

Scott Little
854 E Hollyhock

Tyler Huish, the Chairman of the Steering Committee submitted a comment for the Public Hearing that will/has been read by Wendy Gurr. He tells you that *"This [mixed use] refers to you, as the homeowner, [being able] to run your small business out of your home. He goes on, "This does not mean the property is converted to commercial."*

You can already run many small business (including all of those mentioned by Mr. Huish) out of your home. You cannot convert or redevelop your home into apartments or condos with commercial space below as contemplated by mixed use zones.

Mr. Huish either does not understand the concept of Mixed Use or he is trying to mislead this body.

The Utah Code says, UCA 63N-3-602 (15) "Mixed use development" means development with a mix of multi-family residential use and at least one additional land use.

Most of the Mixed use developments in this part of the valley are essentially apartment houses and condominium projects. To qualify as mixed use, a development only has to set aside room to integrate a small office, salon, club, or coffee shop somewhere in the multi family development.

Look at the Mixed Use development on 700 East just South of the Sandy City Cemetary for an example. It is basically an apartment building with an small H&R Block office on the bottom floor.

There are several other areas where the proposed General Plan deserves a second look.

Page 32 of the Proposed Plan includes a Key Recommendation to *"Update land use codes to be tailored to White City's specific wants and needs."*

The key here is that the Proposed Plan calls to *"update land use codes."* This means re-zone. I believe that most of our residents expressed that they do not want any of our neighborhoods to be re-zoned from the current R-1-8 designation encumpasing about 95% of our community.

Page 32 of the Proposed Plan sets out land use goals for our Township. Including the following:

LU1: Ensure that effective land use planning is kept in balance with preserving the freedom and rights of individual landowners.

By focusing this goal entirely on the rights of "landowners", the Proposed Plan would support the right of a non-resident developer who buys houses (thus becoming the landowner) to re-develop the land, over the objections from neighbors. The Proposed Plan says little or nothing about protecting the rights of Residents to live peacefully in the type of neighborhood that they have chosen to live in. Rather than supporting only the rights of "landowners," to re-develop their property, the General Plan should also support the rights of "Residents" who live here and care about White City.

*LU goal 2: Maintain and promote White City's neighborhood-scale housing character (primarily detached residences) while also promoting a quality of life that attracts and sustains new families and **the housing needs of the Salt Lake Valley.***

This goal really has little to do with preserving the R1-8 single family housing zone making up 95% of White City, but rather, it focuses on maintaining "*neighborhood-scale housing character,*" "*attract[ing] and sustain[ing] new families, and the housing needs of the Salt Lake Valley.*" Preserving "*neighborhood-scale housing character*" can be consistent with re-developing neighborhoods into high density housing. [*A]ttract[ing] and sustain[ing] new families and the housing needs of the Salt Lake Valley,*" means that we are setting a goal to substantially increase the number of housing units in White City. This can only be done by re-developing into higher density housing. Do we really want this as a primary goal for our community?

White City is zoned based on the concept of Euclidean Zoning. This designates different areas for different uses (ie. Commercial, Single-Family Residences, Agricultural, Industrial etc.). On Page 40, the Proposed Plan talks about the difference between Euclidian Zoning and Form Based Zoning. It makes the point that Form Based Zoning regulates the "built environment" (ie design, materials, setbacks, height, etc). "**[L]and use is not dictated.**" Form Based Zoning allows multiple types of residential, commercial, and high density uses, all in the same area (as long as structures meet designated design standards).

On page 41, of the Proposed Plan, the Planners suggest that, "the demand for housing outstrips supply of housing in the Salt Lake Valley" is a factor to be considered in our zoning ordinances.

The Proposed Plan divides our community into "*Character Areas*" which are defined as follows:

*"Character Areas" are specific geographic areas that have unique or special characteristics, have **potential to evolve into a unique area** when provided specific guidance, or require attention suitable to its uniqueness. Character can be thought of as the look, feel and history of a place – those factors which set it apart from other areas. By understanding the various Character Areas of a community, land use ordinances can be tailored to uphold the vision of each Character Area."*

This opens the door for re-zoning our neighborhoods to accomodate the, "demand for housing in the Salt Lake Valley." The Proposed Plan calls for allowing higher density housing in all of our neighborhoods.

Most notably, the Proposed Plan calls for the entirety of 106th South to become a "*Mixed Use*" area as follows:

"small-scale mixed uses (residential plus commercial or institutional) following

strict guidelines could be introduced (per property owner's desire and following proper administrative and legal channels)." Page 54

Again, we are back to allowing a property owner to trump the wishes of Residents. Under this language, developers and speculators purchasing properties become property owners who can re-develop under the terms of the Proposed Plan. Once opened to Mixed Use Zoning, developers can obtain variances for projects that we never even considered.

There are two areas that may be of particular concern to the Agricultural community:

1. The Proposed Plan anticipates a conversion from Agricultural to mixed use for the properties bordering the south side of 106th South. and
2. On page 64, the Proposed Plan anticipates that, "properties along this area could appeal to the Planning Commission to become other uses if the area ceases to be characterized by agricultural roots WHICH IT DEFINES AS (LESS THAN 66% USE). It seems to me that we may already be there if we count all of the properties that are zoned agricultural. This would effectively allow 1/3rd of the property owners to dictate a change of the Agricultural designation.