MEMORANDUM
DEPARTMENT of COMMUNITY and NEIGHBORHOODS

To: Salt Lake City Planning Commission

From: Mayara Lima, Principal Planner
       (801) 535-7118 or mayara.lima@slegov.com

Date: May 27, 2020

Re: PLNPCM2019-00567 – Maplewood Addition Street Closure
    PLNSUB2019-00755 – NT Redevelopment Subdivision Amendment

ACTION REQUIRED: This item regarding a request to close streets at approximately 6780 W North Temple and amend the subdivision plat was heard at the March 11, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting. The Commission discussed the item and voted to forward a positive recommendation to City Council for the requests with the condition listed in the staff report.

Due to a noticing error for the March 11, 2020 public hearing, the request is being referred to the commission for a second hearing. The Planning Commission’s role in this application is to provide a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council will make the final decision regarding the requests.

RECOMMENDATION: Based on the public input received, Planning Staff is recommending that the Planning Commission table the requests and keep the public hearing open for 30 days to allow time for additional public input and for the community to work with the applicant to address their concerns.

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION: Corbin Bennion, the engineer representing the School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration, adjacent property owner, is requesting to close the streets dedicated in the Maplewood Addition subdivision located north of Interstate I-80 and west of the Salt Lake International Airport. The subdivision was platted in 1911 but never developed as intended. The applicant would like to close the streets to incorporate it into the adjacent parcel.

On March 11, 2020, the Planning Commission heard the requests. Four members of the public commented on the proposal. Three were in opposition and one in support. The Commission discussed the item and voted to forward a positive recommendation to City Council with the condition listed in the staff report.

In reviewing the procedures for the public hearing, it was confirmed that the Jordan Meadows Community Council Chair did not receive notice of the March 11, 2020 public hearing as required by the Zoning Ordinance. Due to this noticing error, the request is being referred to the Planning Commission for a second hearing.
After the March 11, 2020, the Planning Commission public hearing, planning staff received four letters of concern. Staff also received a letter from UDOT stating no opposition to the proposed requests.

**Attachments:**
- March 11, 2020 Planning Commission Minutes
- March 11, 2020 Planning Commission Staff Report
- Public Comments received after the March 11, 2020 public hearing
A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at 5:32:11 PM. Audio recordings of the Planning Commission meetings are retained for a period of time.

Present for the Planning Commission meeting were: Chairperson Adrienne Bell; Vice Chairperson Brenda Scheer; Commissioners Maurine Bachman, Amy Barry, Carolynn Hoskins, Jon Lee, Matt Lyon, Andres Paredes, and Sara Urquhart.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were Nick Norris, Planning Director; Paul Nielson, Attorney; Krissy Gilmore, Principal Planner; David Gellner, Principal Planner; Mayara Lima Principal Planner; Rosa Jimenez, Administrative Secretary; and Marlene Rankins, Administrative Secretary.

Field Trip
A field trip was held prior to the work session. Planning Commissioners present were; Maurine Bachman, Sara Urquhart and Brenda Scheer. Staff members in attendance were; David Gellner and Krissy Gilmore.

- **1695 S Wasatch Drive**: Staff discussed the use of the property and current enforcement actions in relation to an Air BNB operation on site. The location of paring for the proposed use was also discussed.
- **1230 East 1700 South**: Staff discussed the height of the addition and design elements.
- **400 West 800 North**: Staff discussed the master plan surrounding property uses and presence of other multi-family developments in the area including some newer development.

**6:22:03 PM**
**Maplewood Addition Street Closure and Subdivision Amendment at approximately 6780 W North Temple** - Corbin Bennion, representing the School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration, adjacent property owner, is requesting to vacate the streets within the Maplewood Addition subdivision. The subdivision was platted in 1911 but never developed as intended. The applicant would like to vacate the streets to incorporate into the adjacent parcel. The subject property is located in the M-1 (Light Manufacturing) zoning district and within Council District 1, represented by James Rogers. (Staff Contact: Mayara Lima at (801) 535-7118 or mayara.lima@slcgov.com) **Case Numbers PLNPCM2019-00567 and PLNSUB2019-00755**

Mayara Lima, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff recommended that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:
- Clarification on owner of surrounding properties

Troy Harold, State of Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration, provided further details.

**PUBLIC HEARING 6:31:33 PM**
Chairperson Bell opened the Public Hearing;
Deeda Seed – Raised concern with what the ultimate plan for development is.

Courtney H. – Stated her opposition of the request.

James King – Raised concern with the aesthetics of the area.

Zachary Dussault – Stated his support of the request.

Seeing no one else wished to speak; Chairperson Bell closed the Public Hearing.

The applicant addressed the public’s concerns.

