com)>  
Subject: [ADU Ordinance Updates]

Message Body:

I don't feel like the ADUs that have been built since the initial ordinance was put in place are actually achieving the goals that are the intent of the ordinance. What data does the City have that indicates that these are in fact being offered as affordable alternatives for working people? What evidence can the city provide that these are not becoming short

term rentals? What evidence is there that transit ridership has increased? There is no enforcement mechanism in place to ensure that ADUs are in compliance or are meeting the goals of affordability and adding to the housing stock. There is an extreme lack of forethought on the part of the Planning Commission right now. We are throwing darts at the wall with our planning and zoning right now under the guise of providing more affordable housing options but the data does not support that affordable housing is actually being created in a meaningful way. People are being displaced. There should be a meaningful assessment of the data and metrics of the current ADU zoning ordinance before making further updates to it.

In the ordinance, the following sections should be RETAINED:

21A.40.200: ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS:

Section A, Items 1-9 should be retained.

Section B, Items 1-3 should be retained.

Section E, Item 1 a-f should be retained.

Section F, Items 1-3 should be retained.

Section H should be retained and expanded to measure the metrics of the ordinance including, but not limited to: long term occupancy rates, affordability, demographics of occupants, owner occupation of primary residence or ADU, short term rental violations, etc. The City should be measuring the success or failure of the ordinances they put into place. The City gathers demographics on all surveys they do and there is no reason there cannot be an annual survey sent to those property owners and tenants who have built and are living in ADUs.

I do not disagree with some of the updates to the ordinance, but I do believe there should be some things retained from the above listed sections. ADUs should remain a conditional use and they should have to go through a planning and permitting process. Additionally, property owners should have to have certificates of zoning and occupancy, adhere to the good landlord program, provide proof of owner occupancy annually, and should be deed restricted.

We must be more thoughtful about how we are planning our city. If the City wants to continue to spout rhetoric about affordability, creating diverse housing options to keep working people in our communities, and not displacing people through gentrification, then there needs to be zoning enforcement, review, and data collection for ordinances such as this to ensure the intent of the ordinance is being met.

July 5th 2022.

REFERENCE: PLNPCM2022-00475 ADU ORDINANCE CHANGES

As President of The Preserve Our Avenues Zoning Coalition (POAZC) a Recognized Community Organization, I am offering our organization's initial response to the proposed changes in the ADU ordinance. While our Bylaws define our purpose as focusing on zoning and land use developments affecting the Greater Avenues District, we believe that the proposed changes and those referenced as possible further changes by the Planning Division will have a major, long-term adverse impact throughout the City.

While we are not opposed to the creation of ADU's that are developed in accordance with the current ADU ordinance, we are opposed to any amendment of the ordinance that would eliminate the owner-occupant requirement to create and maintain an ADU. The suggestion that *"equity considerations"* compel its elimination, in order to protect a renter in residence at the time of sale of a principal residence is a "Red Herring". That concern can be addressed by simply inserting a non-disturbance agreement into an ADU lease and securing the approval of the mortgage lender. A recorded notice of the existence of the ADU and the lease terms will give prospective purchasers notice of the rights of the renter. Those clauses can also protect a renter from a landlord's loss of title due to foreclosure. Even nonresident owners can create issues for unprotected renters by selling or defaulting on mortgage loans. Given that this argument is being used in support of ending the owner-occupant requirement, we find it ironic that the proposed revision of the ADU ordinance appears to eliminate the *"Good Landlord Program"* requirement of the current ordinance. Was that intentional?

There's a second problem with the draft ordinance that will result from removing the owner-occupant requirement. The section proposed for removal requires that the owner be *"an individual"*. Its elimination would mean that developers or investors operating in any legal entity format could create ADUs. Opening ADU creation to developers, speculators and house flippers will undoubtedly increase house prices and rents. Was that intentional?

We have a third concern with the amendment process that is currently underway. It is found in these words taken from the transmittal email that came to us as a recognized community organization: *"Planning may also present two options to the City Council that are not included in the text as written, but could be included as possible changes: removing the owner-occupant requirement and allowing ADU's to be subdivided as condos"*.

While we don't know exactly what was intended by *"subdivided as condos"*, it appears to foreshadow a possible change in the ordinance that would permit an ADU to be sold separately from the principal residence. Was that intended? If so, as with elimination of the owner-occupant requirement and the requirement that an ADU creator be an *"individual"*, enabling the sale of an ADU will further accelerate housing price increases and thereby rents.

