

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
12/14/2022 8:59	Tawnya Crumb	FW: (EXTERNAL) NO TO REZONING 233 CHICAGO ST	I am a residence at REDACTED. And do not want townhouses built right next to me. As it is now the garbage man and recycle man have to pull down the street an back out turn around and back back down for the other side. There is no way a firetruck can get down here and turn around... I like the neighbors I have and do not want the Hassel of new construction right next door. I like living on a dead-end street. Less traffic and safer.
12/14/2022 9:01	Harris Sondak	FW: (EXTERNAL) FW: Virginia Street Reconstruction 2024	Hello, I live at REDACTED. I am writing to provide feedback on the Virginia Stree reconstruction plan. There are many aspects of the reconstruction that I support: Fine to move the bus stop to 3rd Ave; great to add sidewalks and a bike lane. Thank you. A couple of concerns: 1. The crosswalk at 2nd Ave is completely ignored by most drivers, in part perhaps because of the jog in the road to the south. There must be some kind of notification to drivers that crosswalks will be encountered and yielding to pedestrians is required and enforced. 2. If parking is decreased on Virginia – which is fine with me – I strongly request expansion of the residential parking zone with time restrictions that exists on 1st Ave and on the streets east of Virginia. That zone should be expanded to include the block on 2nd Ave between U and Virginia; you should consider expanding it all the way to 3rd Ave between U and Virginia. We already have U of U patrons parking in front of our house most days and this plan is likely to increase that demand. 3. There is much heavy traffic on Virginia (I think there perhaps should be a weight limit added to this plan) and the trucks especially (but not only) are rather noisy. One of the proposed speed cushions is right outside my home office and I am guessing that speed cushions increase the noise level. I am hoping a better solution can be found (perhaps like radar speed notification like on S. Temple). Sincerely, Harris Sondak
12/14/2022 14:53	Matthew Coles	RE: (EXTERNAL) Option 2 for 2100 South - D/7	Hi, As a long-time Sugar House resident who has always thought 2100 South could be better designed, I strongly urge you to go with Option 2. I have driven, biked or walked that street hundreds of times but never used it to commute to or from work downtown. I like the pedestrian-only sidewalk and bike-specific lane, as well as the center turn lane. Though I am not looking forward to upcoming construction, I appreciate your taking the long view and making a better street for all of us well into the future. Best, Matthew Coles

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
12/14/2022 15:39	Ross Goldstein 1/2	Taxi RFP Questions	<p>This email is being forwarded to all interested parties Pertaining to the Salt Lake City international airport and the RFP for on-demand taxi rides at the Salt Lake City international airport part of the Salt Lake city, government and contracts As you all are aware, of the airport Salt Lake City international airport has entered a government contract with the taxi cab company, yellow cab to operate as the sole operator for on-demand rides and ground transportation at the Salt Lake City airport. In the attached email, you will find where it has been brought to the attention of the ground transportation office that the company, yellow cab who holds the sole contract for on demand transportation at the Salt Lake City international airport is not in compliance of contract And when this matter was brought to the attention of Mr. Kristian Wade, he simply replied any action taken by a ground, transportation operator to gather evidence to gather evidence to the lack of compliance, will not will not be tolerated In my humble opinion I feel that this would be in violation of the whistleblower act which which protects an individual from retaliation of coming forward in matters of this nature In all honesty, I feel that the most recent reply by Kristian Wade, manager management of Salt Lake city ground. Transportation division is retaliating, because when it was pointed out to him that there are vehicles that have been specifically passed with ground, transportation, vehicle inspections with the new ground transportation, green sticker that goes on the back for the taxis cabs that are approved. And verified as being compliant are not in compliance, and this has been pointed out pointed out to him Mr. Wade specifically going back to one of the earlier emails where it was pointed out to him yellow cab 22 was a 2013 model Ford Explorer, which had been decaled specifically with the new green sticker that is only for taxicab on demand, compliant vehicles, and in his own words in an email dated on December 9 he said that was an oversight due to it being there at the same time as another vehicle that was being decals with the new green ground transportation sticker for taxi cabs that are compliant and then right after he mentioned, and in his own words,</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
