



October 16, 2020

TO: Salt Lake City Planning Commission

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

RE: PLNPCM2020-00727 Windsor Court Planned Development

We are pleased to have the opportunity to review this project, which is a Planned Unit Development because it does not have direct access to a public street.

This project was posted on our website, and the neighbors received a flyer about the upcoming Land Use meeting. There were about 25 people at the Zoom call on November 16, half were from the neighborhood. It was also in the SHCC Newsletter, and I receive many comments about the project, which are attached.

This project is planned for an RMF-35 parcel, with 17 units, 35' tall, which includes 9 attached single car garages with electric charging station, and a total of 22 surface parking spaces. There will be covered parking for bikes in the garages, otherwise tenants need to put the bikes in their apartment. There are 3 3-bedroom units, with one on the main floor that is an ADA unit, 10 2-bedroom units and 4 one-bedroom units. This project meets the standards for the zone, and the master plan.

This is a difficult parcel. It would appear, looking at the parcel from a map, that access is easy. If someone wants to enter from 2100 South north onto Windsor Street, which the developer seems to be encouraging, it isn't too difficult if you are driving west on 2100 South. But it will be nearly impossible to turn onto Windsor from 2100 South going east at certain busy times of day, which means most of the time. That leaves the best access at Ramona Street, through the shared access skinny driveway behind 1932 Ramona as the other access. Ramona Avenue is a narrower street than most in that neighborhood, and cars park on both sides of the street, most of the time. One car can pass down the middle, but not two. And, garbage trucks are very tight. Perhaps better access should be by going Windsor to Redondo or Redondo to Windsor. (Although I just learned that is a one-way street, not sure which way).

Building setbacks are not an issue. This building is located well away from any neighboring buildings. The house at 1970 Windsor has some concern about privacy, because their bedrooms are along the north wall. I made a recommendation that they plant tall hedge buckthorn trees along the perimeter. Those are 10' tall at the base and 35' tall at maturity. In 4-5 years they are easily 12' tall. That would give privacy to their yard and bedroom windows, which are on the north side of their house.

I don't see any waste collection bins on the parcel, and no place to walk the dogs without having to go half a block away. There should be a small spot for that on the property. There are no common areas, although most units appear to have an outdoor patio. They need to add an electric car charging station somewhere to help tenants who do not live in a unit with a garage.

This extra traffic is not welcome in the area. The streets are narrow and the cars are plentiful. Neighbors say that since the apartments in the area of 900 East and Ramona have all been remodeled in the past year, they have experienced no available parking in front of their houses because the overflow parking goes up and down Ramona and even across 900 East. There isn't any place for overflow parking or guest parking for this project. We recognize that they

are meeting the ordinance, but there are no bike lanes nearby, either. The 2100 South bus is running more often than it used to, and so is the 900 East bus, if these tenants would just use it. The sidewalk on one side of Windsor will remain, so hopefully this will allow tenants to walk into Sugar House for errands instead of driving. They have done a good job of designing to avoid the underground easement for the Jordan Canal.

You can see by reading the comments that most of the neighbors are overwhelmingly against this project. The city infrastructure is a mess, streets are too crowded, no bus lanes, the transit system isn't robust enough to get people where they need to go quickly. Salt Lake City needs to realize that it is important to pay attention to quality of life issues, as well as just creating more units of housing. We have now thousands of new units in Sugar House, but no attention has been placed on how residents living in Sugar House will get to their places of work, since the roads are narrow and all the new housing will soon have no parking requirement, everyone can just park on the street. Very irresponsible. This is a good place to put 3 or 4 large homes, or even a pocket park, instead of apartments. Very few new single-family units have been built in Sugar House in the last decade.

In the 2005 Sugar House Master Plan, on Page 11, one of the Policies is to ensure that decisions made for planning, zoning, public works projects, or any other public or private investment are guided by a full understanding of the relationships between land use and transportation impacts. Another is to require traffic impact studies for projects considered significant to determine the cumulative impact of adding the new development to the area. I don't think the city has done any of this in the last 15 years. Maybe it is time to start paying attention to this mandate.