The Commission and Staff further discussed the following:
- Clarification on how zoning applies when the State of Utah owns the land
- Clarification on whether SITLA is exempt from local regulations

MOTION 6:47:44 PM
Commissioner Bachman stated, based on the findings and analysis in the staff report, the policy considerations for street closure, and the input received, I move that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for the street closure and subdivision amendment proposed in PLNPCM2019-00567 & PLNSUB2019-00755 with the condition listed in the staff report.

Commissioner Lee seconded the motion. Commissioners Lee, Bachman, Barry, Hoskins, Paredes, Lyon and Urquhart voted “Aye”. Commissioner Scheer voted “Nay”. The motion passed 7-1.
To: Salt Lake City Planning Commission

From: Mayara Lima, Principal Planner
(801) 535-7118 or mayara.lima@slcgov.com

Date: March 11, 2020

Re: PLNPCM2019-00567 – Maplewood Addition Street Closure
PLNSUB2019-00755 – NT Redevelopment Subdivision Amendment

---

**Street Closure & Subdivision Amendment**

**PROPERTY ADDRESS:** Approximately 6780 W North Temple  
**MASTER PLAN:** Northwest Quadrant Master Plan  
**ZONING DISTRICT:** M-1 Light Manufacturing  
**OVERLAY DISTRICT:** IP Inland Port  

**REQUEST:** Corbin Bennion, the engineer representing the School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration, adjacent property owner, is requesting to close the streets dedicated in the Maplewood Addition subdivision located north of Interstate I-80 and west of the Salt Lake International Airport. The subdivision was platted in 1911 but never developed as intended. The applicant would like to close the streets to incorporate it into the adjacent parcel.

The Planning Commission’s role in this application is to provide a recommendation to the City Council for the street closure request. The City Council will make the final decision regarding the requests.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Based on the information in this staff report, Planning Staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to City Council for the request to close the sections of the subject streets and to amend the associated subdivision with the following condition:

1. The applicant shall submit a final plat application for the subdivision amendment.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

A. [Vicinity Map](#)  
B. [Property Photographs](#)  
C. [Maplewood Subdivision Plat](#)  
D. [Application Materials](#)  
E. [Analysis of Standards – Street Closure](#)  
F. [Analysis of Standards – Subdivision Amendment](#)  
G. [Public Process and Comments](#)  
H. [Department Review Comments](#)
BACKGROUND: The proposed street closure involves six unimproved streets dedicated in the Maplewood Addition subdivision, platted in 1911. All dedicated streets were designed to connect to the existing road network on eastern portions of the city through future subdivisions. The streets running east to west were named South Temple, First and Second Avenues to reflect the street nomenclature existing in the Avenues neighborhood.

None of the blocks or the streets in the Maplewood Addition subdivision were ever developed. The connection to eastern portions of the city was hindered by development that occurred after the plating of the subdivision and directed the northwest quadrant area to industrial development rather than residential. Similar subdivisions east of the property were vacated through city processes to give room to the airport and its associated infrastructure.

Likewise, between the late 1950s and late 1970s, Interstate I-80 was constructed through the area. The interstate bisected the configuration of the original plat and eliminated the street designated as First Street, as well as large portions of the platted blocks. The result is portions of the Maplewood Subdivision located on both sides of the interstate. This request impacts only the north portion of the subdivision.

The Maplewood Addition subdivision was likely platted for residential uses, which are not permitted uses under the current M-1 zoning district. Development in the area is predominately industrial, including heavy commercial and light manufacturing. These uses typically require larger blocks than those designated in the Maplewood Addition subdivision. Given the zoning restrictions, market demand and current configuration of the plat, it is unlikely that any portion of the subdivision will ever be developed.
The School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA) owns all the land adjacent to the dedicated streets north of I-80, including the land surrounding the subdivision and the blocks within the subdivision. SITLA would like to close the sections of the streets that prevent their property from being a contiguous piece of land. Attachment D includes a highlighted map and the descriptions of the sections of the streets to be vacated.

KEY CONSIDERATIONS:

Consideration 1: City Goals and Policies
Although none of the City master plans specifically address street closures, the city’s master plans help to determine if the request is in line with city goals and is in the city’s best interest.

The Northwest Quadrant Master Plan, adopted in 2016, indicates that new infrastructure is required north of I-80 to adequately serve future development. It suggests that infrastructure is the biggest deterrent to economic development in the area due to the cost of its construction and maintenance. To help manage these costs and minimize public service expenses, the plan establishes as a goal that development be concentrated along major transportation corridors, where infrastructure is existing.

The master plan’s future land use map designates the area as light industrial. To support these uses, the plan recommends complementing access from I-80 with a road system that can handle a variety of vehicles, including large trucks. It states that new infrastructure not abutting existing infrastructure should be appropriately and reasonably sized to account for future development that may occur on the extension. The plan suggests that new streets be constructed as development occurs, with 7200 West and John Cannon Drive (860 North) as key streets to guide future local surface roads in a grid layout.
The citywide master plan, *Plan Salt Lake*, adopted in 2015, contains sections that align with the Northwest Quadrant vision. One of the guiding principles of that plan is to grow responsibly, which includes *minimizing our impact on the natural environment* by locating new development in areas with existing infrastructure and amenities. The plan also recommends prioritizing the maintenance of existing transportation infrastructure and supporting the growth of industrial areas in the city to promote a balanced local economy.

