

August 10, 2020



TO: Salt Lake City Planning Commission

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

RE: PLNPCM2020-00222 Izzy South Design Review

As we always do, we posted this project on our website in early July, with a form for residents to leave comments about the project. It was mentioned in the July and August newsletter, with a link to the project. We flyer'd the neighborhood around the project, to announce the Land Use and Zoning meeting (LUZ). We received so many comments about the project that we had two LUZ meetings in July, this one was by itself on July 21. There were at least 35 people at the Zoom meeting.

If we want to talk about design, if you read the pages of comments, from at least 96 people in the neighborhood, you will see some think the front of the building is wonderful and the rear is terrible. Others think the rear is the best part. Perhaps it is the color on the drawings, it reminds me of the rows and rows of houses and strip malls built in Herriman from the 1980s to now, that for some reason known only to the frogs, all have to be a dark brown in color. This building could be a number of different colors, and that alone would make it much more attractive. Paint it vertically different, so that it looks more like row houses, or town houses, built at different times. The drawings make it seem like the building has lots of windows, but from the outside, the drawings don't look like that at all, it looks very dark with smoky glass. Not sure why that is.

There aren't enough trees, or landscaping. For the south building, except for the narrow plot of land between the south lot line and the building, I am guessing 3-4') the rest is hardscape. The residents of the south building are to share the 20 Greenspace on the north side of the north building, for parties and barbeques. All they have to do is walk to either the corner of 500 East or 600 East and 2100 South, and cross that very busy street, hauling all their party things with them, to enjoy that wonderful space. We see that as a big design flaw. We think the south building could be made shorter so there is a grassy area on one end or the other for recreating.

Once again, we have a market rate development shoe-horned into a single-family neighborhood. The drawings presented show it in an empty, grassy field. It doesn't show the true impact of the building up against the surrounding neighborhood. There is a 7' rear setback up against the small homes that have been on Commonwealth for some 70 years. Parking for this new building will be 7' away with just a 6' fence to keep the carbon monoxide, and lights from their cars, out of their back yards. Original plans called for a dog walking area along that fence, but fortunately, that has been moved. The balconies on the rear looking into the neighbor's yards are a big intrusion into the privacy of those neighbors. And, the exhaust from the idling cars in the winter will be intolerable. The garage will need to be lit and cars will have headlights beaming into adjoining neighbors windows, to say nothing of loud radios. The adjoining neighbors will have no privacy as the rear apartments look right over into their properties. We are requesting a 12' fence. This will go just between the apartment building and the homes on the north side of Commonwealth. It will not extend out to the side streets. The extra height will also help protect the privacy of the neighbors from residents in the second floor of the apartment building. We also have not heard anything about the sort of security system the building will have.

Clearly, the biggest issue with this project is the lack of parking. 71 units and 58 or so stalls. The exact number is very hard to count on the drawings. We estimate, with the high cost of rent, that most of these units will have two occupants, each with a car. That is a shortage of 70 stalls at a minimum. In the five years since the streetcar was built, ridership has been pretty much flat. Even with the two-track system, ridership did not go up. That is in spite of the fact that many new apartment buildings opened up along the route. To give them credit for being eligible for the discounted requirement of

number of stalls is disingenuous. And then to read the comments attached about the lack of parking already on the streets in this area, it doesn't make sense to give them a pass. You will receive information about the exactly number of cars driven by the people who already live here, and the number of street parking stalls, and whether or not there are enough available to accommodate the 70 expected new cars for this project. This does not allow for any visitors to the pub or bodega who might drive.

We know about the Brixton Apartments, finished at Thanksgiving and about 1/3 occupied, on the SE corner of 700 East and the Streetcar. The neighbors say that really filled up available parking on the streets. What happens when that is fully rented? There is a townhouse complex with 70 units and 79 parking stalls. Another apartment building is going up on the west side of 500 east, and the Zellerbach building between 500 and 400 East at the Streetcar has 300 units and optional parking in the garage. The apartment buildings all have a charge for parking, so residents, particular those with two cars, don't put both in the garage, the other car goes on the street somewhere. Or, they both do.

Salt Lake City has no data to show that ridership goes up, that people who live close to a fixed rail station actually take the train. And yet, they continue to allow cutting parking stall requirements by 50%, just because the station is within a quarter mile of the building. We would be more sympathetic, if they could give us good solid data. And, this practice is being perpetuated In the next iteration of the Parking Ordinance, soon to reach the City Council for discussion. The bus system hasn't even increased in any dramatic way. We know that banks don't like to finance buildings without enough parking near a bus, because that bus line could change at a moment's notice, come the next change day.

I asked the owner of this Izzy complex if he would consider not charging for parking, and he said he couldn't do that. He could raise the rent and I bet new tenants wouldn't notice, they would just think they were getting free parking.

I understand the theory of granting reduced parking for buildings within ¼ mile of a fixed rail line. However, this particular group of houses and apartment buildings is already at capacity, and there isn't room to absorb another 30 or so cars, if we assume that half the units in the building will have two cars. The developers justify this lack of adequate parking by insisting some of their renters, and especially those renting studio apartments, won't have cars. But during one of our Zoom calls, the developers themselves admitted their own research indicates 85 to 90 percent of studio renters will have at least one car, with car ownership being even higher among renters of the one- and two-bedroom units. In other words, even the developers admit there will be far more cars than parking spaces. We think this lack of parking will be exacerbated by the fact these are brand new, market rate units in a desirable neighborhood; the demographic likely to rent these units, even if likely to use transit occasionally, will almost certainly have at least one car, and likely more than one. There needs to be a better parking analysis done at the time each of these buildings are approved, particularly when they are the last building in a chunk of land with no readily available overflow parking available on adjoining streets. (see report to be attached from the neighbors). This is a very cohesive neighborhood with many long-time homeowners with skin in the game. Their opinions should not be disregarded.

I just realized that I didn't even mention the fact that this adds another bunch of cars in and out on 2100 South, which is at a standstill every time the 700 East light changes. A right in, right out of the garage entrance might help, but that would just encourage those people to drive around the block to get to the direction they want to go.

In conjunction with the neighborhood, the Sugar House Community Council could approve this project, with the following conditions:

- A 12' fence be placed on the south property line, and
- Another level of parking is built to accommodate the tenants of the building and visitors to whatever retail ends up in the building.
- Some kind of solution for greenspace closer to the south building should be identified.

Enclosures

Comments from the neighborhood  
Flyer, Map and Data Report



## COMMENTS 542 EAST 2100 SOUTH (IZZY SOUTH)

From: wanda brown <[WREVERAND@YAHOO.COM](mailto:WREVERAND@YAHOO.COM)><543 E Commonwealth Ave>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

I am a 15 year resident of the neighborhood whom this building will have a life changing impact on. Your plans to have only a car length (10feet) of green space between our back fences and the beginning of a building that contain balconies right above my back yard is outrageous. I get it you want the view of the mountains, but to have them starting at 10 feet from our fences leave us with no privacy.

You do realize that having a dog walking area butting up to yards that have dogs is simple disrespectfully to the people who live behind this building.

Just when we thought the squirrels where enough for them to deal with, now they get to deal with people and their dogs above them, walking their dogs chilling out. Let the bark fest begin! I hear the back fence is a great place for composting. I did start a garden....

From: Joshua E Lewis <[joshualewis75@gmail.com](mailto:joshualewis75@gmail.com)><549 Commonwealth Ave>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

My concerns are the balconies. The balconies will intrude on my back yard privacy, which is one of the main reasons I purchased my house.

I dont want to walk in my back yard and have to contend with people over looking my back yard.

Also, the balconies will hurt the resell value of my house. People want privacy in their back yard and they will not purchase a property where their privacy is intruded on.....

From: Scott Camburn <[scottcamburn@gmail.com](mailto:scottcamburn@gmail.com)><579 E Elm Avenue>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

Traffic through surrounding neighborhood directly to the South will greatly increase. Specifically drivers looking to bypass the crowded intersection of 700 E and 2100 S. The addition of this many residents is impossible with out addressing the traffic it will cause.

From: Joe Mason <[jdmason65@hotmail.com](mailto:jdmason65@hotmail.com)><532 E ELM AVE Salt Lake City, UT 84106>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

Please review and either reject or re-address the Izzy South building project.

This shows 71 units with only 60 parking spaces.

Our neighborhood is already being overrun with cars parked on the streets from the Brixton, which hasn't even rented out all of its units yet.

Most households have a minimum of one vehicle. When you short change parking spaces, it overflows into neighborhoods.

This is a recipe for disaster. We had issues this past winter already and the Brixton had barely begun filling it's units.

This week alone, I witnessed a yelling match between two occupants of the Brixton, which illustrates the problem well.

The woman passed the parking space to back in and parallel park..... the man pulled forward into the space she had intended to occupy.

She got out of her car and said I needed to park there. He said, your car was in the road but your back-up lights weren't on and I needed to park.

She said, you already have a parking space and I don't. He explained his wife used theirs, so he needs additional space too.

I live a few streets away and already have people parking in front of my house, so my guests have no place to park because of poor planning.

We can NOT continue to exacerbate this type of problem.