12/14/2022 15:39	Ross Goldstein 2/2	CONTINUED! Taxi RFP Questions	<p>said it was an oversight once it was then brought to his attention that there are several other vehicles that have been decaled with that sticker that is only for compliant vehicles that he is now retaliating against that because he has been confronted with why is ground transportation issuing these new decals on vehicles that are nowhere near compliance due to some vehicles being anywhere from 6 to 15 years of age there is only one vehicle that I have found and that multiple other people have found that is within at least the age requirement of five years or newer, and as soon as this was brought to his attention, he replies defensively, and in what I feel a threatening manner telling us that we should not be gathering any sort of evidence that yellow cab is in violation of of the contract that they have Which leads to the question of? Why there are vehicles such as 2007 crown Victoria's decaled with the new green sticker for taxi cabs that is just one example, so in his own words, the vehicle that he told me slipped through because another vehicle was there being decals at the same time and then when we notify him about all the other vehicles which slipped through the inspection process, then he replies very defensively, and in a manner that guy and other drivers fuel is threatening, and now we possibly have to worry about retaliation from Mr. Wade Because we are not just speaking about one or two or three vehicles, it slipped through we're talking about almost every vehicle that I have seen, and that other people have seen and documented out of the vehicles that we have documented so far only one vehicle qualifies by the age of the vehicle to be in compliance with vehicle age in the contract that's not saying there are not other vehicles that qualify that is just saying that that the only vehicle that we have found that qualifies under the age restriction is a 2018 Nissan rogue every other vehicle that we have identified with green stickers on them do not even come close to qualifying under the age requirement. So at this time I am asking You who would be the proper individual that I should be addressing my concerns to for a fair on retaliated evaluation and or investigation Thank you very much. I appreciate all of your time.</p> <p>And look forward to your reply. Ross Goldstein</p>
12/14/2022 15:42	Whitney McCarthy	Fleet Block Rezone - A plea for greenspace	<p>Hello SLC Councilmembers, I live one block from the fleet block and fully support the rezone of the property--if it can guarantee the green space currently in the plan. Our neighborhood is in dire need of green space. The best block to walk by my house is around Mark Miller Toyota because the sidewalks are cleared, they have green parkstrips for dogs, and their lighting means I feel safe walking at night. It's pretty sad when the best walking is around a car dealership. It would be wonderful to have the park currently slated for the NE corner of the Fleet Block, across from Fisher Brewing. Thank you for thinking of our neighbor's walkability, safety, and community as you make these zoning decisions. Sincerely, Whitney McCarthy</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
12/16/2022 10:33	Elin Bertheau	Saying NO TO A REZONE OF 233 Chicago	<p>Hello and good morning, I am reaching out to express my concerns with this attempt to rezone this lot. Here are some reasons why this area should not be rezoned. Street congestion and overcrowding Environmental study for property as the owner has documented chemical incineration / disposal on this property Health study for noise pollution, light pollution, odor pollution Many commercial vehicles have been stored on this property Purchased resources study for fuel, groceries as out resources are already stretched thin in this area Impact study on current public utilities including but not limited to, wastewater and sewage, power, natural gas, water pressure Study on road and pedestrian traffic down the already stressed road. How are large vehicles supposed to turn around as they can not already. Are the plans going to provide access to turn around? Emergency exit strategy for hazards like fire, earthquake, etc. What is the plan for the current house and large garage on this property? Is this a bait and switch to add more townhomes? Quality of life study as there are elderly residents in this area currently Impact on the several neighbors that boarder this tenant I could go on. This is clearly a push for gentrification and is creating numerous stresses throughout our already burdened neighborhood. There are several apartments already existing and planned for our neighborhood all within a few block radius. I say, absolutely NO for a rezone as my family and neighbors are directly impacted by this money grab. This will not, in any way, relieve the housing issues. Thank you for your time Sincerely, Elin Bertheau</p>
12/16/2022 10:44	Jeannine Gregoire	The motion you made Tuesday evening...regarding Ivory Homes rezone request/i.e., retaining walls...	<p>Hi Chris, I sat next to POAZ Peter Wright and Jan McKinnon, in the front row at last Tuesday evenings City Council Meeting. In my opinion, your thoughtful, measured, well constructed request for more stringent security surrounding the retaining walls Ivory intends to build, was delivered with clarity and professionalism. In my opinion, the votes against your motion, do indeed, seem to fall under Peter Wright's coined term, "resentment politics." As far as I can tell, Council members Puy, Mano, nor Petro-Eschler can identify as engineers with the necessary knowledge to be able to vote against your motion of demonstrated concern for safety. I would like to thankyou for crafting and delivering the motion at that meeting in an effort, not only to respect the wishes of your Avenues Constituency, but to also address the safety and well-being of the future residents; if indeed this project is completely green-lighted. I continue to wonder what the verdict might have been had the absent Council Member Ana Valdemoros, been in her chair, instead of missing from a second, critical, monthly City Council Meeting. Sincerely, Jeannine Gregoire</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