The City’s Major Street Plan, updated in 2018, proposes arterial streets that are spaced out creating large blocks in the area. The plan, which is part of the City’s *Transportation Master Plan*, does not propose future local streets in the city and makes no inclusion of any streets where the Maplewood Addition subdivision is located.

These adopted plans show that expectations for development in the area has changed since the Maplewood Subdivision Plat was approved. Cost of construction and maintenance of roads now undermine streets that are relatively close together and that might not serve the needs of new development. The plans support building infrastructure as development occurs to adequately respond to the demand.

The streets in the Maplewood Addition subdivision exist only on paper. They were never developed as an infrastructure system and does not currently support development in the area. These platted streets rather work as an impediment to the use of the surrounding land, because it prevents land from being a contiguous parcel and does not follow the pattern of development in the area. As recommended in the master plans, a more appropriate approach is to plat new roads as development occurs.

**Consideration 2: Lack of Connectivity**

![Aerial view showing that one the dedicated streets matches 6500 W (private access)](image)
The streets dedicated in the Maplewood Addition subdivision are isolated. Development in the area did not follow the street pattern the plat created, leaving the dedicated streets disconnected from a road network system. The construction of I-80 added to the issue by interrupting and even eliminating streets within the subdivision. The interstate cut through the streets running north-south and eliminated one of the three streets running east-west.

The street designated as Main Street in the subdivision currently matches an existing private road named 6500 W. A small section of this road is shown in the City’s Major Street Plan, however, nothing in that plan suggests that the road will be expanded as a public right of way. Instead, 6600 W is proposed as an arterial street to connect to the surrounding street network. It is important to note that the Transportation Department reviewed the proposal and found no issues with the street closure request and that any future development in the area will need to accommodate the construction of the arterial street as appropriate.

**DISCUSSION:**
The Maplewood Addition subdivision was recorded in 1911 when expectations of development in the area were different. The subdivision was likely platted for residential uses, which are no longer permitted in the district. In recent decades, the development pattern in the area has changed to larger industrial lots that can accommodate multiple buildings, larger structures and ample parking. This present scenario, coupled with the current lack of connectivity of the dedicated streets, puts in question the likelihood of these streets ever being developed as intended.

The public benefit of maintaining city ownership of these dedicated streets in its current situation is close to none, because they only exist on paper and therefore, do not serve a transportation or public purpose. That is especially relevant when considering that with the current development pattern, these “paper streets” have become obstacles to future development. Given the development potential, eliminating these dedicated streets could help fulfill the goals of applicable master plans.

**NEXT STEPS:**
After the Planning Commission reviews the request, their recommendation will be forwarded to the City Council for consideration. The City Council will make the final decision with respect to these requests.
ATTACHMENT A: VICINITY MAP

Streets proposed to be vacated
Street Closure

OFFICE USE ONLY

Received By: Chris Earl
Date Received: 6/25/2019
Project #: PNRM 2019-00567

Project Name:
Maplewood Addition Street Closure

PLEASE PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION

Name/Location of the Street: California; Nevada; Main; Montana; Colorado & Second Avenue in the Maplewood Addition

Name of Applicant:
Dominion Engineering Attn: Corbin Bennion
Phone: (801) 713-3000

Address of Applicant:
5684 S. Green Street, Murray, UT 84123

E-mail of Applicant:
corbin@dominioneng.net
Cell/Fax:
Fax (801) 713-3030

Applicant's Interest in Subject Property:

☐ Owner ☐ Contractor ☐ Architect ☑ Other: Engineer

Name of Property Owner abutting the street (if different from applicant):
State of Utah School & Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA)

E-mail of Property Owner:
therold@utah.gov
Phone: (801) 538-5170

► Please note that additional information may be required by the project planner to ensure adequate information is provided for staff analysis. All information required for staff analysis will be copied and made public, including professional architectural or engineering drawings, for the purposes of public review by any interested party.

AVAILABLE CONSULTATION

► Planners are available for consultation prior to submitting this application. Please call (801) 535-7700 if you have any questions regarding the requirements of this application.

WHERE TO FILE THE COMPLETE APPLICATION

Mailing Address: Planning Counter
PO Box 145471
Salt Lake City, UT 84114

In Person: Planning Counter
451 South State Street, Room 215
Telephone: (801) 535-7700

REQUIRED FEE

► Filing fee of $344.51, plus additional cost of postage for mailing notice.

SIGNATURE

► If applicable, a notarized statement of consent authorizing applicant to act as an agent will be required.