Attachments:

Flyer

Map of Neighborhood

Comments from the Neighbors

WINDSOR COURT 1966 WINDSOR STREET PLANNED DEVELOPMENT



The applicant is requesting approval for a multi-family dwelling at 1966 S Windsor Street. The project would be built on an existing vacant lot with 17 units. The building would be apartments for rent, it would be comprised of 3 three-bedroom units, 10 two-bedroom units and 4 one-bedroom unit. The Building would be approximately 35 feet high at its highest point. The total site is .708 acres.

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 proposal will be on the agenda of the Sugar House Community Council Land Use and Zoning Committee November 16 at 6 p.m. This will be a virtual meeting. **If you provide a comment, we will give you the link to join the meeting using Zoom.**

The plans for this project and the regulations for a Planned Development, along with the comment form can be found
<https://www.sugarhousecouncil.org/windsor-court-1966-windsor-street/>



www.sugarhousecouncil.org

WINDSOR COURT 1966 WINDSOR STREET PLANNED DEVELOPMENT



The applicant is requesting approval for a multi-family dwelling at 1966 S Windsor Street. The project would be built on an existing vacant lot with 17 units. The building would be apartments for rent, it would be comprised of 3 three-bedroom units, 10 two-bedroom units and 4 one-bedroom unit. The Building would be approximately 35 feet high at its highest point. The total site is .708 acres.

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 proposal will be on the agenda of the Sugar House Community Council Land Use and Zoning Committee November 16 at 6 p.m. This will be a virtual meeting. **If you provide a comment, we will give you the link to join the meeting using Zoom.**

The plans for this project and the regulations for a Planned Development, along with the comment form can be found
<https://www.sugarhousecouncil.org/windsor-court-1966-windsor-street/>



www.sugarhousecouncil.org

COMMENTS 1966 WINDSOR COURT

From: Wanda Gayle <wgayle@sisna.com><1565 East Garfield>
Subject: Windsor Court Website Feedback

Message Body:

Sugar House deserves better than ANOTHER multi-family dwelling. How about something that enhances the neighborhood instead of something that adds to the traffic, the loss of views, and that claustrophobic feeling? This type of structure is rapidly proliferating and degrading the neighborhood atmosphere. Sugar House is far from what is once was, but let's not tip it over and destroy it. Enough is enough.

From: Jane Buirgy <ejb2535@aol.com><2535 Chadwick Street>
Subject: Windsor Court Website Feedback

Message Body:

Please hold off on approving any new residential buildings until it is known how all condos and apartments that are currently being built will impact traffic and parking in the sugarhouse area. As of now the traffic flow is already a problem.

Dear Planning Commission

I am a 25 year home owner and resident of 1011 E. Hollywood Ave, SLC, 84105 and have a small business in this area as well. Barbara Boller, my mother, owns her home at 1005 E. Hollywood Ave. We have lived in this area over 25 years.

We are writing to voice **strong opposition to the 1966 S. Windsor Project.** Opposition is based on 3 issues:

1. The Sugarhouse area 7th east through 1300 East is over saturated with NEW high density apartment buildings, some of which are still being built. While high density dwellings are a needed part of our sustainability, this area has experienced disproportionate burden of overbuilding, creating less safe space for families including young children and seniors, in surrounding areas due to impact.
2. **Impact of over building:** driving safety issues caused by increased traffic and resulting difficulty entering and exiting our residential areas- it is increasingly difficult to even pull out of our driveways safely due to increased traffic, increased traffic delays, air pollution increases, traffic noise, angry drivers and increased related issues, and overflow parking in single home neighborhoods, are but a few of the very visible impact of all the high density overbuilding over the past 5 years. Decrease in quality of life in areas where we pay increasingly high home taxes, with decreasing quality of neighborhoods due to these impacts.
3. Other areas of land are available for high density housing west of 700 East, with closer proximity to the main transit rail at 2100 South and 300 West. There is no lack of other areas to build with greater benefits and a decreased demand on our Sugarhouse area, while residents can still access the amenities in our area. As building west of 700 East increases, you see increase in businesses that can serve those areas close by as well.
4. The City has a responsibility to build accompanying public gathering spaces to balance the other multi dwelling homes and retail **already built**, as part of good long term planning. **These include wider streets with more lanes for bikes, wider side walks for pedestrian traffic, city traffic calming measures, more trees, senior centers, and neighborhood public parks for families.**

Thank you for including our opposition in your comment gathering process.