When I asked a council member from Salt Lake how many cars each average apartment building has, the average was 1.5.

Homes have a higher average.

With this model presented, even if they only had one car per unit, it would be short by 10.

This doesn't take into consideration the number of second cars. Then couple that with visiting guests and we are way overloaded. Condo's and apartments need to have ample parking for the units they provide, plus they need to have accommodation's for their tenants guests with ample visitor parking.

We do not have a need for housing yet, so we can take the time to plan and use fore-sight in designing our future and neighborhoods rather than using short sighted planning, which has negative rippling effects.

Growth can and should enhance our neighborhood, not create hardships for existing inhabitants, as well as creating problems for incoming people.

Judi, Personally I think developers (and I'm one myself) should be sensitive when they plan a building that is taller than surrounding buildings especially if they are single family homes (and for that matter other high density residential) to plan to have balconies, picture windows, even the placement of the footprint of the building and such, in a way that is respectful to your neighbors and minimizes privacy intrusion. Sadly not every developer feels the same way. Bill Davis

In regards to IZZY South, I really don't want to support another market rate complex in my neighborhood. Especially because I don't know if they city has a comprehensive plan for the repair and reworking of 2100 South. It is a mess. And adding more traffic and construction in our already overburdened neighborhood is quite irksome. If there was any indication that they would put in mixed income housing then I might be more inclined to feel supportive. I am feeling overwhelmed with the Sugar House construction zone. Dayna McKee

From: Dave Ventrano <[ventrano@hotmail.com](mailto:ventrano@hotmail.com)><543 Elm ave.>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

The parking in the area is like a bad dream. With Izzy being planned and if it is developed, it's going to turn into a nightmare. I've lived here for over 15 years. The houses around used to be filled with a lot of rentals. Families have begun to buy up the houses in the recent past making it a much more enjoyable place to live. If this is developed without plans for handling parking issues with not only the tenants, but visitors, it's going to be a problem. There is NO place to park on 2100 S. There is no place to park on right off 2100 S. on 500 and 600 E. This leaves Commonwealth to take the brunt of the parking problems with Elm taking the overflow from there. Please consider more thoroughly the potential parking issues before moving forward with this. Thank you.

From: Ladawn Mullenax <[ladawn.mullenax.801@gmail.com](mailto:ladawn.mullenax.801@gmail.com)><537 e commonwealth ave>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

I think that it is b\*\*\*\*\* that you want to take a well-established neighborhood and disrupt it's over all well-being and peace so you can make a quick buck.  
The noise and fall out/waste from construction will be especially problematic as I have people on oxygen and people in poor health in my home. How do they deal with it ?  
It won't be just the construction that is an issue but also the parking lot-Car Alarms,screeching tires,people yelling and dogs barking but you don't have to deal with that cuz you're rich and have a big house and yard I will have a nice house and yard till this f\*\*\*\*\* s\*\*\* happens I am extremely displeased with what the hell is going to happen to my neighborhood and you don't understand and you don't f\*\*\*\*\* care to see it from my neighborhoods point of view

From: Steven Seftel <[socastevie@yahoo.com](mailto:socastevie@yahoo.com)><2500 s 600 e Slc, Ut, 84106>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Hello With the large influx of apartment buildings coming to Sugarhouse, this raises the question of whether the Commission has discussed putting a cap on population density?

From: Gwen Mitchell <[gsmitchell@hotmail.com](mailto:gsmitchell@hotmail.com)><678 E Roosevelt Ave, 84105>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

0.81 parking spaces per unit is NOT adequate. As has been found with downtown apt units, most apartment dwellers have a car, and a 2 bedroom likely 2 cars. Even a couple living in a 1 BR could have 2 cars. Street parking is extremely limited and would spill over to



the residential streets, which isn't fair to those homeowners. AL NEW BUILDING IN THE CITY SHOULD BE REQUIRED TO HAVE AT LEAST 1 PARKING STALL PER APT

From: CHARLES HUBBERT <[hubbertcg@gmail.com](mailto:hubbertcg@gmail.com)><521 E Elm Ave, salt lake city>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

I DO NOT KNOW WHO WILL EVEN SEE THIS. I AM OLD AND NOT GOOD WITH COMPUTERS. I AM NOT MAD, I JUST TYPE IN ALL CAPS BECAUSE IT IS JUST EASIER FOR ME.

I LIVE ON ELM AVE. , EVERY CLOSE TO THE SITE FOR THIS PROJECT. I AM VERY CONCERNED WITH THE PROJECT AND THE EFFECT IT WILL HAVE ON MY NEIGHBORHOOD. I KNOW INVESTORS DO NOT CARE ABOUT THE NEIGHBORHOOD, BUT WE DO. THE APARTMENTS ON SIMPSON AND 6th EAST HAVE HAD A GREAT NEGATIVE EFFECT ON THE PARKING IN OUR NEIGHBORHOOD AND IT IS REALLY CAUSING PROBLEMS, AND IT IS ONLY 30 % OCCUPIED. WHAT WILL BE THE EFFECT WHEN IT IS FULLY RENTED? THERE IS ANOTHER SET OF APARTMENTS IN CONSTRUCTION ON 21th JUST WEST OF 5th EAST THAT WILL HAVE AN IMPACT AND IT IS NOT EVEN COMPLETE YET.

HAS THE DEVELOPER EVEN INVESTIGATED WHERE PEOPLE WILL PARK? I HAVE BEEN TOLD THAT THEY HAVE NOT EVEN PROVIDED A PARKING SPACE FOR EACH UNIT EVEN THROW THE AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD IN THIS VALLEY HAS 1.5 VEHICLES PER HOUSEHOLD. DO THE PEOPLE PROVIDING THE FUNDING FOR THIS PROJECT EVEN CARE ABOUT WHERE THE TENETS WILL PARK.? I UNDERSTAND THAT MAKING MONEY IS IMPORTANT TO SOME PEOPLE ,BUT AT WHAT COST TO THE PEOPLE IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD. THIS MUST BE ADDRESSED BEFORE THE PROJECT IS APPROVED. THE DEVELOPER STATED THAT PEOPLE ARE ENCOURAGED TO USE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION. THAT IS NOT REALISTIC. THE TENANTS HAVE A RIGHT TO HAVE A CAR. THIS WILL CAUSE THE CARS TO BE PARKED ON THE STREETS IN OUR NEIGHBORHOOD. WE UNDERSTAND THAT WE DO NOT CONTROL THE STREETS, BUT WITH THE CARS THAT CAN NOT PARK ON THE PROJECT SITE, THERE WILL NOT BE ROOM TO ACCOMMODATE THE OVERFLOW, NOT EVEN ADDRESSING THE CARS THAT PEOPLE IN OUR NEIGHBORHOOD HAVE. IT IS JUST GOING TO BE A MESS.;THIS NEEDS TO BE ADDRESSED BEFORE THE PROJECT IS APPROVED. MONEY IS NOT THAT IMPORTANT.

I WOULD SUGGEST THAT THIS PROJECT BE DELAYED UNTIL THE FULL EFFECT OF THE TWO OTHER APARTMENT COMPLEXES, IN THE AREA CAN BE ASSESSED. I KNOW THAT DELAYING THIS PROJECT WILL WILL CAUSE A LOT OF TROUBLE FOR THE INVESTORS AND THE DEVELOPER, BUT IT IS SMALL COMPARED TO THE BAD EFFECT TO OUR NEIGHBORHOOD WHEN THERE ARE MORE CARS IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD THEN CAN PARK.. THIS IS OUR LIVES AND WE HAVE INVESTED EVERYTHING WE HAVE IN OUR HOMES AND IT IS NOT FAIR THAT SOMEONE, WITH A LOT OF MONEY, COMES IN AND FORCES A PROJECT THAT WILL GREATLY DAMAGE OUR NEIGHBORHOOD.

CHARLIE HUBBERT 801-8791-1182 521 E. ELM AVE. SLC, UT

From: Sharon Cotterill <[cotterill@aol.com](mailto:cotterill@aol.com)><2125 S 500 E>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

NO, NO, NO!!! There is inadequate parking. Period. Are we on Commonwealth or 6th East to take up the slack for the inadequacy of apartment parking. You haven't improved the infrastructure for what has recently been built. I have a bus stop in front of my house. The garbage left there is atrocious now. 2100 south can't support the current traffic and now you want to introduce more. Everyone wants their buck at the expense of the current long term residences of the area. I live at the corner of Commonwealth and 5th East. The thought of having cars parked around my house who I don't know who they belong to is extremely unsettling. Our home has been totally ransacked twice, broken into a third time a gas Station next door where management does nothing to police the breezeway between our properties and now you want me to accept people parking on Commonwealth because YOU won't even require adequate parking for each unit. You know darn well there will be multiple vehicles per unit. You know this. The number of apartments is too many for that space. Why are you cramming this down our throats, because that is what it feels like. Commonwealth has already been experiencing traffic going too fast. Again, why are you doing this? Let m know how many new apartments are going into your area. Developers wanting quick bucks at the expense of the rest of us. Is this your answer to the lack of housing. I think this is a joke.