Signature of Owner or Agent: [Signature]
Date: 6/24/19
PETITION TO CLOSE A STREET

Name of Applicant: Dominion Engineering

Address of Applicant: 5684 S. Green Street, Murray, UT 84123

Date: June 5, 2019

As an owner of property adjacent to the street, I agree to the proposed street closure. I also understand that I have the option to purchase the portion of the street adjacent to my property at fair market value.

SITLA 675 E 500 S, Suite 500, SLC UT 6/14/19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Print Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16
June 5, 2019

DESCRIPTION OF STREETS TO BE VACATED

All Streets within the Maplewood Addition to Salt Lake City recorded in Book "F" of Plats at Page 70 in the Office of the Salt Lake County Recorder and lying north of Interstate 80, U.D.O.T. Project No. I-80-3(12)105 and located in the Southeast Quarter of Section 34 and the Southwest Quarter of Section 35, Township 1 North, Range 2 West, Salt Lake Base and Meridian, Salt Lake City, Salt Lake County, Utah, more particularly described as follows:

BEGINNING at the Northwest corner of Block 18 of said Maplewood Addition, which is 1320.44 feet North 00°04'33" East and 134.74 feet North 89°58'29" East from the Southeast corner of said Section 34, and running thence South 00°03'37" West 122.05 feet; thence North 89°58'24" East 124.97 feet to the East line of said Maplewood Subdivision; thence South 00°03'44" West 66.00 feet along said East line; thence South 89°58'24" West 124.96 feet; thence South 0°03'37" West 197.84 feet to the Northerly Right-of-Way line of said Interstate I-80; thence South 86°03'41" West 66.16 feet along said Interstate I-80; thence North 00°03'37" East 202.35 feet thence South 89°58'24" West 249.98 feet; thence South 00°03'22" West 270.69 feet to the Northerly line of said Interstate I-80; thence South 89°58'06" West 66.00 feet along said Interstate I-80; thence North 00°03'22" East 270.69 feet; thence South 89°58'24" West 249.98 feet; thence South 00°03'07" West 270.72 feet to the Northerly line of said Interstate I-80; thence South 89°58'06" West 66.00 feet along said Interstate I-80; thence North 00°03'22" East 270.72 feet; thence South 89°58'24" West 249.98 feet; thence South 00°02'52" West 270.74 feet to the Northerly line of said Interstate I-80; thence South 89°58'06" West 66.00 feet along said Interstate I-80; thence North 00°02'52" East 270.75 feet; thence South 89°58'24" West 249.98 feet thence South 00°02'37" West 270.77 feet to the Northerly line of said Interstate I-80; thence South 89°58'06" West 66.00 feet along said Interstate I-80; thence North 00°02'37" East 270.78 feet; thence South 89°58'24" West 124.99 feet to the West line of said Maplewood Subdivision; thence North 00°02'29" East 66.00 feet along said West line; thence North 89°58'24" East 124.99 feet; thence North 00°02'37" East 122.03 feet to the North line of said Maplewood Subdivision; thence North 89°58'21" East 66.00 feet along said North line; thence South 00°02'37" West 122.03 feet; thence North 89°58'24" East 249.98 feet; thence North 00°02'52" East 122.04 feet to the North line of said Maplewood Subdivision; thence North 89°58'21" East 66.00 feet along said North line; thence South 00°02'52" West 122.04 feet to the North line of said Maplewood Subdivision; thence North 89°58'21" East 66.00 feet along said North line; thence South 00°03'07" West 249.98 feet; thence North 00°03'22" East 122.04 feet to the North line of said Maplewood Subdivision; thence North 89°58'21" East 66.00 feet along said North line; thence South 00°03'22" West 122.05 feet along said East line; thence North 89°58'24" East 249.98 feet; thence North 00°03'37" East 122.05 feet to the North line of said Maplewood Subdivision; thence North 89°58'21" East 66.00 feet along said North line to the POINT OF BEGINNING.

Containing 5.26 acres, more or less.
Title: MAPLEWOOD ADDITION - STREET VACATION DESCRIPTION  
Date: 06-05-2019

Scale: 1 inch = 200 feet  
File:

| Tract 1: | 5.263 Acres: 229235 Sq Feet: Closure = n47.3451e 0.02 Feet: Precision =1/402283: Perimeter = 7078 Feet |  |
| Tract 1: | 001=s00.0337w 122.05 | 016=s89.5824w 249.98 |
| Tract 1: | 002=n89.5824e 124.97 | 017=s00.0252w 270.74 |
| Tract 1: | 003=s00.0344w 66.00 | 018=s89.5806w 66.00 |
| Tract 1: | 004=s89.5824w 124.96 | 019=n00.0252e 270.75 |
| Tract 1: | 005=s00.0337w 197.84 | 020=s89.5824w 249.98 |
| Tract 1: | 006=s86.0341w 66.16 | 021=s00.0237w 270.77 |
| Tract 1: | 007=n00.0337e 202.35 | 022=s89.5806w 66.00 |
| Tract 1: | 008=n89.5824w 249.98 | 023=n00.0237e 270.78 |
| Tract 1: | 009=s00.0322w 270.69 | 024=s89.5824w 124.99 |
| Tract 1: | 010=n89.5806w 66.00 | 025=n00.0229e 66.00 |
| Tract 1: | 011=n00.0322e 270.69 | 026=n89.5824e 124.99 |
| Tract 1: | 012=n89.5824w 249.98 | 027=n00.0237e 122.03 |
| Tract 1: | 013=s00.0307w 270.72 | 028=n89.5821e 66.00 |
| Tract 1: | 014=s89.5806w 66.00 | 029=s00.0237w 122.03 |
| Tract 1: | 015=n00.0307e 270.72 | 030=n89.5824e 249.98 |
Preliminary Subdivision Plat

☐ New Lots  ☑ Amendment

OFFICE USE ONLY

Project #: PLNSUB2019-00755  Received By: ML  Date Received: 8/13/19  Zoning: M-1

Proposed Subdivision Name:

NT Redevelopment

PLEASE PROVIDE THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION

Property Address(s):

6780 W. N. Temple Frontage Road

Name of Applicant: Corbin Bennion - Dominion Engineering  Phone: 801-713-3000

Address of Applicant:

5684 So. Green Street  Murray, Utah  84123

E-mail of Applicant: corbin@dominioneng.net  Cell/Fax: 801-450-0604

Applicant's Interest in Subject Property:

☐ Owner  ☑ Engineer  ☐ Architect  ☐ Other:

Name of Property Owner (if different from applicant):

School & Institutional Trust Lands Adm. (SITLA)

E-mail of Property Owner: therold@utah.gov  Phone: 801-538-5170

\ Please note that additional information may be required by the project planner to ensure adequate information is provided for staff analysis. All information required for staff analysis will be copied and made public, including professional architectural or engineering drawings, for the purposes of public review by any interested party.

WHERE TO FILE THE COMPLETE APPLICATION

Mailing Address: Planning Counter
PO Box 145471
Salt Lake City, UT 84114

In Person: Planning Counter
451 South State Street, Room 215
Telephone: (801) 535-7700

REQUIRED FEE

\ Filing fee of $388 plus $121 for each new lot created.
\ Plus additional fee for required public notices

SIGNATURE

\ If applicable, a notarized statement of consent authorizing applicant to act as an agent will be required.

Signature of Owner or Agent:  Date: 8/12/19

Updated 7/1/19
ATTACHMENT E: ANALYSIS OF STANDARDS – STREET CLOSURE

In 1999, the City Council adopted a street closure policy that includes the following provisions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It is the policy of the City Council to close public streets and sell the underlying property. The Council does not close streets when the action would deny all access to other property.</td>
<td>The streets only exist on paper. Thus, they do not provide access to adjacent private property and do not serve a broader connectivity function. The land adjacent to the streets are owned by SITLA, which is willing to buy that land if the closure is approved by the City Council.</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The general policy when closing a street is to obtain fair market value for the land, whether the abutting property is residential, commercial or industrial.</td>
<td>The adjacent property owner initiated this petition to obtain the vacated streets and to incorporate into his parcel. The applicant is willing to pay fair market value for the land.</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There should be sufficient public policy reasons that justify the sale and/or closure of a public street and it should be sufficiently demonstrated by the applicant that the sale and/or closure of the street will accomplish the stated public policy reasons.</td>
<td>Adopted master plans take into consideration the development pattern and the cost of building and maintaining infrastructure in the area. These plans propose minimizing impact in the environment while supporting new industrial development. To do so, the plans recommend using existing infrastructure and building new infrastructure as development occurs. As discussed in the Key Consideration of this staff report, the streets in Maplewood Addition Subdivision are disconnected from the existing road network system and do not reflect the current development pattern of the area.</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The City Council should determine whether the stated public policy reasons outweigh alternatives to the closure of the street.</td>
<td>The alternative to this request is to maintain the property as it currently exists. However, there is no public benefit in maintaining city ownership of these dedicated streets because they do not serve a transportation or public purpose. Eliminating these streets could allow for development to occur on the consolidated property and help achieve city goals.</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT F: ANALYSIS OF STANDARDS – SUBDIVISION AMENDMENT