Sincerely,
Barbara Boller, annaboller@waterfordschool.org
1005 East Hollywood Ave

Anna Boller
1011 East Hollywood Ave

From: Heidi Schubert <heidi@biochem.utah.edu><831 Coatsville Ave>
Subject: Windsor Court Website Feedback

Message Body:

In general I am supportive of additional housing opportunities within Sugarhouse. My preference would be condos - locations where people who love to live here but can't afford a broken down 100-year old expensive house could live. These apartments just ensure

more people learn to like living here - with no place for them to buy. Condos in this location would be even better - would ensure the established houses have owners next door instead of renters. Plus the traffic at the housing development would be quiet - perfect for people who want condos - they don't want to live on 2100 south just like other homeowners. We have enough renters - let's bring owners to Sugarhouse.

Alas, I am not the current developer/investor with community development in mind. So we we deal with the current owner and his needs/wants/ideas.

Perhaps traffic could be designed to limit disruption to 2100 S and Romona. Can only some units have access to parking off Romona reducing traffic there? Like some barrier that restricts traffic cutting through. Or can we have incoming traffic from 2100 but outgoing traffic to Ramona to at least add method to the madness.

If the units will allow pets can a fenced in dog area be planned to corral the poop?

I couldn't see the pictures from the link above. Maybe I'll comment again once the link is fixed.

From: Jeff Laver <cjefflaver@gmail.com><1957 S 900 E>
Subject: Windsor Court Website Feedback

Message Body:

That whole area is prime space for redevelopment. I support new development IF the developers AND the city take measures to maintain and improve quality of life in nearby, historic neighborhoods. There is already a lack of parking for apartments in that area. Those of us on Hollywood Ave. just east of 9th E, already have cars from the remodeled apartments just west of 9th constantly taking up the street space by our homes. It's only been a problem in the last year, since the remodel. I know the goal is to have fewer cars and more use of public transit, and I support that goal, but until people reduce the number of cars they have, parking needs to be provided. I need street space by my house for MY guests and my garbage cans.

From: Martin Beatch <martinbeatch@gmail.com><1961 S 800 E>
Subject: Windsor Court Website Feedback

Message Body:

Please send link to Zoom meeting. This development is directly behind our property. A 35 foot structure a short distance from our back fence will have significant impact on the privacy level in our yard.

From: Brett Nelson-Stippich <brett@stippichdesign.com><1970 Windsor Street>
Subject: Windsor Court Website Feedback
Hi,

Wondering will this impact Parley's Creek which is underneath proposed building and how they are thinking of mitigating any impacts? Looks like a total of 18 parking spaces is this correct? With 13 multi bedroom units wondering if this will be enough parking and thoughts on where overflow parking will go. At end of our property on North sidewalk ends, from the renderings it does not look as if they are planning on connecting to this sidewalk would appreciate clarification. Will Windsor flow directly into planned community or will there be some sort of stop or yield sign and will it connect to be able to exit still on Ramona?

Thank you.

From: Heidi Schubert <heidi@biochem.utah.edu><831 Coatsville Ave>
Subject: Windsor Court Website Feedback

Message Body:

Thanks - Judi - for fixing the link for the plans. I see that now, instead of combining with the other lots this is a proposal going alone on just the unbuilt lot. This is good - in that the majority of the height and building tucks up against the alley and only two "single family" houses. This reduces community resistance. But if I lived there I could see the writing the walls and that the old apartments will eventually get knocked down and eventually something else will be built - that this project will still only be part of something bigger in that area long term.