From: Joe DeGooyer <[joedego@gmail.com](mailto:joedego@gmail.com)><571 East Ramona Ave>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

Don't change the zoning to allow this higher density housing, especially on the north side of 2100 south. Too much density is being developed in Liberty Wells and Sugarhouse without much thought to the strain on traffic, parking, stores, open spaces, etc. Remember The St. Joseph's Villa proposed expansion and how it was decided to not allow that to preserve the sanctuary of the neighborhood? Let's not develop every upcoming plot as high density housing, please.

From: Judith Patterson <[judithkpat@msn.com](mailto:judithkpat@msn.com)><2030 South 600 East Salt Lake City, Utah 84105>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

Inadequate parking for the number of housing units. Figuring one person per studio and one bedroom unit (40 and 21 respectively) and two for each of the two-bedroom units (20), this would be 81 tenants. The proposal states there would be 58 parking stalls. In addition, the retail space would likely also require parking. Overflow parking of tenants, their possible guests, and customers of the retail establishments would spill into neighborhoods which are already currently crowded with residents' vehicles.

From: Jordan Kohl <[j7kohl@gmail.com](mailto:j7kohl@gmail.com)><808 E Kensington Ave, SLC, UT>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

I would just like to add my counter-voice to what I'm sure are a lot of complaints you'll be getting. Specifically, I know some people are unhappy about the parking requirements being too low and the building being unattractive. Let me just state that I would be thrilled if the parking allotments were even lower (huzzah for reduced auto traffic), and as for the design, well I am not a design architect. All I know is that Salt Lake City needs more affordable housing, and the best way to do that that I know is to have more housing available, period.

Dear Judi,

My house is located at 2123 so 600 E. I just found out about the Izzy development plan on Monday evening. I'm cannot support more apartments in the area. They just completed two huge complexes near 2250 so and 600 E. The streets will not be able to handle the influx of new traffic. There's already gridlock on 2100 so., at certain times of the day. How many folks do they intend to stuff into the area.

Parking is also an issue. Currently, lots of cars park on the side streets. New developments tend to not provide enough parking stalls for the occupants, so they'll likely park in the neighborhoods.

I really hope they reconsider. I'd much rather see a small business or cafe, (not a homeless shelter). We want sugarhouse to be walkable... soon it'll be too crowded to walk anywhere.

Sincerely,  
Peggy Clark

From: nicole warner <[niwar77@gmail.com](mailto:niwar77@gmail.com)><564 E Redondo Ave.>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

Little by little the charm of this area is being stripped to make space for another unsightly, un-special, dime a dozen high rise of condos or apartments. Blue planet is one of the last unique businesses that catered to a niche demographic, and provided a busy, reputable service to this area. And having walkable restaurants and gyms etc. is literally what every person desires in their neighborhood! To think that we'll be potentially losing these businesses to be walled in by more god awful stucco, pseudo modern, and unnecessary apartments makes me furious. So, we can look forward to apartments from 6th to 5th, with the exception of the gas stations that will be spared at both corners?! Why not get rid of Saffron Valley too? Throw in another gas station there, or better yet, a new apartment/condo structure to meet up with the new one on 4th!

If you can't read through to this sarcasm, I'll let you know...that was sarcasm! This community is selling off everything, and making terrible choices in very concentrated areas to try to meet housing needs. Sugar house is gonna be the new Daybreak if someone doesn't start paying attention to what we're losing.



From: malissa rae hazel <[malissahazel@gmail.com](mailto:malissahazel@gmail.com)><2525 s 500 e>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

Please stop allowing all these multi units! Sugar house, especially off 2100 is already way over capacity. Traffic is ridiculous. 10 years ago when I bought off 500 E this was still a quaint part of lower sugghouse. Now it's something else all together. Why do we insist on turning this neighborhood into a city?!

From: Jamin Heath <[xheathj@gmail.com](mailto:xheathj@gmail.com)><1586 s 500 e>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

It will be a slight burden on traffic getting in and out on busy 21st. Will these be affordable? Because 1200 a month for a one studio apartment is not affordable for 75 percent of the people living here. 800 for a studio, 900 for a one bedroom, 1000 for two bedroom is what these should cost. They will always be rented for that price. And people can actually afford it. Thanks

From: Alex Nygaard <[ax.nygaard@gmail.com](mailto:ax.nygaard@gmail.com)><Wilmington Ave>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

There is not enough room for parking/commuting around 2100 s as it is - packing more people into this small space is the last thing we need to do right now. Also those buildings look hideous.

From: Julie Fife Mclaughlin <[fifejulie@yahoo.com](mailto:fifejulie@yahoo.com)><581 Redondo Avenue>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

I absolutely do not want another monster apartment complex going up in my neighborhood. Traffic is already a nightmare on 2100 south. I live on Redondo and 6th East, I pay taxes, and I demand some input on this. Sugarhouse itself is as inviting as a prison complex. All views of the mountains are forever gone and the dozens of chain burger places, yogurt places and others are boring and repetitive. PLEASE do not ruin this neighborhood more than it already has been.

Sincerely,  
Julie Fife

From: Shannon Legge <[legge.shannon@gmail.com](mailto:legge.shannon@gmail.com)><2150 S Main St>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

I am very concerned there is not enough parking stalls for the people who will reside in this building. The average household in Utah has 2 cars (the Census Bureau ACS 1-year Estimate 2018). There are 71 units planned, indicating there is likely to be 142 parking stalls needed, and additional when considering visitors and new tenants. The building only plans 58 parking stalls, creating a deficit of at least 114 parking spots. There is no parking available along 2100. This will force residents to park along the residential streets. With this planned building and more buildings in the area, parking will create unattractive congestion along these residential street. I strongly urge the city planning committee to consider the parking implications of these higher density buildings. Please keep parking congestion down and available for homeowners in the area.

From: Martin <[nog@yahoo.com](mailto:nog@yahoo.com)><342 e Burton ave>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

Looks like it's going to be a real shit show. What's up with the overdevelopment in the sugarhouse area

From: Michael Lobb <[Lobb@sfrg.com](mailto:Lobb@sfrg.com)><1714 S. 1100 E.>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

Enough development in Sugar House!!!

From: Marlene Fairchild <[marssams@comcast.net](mailto:marssams@comcast.net)><419 E Blaine Ave>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

NO! MORE! APARTMENTS/CONDOS!

There are already TOO MANY in the area. We are in a DESERT, which means we are a dry state. WHERE IS ALL THE WATER GOING TO COME FROM? We also live in a bowl which traps pollution, which INCREASES with each building put in--electric or not!

STOP building, for crying out loud!

From: Danielle Hamon <[dhprairie@gmail.com](mailto:dhprairie@gmail.com)><546 E Elm Ave>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

I am a very concerned homeowner impacted by these monstrous developments. This parking is inadequate. We bought our home to live in an established residential neighborhood. It is being converted to all high density housing now. We are already seeing the gangs move in in the S-line properties, with shooting and drug deals on the streets. Let's hope these transient apartments go away!

From: Ben Hagenhofer-Daniell <[ben.hagenhofer.daniell@gmail.com](mailto:ben.hagenhofer.daniell@gmail.com)><768 E 1700 S>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

I support the construction of the project as submitted in the design review packet. Much needed dense housing in an appropriate site.

I wish that the first floor facing 2100 was commercial/retail.

I wish that a large portion of the apartments were required to be affordable/rent controlled

I wish we didn't squander the opportunity the site provides and only build 3 instead of 4 or 5 or 7 stories (would need different parking mins for that density)

I also don't think we'll get affordable or rent controlled units in any of these developments without a citywide ordinance requiring it. Developers won't do this altruistically, nor would I expect them to. Something to pass on to true city council.

since all of those things require a different zoning regime and the force of new municipal ordinance, that I don't see changing much, I support the plans as submitted

From: Lori D Salazar <[ldeesalazar@outlook.com](mailto:ldeesalazar@outlook.com)><562 E. Commonwealth Ave>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

My concern in parking. How many parking spaces are going to be provided? I live through the block on Commonwealth and parking is already limited. In the past, the city council has made it difficult to add driveways or make improvements on our properties. I would hope that these developers are being held to the same scrutiny the city council has held us to through the years. Granted, there is a need for affordable housing in SLC, in addition to mindful urban planning. I hope greed doesn't get in the way of this.



From: Wanda Brown <[wreverand@yahoo.com](mailto:wreverand@yahoo.com)><543 E COMMONWEALTH AVE>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

I heard you took the issues of this place off the concerns of the council. PLEASE LISTEN to the people who live behind this building and in the community. If I need to get 10 people to comment besides myself I will. Don't let this issue be dropped.

From: Kerri Wagner <[kerri\\_y@hotmail.com](mailto:kerri_y@hotmail.com)><560 East Elm Ave>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

The parking spaces seems very inadequate. With all the new developments in this area, we have already seen overcrowding on the streets. This is a problem! Not enough street lights and speed bumps in the are!  
to me

From: Melanie Williamskn <[mwilliamson33@yahoo.com](mailto:mwilliamson33@yahoo.com)><1145 E Browning>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

I am against more high density housing in this area! There is already so much - many units have yet to completed or occupied and the impact of such high density population is still unknown. The existing infrastructure (roads, parking etc) cannot continue to support such rapid growth without having a very negative impact on the neighborhood. While this area of SLC is very desirable I believe the rapid growth and explosion of high density housing is wrecking the neighborhood. It will soon be so difficult to get through traffic no one will want to visit or live here.