**20.16.100: Standards of Approval for Preliminary Plats**

All preliminary plats for subdivisions and subdivision amendments shall meet the following standards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. The subdivision complies with the general design standards and requirements for subdivisions as established in chapter 20.12 of this title;</td>
<td>The subject property complies and conforms to the design standards and requirements as set forth in Section 20.12 of the Salt Lake City Code. Staff forwarded the proposed plat to other city departments for review. Another review will be done to the final plat, which will need to comply with all other department requirements.</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. All buildable lots comply with all applicable zoning standards;</td>
<td>The vacated streets will be consolidated into the adjacent parcel in the subdivision plat and will comply with the minimum lot width required in the M-1 zoning district.</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. All necessary and required dedications are made;</td>
<td>The subject property does not require dedications to be made.</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Water supply and sewage disposal shall be satisfactory to the public utilities department director;</td>
<td>No water or sewage is being proposed for the properties at this time. Any future improvements will need to comply with Public Utilities requirements, and the final plat will require approval from the public utilities department director.</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Provisions for the construction of any required public improvements, per section 20.40.010 of this title, are included;</td>
<td>No public improvements have been proposed or required in connection with the preliminary subdivision plat.</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. The subdivision otherwise complies with all applicable laws and regulations;</td>
<td>The proposed subdivision amendment complies with all other applicable laws and regulations.</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. If the proposal is an amendment to an existing subdivision and involves vacating a street, right of way, or</td>
<td>As discussed in the staff report, the dedicated streets serve no transportation or public purpose. The streets are on paper only and do not provide access to adjacent properties. Therefore, the</td>
<td>Complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easement, the amendment does not materially injure the public or any person who owns land within the subdivision or immediately adjacent to it and there is good cause for the amendment.</td>
<td>subdivision amendment to close the streets will not have any negative impact to the adjacent property owner and general public.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following is a list of public meetings that have been held, and other public input opportunities, related to this project:

**Public Notices:**

- Notice of the project and request for comments sent to the Chairs of the Jordan Meadows and Poplar Grove Community Councils on July 8, 2019 in order to solicit comments. No comments were received.

- Open House notice was mailed on July 9, 2019.

- Open House was held at the City & County Building on July 18, 2019. Staff did not receive any comments at the meeting.

**Public Hearing Notice:**


- Public hearing notice posted on City and State websites on February 28, 2020.

- Sign posted on the property on February 27, 2020.

**Public Comments:**

- At the time of the publication of this staff report, no public comment was received. Any comments received after the publication of this staff report will be forwarded to the Commission.
Public Utilities – Jason Draper

- The North Temple Drainage needs to be shown on the plat.
- Water and sewer service will need to be extended to service any development of this property.
- There may be soil or groundwater contamination on this property.
- Contribution to storm drain improvements will be required for any building permit or development.

Transportation, Engineering, Building, Zoning, Fire and Police found no issues with the requests.

Real Estate Services and Sustainability did not provide comments.
To: Mayor Erin Mendenhall  
Cc: SLC Council  
Re: Maplewood Addition subdivision streets

April 17, 2020

The League of Women Voters of Salt Lake believes it is important that Salt Lake City retain control of the Maplewood Addition subdivision streets. In that case, the citizens of Salt Lake City would have some control over what is allowed on the former city landfill and how the site is mitigated.

We are asking you to reconsider acquiescing to the State Institutional Trust Land’s (SITLA’s) request for the street closure on the southeastern edge of the landfill property bordering on Highway I-20 until all the concerns of the public, and the League have been resolved.

The League has long advocated for the protection of the Great Salt Lake because of its unique place in the environment of Utah and to the ecological system of the Northern Hemisphere and our planet. In addition, we also advocate for a safe environment for humans because we have studied the effects of human and industrial waste and understand the complexity and expense of remediation of toxic landfills. Therefore, we have these two concerns.

First is SITLA’s relationship to planning and zoning constraints. Although League members have tried diligently to follow planning for the proposed Utah Inland Port, we are aware that our understanding is limited. However, we do know the following: SITLA holdings are lands of the State of Utah and therefore not subject to local planning and zoning. Perhaps in contradiction, there is some precedent to believe land SITLA sells to another entity might then be subject to local control. But would leasing be a way to avoid city zoning ordinances?

The League suggests that Salt Lake City retain control until all uncertainties around SITLA’s powers, intentions, and responsibilities to Salt Lake City planning and zoning are clarified.
We are also alarmed by the uncertainty and lack of information about the state of the Salt Lake City landfill. We have studied the many forms of pollution that beset our civilization and are only too aware of the difficulties of containing the poisons in landfills and how they might, or might not, be reclaimable.

For all of the above reasons and because of our core belief that the citizen must clearly understand and be a party to all government action, we strongly urge Salt Lake City to employ any appropriate legal means it can for the city and its citizens to understand the project proposed for this publicly owned land. Thus, the city should retain any negotiating power it might have.

Respectfully,

Kathy Biele, LWVSL President

*For the League of Women Voters of Salt Lake*
Dear Mayor Mendenhall,

On March 11, the Salt Lake City Planning Commission met to review the State Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA) request to close streets planned, but not yet developed, in the Maplewood Addition subdivision (on the south eastern edge of their North Temple landfill property). Despite very short notice of this agenda item, several citizens spoke in opposition to the request. Nevertheless, the Commission voted to forward the request with their approval stating that citizens’ concerns would be better addressed by the City Council. We urge you to delay submitting the SITLA request to the City Council until the City has additional information regarding the proposal.