Peter Wright  
Avenues

ADU housing has been promoted to residents of Salt Lake City as a property right of individual property owners. ADU advocates have assured concerned residents that... *"It's one unit at a time. It's not a subdivision.... [They] have little impact on actual neighborhoods and streets. They often blend in and are unnoticed."* (See Tony Semerad article in the Salt Lake Tribune, edition 9/1/2019).

However, our organization is currently opposing an Ivory Development housing proposal that has recently been recommended to the City Council by the Planning Commission. That proposed development seeks rezoning to nearly double the number of buildable lots on a 3 acre site in exchange for a promise to create ADUs on 14 of the proposed 19 lots. However, it is a subdivision! It's not one at a time! It doesn't meet any affordability test! Ivory Development can't even assure the City that any ADUs will be created following construction! And Ivory Development calls it *"an experiment!"*

This is the future that all neighborhoods in all sections of the City will face if the suggested changes in the ADU ordinance are adopted, subdivisions of ADUs owned by developers and property companies? The Planning Division owes it to the residents of the City to clarify its position on the issues of the owner-occupant requirement and the conveyance of ADUs. Are ADU's merely a tool for developers to extract otherwise meritless concessions from the City? Is increased housing density without reducing housing costs or advancing other vision goals of the 2015 Plan Salt Lake a worthy achievement?

It is revealing that the purpose clause of the draft ordinance deletes the purpose clause of the current ordinance which includes numerous considerations that are intended to guide ADU development and the interpretation of the ordinance. It substitutes this wording: *"Purpose: the regulatory purpose of this section is to promote an increase in the housing stock within the city and promote housing choices by allowing and regulating accessory dwelling units."*

The only purpose is creating ADU housing. There is no need to advance or consider the concepts of "sustainability", "livability", "responsible growth", "safety", "affordable housing," and the other values stressed in the 2015 Plan Salt Lake Citywide Vision Statement. That Vision Statement appears to have gone into a file drawer labeled "Community Interests" and the Planning Division is working out of another file drawer labeled "Developer Interests".

There are other concerns we have with the draft ordinance, so we reserve the right to submit future comments. If the proposed draft is revised before going to the Planning Commission, we also request a 45-day advance comment period to review the final draft. There's a lot at stake for the City and its residents. This needs to be done thoughtfully, not quickly.

In four short years the intent of this ordinance has morphed from "mother-in-law apartments", created one at a time by individual owner occupiers, to dense subdivisions of ADUs created and owned by developers and speculators.

These comments were unanimously endorsed by members of the POAZC meeting held 7/5/2022.



From: Kristina Lyn Heitkamp <[krislyn24@gmail.com](mailto:krislyn24@gmail.com)>  
Subject: [ADU Ordinance Updates]

Sugar House Community Council <[wordpress@sugarhousecouncil.org](mailto:wordpress@sugarhousecouncil.org)>

11:27 AM (2  
hours ago)

to me

From: Hal Crimmel <[hccrimmel@gmail.com](mailto:hccrimmel@gmail.com)>  
Subject: [ADU Ordinance Updates]

Message Body:

In the strongest possible terms my spouse and I are opposed to changes to the Accessory Dwelling Ordinance city-wide, and particularly as proposed for Sugar House, the neighborhood in which my family and I have lived for 22 years. Let me say I am not typically a person who writes letters to the City expressing frustration or outrage but I am going to do so here.

First, this / these proposed changes take away the opportunity for neighbors and community members to provide input on individual conditional use permits. Shouldn't neighbors have a say in what happens in their neighborhoods? Why should an individual property owner be allowed to build something that doesn't align with current zoning regulations? I paid a premium for my property because we did not want to live in a densely populated neighborhood --and now the city comes along and says, 'just kidding'--we're going to rezone and in fact let people build an extra dwelling on their property! None of my neighbors want to see the zoning laws changed--it's outrageous.

The proposed new Ordinance will allow construction of buildings that will wall in people's backyards, reduce backyard privacy, increase noise, traffic and backyard green space, increasing the urban heat island effect. Who on earth wants to be surrounded by single-family lots that will now be two-family lots with two story homes!? The changes are a dream for developers and landlords and a nightmare for homeowners who treasure privacy, quiet and some breathing room. The new ordinance, with its permitting of a second story, balconies, decks, patios--these are not ADUs but full-blown homes!-- that the City wants to stuff into properties zoned for single family homes. 5 foot setbacks as outlined in section F? Seriously!? I could have 20' foot high homes on all three sides of me on 5 FOOT SETBACKS! Instead of looking at trees I would be looking at the walls of houses! Who dreamed up these regulations!? Ivory Homes?