From: Tara McCutcheon <[tarmccutch@gmail.com](mailto:tarmccutch@gmail.com)><323 E Ramona Ave>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

The best thing about Liberty Wells is the proximity to the city without the hassles of traffic and overcrowding- a rarity in our ever-expanding city.. As a resident of this neighborhood I am very concerned about parking availability on the streets for people living adjacent/near to these big housing developments as well as increased traffic congestion on a street with little room for expansion (2100 S). There's currently a multi-unit housing development in process on 2100 S and 400 E that will add stress to an area that's already becoming busier by the month. Please keep those of us in mind who love our quiet, residential neighborhood.

From: Danielle Hogle <[utahlily@gmail.com](mailto:utahlily@gmail.com)><1051 E Hollywood Ave>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

STOP! FOR THE LOVE OF GOD! Congestion has not been dealt with. Parking has not been dealt with. I cannot tell you how many times I've almost been hit by a car in my residential neighborhood because people are looking for parking I need complexes. Have no regard for the residential neighborhoods around them. These multi-level apartment buildings in complexes are ruining everything that is great about Sugarhouse. Stop. Please for the millionth time from Sugarhouse people. Bring back the small, local businesses and not these huge chains. That will improve the economy more than overpriced apartment buildings.

From: MacKenzie Gilson <[Mackenzie.holtiv@gmail.com](mailto:Mackenzie.holtiv@gmail.com)><603 E Browning Ave>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

Hello-

Can we please just stop with all of the tightly packed, economy apartments? We have already begun to have issues with parking due to lack of adequate accommodation for the renters in the apartments, not to mention increases traffic and noise pollution. This is destroying the peace and comfort that we are all paying top dollar to enjoy. Please have more respect for us.

From: Candyce Taylor <[candycefife@gmail.com](mailto:candycefife@gmail.com)><1962 s 500 e>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

**Message Body:**

I do not support this land being used in this way. We have way too many complex's without enough parking or resources and this area is overly congested as it is. These old private homes rarely have enough parking and we rely on parking on side streets to accommodate our families. Our city has completely lost its charm and with this large of a population, crime becomes the surrounding homeowners problem and not the city. We have incredibly high theft rates and this will only perpetuate the ever growing problem.  
Thank you, Candyce

From: Helen E Buzianis <[hbuz2015@gmail.com](mailto:hbuz2015@gmail.com)><637 E Bryan Ave>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

**Message Body:**

No more apartments! Traffic is so congested now it is ridiculous! All these apartments are destroying what was once a quaint area (Liberty Wells to Sugarhouse), it's becoming unrecognizable. I don't care that they are so energy efficient. Put them somewhere else.

From: Anne <[aestewart83@yahoo.com](mailto:aestewart83@yahoo.com)><3017 s 800 e>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

**Message Body:**

There are enough housing units going up in this area as is. There is a new complex basically across the street. Stop turning our city to cement. Create something that will beautify!

From: Melissa Seipp <[missyseipp@gmail.com](mailto:missyseipp@gmail.com)><371 East Coatsville Avenue>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

**Message Body:**

My concern with all the apartment projects, is there is always a lack of parking. There needs to be two parking spots per apartment in the underground garage. Clearly there is no plan to deal with ALL tenant and guest parking, which will overflow into home parking and it is hard enough to park in this neighborhood without these projects. Unless they can ensure that they are providing parking for ALL tenants (all cars of people living there) as well as their guests, I don't want it in the neighborhood.

From: Staci Duke <[staciduke@gmail.com](mailto:staciduke@gmail.com)><210 E 1300 S>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

**Message Body:**

Please stop building apartments that don't have adequate on-site parking. This development doesn't even have one parking space per unit,, and common sense dictates that many of those apartments will be leased by couples with two cars. And what about their visitors? We keep seeing this again and again despite telling our leaders that we already don't have enough street parking to accommodate ourselves and our visitors.

It isn't fair to keep overcrowding our neighborhoods so a few developers make more money. It's greed to build a project that has more apartments than parking spaces. It's greed to constantly ask for variances so you can



squeeze your property for every dime. It's greed to pretend your project won't impact local congestion and noise.

Most of these developers do not live in this area, but you do. Please protect us! Taxes are important, of course, but so is the livability of our homes and neighborhoods. We want growth, but we want growth that is thoughtful and measured and helps preserve and enhance our neighborhoods.

From: Meg bond <[meghanelizabethbond@gmail.com](mailto:meghanelizabethbond@gmail.com)><414 e Williams ave>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

**Message Body:**

I support this project. I like that it is utilizing energy efficient techniques, along with the all-electric approach. We need more housing in SLC and the lot is currently wasted space. The fact that the units are low rise is also a welcome surprise.

From: Diego Lurati <[diego.lurati@gmail.com](mailto:diego.lurati@gmail.com)><609 e Redondo Ave>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

**Message Body:**

Our streets are already congested in this part of town as it is, we don't need more high density housing that is 1) not affordable for working class families and 2) does not have the necessary parking available for all units. Families do not have .8 cars, especially considering the atrocious public transportation this state has that working class families need to get to and from work, to the grocery stores and beyond.

From: Carrie Moore <[carriemoore22@gmail.com](mailto:carriemoore22@gmail.com)><324 E Wilson Ave>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

**Message Body:**

The parking, noise and congestion is a concern

From: Emily dixon <[magicckr@gmail.com](mailto:magicckr@gmail.com)><354 e Hollywood ave>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

**Message Body:**

We need affordable housing. If this is not geared towards the people in this community, who are working class, first time home owners and new family's Then I adamantly oppose a new fancy apartment building with huge price tags.

From: Sierra <[sierradungan93@yahoo.com](mailto:sierradungan93@yahoo.com)><1760 downington ave>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body: From: Joe Mason <[jdmason65@hotmail.com](mailto:jdmason65@hotmail.com)><532 Elm Ave>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

**Message Body:**

I have looked at the codes and have come to the conclusion that the developers were misleading the conversations.

The codes show that one parking space per unit is the current code. R-MU-35 Residential - 1 Space per dwelling Unit

For them to say otherwise is untrue, without an exception being granted.

This is misleading at best, or dishonest as represented.

Please make sure they are responsible and ethical in dealings.

We continue to have problems with parking in our neighborhoods between 700 East and 500 East between

2100 South and as far south as Stringham and Driggs.

Brixton has already created drama and trauma among neighbors, due to insufficient parking and charging additional for tenants. This overflow has impacted the neighborhood and has made it less safe. There are often people who barely avoid accidents because we can't see around corners, due to too many cars on the streets.

This is a blatant disregard for current residents and for those who should be welcome into a nice and safe place.

Please DO NOT CONTINUE this blatant and negative pattern toward the citizens of Sugarhouse.

From: LARRY DEAN <[j.laurence.dean@gmail.com](mailto:j.laurence.dean@gmail.com)><1785 South 500 East, 84105>

Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

Salt Lake City continues to become more hostile to cars and their owners. The current project on 500 East between 1700 and 2100 will only have parking on the west side of the street eliminating a lot of parking. It's not right that developers can build these boxes and not have to provide parking. As mentioned the parking shortage will fall on the residences near by. From what I've heard and read, more people are driving not less. Until UTA can come up with a way to make their buses and trains safer from the virus fewer people will want to ride them. I don't expect much from the planning commission, The city is incredibly pro developer.

From: Kayla Chandler <[kaylachandler@gmail.com](mailto:kaylachandler@gmail.com)><2233 S 500 E #110,>

Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

The lack of parking for these new buildings is alarming! There needs to 1 parking spot per unit at a minimum.

From: Lynn Ionardo <[6lonardos@gmail.com](mailto:6lonardos@gmail.com)><1550 e Ramona av>

Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

Please, do not allow Izzy North and Izzy South to continue to be built UNLESS\$ they have enough parking for ALL tenants! It would put too much into the surrounding neighborhoods! The owners MUST confirm to the rules! No variances allowed!! It's already going to be crazy on 2100 with all the horrible traffic from all the other apts going up!!!!

Thanks, Lynn Ionardo

From: Brad Bishop <[brad.bishop2@yahoo.com](mailto:brad.bishop2@yahoo.com)><Elm Ave>

Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

50 parking spots for 71 rentals? An average of 2 cars per rental. Where are the other 92 cars going to park? The over flow seems to be heading to my street where my kids play and cars speed by. I am very much against more parked cars on my road creating blind spots for cars driving through.

