

## Kim Guill

---

**From:** Todd Jenson <toddkjenson@agutah.gov>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 20, 2021 4:57 PM  
**To:** Public Comment  
**Subject:** comment on 10/20 Agenda Item 4(c) Preliminary Riverwood Subdivision

To the Chair and Commissioners of the South Weber City Planning Commission,  
I represent the Governor's Office of Economic Development (Go Utah), pursuant to Utah Code 63M-6-201.  
I write regarding an agenda item 4(c) on the 10/20/2021 agenda for the Planning Commission.  
More than a decade ago, the State acted to condemn certain parcels of property around Hill Air Force Base (HAFB), located in and around the Accident Potential Zone (APZ), to create restrictions on development, easements, etc. There is a review process in place with our office and HAFB to review proposed developments in that area around HAFB, to verify that the subject properties were not affected by a prior State condemnation action, judgments, other restrictions on development in that area, easements, or other land use restrictions. A title search should have identified those recorded restrictions, but sometimes, title reports miss things (that's why there is a title insurance industry). Of course, hopefully, the parcels in this particular Riverwood project/subdivision are not burdened or negatively affected by the State's property interests and restrictions, but it is best to double check first before developers or other entities incur or spend thousands of dollars on a development that is prohibited by law.  
I have also reached out to the agent of the developer involved in this project, Nilson Land Development, LLC, and asked them to submit the parcel numbers involved with this project to my office, so we can conduct a review together with HAFB.  
I suggest that any approval of this development project by the South Weber City Planning Commission may be still be subject to some type of land use restriction created by the State's prior condemnation action or easements. It is too soon at this point in time to make a determination on that issue, but preliminary review of the location of the parcels, and names of prior owners compared with records in our office suggest the subject parcels may be affected. We would like to review this more in depth, with additional information provided by the developer.  
Thank you for your consideration.  
Sincerely,

Todd Karl Jenson, Assistant Attorney General  
State Agency Counsel Division  
Utah Attorney General's Office  
160 East 300 South, Fifth Floor  
P.O. Box 140857  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-0857  
Mobile: (385) 414-2654  
[toddkjenson@agutah.gov](mailto:toddkjenson@agutah.gov)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure, or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender and destroy all copies of the original message. Thank you.

## Kim Guill

---

**From:** joel.dills@gmail.com  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 20, 2021 4:53 PM  
**To:** Public Comment  
**Subject:** Planning commission meeting, Oct 20, 2021

Joel Dills

7749 s 2100 e

Dear commissioners,

There was an article in the Salt Lake Tribune yesterday entitled "This street is falling apart and Salt Lake City leaders say it's not their problem". It's about a private road that has fallen into such disrepair, that the residents living on the road can no longer even drive on it. They can't afford to fix it themselves and so the city refuses to plow it, mail trucks cant deliver and even the garbage truck requires the trash cans to be drug out and onto another street to be picked up. The cost for road repair is outrageously expensive and far beyond the price range of the dozen or so homeowners stuck there.

While I agree our city code is an abysmal mess, I don't see anything in there that refers to a private street being only 26 ft wide with no parking – that's new.

1. Major streets: One hundred ten feet (110');
2. Collector streets: Seventy-eight feet (78'); and
3. Local streets: Seventy feet (70');
4. Public streets are a minimum of fifty (50')
5. PUD Private streets: minimum of forty-one feet (41') in width with the same construction standards as required for a public street, in the city subdivision standards, from the back of curb to back of curb.
6. Alley: A public thoroughfare less than twenty-six feet (26') wide.

Looking at the code of other cites, widths may vary, and I do think we could do a better job organizing our standards to be more easily understood, but other than that, I'm having a hard time understanding why this so-called attempt to clean up the code and "to fix the inconsistencies" is instead suggesting we cut the minimum requirement for roads in half!! In effect making them the size of an alley. On top of that, our City Staff has recommended this only be changed in our highest density (R7) zone.

So in the zone of side by side townhomes, usually squished together with the bare minimum of driveways, they suggest it will serve the citizens who buy those homes best to make their road smaller than the average driveway... AND because it's so small, ban all street parking.

Sorry but this is ONLY in the interest of the developer who isn't satisfied with our highest density residential zone but wants to minimize the roads down so he can squeeze even more homes in.

In my opinion, all of our city roads, public and private should be the same width. Why would it make sense for public roads to be 70' but private roads to only be 26'? Should we make all public roads 26'? What is the difference? Why would one residential road need to be 70' and a much higher density road, with a higher traffic density as well, only need to be 26'? Make them all uniform – it works in other cities.

Private roads in the other commercial and industrial zones need even more research before we make any decisions. The last thing we need to do is make our limited commercial zones cheap and congested.

The only reason for this change, being disguised as cleaning up “inconsistencies”, is to make more money for a developer, and that is NOT the responsibility of the city. The responsibility of the city is to serve and protect the citizens – those who live here now and those who may move into a project YOU as Planning Commissioners make possible. Is this really what you want to recommend?

Thank you,

Joel



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.

[www.avast.com](http://www.avast.com)