Having said that - it seems fine. It's obvious they are working around the underground stream. They are now working lower and

within current site plan allowances. I see nothing wrong. It's not so big that traffic will change significantly for now. I can't tell if this project will be able to access existing parking lots and hence have access out the back to Ramona, but I would think most traffic will funnel to 2100S and be "fine."

Again - I'd rather have condos - so people can own in Sugarhouse, But who am I to say. AND, Utah's condo association laws are so lax that there is no guarantee the property would be kept up, even with owners in charge.

Brandon Hill. I strongly object to the project size on Windsor and also based on neighborhood feedback at the meeting.

From: Taryn Roch <tarynroch@gmail.com><1961 S 800 E>
Subject: Windsor Court Website Feedback

Message Body:

I'm writing in regards to the proposed development at 1966 Windsor. I am a homeowner adjacent to this development.

1. I didn't see mention of any affordable units in the description of this development. Given the significant housing cost issues impacting many SLC families, I believe not including affordable units in this new development would be a missed opportunity.
2. Since Parley's Creek runs through this parcel, how does the development plan to mitigate potential environmental impacts?
3. Given that our backyard is adjacent to the western side the proposed building, I would like clarity on the buffer on that side of the development and plans for landscaping given the significant potential impacts to our privacy.

Thank you!

From: Chuck Krivanek <charleskrivanek@gmail.com><1992 South Windsor Street, Salt Lake City, UT 84105>
Subject: Windsor Court Website Feedback

Message Body:

How will the south side of this proposed development blend with Windsor Street?

From: Rory Bernhard <Rbernhard13@gmail.com><1983 South 800 East>
Subject: Windsor Court Website Feedback

Message Body:

I would like to express my complete disagreement with this proposal. I understand that our neighborhood is urban residential and it is snug already but I do not and can not agree with trying to see if we can pack as many people possible into this neighborhood as if it was some sort of clown car. On street parking has become increasingly sparse already and this project will only add more strain. Another point is the overall infrastructure, 2100 south is a rough, torn up, pothole infested street that is overly congested during peak times, Sometimes it is nearly impossible to get out of my street. long traffic lines form stretching north at the light of 9th and 21st as well. Allowing this project will multiply this issue immensely. I can't see the logic in adding to a problem that the city has not already fixed.

There are several other broader issues as pertaining to the valley itself in way of sustainability of water, air quality, and crime to name a few. All issues that increase exponentially when population density goes up.

Please keep me updated as to the progress of this proposal and hopefully we can get it denied full stop. Thank you Rory Bernhard

Hi Judi,

I am concerned about the proposed building on Windsor Ave. I live at 866 E Ramona Ave. The Ramona exit is directly east of my home. I am concerned about the amount of traffic coming out of that exit. Ramona Avenue is a very small street and there is already too many people parking on the street, and we often have to pull over to one side of the street to allow another car to pass.

I would like the city and the developers to consider adjusting their plans to reduce the amount of traffic exiting out onto Ramona Ave. Thank you!

--
From: Walter Howard <walterobson@gmail.com><1011 East Hollywood>
Subject: Windsor Court Website Feedback

Message Body:

I STRONGLY oppose this proposed building. I can't safely get in and out of our neighborhood in Sugarhouse due to the increased traffic in this area. Speeding has increased with the accompanying increase in numbers of too many people crammed into this area. Just last month, a child was tragically killed crossing 2100 S. East of this lot—there is a trickle down impact surrounding all of 2100 south and the side streets, and east of 700 East of sugarhouse. The entrance exit areas of this lot are not built existing traffic, let alone for traffic this building will cause. In addition to the speeding, the congestion of the area is awful. We need more public spaces like parks, bike lanes, senior centers etc to rebalance The disproportional high density building that has and is still occurring.