From: Shannon Legge <[legge.shannon@gmail.com](mailto:legge.shannon@gmail.com)><2150 S Main St>

Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

There is not enough parking planned for this structure. There have been issues with other higher density complexes such as the Braxton forcing residents of both this complex and surrounding single family housing to engage in parking wars. This creates an unsafe environment which attracts accidents due to not being able to see around vehicles while pulling out of drive ways, petty theft, and an unattractive street view that is clogged with cars instead of the beautiful mature trees that line this area. The US Census for Utah in 2018 states the average number of cars per household is 2, the building currently plans only one spot per unit. This is simply



not enough as there are multi bedroom units in this complex along with a need for space for visitors and new tenants. If this area seeks to grow as a multi use space, considerations need to be made regarding parking. If there are shopping areas developed, where will customers park? There will be no curb space available. If more high density units are built, where will those cars go when there is not enough space in those buildings to handle the parking? We don't want cars densely packed on our streets! This is not the Avenues! As additional parking is more costly, the developers might consider renting out any overflow parking. We have an opportunity here to demand the elimination of future years of headaches over parking issues.

I urge you, please, demand the developers provide enough parking on the premises for the residents who live there, their guests, and day visitors. Street parking is not a responsible option.

From: Joe Mason <[jdmason65@hotmail.com](mailto:jdmason65@hotmail.com)><532 Elm Ave>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

Where are the Off Street Parking or loading facilities on this proposal?

6. Circulation Plan Required<sup>65</sup>

Any application for a building permit shall include a site plan, drawn to scale, and fully dimensioned, showing any off street parking or loading facilities to be provided in compliance with this title. A tabulation of the number of off street vehicle and bicycle parking, loading, and stacking spaces required by this chapter shall appear in a conspicuous place on the plan.

It appears the shown parking spaces are not full sized, so it seems the total on the design may be in question.

Please have the planning commission pay attention to the existing problems created by the Brixton in this same neighborhood.

This is already having major negative consequences, and they actually have 'on street parking' options available on two sides of the building, which the Izzy North and South will not have.

From: Joe Mason <[jdmason65@hotmail.com](mailto:jdmason65@hotmail.com)> [home-address]  
Subject: Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

Please revisit this statement:

Implemented Environmental Best-Practices

- Lowered required parking to reduce surface area heat gain, water contamination, and emissions

This is true for building new parking lots and structures.

It fails to be true, when you don't require adequate parking within structures being built.

You compound the very thing you state you as environmental best practice.

Making more people fill the streets by parking over and in gutters, which collect dripping oil becomes detrimental to the environment, where when you require the adequate parking inside parking facilities and within the buildings, the owners are more likely to take pride in keeping the facilities clean. This encourages good behaviors and adds responsible building practices to sustain long-term enjoyment.

From: Taylor W Anderson <[Taylorwanderson@gmail.com](mailto:Taylorwanderson@gmail.com)><228 E Coatsville Ave>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:



2100 South is not in step with what residents want in this city. I support this becoming an urban corridor, but we can't realize the full potential of Sugar House if 2100 South is cars-first, cars-only. I support this development, but we need improvements for people outside of cars on 2100 South.

From: Jackie Assaad <[jakey248@gmail.com](mailto:jakey248@gmail.com)><318 E 1700 S>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

**Message Body:**

I think it's incredibly important to make sure there is a realistic amount of parking stall for this project. There should be at least a 1.5-2:1 parking ratio. Having fewer will lead to a lot of people who already live in the neighborhood not being able to park on the street in their neighborhood. There are already a number of houses that do not have any off street parking and have to park on the street. Please please please this is very important to making sure the neighborhood doesn't become an awful parking mess. I am all for development but you need to provide residents parking, as well.

From: Mary Hubbert <[mlhubbert@msn.com](mailto:mlhubbert@msn.com)><521, E Elm Ave>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

**Message Body:**

I (and many of my neighbors) have concerns about parking & traffic related to this building. My residential street (E Elm Ave) is already being used as a bypass for 21st South and have seen increased traffic & more speeders since the apartments built off of 6th South opened. We do not need more. Commonwealth, Elm & Wilmington Aves all have small children in residence. Traffic is especially heavy on Commonwealth & Elm Aves as the streets are wider. Little children do not always look both ways and many cars have no regard for this. They are treated like main thoroughfares.

Parking is another problem. It seems as if there are not enough on-site stalls for each resident, making it necessary to park in residential areas. This is another burden for our neighborhood since there is no street parking on 21st by the proposed apartments. Please take these issues into consideration when making your decisions.

From: George Mcdonald <[george@georgelife.com](mailto:george@georgelife.com)><1880 s 200 e>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

**Message Body:**

You can NOT allow these buildings (any in this area) to be built without adequate parking. No one is using mass transit, and I'm sure with Covid 19, people will use it less for years to come. Everyone drives, most couples have TWO cars, I experience this on my street constantly. Ask parking enforcement about my address.. I have people blocking my driveway constantly. Please make this a policy. Apartments must have parking (makes sense)!

From: Lauren Fisher <[lfisher319@gmail.com](mailto:lfisher319@gmail.com)><521 E Hollywood Avenue>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

**Message Body:**  
Hello,

I just learned of this project and the lack of parking proposed for the North Side - Izzy building that goes against code R-MU-35 Residential requiring 1 Space per dwelling unit. We own a home immediately behind the proposed area for the North building where many residents already need to park on the street due to lack of or shared driving way spaces in older homes. With the lack of proposed parking, I'm worried that our street will become even more so congested as residents of this new building have to search for parking off of 2100S. What we love about the area now is that it is open enough for us to see oncoming traffic, bike on, and otherwise enjoy. We want to avoid future parking issues, especially ones that lead to creating a parking permit system like they have in the Avenues, and to do so, new builds need to meet the minimum requirements for



parking--this project included.

Thank you,  
Lauren

From: stephen letendre <[handsomesteve@mail.com](mailto:handsomesteve@mail.com)><573 east redondo avenue (2000 south) SLC 84105>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

this area is already congested enough, parking is likely to become a nightmare, more importantly, much more importantly is the expected increase in crime from transient housing. Our geographic area already has one of the highest rates of car burglary and home prowls in the city. Single family homes deserve the privacy they expected upon purchase. These apartments will be looming over the yards of family homes, depriving them of their expected and purchased privacy. Enough with these ugly buildings placing more people on small spaces of land than can realistically house them among those already living on virtually the same space.

From: Stephanie Anderson <[stephaniea6080@yahoo.com](mailto:stephaniea6080@yahoo.com)><1728 South 300 E>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

More massive housing in the sugar house area is not sustainable without designated parking. Our streets are filled with cars already.

We know that many people moving to Utah are for tech jobs these are not located within public transportation areas. We are a commuter state. Until we have a decent public transport system we can not continue to develop like this.

Until we have transportation trends that support a massive shift from individual automotive ownership towards public transit, I feel building for the future without regard to current trends is very ill advised. I feel it would be better to build for the present constraints with adaptability for the future. If the expanded garage is not filled by residents, they can choose to offer parking permits for nearby offices and other high density housing that is in the works or already congesting our streets. If parking becomes so obsolete that 71 units do not need a measly 58 currently planned stalls (which is an issue in itself), or the minimum 150 stalls actually needed in the next 20 years, empty parking garages can be converted into storage, an office space/business hub (Peckham Levels in London), affordable housing/apartments (Broadway Autopark in Wichita), or even a hotel (The Summit in Cincinnati).

From: Kristin hessick <[songwolff@gmail.com](mailto:songwolff@gmail.com)><1391 S Green Street>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

please build all new apartments and condos with a minimum of one parking space per unitFrom:

Malaika Homo <[trimalaika@yahoo.com](mailto:trimalaika@yahoo.com)><2153 S 600 E>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

I'm concerned about this proposed development because of parking issues. I live on 6th E (which is a heavily used bike route) and already with the recent development in the neighborhood there are more vehicles parked in the street. It makes it very difficult to see cyclists (not to mention other cars) coming down the road when I'm trying to get out of my driveway. I worry that additional high-density housing with minimal parking will add to the existing traffic and parking issues .

From: Britney <[brit.beardmore@gmail.com](mailto:brit.beardmore@gmail.com)><1874 s 500 east>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback



Message Body:

We built a permitted ADU in the neighborhood and were required to meet all zoning and permitting, which included a designated off street parking for the ADU. To provide developers with exemptions to these requirements is unfair and does not uphold the best interest of our neighborhood. Please take this into consideration.

From: Kaitlin Abare <[kaitlin.abare@gmail.com](mailto:kaitlin.abare@gmail.com)><2027 E 2100 S>  
Subject: TWENTYONES TAKE TWO Website Feedback

Message Body:

Hello-

I'm very excited that the trash heap that that corner has become will be better utilized! It is an eyesore on our neighborhood and I am at a point of avoiding the block all together due to the filth and dead birds that litter the area. I do however have a few concerns:

- I am all for less driving but given how car centric this city is, the parking spots are insufficient. What will be happening to encourage public transit usage and bike travel to this location?
- What type of traffic changes will happen on 2100 S and 2100 E both during construction and after? I live about a block away on 2100 S and I would like to make sure I am still able to get in and out of my driveway without concern.
- I have seen several rear end crash situations on 2100 S street due to cars slowing down to turn and others speeding and not paying attention, What will be done to ensure pedestrian and vehicle safety when more cars are added to this dangerous mix? UTA buses are some of the worst speeding offenders on this street.
- I am also concerned about local businesses in that area that I frequent and value greatly. The Bean Whole and Blue Plate are businesses that make our neighborhood special and I would hate to see them leave the area. Will they have priority for retail space in the new development?
- Will businesses in this development be able to sell alcohol since there is a school nearby? We really need a bar or pub in this neighborhood and I'm sure I speak for a lot of people in this changing area when I say that it will be easier to put up with construction and increased traffic if I know I can have a have a pint or cocktail with dinner when I patronize the new restaurants in the development.
- What type of signage will it have? The newly rebuilt bank nearby on 2100 S has an incredibly tacky light up sign that glows into the houses across the street and we were never warned about that monstrosity entering our neighborhood.

