



January 16, 2022

TO: Salt Lake City Planning Commission

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

RE: PLN/PCM2021-01092 The Harvey 501 E 2700 S

The Sugar House Community Council reviewed this project during the December 13, 2021 Land Use and Zoning Committee. We put flyers out in the neighborhood and collected comments. Some of the neighbors attended the meeting.

This is a request from the property owner, designed by Babcock Design, for a redevelopment of this parcel to 14 residential units, (eight townhomes and six apartments) and one commercial space. This is a planned development, asking for:

- A driveway in the landscape buffer on the north property line to allow for access from the parking garage from the alley
- Additional building height up to 5' to accommodate the garden level patios
- Modification to the required setbacks from 15' to 10' for the garden level patios
- Increase in the lot size maximum (26,500 sq. ft.) in the CN zoning district to approximately 18,000 sq. ft.]

This is actually a project that looks like my interpretation of the CN (Neighborhood Commercial) Zone. This will have an automated parking garage accessed from the alley, and common amenity spaces for the residents. All 15 units (14 residential and 1 commercial) are planned as for-sale condominiums. The project uses the entire buildable footprint, and reinforcing the historic scale and ambience of traditional neighborhood uses which are oriented toward the pedestrian scale. The three condos with the English garden facing 2700 South are partially submerged, and triggers the request for the extra height and a reduced front yard setback.

We are pleased that the project is all electric, with all-electric heating and hot water than using natural gas. Eliminating natural gas will reduce greenhouse gas. The building will have extra insulation, high-efficiency equipment and appliances.

The reduced front yard setback is difficult, because it does not match the setbacks on the rest of the block face, and the height causes a privacy issue with the back yards of several homes to the east. We think you should deny that request. If it is that important to the design of those units, they could reduce the south side by five feet, so it matches the entire block face. We don't like the idea of a separate unit in the bottom floor because that would require three more parking stalls, and there is no room for those. Those renters would have to park on the street a block away.

The biggest problem with the whole project is the lack of parking. There are two spaces per unit and three for the commercial space. Maybe one unit can be removed to allow for extra parking in the automated parking system. A commercial space can't exist without parking. The neighbors tell us there is no parking for anyone nearby. These residents will have no parking nearby for visitors, and the commercial business will barely have room for two employees and a customer, much less three customers at a time.

We think the city should deed the alley, perhaps currently owned by no one, from 300 East to Park Street, to this project, and in the CORs clarify how the alley is maintained. The owners of these condominiums should be responsible for the letter to PC from SHCC 2900 S 900 E ADU [www.sugarhousecouncil.org](http://www.sugarhousecouncil.org)

maintenance. This would be to help alleviate the concerns of the neighbors to the east that have to use this alley to access their garages since they don't have a driveway on the street and there is no parking on the street. It is difficult to tell exactly how many driveways access the alley. A solution might be to make the alley one way only up to Park Street, and allow those homeowners without driveway access on the street to use the alley. If that were done, then it might be possible to add a landscape buffer on the north side of the alley.

This project is terrific, and with a bit of tweaking, it could easily solve the problems described above.

Enclosure:

Comments from the public

Flyer

Comments 501, 551, 515 E 2700 S

From: [francis.lilly@gmail.com](mailto:francis.lilly@gmail.com)

Date: December 6, 2021 at 9:33:08 PM MST

To: [sara.javoronok@slcgov.com](mailto:sara.javoronok@slcgov.com), [minnesotaut76@gmail.com](mailto:minnesotaut76@gmail.com), [amy.fowler@slcgov.com](mailto:amy.fowler@slcgov.com), [900east@slcgov.com](mailto:900east@slcgov.com), [mayor@slcgov.com](mailto:mayor@slcgov.com), [nick.norris@slcgov.com](mailto:nick.norris@slcgov.com)

Subject: 900 East Reconstruction and The Harvey Planned Development Approval

Good evening,

I'm a SLC resident, and I live at 916 E Queensmill Lane, which is 3075 S.

I thought I would send you one email on two topics:

1) the 900 E reconstruction project is almost done - and I love it! The street is lovely, and the cycle path is a great idea. I hope you will extend it south of 2700 S in a future phase. I love seeing how we are reclaiming our streets, and I know it takes time. But nice job...and thank you.