From: Olivia Robson <drannaboller@bollerpsychologicalservices.com><1011 East Hollywood Ave>
Subject: Windsor Court Website Feedback

Message Body:

I strongly oppose this Proposed building. My family has lived in Sugarhouse over two decades.. while I support high density housing, our area in the midst of a surge of high density housing buildt and already built without key components researched to be part of sustainable neighborhoods, which includes public gathering places for all ages,-parks, senior centers, wider streets for bike lanes, increased trees and traffic calming. All corridors in the area of this building are over taxed by increased traffic beyond existing Road design which results in dangerous access in and out of stores, homes, the post office, And restaurants Already built. Increased traffic, due to this high density overgroth has already caused idling, air pollution, noise. All to an area without the infastructure to add more high density housing. . Better placement would be land closer to the trax hub at 2100 South and 300 west. This current lot should be bought by the city for a park- isn't there a natural stream that runs through this lot? If there is, that brings even more environmental risks in addition to this proposed building in this lot. Please refocus efforts on the issues related to sustainable communities that are identified in the research literature.

From: Wanda Gayle <wgayle@sisna.com><1565 East Garfield>
Subject: Windsor Court Website Feedback

Message Body:

I would like to see something built here that is in scale with the surrounding properties, something that the community welcomes, and a place that is Sugar House neighborly (not urban/industrial). This proposal is inappropriate and not welcome. Though it seems to meet regulations for height, etc., that means that the regulations are not working for what the citizens of Sugar House want, and need to be revised.

Hi Judi. It seems that the major discontent regarding this project would be the increased use of Ramona Ave. which already appears to be maxed out with traffic and cars parking in residential area. Both Anna Bolller and David Fernandis made excellent points regarding the impact of not just this project , but how all the apartment construction in Sugar House has negatively impacted our community. And there are so many more still under construction. (how many 500-600 new apartments?) I think I have verbalized this to you previously, but will state again how I don't believe the Planning Commission or the Council give enough credence to the input of residents when they express how all this additional traffic and street parking negatively impacts them. Home owners have made long term investments in their real estate whereas the developers pack up and leave after the projects are completed. That seems unfair treatment of property taxpayers.

I really would like to see a moratorium on apartment construction in Sugar House and I expressed that on my objections to the Sizzler proposal as well. Although Soren had a negative response to the Urban Reform Institute's suggestion of a need for SmartSprawl, I see it as something that should be explored (similar to DAYBreak), mainly because I can't imagine families raising children in an apartment and not being able to play outside. Also, people will not give up their cars and use public transportation exclusively--a good example of that is how the S-line has failed to attract commuters. There needs to be an alternative for families. So would the Windsor builders consider putting 3-4 homes on that property or it is just not financially feasible? All my realtor friends (of which I was once one of them) are complaining that there is a huge lack of single family homes. This situation needs some serious consideration moving forward on ways to accommodate families as well as singles and couples. Patsy MacNamara

Hello, I am Kyle Williams of 863 Ramona Ave. My home is directly across from the driveway of the Ramona Apartments, and the proposed Windsor Court project. While I am in favor of creating more dense housing in order to reduce countryside sprawl, I am against the design of this new project, routing the driveway out onto Ramona. Ramona is a small narrow neighborhood street, not an arterial route, and is already very congested. Because of the difficulty of turning left onto 2100 South off of 8th east, drivers come east on Ramona as it is the last possible option to access 9th east and thus to access the light at 2100. People roar through Ramona at speeds as much as 50 MPH. Adding more vehicles to this already crowded street is not workable, and neither the new nor current residents will be happy. There are several routes that could provide access in and out of Windsor street to the south, most being

commercial parking areas near the IHC Clinic, the Yellow Rose, and the Even Stevens sandwich shop. Easements could be obtained for residents of Windsor Court to access 9th east through them, which would be faster and more convenient than on Ramona . There is also the 1 way Redondo which is basically an alley. It could be enhanced to provide better access. If the city were to install speed abatement items on Ramona, it might encourage everyone to choose a different path towards 9th. (by the way, we have tried over the years to have the city install speed abatement components on Ramona in order to slow these motorhead folks down a bit, to no avail. We were very dismayed to see, at the same time however, that on Hollywood east of 9th, 3 such speed abatement items were installed, even at existing stop signs, which is the ultimate speed abatement and nothing else should have even been needed! These 3 items are huge round-about landscaped planter installations with power and water for irrigation of the landscaping. All we were asking for was a simple speed bump and they got 3 over the top un-needed installations! If I sound bitter its because I am. Every time I drive that street I get angry all over again...)