Since this development will be anchoring this section of Sugar House, it's important to consider the transit paths between here and the larger core section. 2100 S would greatly benefit from bike lanes, at least from 2100 E to the park. This bike lane would connect to the 2100 E bike lane, making bike commuting more feasible and making the new apartments more desirable. This would also help control speed on 2100 S and make it safer for pedestrians.

With the appropriate traffic mitigation, I am excited to have this new development in the neighborhood and look forward to more dialogue.

Kaitlin

From: Kara Agresta <[karaudah7@gmail.com](mailto:karaudah7@gmail.com)><2027 EAST WILMINGTON AVENUE>  
Subject: TWENTYONES TAKE TWO Website Feedback

Message Body:

To whom it may concern,

I am reaching out as I have looked at the plans since the blue plate diner has decided to sell to the developer. With the new plans in place they have forgotten to plant trees, where is the outdoor dining and why are they trying to go higher. This will ruin our upper East side community if we have tall buildings in the area for which the developer has plans to do. This is outrageous, maybe for downtown sugarhouse, but at 21st and 21st which is already incredibly busy with small streets. This project will put more kids at risk walking to school due to the amount of traffic that will be added to what is already there. How does the Sugarhouse community council plan on keeping our kids safe walking to school as it's already a busy intersection that is absolute crazy



and only one working crossing guard. as The old plans also had ideas about bike racks to promote biking and less use of vehicles. These new plans look nice on paper, but as a community trying to preserve the area, these plans are way too big for the area, I would really like to see the developer make some plans for trees and to assure that this will be an area that the community can enjoy local businesses, dining outside is a must for restaurants and must be a location that people can safely walk or ride their bike to. Is that in any of the plans? Be an advocate for your neighbors, your friends and family and for our community!

From: Stephanie Oblad <[stephanie.oblad@gmail.com](mailto:stephanie.oblad@gmail.com)><2033 E. Wilmington Ave>

Subject: TWENTYONES TAKE TWO Website Feedback

Message Body:

I am worried about extra height. They didn't need it before, I don't understand why they need it now. More trees! We walk all over this neighborhood to Dilworth and Fresh Market. We need more trees on the side walk. Please use brick or something that makes it look like it fits into the neighborhood. We don't need something that stick outs and looks like a modern eyesore. So many townhomes and new buildings are stark white or use metals on their exterior and they don't fit in. Sugarhouse is losing its charm. There doesn't seem to be a lot of space for outdoor/patio dining. Since it seems like we will have Covid restrictions for the next few years, you need to be able to have outdoor seating for restaurants.

From: Cinda Salazar Eresuma <[ceresuma@centurylink.net](mailto:ceresuma@centurylink.net)><2258 South 900 East>

Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

There is very little to compliment in this design. It doesn't fit the look and feel of the neighborhood, it lacks adequate parking for the residents & their visitors., and it's current design would push parking into the neighborhoods and traffic onto 2100 south. The committee should require modifications. The impact to traffic should also be studied and mitigated. I would ask the builder this question:: How many vehicles do YOU park at your place of residence ? I doubt it's one,

From: Jackie Assaad <[jakey248@gmail.com](mailto:jakey248@gmail.com)><318 E 1700 S>

Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

I think housing in the area is definitely needed and have no issue with the building of apartments/condos there. My only comment/concern is that these units are not affordable for the people in the neighborhood. There should at least be a few units on the lower end of the pricing spectrum. If I recall correctly, when I walked by there, the units were starting at 4-500's. I think we need more affordable housing before we put in more higher end housing which is all that seems to be getting built in the area. It would also be nice to have some retail or restaurant spaces on the bottom level, as well. Also, to be honest, they're quite ugly looking from the outside.

From: Steve Bunker <[bunker.steve@gmail.com](mailto:bunker.steve@gmail.com)><1493 S 500 E, Salt Lake City, UT 84105>

Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

I'm writing to tell you to stop destroying our historic neighborhoods with these obscenely ugly and overbuilt structures!!! No place is safe anymore from the urban blight of these god-awful, poorly designed buildings that are like a cancer popping up all over our neighborhoods. Every single one of them is clearly built for PROFIT ONLY for the developers, with absolutely no care or consideration on how it will affect the surrounding properties and neighborhoods around it (blocking views, leaving 100-year-old houses with ZERO privacy, and absolutely piss-poor parking and green spaces).

As a homeowner in this neighborhood for 22 years, I am passionate about what happens to my community and I have had enough!!! I am not allowed to build structures on my property that take up more than 25% of the space (I found that out when I couldn't build a new garage the full size I wanted in my small backyard). Who



allowed zoning for this!?! Why is there NEVER any off-street visitor parking or even enough parking for one car per unit (in this current plan)!?! I'm all for building new housing and apartments in our neighborhood but they need to be scaled back to at least half of what is being proposed and designed to fit into the character and nature of the neighborhood. And they need to fully accommodate the needs of the tenants and their guests in their designs and planning without straining and overwhelming the neighborhoods around them.

71 units on this property is appalling!!! It should be cut in half (at least, if not more) and there should be buffer space on the south property line to not encroach and dominate over the houses there. If I'm required to have 75% of my yard (in front and back) be green space and plantings, then EVERY developer should also be required to have at least 25% of the allotted property be green space (not ZERO percent like in these plans). And guest and off-street parking on every one of these developments has been a joke. Every 3-story box townhouse property that has been built around me has zero parking for guests. That means myself and every homeowner in this neighborhood is SUBSIDIZING the developers with our tax dollars to maintain roads and curb/gutters because they are too stingy to provide ample and adequate parking in the development itself. It is obscene that these developers will walk off with MILLIONS of dollars in profit after destroying the aesthetic and livability of our neighborhood, leaving us to fight with tenants over parking spots on residential side streets that shouldn't have to subsidize the developers GREEDY plans and the city's poorly thought out zoning rules.

This particular development is EXTREMELY UGLY, and the thought that there would be a mirror development on the north side of 2100 will make this section of the neighborhood look hideous. WHY DOES NOTHING MATCH OR EVER BLEND IN WITH THE HISTORIC NEIGHBORHOOD AROUND IT!!! In the last 10 years, every single development built not just in the Liberty Wells neighborhood BUT EVERYWHERE are giant EYESORES on the community. We'll look back at this era of architectural building in this city with SHAME because it was all built for greed and profit, not to augment, add to, and beautify each community. We need to build a NEIGHBORHOOD that works for ALL OF US, not line the pockets of developers that have never lived here, have zero respect for the historic communities they're building in, don't understand what quality architecture design is, and don't care or listen to the residents that make this community what it is.

There needs to be a moratorium on any new buildings in this city until zoning is updated to actually take into account all the issues I've addressed above as well as the aesthetic of structures and how they fit in context to the historic ones around them. Liberty Wells and Sugar House are being destroyed before our eyes at the altar of the almighty dollar and it needs to stop now with this, and future developments!

From: Emily Pennock <[calicocool1@msn.com](mailto:calicocool1@msn.com)><2214 S 600 E>  
Subject:Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

There is a rash of projects like this in Sugarhouse—projects that put modern-day stress on historic neighborhoods. This 1920's neighborhood was never designed or intended to support the kind of cars/traffic imposed by these large, very dense apartments with insufficient parking. Developers are cutting corners to pad their bottom line and forcing our unique and cherished neighborhoods to pick up the tab. The S-Line street car does not provide sufficient service to make this small amount of parking tenable. It's faster to walk than to ride on most stops and a bicycle is still faster from start to finish. The streetcar is another lie between the city and developers, a way to gentrify and exacerbate housing inequality in the city without actually investing in sustainable infrastructure or providing adequate public transit. These projects are part of the Master Plan, but these oversights will be the death of what Sugarhouse has been for generations; the kind of place I want to see survive and adequately adapt to the modern age

From: John Peterson <[jmpslc3@gmail.com](mailto:jmpslc3@gmail.com)><581 E Cleveland Ave,>  
Subject:Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

This is a much better looking project than most. I love the style, included businesses and the all-electric approach



From: Charles Bench <[cbench79@yahoo.com](mailto:cbench79@yahoo.com)><1883 S 600 E, SLC UT 84105>

Subject:Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

Please allow these buildings to be built, they would be a welcome addition to our neighborhood.