We have many questions and concerns, and the fact that SITLA needs the City to approve the street closure before they can proceed gives Salt Lake City the opportunity to acquire information on behalf of all concerned about this project. SITLA needs to explain how it intends to develop the property. SITLA needs to be transparent and accountable regarding these plans. This is best accomplished with a thoughtful community dialogue rather than a constrained public hearing that tends to exacerbate differences rather than resolve problems and build trust. Salt Lake City residents have a right to know what will happen on publicly owned land.

For example, we are all aware that this un-remediated landfill poses special development challenges. The City needs detailed responses to citizens’ concerns regarding remediation and whether those plans follow best practices for contaminated materials. Efforts now can enable the City to prevent costly problems in the future.

After SITLA acquired the North Temple property in January 2018 from Suburban Land Reserve (a for-profit subsidiary of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints), they publicly discussed turning it into a truck-to-rail intermodal facility for the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) railroad. One iteration of this concept was to simply pour tons of concrete on top the old landfill and not fully remediate it. This is deeply concerning, as the contamination from the landfill would persist and we would be subject to the additional pollution created by a second railyard (in addition to the facility already owned and operated by Union Pacific).

An alternative development plan has also been discussed. This plan calls for phased remediation moving east to west, with development occurring as each section is remediated. This may be the better plan. However, we need to understand how and where toxic materials will be
disposed. One suggested location is the Promontory Point landfill. This would be disastrous as that landfill is only 500 feet from Great Salt Lake and built on heavily fractured soil.

We know that you are committed to a sustainable, healthy future for Salt Lake City and we look forward to working with you to get answers to these important questions about SITLA’s development plans. Thank you for all you do.

Sincerely,

The Utah Audubon Council
Utah Physicians for a Healthy Environment
The Center for Biological Diversity
Utah Tar Sands Resistance
SLC Air Protectors
Elders Rising
Environmental Caucus
Westside Coalition
Salt Lake Education Association
Wasatch Clean Air Coalition
Heather Dorrell
David Scheer
Lionel Trepanier
Samantha Stott
Tena Rohr
Katie Pappas
Larry Dean
Alex Taft
John Gleave
Rebecca Burrage
Liam O’Donnell

Cc: Rachel Otto
    Nick Norris
    Mayara Lima
    Salt Lake City Council
    Cindy Gust-Jenson
Dear Mayor Mendenhall,

First, I’d like to thank you for your exemplary leadership during this pandemic. You have led our city with great confidence and your stalwart yet kind demeanor has been amazing.

Although this is not as dangerous and life altering as our current pandemic, the topic of this letter revolves around the SITLA development for the Maplewood subdivision occurring within the bounds of Jordan Meadows here on the West Side of Salt Lake City. SITLA is wishing to make some developments to a series of “paper streets” that were mapped out but never finalized back at the beginning of the last century. This began long before I became the Council Chair and was recently brought to my attention by citizens of the community who have concerns. I hold no personal stake in this but would like to have the voice of those in my community heard.

In reading the proposal from SITLA, they did not address what exactly they will be doing with the land so it is difficult to ascertain whether or not it will actually have impact on the citizens of our region of Salt Lake City and the overall West Side of the city. I have heard concerns about this development and I feel the voice of the people deserve to be heard, as that did not happen and has not up until this point. I cannot find any communique to Jordan Meadows’ previous Chair to notify her about any decision making and get her or the Council’s feedback in 2019.

Concerns about this proposal I have heard extend to the statement in the proposal that “there is soil or groundwater contamination on this property” and, since it is relatively close to a landfill, how that might affect the communities and the overall health of the surrounding land. We would like notification about ecologic scientists’ involvement to ensure this proposal is as safe as possible before making it to an execution phase.

For this reason I have been asked to reach out to you and your administration to request that this proposal be stalled from being presented to the Salt Lake Council so more discussion and preparation can be made to not only better gauge public opinion, but to also ensure it is as environmentally safe as possible, should it be cleared at that stage.

Once again, thank you very much for all you do for our city. I am thankful for your leadership and hope we can have your help so the concerns of citizens of Jordan Meadows and the West Side of Salt Lake City can be alleviated around the SITLA proposal for the Maplewood subdivision.

Sincerely,

Joseph B.V. Arrington, Chair of Jordan Meadows Council
April 30, 2020

The Honorable Erin Mendenhall
Office of the Mayor
451 South State Street, Room 306
Salt Lake City, UT 84114
Via email

Subject: Community Engagement Concerns: SITLA Street Closing Request

Dear Mayor Mendenhall,

As you are well aware, we are living in difficult and uncertain times. Such circumstances not only create great pain and hardship but also bring new clarity and urgency to long-festering concerns and problems. As such, we particularly appreciated your leadership in organizing the recent Equity Roundtable to begin discussions on the disproportionate impact the pandemic is having on Westside neighborhoods. As you have stated, the roundtable is just the start of an important and overdue effort and we look forward to increasing future interactions.