As much as it is important to create housing, it is just as important to keep quality of life issues in mind. With thousands of new living units being installed in the area over the last 5 years, how much thought is given to how all these new residents are going to get in and out of the area? Traffic in Sugarhouse is a complete mess. and must be addressed before new living spaces are added, and what about creating parks and open space? With what was spent on those 3 unneeded speed abatements on Hollywood, I bet the city could have purchased this odd awkward piece of property where Windsor Court is planned and created some open space.

I am not in favor of the new Windsor Court project as it is designed now.

thanks

Kyle.

Notes from 11/16/20 LUZ meeting Windsor Court

1966 Windsor St LUZ 11/16/20 Vacant RMF 35 moderate density variety for
Moderate density housing type height 35 feet. 1 structure 35' 3 levels,
17 unit multifamily 3 levels above 5 ground 6 second 6 third floor
9 single car garages 3-3 1 ADA unit van garage, 10 are 2 BR and 4 are 1 BR
31 total parking spaces 9 in garage 22 outside. Meets the 1.75 per unit.
Square feet 1 6000 2 7500 3 6700 sd 20170 footprint 8460.

Meets purpose increases number and height of units. Consistent with master plan
Main entrance Windsor street off 2100 south, the other parcels to the north access via
Ramona Ave and a carport, we have an easement so we share access with that property so
Windsor can use Ramona access.

1961 S 800 (west) Any affordable, no. Lance cost of units doesn't allow for any affordable.

Psrleys Creek project built in accordance to the creek setback. Privacy in our back yard?

10' landscape buffer S and W trees going in, all we can do for the buffer.

10 new trees going in. udi what about tall hedge buckthorn.

Any sidewalk on the buffer? No then buffer should be enough space.

Windsor St is not to code street, try to make it to code narrow, seems pretty tall can you do

Two stories. Limited on footprint because of creek. Windsor looks

Better than Ramona exit. Mahon not crazy for 3 story building, entering on Windsor if you are leaving

Those apartments if you want to go west, you can't turn east off of

Windsor on 2100 South. Most in out n Ramona Windsor on occasion

For some people but most on Windsor. The Ramona apartments

Only have 18 units so this doubles the amt of traffic in out Ramona.

Packing many into a small space. Develop with half the units, this is Overkill.

Theresa Willason agree with traffic and most will go to Ramona, If you have seen Campfire no one goes out
Windsor?

The shape of the building is limited by the conduit for the creek, So they do not build on conduit.

Gabriel Kerr and McKenzie Kerr lots coming out already, people Park on that street, share same
worries.

Sustainable communities have bike lanes, open space a senior center, there is none of that in
this neighborhood. It is difficult to get out of our driveways because cars are backed up

Trying to get out onto 2100 S. Would be better to put in a park for the families in this area.

The owners refer to this as a land locked unit of land, not the place to add more housing. Not the
Place Put these units closer to the TRAX.

Soren we should add infrastructure BEOFRE we add More apartments. 2100 S Windsor st bus
stop is being eliminated. Design rethought so it is a pedestrian and bicycle first

Melissa We live in turquoise house, similar concerns, definitely have concerns about privacy

Close with no privacy. Are you planning to continue sidewalks into your development from

Windsor? Spainour will connect sidewalk

Kyle lives on Ramona across from driveway being discussed, people choosing

Ramona as opposed Windsor? Could people exit through road by tattoo parlor or Clinic

Could an easement be obtained, Ramona cannot handle it.

Would like something nice and thick and tall The medical clinic Mention Redondo eastbound
doesn't Go anywhere. Having lots of units on thing But quality of life is another. The more

sidewalk you can put in urges People to walk, if no sidewalks they won't walk. Timeline?

Planning Commission date not scheduled yet. Will send a notice

To property owners within 300'. Too many units For such a small space. Access for electric cars?

The closed garages Will have that. David only electrical outlets in 9

Garages. Will look into one not covered.

Design for more walking and biking, it meets

Planning requirement.