From: Kerri Wagner <[kerri\\_y@hotmail.com](mailto:kerri_y@hotmail.com)><560 East Elm Ave>

Subject:Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

How many parking stalls in the garage? Our neighborhood has already experienced an increase of street parking, since the Brixton townhouses and apartments went in. Our streets are not equipped to handle more street parkers. We don't have enough street lights. We have too many speeders that kill the squirrels on our streets. And we do not have any speed bumps! Additionally, in the winter having street Parkers make it difficult to have our streets plowed. Please provide more information on the parking requirements for this new structure.

---

From: Peggy Clark <[peggy3656@comcast.net](mailto:peggy3656@comcast.net)><2123 So 600 E>

Subject:Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

71 units and how many parking spaces? 140? Most people who live together have 2 cars.... not 1. There needs to be enough larking spaces or there will be cars parked all over the side streets. The side streets are narrow and 600 E is a bike route. Home owners don't want the overflow cars parking in front our houses. I hope the builder has provided ample parking. for these 71 units. PS Also, have them drive down 500 and 600 east so they can see how many cars already park on the street. Grrrrr.

From: Jeff Bair <[jeff.bair@outlook.com](mailto:jeff.bair@outlook.com)><1957 S 400 E, SLC UT 84115>

Subject:Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

Though it's important to reduce the use of cars, we just aren't there yet. There isn't enough parking proposed for this development. With housing costs continuing to rise, most of these units will probably be filled with "roommates" that most likely will mean multiple vehicles per unit. This will mean all of these extra vehicles filling up the adjacent streets making it difficult for residents of those streets to have visitors as they won't be able to find parking.

Again - I encourage the reduction of vehicles and walkable communities, but we also need to be realistic in planning developments like these and the direct impact to the neighborhoods.

From: Mary <[jomary1.mjp@gmail.com](mailto:jomary1.mjp@gmail.com)><Hollywood>

Subject:Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

These are horrible. They don't fit the neighborhood at all. Build something meaningful. Something that won't negatively impact the neighborhood.

No one who can afford these will go without a car. Were any impact studies completed? Guarantees for permitted parking for existing residence? The neighborhood already has speeding problems without any real plans to mitigate that. 70 units is another 100+ adults that need infrastructure that single family residence cant

accommodate in a single block. Seriously the back of the building looks 1000x better than the street facing side.

From: Michael Lobb <[Lobb@sfrg.com](mailto:Lobb@sfrg.com)><1714 S. 1100 E.>  
Subject:Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

To all involved,

It seems to me that the general area has and is being overbuilt for the infrastructure currently in place. Once again, the developer is asking for limited parking. The parking issues created at the development on 600 e and approximately 2200 s have already generated safety issues as well as several accidents. Adding a project of this magnitude would further stress the current issues already being pushed to their limits. The general infrastructure for these neighborhoods is old and already in need of repair. Adding the extra population will expedite the needs for repairs/replacement of the current systems and it ends up at the communities expense. We've seen the outcome of poor planning in addressing the developers needs without anticipating the impact on the community. Part of any approval process should include the future costs of dealing with these kinds of issues. We don't need another traffic fiasco like we have on the corner of 2100 s 1100 e. or any of the other nightmares we've experienced.

I've lived in Sugarhouse 60 years and think at this point we have enough high end developments. This project once again doesn't seem to be offering any kind of affordable housing or anything else the City touts about when speaking to the public.

I personally am not in support of this project!

Sincerely,

Michael Lobb

From: wanda brown <[wreberand@yahoo.com](mailto:wreberand@yahoo.com)><543 East Commonwealth Avenue>  
Subject:Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

I Have the fact that neighbors who are behind this building will have to deal when loosing privacy and parking!

From: Charlotte W. Ovard <[covard@yahoo.com](mailto:covard@yahoo.com)><2281 S 600 E>  
Subject:Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

I see from the article that 71 units will be built, but only 58 parking spaces will be provided. Save yourselves the mounting conflicts of limited parking and the growing anger of the mounting over-crowding issues that have existed for the last 3-5 years and provide either at least 13 more spaces or limit the units to 58. Most couples have more than one car so even providing 13 spaces is NOT enough. Your denial or lack of appropriate planning is making our city and community very congested and extremely unpleasant. Other cities need to take on the ever growing burdens of too much development and population growth.

From: Donna Bradshaw <[dbradshawlaw@gmail.com](mailto:dbradshawlaw@gmail.com)><1065 S 300 E>  
Subject:Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

Wow that's a lot of people to add into the area! And how many parking spaces? That's not listed anywhere I could see. Parking is already getting crazy in that area- and everywhere in Liberty Wells, so that it seems like this many people will tax the already difficult parking situation. I don't agree with this and if I could vote against it I would



From: christopher tartaro <[Tartaro@comcast.net](mailto:Tartaro@comcast.net)><2167 S 800 E>  
Subject:Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

Sugar House will never be the same. These greedy, big builders and land owners are being allowed to take over a once quaint neighborhood. It is disgusting. It doesn't seem to matter what the people say or do that have lived here for 25 plus years. Why on earth do we need more tacky apartments in the area? Please, someone listen to us. This development needs more off street parking and less units.

From: Tom Barraco <[tom.barraco@gmail.com](mailto:tom.barraco@gmail.com)><617 East Driggs Ave,>  
Subject:Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

I want one parking space for every bedroom to be built on the property itself. This, "they'll take the trolley" doesn't happen. We're heading to a real problem with on-street parking in this area, and it needs to stop. We really need to make these developers do more than make a bunch of money. While we're at it, I really think they need to be taxed more, not special tax considerations for land developers!

From: Emir Tursic <[emir.tursic@gmail.com](mailto:emir.tursic@gmail.com)><573 E Elm Avenue>  
Subject:Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

The proposed number of parking stalls is inadequate. Recently completed multi family project on 600 E and Wilmington Avenue has flooded the surrounding streets with parked cars and this project will do the same. Residents in this area do not ride the public transportation and rely heavily on cars. East and West Elevations should be more articulated to reduce the perceived scale of the building.

From: Dean Mellott <[rangerdean@hotmail.com](mailto:rangerdean@hotmail.com)><574 EAST ELM AVENUE>  
Subject:Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

One main reason for another review of the proposed zoning change is the 2100 South street doesn't have a turn lane for the amount of traffic entering and exiting the Izzy South which will impact commuting drivers on the heavily used 2100 South. It is illegal to cross the double yellow line when traveling westbound to enter the limited parking structure, as well as illegal to exit the Izzy South inadequate parking structure and turn westbound. There are already limited restrictions for automobiles on 600 E when making turns on 2100 S because of the biking route, and recent safety traffic light implemented for bikes and pedestrians.

The south side of Izzy South abutting the single family resident's backyards with the garage exposure, noise and exhaust pollution is unacceptable for an enjoyable relaxing backyard experience. The proposed plan "held the building back from the neighborhood a total of 20' (instead of the 10' required) to account for this increased height request." That 20' set back proposal is at the expense of property tax paying citizens who are having a zoning change for a giant complex placed right up against them and reducing their ascetically pleasing views of the sky and backyard. Is there going to be light pollution from the Izzy South at-grade parking shining in neighboring homes and yards sunset to sunrise year round?

A possible new coffee shop in Izzy South is not needed for there are already established businesses of numerous coffee shops, businesses selling coffee less than a block away. Most importantly, where will patrons park vehicles to enter the shop? Pedestrians will not allow the multi-level coffee shop/restaurant to be profitable. It sounds great on paper for a proposal though there is no parking lot.

The at-grade parking of 58 stalls, a .81 parking ratio isn't 100% of the 71 units and it is simple math.. 71 units with one automobile each and some units with two automobiles, visitors to the units needing a place to park and tenets (reserved parking stalls?) having their parking spaces being taken by visitors doesn't leave options other than parking in the single-family residential area on 600 East and especially Commonwealth & Elm. Just



the 71 units minus the 58 proposed parking stalls leaves a remainder of lucky 13 unavailable people, and if there is only one automobile per unit in Izzy South. Again, where is the parking lot for the west end possible retail? If this project of Izzy South parking issue isn't resolved there will be the same issue with Izzy North in the near future.

There are great examples of residential single-family homes affected by huge parking garages and monster apartment complexes with light pollution and ascetically pleasing, comfortable living they once had as well as the over crowded street parking by tenets on the south side of the S-line between 300 East and 500 East on E Haven Avenue. Though that is in South Salt Lake City it is what will occur in this Izzy South proposal.

If you have any questions please contact me.

From: Bob Farrell <[mtgreenheads@gmail.com](mailto:mtgreenheads@gmail.com)><546 E Elm Ave>  
Subject:Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

I am deeply concerned with the Izzy development. I understand there will only be one parking site per 2 rental units, and these will cost tenants an additional monthly fee. Also, I hear the retail units will not have dedicated parking. This will lead to even more strain on our neighborhood parking, as the tenants of Brixton congest our neighborhood.

In addition, the city chooses not to crack down on the vagrants that live on our streets in their vehicles that congest the area and bring crime such as shootings and nude crack heads menacing the area.

I am hoping our Council is respective of homeowners that care about our area, and limits developers that are not concerned with our way of life.

