

Minutes of the Avenues Housing Compatibility Committee  
May 24, 2006 Sweet Library  
7:00-8:20 pm  
minutes: Jill Van Langeveld  
Conducting: Shane Carlson

### ***City Council Meeting June 6, 2006***

Notices have been received by residents in the SR-1 Zone in District 3 informing them of the public hearing concerning Petition 400-06-08 to amend existing provisions of the Salt Lake City Zoning Ordinance. The City Council will have their Work Meeting at 5:45 pm where we may watch and listen and then the Public Hearing segment will begin at 7:00 pm with comments from the audience.

There are three (3) proposals before the Council:

1. Our proposal with minor rounding of some numbers.
2. The Mayor's which is an endorsement for ours.
3. The Planning Office's proposal which follows our proposal except raises limits for accessory buildings.

The Council will listen to public comments and then take a vote. They should vote that night. If they do not then there will be a "unprotected window" where permits could be given following the city-wide codes before the Council could address the Petition again.

### ***Points to Stress when addressing the City Council***

1. This has been a community driven process.
2. This is a solution oriented proposal.
3. The proposed overlay protects what we have moved here for.
4. Projects with potential to change the character now have the burden to show "no ill effects."
5. The proposal will eliminate unnecessary tension or potential conflicts between neighbors.
6. Over 85% of the lots on the Avenues are "non-conforming narrow lots." The side setback formula allowed for narrower lots is an example of solution focus in our proposal.
7. Narrow lots bring neighbors closer physically which can be good or bad.
8. Planning Office's accessory building recommendations perpetuates problems of narrow lots.
9. Planning Office's accessory building recommendations restricts small home owners while creating incentives to build larger primary structures so they can have larger accessory structures.
10. In our proposal for accessory buildings all property owners are treated equally. Size of accessory structures is not tied to the size of the home.
11. Family Friendly is a community emphasis rather than a specific building size.
12. Larger buildings bring higher prices and higher taxes which, sadly, often prices families out of a particular market.
13. The Tiered Process is **key** to protecting our very diverse neighborhood which has small – some less than 23 ft – bungalows just down the street from 2½- story Victorian mansions. The alternatives are limits that go too high for many, too low for some or to chop the SR-1 zone into many small areas, each with their own set of rules and regulations.
14. The Tiered Process is already working because the burden of showing negative impact has shifted to the applicant proposing a project larger than the development pattern.
15. Planning for the successful implementation of the Tiered Process is extremely important for the whole new City-wide Zoning as well as District 3 Overlay to work smoothly
16. The Planning Office says that a 9' flat roof accessory building is an "inconvenience" for the builders. Engineers and Building services Director, Orion Goff, say that it is relatively easy to build.
17. If a 10' flat roof accessory building is approved, why must a pitched roof accessory building also have a 10' sidewall when a 9' would work just as well?
18. If someone pays top dollar for a home with a view and then someone below them builds a home or accessory building to block that view, the first person has lost value.
19. It is important to error on the side of protection because it always easier to loosen some restrictions later but next to impossible to fix the damage caused when needed protection is not in place. Case in point: The Call House.
20. Lower the fee for routine and uncontested accessory structure permits, when all neighbor signatures are obtained and no hearing is required, from \$200 to \$50.