12/16/2022 13:00	Ira Hinckley	Fleet Block Murals	Hi Darin, Regarding recent discussions over the murals in your district: My request for the fleet block mural graffiti is that they are torn down and placed in the dump where they belong. How would you feel driving by this shameful display, if you were the victim of one of these criminals and now they were being celebrated and honored with attention. What a slap in the face! This uninvited graffiti is also a slap in the face to our hard working, dedicated Law Enforcement Officers who see that this city places more value on criminals than the trauma they endure while protecting our city. It needs to go. Now. > Regards, > Ira Hinckley > Resident
12/19/2022 16:08	Patsy O. Johnson	Rezone and Master Plan Amendment at 675 North F Street	Dear SLC Council, The overwhelming opposition by the Avenues community to this development has not been honored by the SLC Council. Our streets will not accommodate this development. Sincerely, Ramon and Patsy Johnson
12/19/2022 16:11	Cheryl Cook	Rezone and Master Plan Amendment at 675 North F Street	I just want to thank the Mayor and Salt Lake City Council for totally ignoring the citizens they purport to represent. The only thing which seems to matter to you is the business community making more money. The rezone you approved will not provide low cost housing or in any way add to the diversity of the City. Thanks for nothing and not listening to the people. Cheryl Cook
12/19/2022 16:12	Carolyn R Chase	Rezone and Master Plan Amendment at 675 North F Street	Thank you for the update. Certainly extremely disappointing. Thanks, Carolyn
12/19/2022 16:13	Rodrigo Schmeil	Rezone and Master Plan Amendment at 675 North F Street	Thank you for letting us all know that the ONLY thing that matters is MONEY, the city council does not care at ALL about what the residents, people who actually live in the area think and want. As long as the developer has money, and influence, they will get what they want. Way to go SLC city council!
12/19/2022 16:15	Julie Sanders	Rezone and Master Plan Amendment at 675 North F Street	Dear Council, I am disappointed that you chose to pass this rezone request. I strongly feel that Salt Lake City Avenues does not have the infrastructure to support this endeavor. Once again the cart is before the horse. I do not understand your logic. This is NOT in my opinion a good long term plan and you the council have set into play future issues in terms of zoning, water, streets, green space etc. Based on this decision and the one you made down the street from me on Tomahawk, I have lost all faith in the council to listen to the people. Julie Sanders
12/19/2022 16:17	David Tanner	Rezone and Master Plan Amendment at 675 North F Street	This is as expected Developers win again and the residents loose. The base facts are distorted and the council caves in. I am still stunned by the term cottages. Million dollar housed ar not cottages. Where do you propose all the care will park. Are the roads in and out private or city. Is the development in a P.U.D. No matter Ivory got what they wanted. They walk away and leave the neighborhood with the mess to live with.

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
12/19/2022 16:20	Sierra Fledermaus	Rezzone and Master Plan Amendment at 675 North F Street	Of course, you approved the development despite having historic low water levels, we already have limited parking available, there's already too much traffic on F. Street, and being one of the oldest neighborhoods in the valley that is already fully developed you go ahead and proceed against all the neighbors' wishes. In the past 25 years, the population has just about tripled in one of the driest States in the U.S. It's irresponsible and illogical! Your commission should pay the neighborhood's increased utility and service costs, as well as how to manage traffic and parking in the area. There's no way to repair the historic beauty taken away by constant development. My neighbors and I can't help but feel that when your last name is Ivory, all doors open for you and none of the neighbors' concerns are valid. We live here and are more than disappointed. You are chiseling away at the charm and the view in the Avenues the reason we all chose to live here.
12/21/2022 12:19	Megan O'Brien	(EXTERNAL) Northpoint Small Area Plan - Support Letter	Good morning Krissy and Victoria, Attached is a support letter for the NPSAP from Dan Rubenstein for your records (NPSA AG land resident). Thanks, Megan
12/21/2022 13:53	Rose-marie Walton	Rezzone and Master Plan Amendment at 675 North F Street	Well, that's very disappointing. The community has made it very clear that we don't want this change and there is good reason to think it will negatively impact the safety of the neighborhood.