2) I'm also happy about 'The Harvey', the planned development proposed for the corner of 500 E 2700 S. The scale is right for the neighborhood, the design and massing of the buildings is elegant, and I like the commercial corner. To the extent you can, hold them to the all-brick facades. That makes a big difference in the quality of the design. Count me as one who is very happy to see this type of development in my neighborhood.

Thank you for all you do.

Francis Lilly

Sent from my iPhone

From: Stephanie Holmgren <[sholmgrend@yahoo.com](mailto:sholmgrend@yahoo.com)>

Date: Thu, Dec 2, 2021 at 7:18 AM

Subject: The Harvey

To: [minnesotaut76@gmail.com](mailto:minnesotaut76@gmail.com) <[minnesotaut76@gmail.com](mailto:minnesotaut76@gmail.com)>

Hello Landon Clark,

I am writing to you because I was mailed notice of a proposed plan to add a 14 unit housing complex on the corner of 2700 south and 500 east. This development is called The Harvey. When I visited the City website your name and email was provided in order to request that the Sugarhouse Community Council review the petition of The Harvey development.

If I may provide some background; I purchased my home at 517 East 2700 South (5 feet way from the proposed build) September of 2018. My husband and I had lived in apartments downtown for 10 years while we saved and searched for open space in Salt Lake City. We purchased an historic home with a property full of mature trees and plenty of space to garden, and breathe away from the big buildings.

Below are a list of my initial concerns:

1. After a review of The Harvey's plans it became clear that I would lose my west light significantly if not completely in certain areas. They are proposing to decrease the zoned setback from 15 feet to 10 feet, this setback re-zoning would remove all of the sunlight from front porch and a great deal from my future garden for the front of my home and it has potential to completely remove my ability to enjoy evening light in my backyard.

2. Our home does not have a front driveway and so we are therefore dependent on the alleyway that they are requesting access for their parking garage. How will 14 units' tenants, occupants and visitors effect this already dilapidated alley? Is there a plan to repave this alley before they direct all this new traffic onto it? Will they be in charge of the care of this alley? In addition to the condition of the



alley I am concerned about the air quality in my backyard as it will sit parallel to the parking garage. A minimum of 14 cars' fumes added to this small corner of land is incredibly upsetting to me.

3. On the upper west level of the garage is a tenant patio with an overlook onto my backyard. This proposed placement of a social patio will take away any semblance of privacy that I might have with apartments next door. There is no fence height that can then replace my privacy. If they need to have a patio why not put it on the east portion of their parking garage? Why is the ideal 'viewpoint' my backyard?

4. Our home was built in 1910 and has its original foundation. While the foundation is as adequately strong as one would expect for a 111 year old home, I am concerned about the impact of heavy machinery, drilling and vibrations on my home's structural integrity. I think the preservation of these old homes is incredibly important to our community, this is why we purchased and are working so hard to restore it.

It needs to be said that I am not opposed to development on this corner. I simply need to raise these red flags and bring this development to your attention. We bought this home as our final home. If the Harvey comes in then we will be this building's nearest neighbor for the rest of our lives and will be tremendously affected by its installation and existence.

I appreciate you taking the time to read this and for helping us, my husband and I, to have a voice with this redevelopment's petition.

All our very best, Stephanie Holmgren and Brandon Dan

From: Stephanie Macgill <[macstephanie@gmail.com](mailto:macstephanie@gmail.com)>

Date: Mon, Dec 13, 2021 at 11:16 AM

Subject: Case No. PLNPCM2021-0192

To: <[sara.lavoronok@slcgov.com](mailto:sara.lavoronok@slcgov.com)>

Hi Sarah,

I am the owner of the home at 525 E 2700 S, Salt Lake City, UT 84106 and I would like more information about the proposed development going in at 501-515E 2700S.

I have some concerns about the requested zoning changes that would be needed, as well as the general size of the building.

I have heard that there is a community meeting tonight about this. Could you please provide the zoom information so I can attend and learn more?

Could you also advise how and where is the best place for me to log my public comment?