Anyone who thinks the city can enforce the stipulations described in C. 1-4 has got to be kidding. Our current zoning regulations can't even be enforced. We moved from our previous home due to a landlord who put 6 hard-partying students into a Sugar House bungalow on a street full of single-family homes above 15th East. People from the city came out multiple times but no one seemed able to do anything about the 'no-more-than-3 unrelated-persons in any rental' rule. Then our neighbor across the street rented his house to people who didn't live in it but ran a business. Same story. After we moved off the street another neighbor decided he was going to turn his home into an Airbnb, which made life miserable for the remaining neighbors (rave parties, drug dealing, 10 people staying on weekends)--after two years the city finally had enough "evidence" and started fining the guy and he stopped. Does anyone really think the city has the resources to determine who is living in a home and an ADU and whether they are a "family member" or out of the country on required business, etc.? This is a recipe for a resort-town rental nightmare where the neighbors never know who is next door. Do neighbors really have the emotional energy to gather the documentation and make all the calls to the city to ensure that these new proposed regulations will be enforced? Should they have to in order to preserve their quality of life?

Frankly, ADUs rarely benefit anyone in a neighborhood except for the property owner--there are simply more cars, more noise, more density for everyone else, while the property owner cashes long-term or illegal short-term rental checks. Further, ADUs only serve to increase property tax, as single-family homes, once approved for ADUs will now have increased income-producing potential, thereby increasing their market value. Once a property can produce a higher income stream than what is currently possible, property prices will follow. Why change the zoning to neighborhoods originally zoned the way they are currently--and that's why people paid a premium for homes there.

Big picture, the City claims that ADUs will help alleviate the housing crisis by putting more affordable housing on the market. This argument is a trojan horse. Does anyone at the City really think East Bench ADUs will be rented for an "affordable" rate--e.g., \$600-\$750 per month which is about all a person in a low-wage job can afford? More likely these properties will be rented at eye-popping rates--if not immediately by current owners, then soon thereafter given that Americans move on average every 5 years--and surely



any new owner would utilize the income potential of the ADU--or be forced to in order to be able to afford the property in the first place. This is exactly what happened in Austin, Texas, which went all-in on ADUs. Here in SLC nothing will be made more affordable--it just forces new buyers to be landlords.

In sum, adding an ADU here or elsewhere will increase the property tax, as it has done in California and in housing markets similar to Utah's such as in Austin, TX. Higher property taxes do not result in more affordable housing--in fact, they do exactly the opposite, especially when houses with ADUs are resold. ADUs simply accelerate gentrification and/or commercial ownership of residential homes, further fraying the unique character of owner-occupied single family home neighborhoods. Why the city is pushing so hard for ADUs makes little sense. Why not purchase land and build city owned apartments and implement rent controls if really serious about providing affordable housing on a mass scale? The City had the chance to do this in downtown Sugarhouse--but are any of those apartments "affordable"? A quick google search shows that a one bedroom is at least \$1500/month and most are closer to \$2000. Why now try to make up for this by pushing more unaffordable density into neighborhoods with single-family homes?

--  
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on Sugar House Community Council (<https://www.sugarhousecouncil.org>)

Judi, here are my thoughts...I have a lot of questions and would like to understand this all better.

I have concerns about ADU owner occupied requirement being taken away since the large majority of the rentals (single family homes & multi-family units) are not maintained, its easy to spot any rentals based on the conditions of the houses and the landscaping is also neglected. We already have short-term rentals and code issues with the number of people living in them, many have weeds greater than 6 inches high. Trash cans are often stuffed to full and beyond, the larger units have dumpsters that are dumped as early as 5 am. Code is enforced by neighbors having to turn in the code violations which doesn't help with trying to maintain a positive relationship with your neighbors. Developers and businesses that own these properties, and many times the renters don't have any interest in keeping up the properties or having any interests in the state of the neighborhood. Since they are temporary residents they often don't get involved at all.

Also, I have a lot of questions about the changes in general and hope that we can have more community outreach to better understand how this and the affordable housing together will impact our neighborhoods. Right now it seems to benefit developers or those that have the means to create ADU's. Since the way Federal & State taxes are collected with regards to affordable housing, the market rate still applies or there are negative tax consequences if you want to build and rent a 720 sq ft ADU that a minimum wage single mother can afford. I see no incentives for homeowners to try to increase AFFORDABLE housing...we are looking at building costs + increased property taxes + higher interest rates + not really being able to be AFFORDABLE anyway.