12/21/2022 13:54	Golden Hatch	Accessory dwelling units	Hi this message is for all of the city council members, I just wanted to ask you to please move forward with approving the changes to the regulations in regards to accessory dwelling units in Salt Lake City my intention is to build an ADU either way but if the new guidelines are approved, I would have the option to build a much nicer accessory dwelling unit so until your decision is made I am just in a holding pattern not able to move forward. Salt Lake obviously needs more housing so I believe it's a win win for everyone.
12/23/2022 12:48	Faith RITTER	Old Trailer at 375, 379 & 385 N Virginia Street 84103	To whom this may concern: There is an old trailer truck with garbage cans & tarps hanging off the rear of the trailer that does not belong to any of the neighbors. It has been parked at 375, 379 & 385 Virginia Street 84103 for the last 2 years or kore. The neighbors & I have made several complaints to various persons of the City & we have all been told that we are on "a waiting list" but we are going into yet another year, 2023, and still nothing has been done to get this trailer truck removed. There are people living in the trailer & it moves forward & backward 10-20 feet every now & then. We do not know where they are disposing all of their waste but they are most likely dumping it at Popperton Park across the street. Kindly let us know who the correct person we should be addressing this to to get this job done once & for all. We are all paying high property tax in this area and this eyesore is not worth the property tax we are all paying. Someone we voted for needs to do something about this. This ignoring of our voices is NOT acceptable. Kindly call Faith at REDACTED & let us know what can be done. Sincerely, Pedro, Agapita Raneses Faith & David Ritter Alma Cherie Flandro David Kranes

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
12/27/2022 15:02	Nathan Marshak	2100 south reconstruction concepts: 3-lanes with bikeway please!	<p>Greetings from Nathan! I am an SLC resident who travels to Sugar House in order to shop and use the post office. It appears that there are two options being considered for a 2100 South reconstruction. Option 1 is four car lanes and a shared use path for pedestrians/cyclists. Option 2 is three car lanes (including one turning lane) and a dedicated bicycle lane. As a pedestrian and cyclist, I would feel safer with option 2. A street with fewer lanes is safer to cross, and I'd also be less worried about collisions between pedestrians and cyclists due to the dedicated bicycle lane. I also think that fewer lanes for traffic would be good for local businesses, e.g. restaurants and coffee shops. Who would want to sit outside at a cafe when there are many lanes of noisy traffic right next to you? Sincerely, Nathan</p>
12/27/2022 15:04	Laura Vielstich	My son Matthew Taylor Dunlap	<p>What if police failed to do their job at protecting and serving? Failed to just see an injured person as a person no matter the location they were found and want to help them or give information to their surviving families? Why did they fail my son? Me? His dad, brother and sister? We are all people. Yet, Aug 26, 2018, at 11:30pm at SLC old, The Road Home Shelter my son was found in a pool of blood with blunt force trauma to his head. This is from reports I have from Fire and Gold Cross ambulance. Yet, no police report. No policeman ever filed a report on that night. No one. They didn't investigate or even care to file a report. I don't even know who gave fire and ambulance information on how my son was injured. And why at a homeless shelter (known for violence and safety concerns) this person's word was enough to not have an investigation done. My son, had half his skull removed to release the pressure in his brain. I was told he lost his eye sight was deaf and paralyzed from his injury. That was after 2 weeks on life support. He passed away on 9/10/18. State of Utah bought the shelter in October. Matthew Minkivich was fired or resigned in November. My son had epilepsy and CP. A "witness" whom know one knows who it is, said he did a backflip off the top bunk and hit his head. Could my son have had a seizure? And maybe it looked like that to an unknown person? After all, the ambulance was there 5 days prior because he did have a seizure. OR, did someone hurt him? He was visiting with me that day and led me to believe someone was harassing him but he would be okay. That's what he told me. No drugs or alcohol in his system. I'm writing this because I've tried for years just to find the truth. As his mom, no police ever interviewed me or talked to me until I after several attempts opened a police report. How disappointing. A detective told me I need to accept that I'll never know the truth. This was after I received her final report closing my police report. You should read it. If you have children, you would be alarmed about why I have concerns and questions then ever before. The lack of trust I have in Utah's government and police should be alarming. I think you would agree. Merry Christmas from a mother who is still mourning her 25 year old son. I filed a report against the police working that night just a couple days ago. Their lack of compassion against someone at a shelter and offering closure to his family speaks for itself. I hope what I've shared with you all will give you the opportunity as humans to do what's best for everyone. We voted you in to represent us. All of us. No matter who we are. We all have parents, siblings, grand parents, kids grandkids aunts uncles and cousins. We all are living people who deserve respect, a simple smile and most of all hope. Please be the best you can be. Remember, a stranger you pass on the street, has someone who loves them dearly. I pray for closure. I pray for truth. I've lost my way since my son passed away. Done things I've never done before. But I'm human and will find my way back. Im a good woman. Regardless. Best wishes, Laura Vielstich</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