Thank you, Stephanie Macgill

From: Stephanie Holmgren <[sbholmgren@yahoo.com](mailto:sbholmgren@yahoo.com)><517 E 2700 S slc, UT 84106>

Subject: The Harvey

The Harvey proposes to use the 7' landscape buffer on the north property line to allow for access to their parking garage from the alley. By using the alley as access for their 28 car garage they will be increasing the use of this already unmaintained and dilapidated alleyway 100 fold. This alley which has no name and which no one claims ownership to is the only way for myself and three other neighbors to access properties with a vehicle. In the design plans they are going to take 'ownership' over a portion of the alley in front of their garage entrance and pave it.

This will leave half of the alley still unpaved. If the city approves this access then the city should either make the developers pave the entire thing or pave it themselves to protect it from rapid deterioration...

The 500 east and 2700 south intersection is already a busy one and therefore it is unrealistic to think that new residents will not take advantage of this back alley access to make a quick loop through the

neighborhood to avoid the busy this corner.

I am pleading with this council, city zoning, city planning and the Harvey developers to please give this alleyway access more consideration and careful review.

The Harvey Development is also requesting to modify the existing setback at 2700 south from 15' to 10'. If they are granted this request it would put their building out in front of everyone and would certainly remove the possibility of watching a sunset my porch. I cannot put a price on a sunset. But I would be remiss if I didn't express my strong objection to this modification.

The last issue that I will mention in tonight's meeting is the Harvey's placement of their occupants Amenity's Patio. This patio is on the second floor and on the East side of the structure. The placement of this public patio will overlook my entire backyard as well as 3 of my neighbors yards. I am requesting that this design flaw be altered or completely changed in order to provide privacy for myself and my neighbors.

From: Thea Brannon <[theabrannon@yahoo.com](mailto:theabrannon@yahoo.com)><1768 E Wilson>

Subject: The Harvey

It seems to me this proposed development is much more in keeping with the Sugarhouse area look. The design is simple, not overly busy like most of the cookie cutter projects being put forth. The brick is appealing, the stoops with English basement are great--a classic urban design to maximize space. The efforts to reduce pollution and be energy efficient are to be commended. The automated parking is brilliant--assuming it works and the tenants use it. It is exaggerated to call the entry to the basements a "patio", entered by a "courtyard," but this is small potatoes. I'd say this design is multiple orbits above the pitiful design presented for the project next to Allen Park.

From: RON LINDQUIST <[ron.lindquist01@gmail.com](mailto:ron.lindquist01@gmail.com)><2357 South 500 East>

Subject: 2435 S Park St

1. Are there any plans for improvements to the existing alley surface? Currently there is a mix of gravel, recycled asphalt, dirt, grass, and weeds.

2. Will any signage be included in the project? Currently no signs are in place.

3. Is the city planning to do service or maintenance in the alley such as snow removal, tree pruning, and cleaning of the area? Currently snow removal is non-existent and tree, brush, & weed control is taken on by those who own property along the alley.

4. Will the City begin parking enforcement in the alley? Currently parking enforcement is only done if an issue is reported.

Judi, just a few comments...First, I applaud the fact that this is a condo development rather than more apartments. Yea! The Harvey will meet the needs of those who would prefer the permanence of being a homeowner rather than a renter. As is always the case in the approval/disapproval process, the homeowner's concerns surface regarding on-street parking when a multiunit is proposed. This concern seems to be ignored by the planning commission repeatedly. As an aside, it is likewise for the street planners who want to eliminate street parking on 1100 east and Highland to create more bike lanes, to the detriment of homeowners who are ultimately denied guest parking.

Now, I was unclear if the Harvey was not including parking as part of the condo price or if it was optional. One gentleman, Darrell, I think, alluded to that, but I didn't hear it from the developers. It would be strange not to require it as part of the total sales price.

Here is a wild suggestion that would perhaps eliminate a few cars that would have to utilize 500 East for parking. Rather than selling that commercial space, would the developers consider using it for a gym or a gathering space for the owners, a fairly common amenity. To offset the loss of revenue from selling that, they could increase the sales price of the condos accordingly. A gym space might be a selling point for the condos; buyers could sell their gym memberships.... Thea Brannon

*Verbal comments from Steph Homgren at LUZ meeting "The Harvey development proposes to use the 7' landscape buffer on the north property line to allow for access to their parking garage from the alley. By using the alley as access for their 28-car garage they will be increasing the use of this already unmaintained and dilapidated alleyway 100-fold.*

This alley which has no street name or number, is the only way for me and three of my neighbors to access our properties with a vehicle. In the design plans they are going to pave the portion of alley that leads to their garage.

