

**Housing Advisory and Appeals Board  
Staff Reports  
September 9, 2015**

Exhibit A:

Consideration of Proposed Demolition and Housing Mitigation at 762 South Post  
(Case No. HAZE2014-00569; Salt Lake City Corp.) City Council District Two

1. Address: 762 West 900 North. The structure to be demolished is a single-family dwelling. The owner of the property, Salt Lake City Corp., is requesting demolition approval. The proposed post demolition use of the property is to provide access and parking for the adjacent fire station.
2. Description of property and structure: The building is a one story frame structure which is currently vacant.
3. Description of area: The property is zoned R1-5000 (Single- Family Residential District) and the area consists of residential uses.
4. Probable effect of the proposed demolition: The demolition of the structure will affect Salt Lake City's housing stock by reducing the number of residential units by one.
5. Proposed housing mitigation option: Fee based on the difference between housing value and replacement cost.
6. Comments from the public on the impact of proposed demolition: The community recommends approval of demolition.

Exhibit B:

Consideration of Proposed Demolition and Housing Mitigation at 962 West Montague Avenue  
(Case No. HAZE2014-00568; Salt Lake City Corp.) City Council District Two

1. Address: 962 West Monague. The structure to be demolished is a single-family dwelling. The owner of the property, Salt Lake City Corp., is requesting demolition approval. The proposed post demolition use of the property is to incorporate the land into the adjacent park.
2. Description of property and structure: The building is a one story frame structure which is currently vacant.
3. Description of area: The property is zoned R1-5000 (Single- Family Residential District) and the area consists of residential and open space.
4. Probable effect of the proposed demolition: The demolition of the structure will affect Salt Lake City's housing stock by reducing the number of residential units by one.
5. Proposed housing mitigation option: Fee based on the difference between housing value and replacement cost.
6. Comments from the public on the impact of proposed demolition: The community recommends approval of demolition.

Exhibit C:

Consideration of Residential Housing Code Violations at: 867 & 869 East Browning Avenue  
(Case No. HAZE2015-00849; Brian Cone) City Council District Five

- A. Appealed Deficiency: The stairway headroom leading to the basement is insufficient in height. The headroom is deficient in height and measures 5 feet 9 inches to the leading edge. Overhead is a structural support for the main floor. Findings: Because the headroom at the bottom of the stairway is 7 inches shy of meeting code requirements, staff recommends denial of the appeal.
- B. Appealed Deficiency: Encroachments into the required ceiling height. In the hallway leading to the living room is an encroachment that when measured to the low point is 6 feet 2 inches. Findings: Staff recommends approval of the appeal provided the low point is posted with reflective tape.
- C. Appealed Deficiency: The egress window in the North West and North East basement bedrooms lack minimum window dimension. There are two basement bedrooms that both have identical emergency egress windows. The windows clear opening dimensions are 31 inches by 19 inches which provide 4.1 square

feet of net openable area. Below both windows a permanent step has been installed that meets the exception for minimum sill height. The windows however, open to the downward position causing a person to crawl over the window. Findings: Even though the windows are shy of meeting minimum dimension requirements by 1 inch, due to the downward operation of the window which creates a safety hazard exiting the window, staff recommends denial of the appeal.

Exhibit D:

Consideration of Residential Housing Code Violations at: 427 South Douglas Street  
(Case No. HAZE2015-00665; Cissy Tan) City Council District Four

A. Appealed Deficiency: The front porch guardrail is deficient in height. The guardrail at the front porch measures 27 inches in height. City minimum standard is 36 inches. Findings: An exception in the Existing Residential Housing Code allows for guardrails to be less the 36 inches if the guardrail was installed as part of the buildings original construction, appeal withdrawn.

B. Appealed Deficiency: The windows used for emergency egress are deficient in dimension, net openable area and sill height. 1. The emergency egress windows located in the upstairs southwest, southeast and north bedrooms are deficient in window dimension and measure 18 ½ inches by 20 inches. The housing code minimum dimension requirements are 20 inches by 24 inches. 2. Also being appealed is the window sill height for each of the bedrooms. The sill heights measure 53 inches, exceeding the maximum code requirement of 48 inches. There is an exception for excessive sill height and can be approved provided a ladder or step is permanently installed beneath the window. Hard-wired smoke detectors would also be required in the bedrooms and area giving access to the bedrooms.

Findings: 1. Staff recommends denial of the appeal for window dimension and net openable area.

Findings: 2. Provided the exception for sill height is met, appeal can be withdrawn.

C. Appealed Deficiency: The doorway for the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor west bedroom is deficient in headroom height. The headroom for the doorway measures 6 foot 1 inch, shy of meeting housing standards by 3 inches.

Findings: Staff recommends approval of the appeal provided the door header is posted with reflective tape or sign warning of low headroom.

D. Appealed Deficiency: The basement stairway is deficient in headroom height.

The headroom at the stairway that leads to the basement measures 6 feet ½ inch at the low point. The low headroom is a result of structural members of the main floor. Findings: Because it would require considerable structural changes to increase the headroom, staff recommends approval of the appeal provided the low headroom is posted with reflective tape or sign warning of low headroom.

E. Appealed Deficiency: The first riser of the same stairway exceeds the allowed variation in rise.

The risers are all consistent in height and meet housing code standards however the riser at the bottom of the stairway measures 3 inches exceeding the allowed maximum variation in rise.

Findings: Because the wide run of the bottom tread can function as a landing and the variation in rise does not create a hazardous condition, staff recommends approval of the appeal.

Exhibit E:

Consideration of Residential Housing Code Violations at: 237 South 400 East  
(Case No. HAZE2015-00895; Chris Venizelos) City Council District Four

A. Appealed Deficiency: The hallway entrance leading to the east bedroom is deficient in width and height. The hallway entrance opening measures 22 inches in width and 5 feet 9 inches in height at the highest point. The lowest point measures approximately 5 feet 2 inches. Findings: Because the deficiency in both entry width and height is below allowed minimums, staff recommends denial of the appeal.

B. Appealed Deficiency: The east bedroom doorway is deficient in width and height.

The doorway measures 22 ¾ inches in width and 5 feet 10 ½ inches in height. Findings: The doorway headroom meets the minimums that are allowed under the purview of the Administrative Hearing Officer. The width however is deficient by 7 ¼ inches. Staff recommends denial of the appeal.