The pandemic also emphasizes the critical role that local government and community action and engagement can play in addressing and resolving issues. While our current focus is necessarily on issues of public and economic health, we want to call attention to other issues that we need to collectively address – in particular, the ongoing civic and environmental health of our communities. This issue has recently been obscured in the seemingly routine issue of closing “streets” on the SITLA property located on the edge of the old North Temple landfill.

You may have already received letters from the Jordan Meadows Community Council, the League of Women Voters, and several environmental and public health advocates expressing their concerns regarding this proposal. As a coalition of Westside community organizations and leaders, we agree with and support the broad range of issues they have addressed. But, there is more…

The erosion of civic health begins gradually and escalates quickly until the damage cannot be undone. It begins with inattention, carelessness, and information inequality. The result is an undermining of public interest and a prioritization of special interests that soon becomes the “norm.” In the case of the SITLA proposal, that “erosion of engagement” is taking place as follows:

- The initial notice of the requested street closure and the resulting Open House was scheduled in 2019 during the week between two major summer holidays (July 4th and July 24th) making it very difficult for the public to comment. Furthermore, notice requirements limited mailing to property owners with vested interests and did not include community residents potentially impacted, including community council leadership which has always been customary. As a result, no public comments were submitted.
• Despite the unique opportunity for the city to have an impact on this highly controversial development, only one city department commented. While Public Works warned that there “may be soil or groundwater contamination on this property.” The Department of Sustainability did not comment and no one else followed up on the prospective community health issue identified by Public Works.

• The staff analysis of the applicable standards reflected a very narrow and cursory review of the evaluation criteria. Such standards specifically require that the subdivision amendment provide “reasons” which are “sufficiently demonstrated by the applicant… (that) closure of the street does not materially injure the public…“and that the street closure(s) have “sufficient public policy and will accomplish the stated public policy reasons.” The analysis provided to the planning commission took the position that since the applicant had not provided detailed information there was no evidence that such plans did not comply with standards. This is an error of omission and further investigation would likely reveal that it did not and does not comply with standards.

• The Planning and Zoning Commission meeting on the proposal was not scheduled until March 11, 2020 – nine months after the initial notice. Only after a commissioner, who was aware of past controversies, inquired about the lack of public discussion were a few people informed of the upcoming meeting.

• Planning and Zoning Commission procedures grant the host community council priority in addressing proposed zoning changes in their area. However, in this case not only was the host council not aware of the meeting, but neither were any of the other five other west-side community councils. No community council or Westside Coalition members were made aware and therefore did not attend the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting in which this proposal was voted on.

In closing, we respectfully urge that the issue of street closings requested by SITLA be put on hold until all community concerns can be addressed and resolved. Further, given the isolated circumstances in which we find ourselves, we ask for a refocusing of effort to inform our communities and in soliciting their input on issues impacting their health, safety and quality of life. Thank you and stay safe.

Sincerely,

Richard Holman, Chair
Westside Coalition
May 18, 2020

Via Electronic Mail (mayara.lima@slcgov.com)
Mayara Lima, Principal Planner
Salt Lake City Corporation
451 South State Street, Room 406
Salt Lake City, UT 84101

Subject: PLNPCM2019-00567 – Maplewood Addition Street Closure
        PLNSUB2019-00755 – NT Redevelopment Subdivision Amendment

Dear Ms. Lima,

On behalf of the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”), I write with respect the State of Utah School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (“SITLA”) request to Salt Lake City to close the streets of the Maplewood Subdivision and amend the subdivision to incorporate it into the adjacent parcel. As you are aware, UDOT owns the right-of-way for Interstate 80, which abuts the area that is the subject of SITLA’s request to the south. As you are also aware, Interstate 80 is a no-access facility, and UDOT has several projects in and around this area in various stages of the design and approval process. We have been in regular contact with SITLA with respect to UDOT’s plans in and around this area, including an interchange planned as part of a future phase of Mountain View Corridor, and we look forward to working with them and Salt Lake City in the future as this UDOT project moves forward.

Assuming that the requests of SITLA do not impact the right-of-way (“R/W”) and no-access (“N/A”) lines that UDOT has in place, UDOT has no objection to the requests of SITLA with respect to the items before the Planning Commission. We would request that any subdivision amendment that is approved include specific reference to UDOT’s R/W and N/A lines to ensure that there is no confusion regarding their existence. We also note that UDOT reserves its statutory and regulatory powers with respect to the control of access on Interstate 80 and other nearby state routes.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you need additional information from UDOT regarding the above referenced requests of SITLA. My email address is castormont@utah.gov, and my direct phone line is 385.226.8948.

Very truly yours,

Charles A. Stormont
Director, Right of Way and Property Management