This will leave half of the alley still unpaved. If the city approves this access, then the city should either make the developers pave the entire thing or pave it themselves as part of the *City's Alleyway Pilot Program* to protect it from rapid deterioration.

The intersection at 500 east and 2700 south is already a busy one and therefore it is unrealistic to think that new residents will not take advantage of this alley access to make a quick loop through the neighborhood to avoid the busy corner.

I am pleading with this council, city zoning, city planning and the Harvey developers to please give this alleyway more consideration and careful review.

The Harvey Development is requesting to modify the intent of the existing setback at 2700 south from 15' to 10'. Most homes porches are set at 15' and if granted this request, it would set their building in front of everyone else along the street and would remove any possibility of watching a sunset from my porch. While I know it may seem like small potatoes to some, my porch and its views is one of the reasons I purchased my home, and I would be remiss if I didn't express my strong objection to this modification.

The last issue that I will mention for tonight's record is the Harvey's placement of their occupants *Amenity's Patio*. This patio on the East side of the second floor plan will overlook my entire backyard as well as 3 of my neighbors' yards. I am requesting that this design flaw be altered in such a way as to provide privacy for myself and my neighbors.

Thank you very much for the time."



Hello Sara and Landon,

We received a postcard in regards to the Harvey project. Our property is located 1/2 a block east of the proposed development. With all high density developments, the real problem is always about parking and the amount of cars being parked in front of other nearby properties. The proposed picture shows parking for only 1 car for each apartment/townhome. In reality, some residents have more than 1 cars, ie for their spouses, visitors, etc and will definitely overflow to nearby neighbor's properties. What is the developer's proposed solution to address this?

Salt Lake City only allows legally a max of 3 occupants for a single family residential. That means 3 cars for a property as big as a .15-.17 acre per each lot. There are 3 lots that are being used for this development, that means there should only be a maximum of 9 cars in normal circumstances. This high density development grossly surpasses the amount of cars for the given ratio. As a property owner, it's frustrating to see people keep parking in front of our property.

<https://www.slcc.gov/planning/2021/11/29/the-harvey/>

Thanks

Ingrid

Ingrid Blankevoort <[ibbieb@hotmail.com](mailto:ibbieb@hotmail.com)>

hello Sara,

Happy new year! I hope this message finds you and your family well.

This email is a repeat and more in depth version of information from the voicemail I left you earlier. I would like to express my concern again regarding the Harvey's petition, specifically their plans to use the Alleyway access for their 28 car garage.

If approved to use this alley, the amount of traffic will be increased to such a degree that I believe the access to my property could become a hazard due to the deterioration of the alley.

In the Harvey's plans they propose to pave a portion of the alley which could then result in drainage and infrastructure issues to adjacent properties where the alley is not repaved. This potential damage is further complicated due to the location of a power pole. I am concerned that if enough drainage and overuse damage occurs to the unpaved area, that it could put this pole's structural integrity at risk.

I have reached out to the Engineering department and have spoken to David Jones, Public Way Coordination Program Manager, about the alley and he shares my concern about the potential damage that the Harvey's current plan presents to this alley and adjacent properties.

He asked me to include his information here for you so that you can speak to him directly:

DAVID A. JONES  
Public Way Coordination Program Manager  
Engineering Division  
801-535-6425

As always, I appreciate you taking the time to read my comments and to consider my concerns as related to The Harvey development.

Warmest regards,

Stephanie Holmgren  
435-770-1084

The Harvey is very similar to a couple of developments near me in that it has the 1st floor partially below grade. The only misgiving I have with that is to make sure there is good drainage in front of each unit. Of course some of the "work/live" spaces will be AirBnbs. I know they are trying to "sweat the land" and use the driveway on the north as a buffer, but it isn't, it is a driveway and I know why they want it that way, but I think it still needs the buffer. Also, no parking provision for the small retail spot, which may not need it, but, still, no acknowledgement that it will be needed. And, while they say it will be "more affordable" than SFRs, they don't say how much, so I doubt it meets what we think affordable is. Lynn Schwarz