Respectfully  
Hi Caitlyn,

As a concerned resident living in a home on Redondo Avenue that will be directly behind the Izzy North property, I recently reviewed the mailer sent to my address. While I have many reservations regarding this new development and its effect directly on my household and the homes of my neighbors, one pressing issue stands out. The parking listed (60 stall for 75 units with no visible parking for the Izzy pub) is by no means sufficient to accommodate the number of dwellings planned, let alone a business that will need additional parking for patrons. What plans are in place for parking to accommodate not only residents of Izzy North and South, but customers of the future businesses? There are no parking options available on 2100 South, and my own home has no off-street parking. This leaves me in fear of our small residential streets overflowing with cars and my family with no place to park at our home of over 17 years. I have seen this happen in other neighborhoods in Salt Lake City when a new business or apartment moves in without providing adequate parking spaces. It would break my heart to feel forced out of my own home due to a lack of parking. This is of utmost importance to me, so please respond and address the concerns I have regarding the proposed Izzy project. I look forward to hearing from you.

Thank you for your time,

Adriana Pinto

From: Thea Brannon <[theabrannon@yahoo.com](mailto:theabrannon@yahoo.com)><1768 E Wilson Ave>  
Subject:Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

The bland and tacky facade is too monolithic. I think it would be OK to allow 2 or 3 feet of added height for intermittent, interesting facade extensions such as in Holladay project, which is infinitely more attractive. The proposed outdoor eating area next to a driveway and underneath the upper apartment is extremely uninviting. Burger in a cave with exhaust on the side, anyone? Ditto on the other two. Save the large trees for



clean air and a chunk of the green natural world as valuable amenity for the project and the proposed diners and shoppers. Enough asphalt and concrete!

From: Thea Brannon <[theabrannon@yahoo.com](mailto:theabrannon@yahoo.com)><1768 E Wilson Ave>  
Subject: Izzy South Website Feedback

Message Body:

Ugly, ugly, ugly design. I figure realistically you need about 100 parking spaces, and I can't see where plan says how many are provided, but I'm sure it won't be anywhere near enough. The houses on the street behind are very cute and have a relaxed feel. N-S street quiet--if this plan is approved as is, the neighborhood will be inundated with parked cars. And it's SO UGLY!

Hi Judi, a few comments regarding last night's LUZ meeting:

While I very much admire the design of the Izzy project on 21st So., the recurring issue for all of our Sugar House neighborhoods is that of on-street parking. Why is it that the City Council/ City Planning seem to favor developers rather than their constituents in the neighborhoods? This is a seemingly constant cry for fairness and consideration; it's time to address this issue. Can the SH Council request the City give this issue some serious

study and dialog with those affected most by the approval of apartment buildings in single family neighborhoods? It seems that the problem could be somewhat resolved if (as Lynn suggested) parking was automatically part of the rental agreement with a proviso that if the renter did not own an automobile, he/she would have the option of renting the space to another resident (who might have 2 autos) or allowing the space to have a storage unit....The parking standard of the City needs to be altered; it is disingenuous to burden neighborhoods to accommodate developers!

In the case of the Izzy project, there is a possibility that residents would attempt to utilize the Uinta Golf parking lot or that of St. Anns Church/School.!

On a positive note, the Izzy project design has some style--not the predominant "box/cargo container" style that has been approved throughout the City. I still have a problem with the "no setback" from the sidewalk.  
Patsy McNamara

From: Sharon Cotterill <[cotterill@aol.com](mailto:cotterill@aol.com)><2125 S 500 E>  
Subject: 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South) Website Feedback

Message Body:

I am opposed to the development because of inadequate parking for the number of units proposed. If this were 2050, maybe providing less than one Parking space for each unit is adequate but for today and the foreseeable future, there is insufficient parking allocated for these units. People can take mass transit for work, BUT they will more than likely own a car, or more than one per unit. YOU ARE PUTTING THE WEIGHT OF ADDITIONAL HOUSING ON ESTABLISHED NEIGHBORHOODS AND THAT IS NOT FAIR, TO THOSE WHO LIVE IN THESE ESTABLISHED NEIGHBORHOODS, we deserve to have our neighborhoods safe. Having to deal with unknown cars parking wherever they want for days on end because of a shortSighted council willing to approve a project they know will cause tension in the neighborhood is unconscionable. The cry of those who say NIMBY is not what I am saying, but to knowingly approve a project that will dramatically impact those streets where overflow parking will occur, is a dereliction of duty to the current taxpayers of the community. These are NOT affordable housing units. It is to squeeze as much as YOU allow into a small space. Five years from now, it will be a trash dump and an eyesore.

---

## High Boy Izzy South project destroys 2100 S. traffic throughput

---

george chapman <gechapman2@gmail.com>

Mon, Jul 6, 2020 at 4:25 PM

To: caitlyn.miller@slcgov.com

Cc: "Larsen, Jonathan" <jon.larsen@slcgov.com>, nick norris <nick.norris@slcgov.com>, Judi Short <judi.short@gmail.com>, Levi Thatcher <levithatcher@gmail.com>, Larry Migliaccio <ldmigliaccio@gmail.com>, Landon Clark <minnesotaute76@gmail.com>

I call the Planning Department's (and Transportation's) attention to the fact that the proposed project (Case number PLNPCM2020-00222) adds driveways to 2100 South and decreases safety for pedestrians and bicyclists due to the encouragement of more traffic exiting and entering the project from 2100 South (4+ driveways).

It effectively destroys a major east west bicycle route and does not increase sidewalk width. Left hand turns are 3 times more likely to kill or severely injure pedestrians and bicyclists. Senior citizens are most at risk of being killed in a left hand turn. Median age of bicyclists and pedestrians killed by left hand turns is 67 years old. 36% of all accidents occur during a turn. And left hand turns are two times more fatal than right hand turns.

The buildings should have ground floor retail to encourage mixed use which was what the area's last major rezone planned (the Sugar House Streetcar Form Based Zoning). The design effectively creates a zombie building. That encourages unwalkable areas since the ground floor is closed to pedestrian engagement.

Adding entrances and exits onto major arterials like 2100 South will back up traffic and increase air pollution on a road that is maxed out at almost 18,000 ADT. The result will be like the Chick A Fil restaurant (1200 East) that backs up eastbound traffic on 2100 S during evening rush hour. Poor planning effectively increases pollution in that case and it is also part of this plan.

Due to the significant danger to pedestrians and bicyclists that this project creates, I urge Planning to find that it should not be approved. I would not be so against this project if all of the exits and entrances were on 600 East and 500 East which have much less traffic. This project, as planned, will kill.

George Chapman  
1186 S. 1100 E.  
Salt Lake City  
801 867 7071

HIGH BOY VENTURES | IZZY SOUTH



## 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South)



The **Sugar House Community Council** has a request to review the proposal to build an apartment building at this location, just west of Uintah Golf.

Please read the proposal on our website, and give us your feedback using the comment form. We will send comments along with our letter to the Planning Commission. This is for a 3-story building with 71 apartments. It will be an all-electric building, and potentially solar panels on the roof.

This proposal will be on the agenda of the **Sugar House Community Council Land Use and Zoning Committee** May 18 at 6 pm. This will be a virtual meeting. If you provide a comment, we will email the link to join the meeting using Zoom.

Go here to review the plans and provide a comment.

[Plans for 542 South 2100 East](#)



## 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South)



The **Sugar House Community Council** has a request to review the proposal to build an apartment building at this location, just west of Uintah Golf.

Please read the proposal on our website, and give us your feedback using the comment form. We will send comments along with our letter to the Planning Commission. This is for a 3-story building with 71 apartments. It will be an all-electric building, and potentially solar panels on the roof.

This proposal will be on the agenda of the **Sugar House Community Council Land Use and Zoning Committee** May 18 at 6 pm. This will be a virtual meeting. If you provide a comment, we will email the link to join the meeting using Zoom.

Go here to review the plans and provide a comment.

[Plans for 542 South 2100 East](#)



## 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South)



The **Sugar House Community Council** has a request to review the proposal to build an apartment building at this location, just west of Uintah Golf.

Please read the proposal on our website, and give us your feedback using the comment form. We will send comments along with our letter to the Planning Commission. This is for a 3-story building with 71 apartments. It will be an all-electric building, and potentially solar panels on the roof.

**This proposal will be on the agenda of the Sugar House Community Council Land Use and Zoning Committee May 18 at 6 pm. This will be a virtual meeting. If you provide a comment, we will email the link to join the meeting using Zoom.**

Go here to review the plans and provide a comment.  
[Plans for 542 South 2100 East](#)



## 542 East 2100 South (Izzy South)



The **Sugar House Community Council** has a request to review the proposal to build an apartment building at this location, just west of Uintah Golf.

Please read the proposal on our website, and give us your feedback using the comment form. We will send comments along with our letter to the Planning Commission. This is for a 3-story building with 71 apartments. It will be an all-electric building, and potentially solar panels on the roof.

**This proposal will be on the agenda of the Sugar House Community Council Land Use and Zoning Committee May 18 at 6 pm. This will be a virtual meeting. If you provide a comment, we will email the link to join the meeting using Zoom.**

Go here to review the plans and provide a comment.  
[Plans for 542 South 2100 East](#)