Thank you for allowing me to comment and I'm hoping that we can get to a point where it is not just a win/win for developers or rich landlords that care more about the profit than the people — but for families and others that would like to supplement income and provide affordable housing to make our neighborhoods better. Yvonne Martinez

**Sheila O'Driscoll**

Jul 4, 2022, 5:00 PM (1 day ago)

to Judi.Short

Judi,  
This is Sheila O'Driscoll.  
I'd like the zoom link to this meeting.  
I'm reading the text of the proposed changes.  
As I have not been active in the loop on a number of these issues lately.  
I'd like to have your opinion on this.  
I will be sharing this info on the SHCC web link, so that others can read it too.  
I have the following concerns.  
Please remember I'm very rusty on this info.  
Parking and speed:  
I live on 1800 east. ( 1888 South)  
Westminster Ave dead ends right in front of my house.  
There is a sloping straight run on 18th East from Buena Vista to the north down to Ramona Ave. on the south.  
Vehicles regularly are speeding over the old residential speed limit of 25mph.  
There are still a few families on 18th in these blocks with a number of small and elementary age children.  
How does the city expect to enforce a 20mph speed limit?



This neighborhood was originally built with a mix of small post WWII houses and duplexes. The original houses likely had a one car garage or none.

Some houses have basement apartments. I expect some are legal and others are rented out and not legal.

My concern with ADU's and the size and number of occupants and added on street parking is that there will be serious safety hazards created by people, especially kids, trying to cross the street, stepping into the street between parked cars.

Adequate off street parking for residents, seems particularly important for the safety and continuing quality of life in this well established residential neighborhood.

If on street parking is taken up by tenants where are people who arrive in vehicles or service vehicles (garbage trucks) supposed to safely stop?

These are just two issues that pop into my mind.

My neighborhood was recently removed from city council district 6 to district 7.

So we have some "getting acquainted with" Amy Fowler opportunities that need to take place.

1700 east, 1800 east, and 1900 east between 1700 south and 2100 south all have some serious speeding and running the stop sign issues that need to be addressed.

Creating a more densely populated neighborhood here I see as just making it worse!

I'll keep in touch with you and others who are supposed to represent is on the SHCC and in the SLC Council.

Sorry for the long email.

Sent from my iPhone

**Lynn Schwarz**

Mon, Jul 4, 5:14 PM  
(1 day ago)

to michael.mcnamee, me

The purpose of an ADU Ordinance should be to balance the mitigation of undesirable effects of an ADU on neighboring properties with the rights of property owners, while also reaching the objectives the government wishes to achieve. However the proposed changes tilts the scale way to much on the side of the property owner. The increased height allowances, decreased setbacks, increased square footage, decreased parking requirements, and possible removal of the owner occupancy requirement do not respect the appearance and scale of existing single family neighborhoods. As one of your Planners, Ms. K. Lindquist, has stated, SLC has no evidence that ADUs increase affordable housing options. Indeed, all of the ADUs that have come before the Sugar House Community Council have been for market rate rentals. When you combine this with the almost non-existence of enforcement of the Short Term Rental Ordinance violations that are endemic in SLC, you are making major changes with NO evidence the desired results will be achieved. Stop using single family residence owners as experimental subjects in some grand unproven scheme. Leave the ordinance as it is.

From: Jan Thomas <[Jan.Thomas1914@gmail.com](mailto:Jan.Thomas1914@gmail.com)>

Subject: [ADU Ordinance Updates]

Message Body:

I liked the meeting however Is there more information on the alleyway issue. Is this only based on ADU? The only other issue I would have with this is the parking and increased traffic. Some of the neighborhoods no longer have anyplace to park cars. This is a big issue during the winter. Also owner occupied is necessary in these units.

Thanks

Jan Thomas

[Larry1756@hotmail.com](mailto:Larry1756@hotmail.com)

I think you will receive the information on where and how to look at the report. When you get it can you please forward it to me. I have lived in Sugarhouse for almost 24 years. The Sugarhouse that I moved into is not the Sugarhouse that I live in today. I'm trying to get more educated on what is the thinking or motive behind the changes. I'm very concerned about my neighborhood becoming income property. The only way I see to slow down the changes is the requirement for Owner Occupancy.



**dhalkire@gmail.com**

8:43 AM (4  
hours ago)

to me

Hi Judi

My main concern is around owner-occupancy. That seems like a prudent requirement to mitigate the potential disruptive impacts of increased density within single-family areas. Although I understand staff's concern about enforcement, that's a choice—something we can choose to do well or do poorly. If it's worth doing, it's worth doing right. Otherwise let's just skip it.

I would like to see a requirement that ADUs match the materials/design of the principal building.