12/28/2022 11:41	Sarah Monette	Support for 3-Lane 2100S - D/7	<p>Hello, I am writing to support the pedestrian-friendly 3-lane option for the redesign of 2100 South. My family and I live in your district. We need to walk along 2100S regularly. The current 4-lane traffic configuration feels chaotic and is dangerous. We walk and take the bus now; we would prefer to bike, but it is too dangerous to share the road in its current layout. We have a car but only drive occasionally, when it is too far or too late to walk/bus. I know there is support for keeping 2100S a 4-lane road, with folks saying it is necessary so that they can drive through town faster and more conveniently. But there are already many options for driving to and through Sugarhouse, including an interstate. And there are massive parking lots everywhere. Right now, cars absolutely dominate Sugarhouse. Cars decide how/when people can cross streets, walk on sidewalks near drive-through restaurants, and approach buildings (e.g. the amount of businesses on 2100S that have closed their front sidewalk entrances, and require customers to enter from a back parking lot). This is backwards! Pedestrian/bike lanes will be used. There are a lot of folks in this neighborhood who don't drive, and our city (and tax dollars) should provide us at least the same safe and convenient access to public spaces as cars are given. Please support a walkable Sugarhouse. Sincerely, Sarah Monette</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
12/28/2022 13:07	Scott Harris	2100 S Redesign Plan - D/7	<p>Hello, My name is Scott Harris and REDACTED. I am very excited about the opportunities that revitalizing 2100 S opens up for my community. As a resident, I have noticed how dangerous, frustrating, and difficult it is to use 2100 S. This is very unfortunate because of all the fantastic businesses that are located right along that street that suffer due to the poor infrastructure. I am writing to let you know that I support Option 2 (3-lanes with bikeway) for 2100 S. I am a multi-mode transportation user: I drive, cycle, walk, and use transit. I believe that the best option for all residents in our community does not cater to a single transportation mode, so we should not be prioritizing personal cars over other transit modes. Cars are the most dangerous, expensive, and inefficient transportation option that we use today. That is why I believe that large sidewalks for pedestrians and a separated bikeway for safe cycling is of paramount importance for our community. A shared-use path is dangerous for pedestrians and frustrating for cyclists, which means that it will be used far less than separated paths for each transportation type. Prioritizing people and not just their cars will also be a massive economic benefit for the city as well as the businesses along 2100 S, as they will get more pedestrian traffic that would otherwise pass them by if they were driving in cars. More pedestrian traffic means better business for local businesses, which means more tax revenue for the city. It is a win for everyone. Separated bikeways will be immensely safer for cyclists, pedestrians, and drivers. When there is a large difference in speed between moving bodies, there is a high risk for collision and injury. This risk is particularly high for those that are outside of a vehicle, so we have a duty to protect them in any way we can. That is why it is vital that we pursue Option 2 rather than Option 1, which does not solve any of these issues. I believe in this city and I think we can do the right thing to help all of our residents, so I urge you to pursue Option 2, as this would be the safest, most economically advantageous, and efficient use of our tax dollars. We need to take bold action to really make a difference in the world, we just need courageous local leaders and decision makers to do their part. Best Regards, Scott</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
12/29/2022 14:12	Simon Harrison	2100 Reconstruction Project - D/7	<p>Hi Simon, I am Julee Mori, the Constituent Liaison for Council Member Fowler in District 7. I will share your thoughts and comments with Council Member Fowler and the entire Council. Thank you for reaching out on this matter. Regards, Julee Mori Salt Lake City Council Staff</p> <p>She/Her/Hers OFFICE of the CITY COUNCIL SALT LAKE CITY CORPORATION TEL 801-535-6041 SLCCOUNCIL.COM <http://www.slccouncil.com> To assure proper attention to your email, please 'Reply to All' or include city.council.liaisons@slccouncil.com <mailto:city.council.liaisons@slccouncil.com> on the address line of this email. From: Simon Harrison <simonhar@icloud.com <mailto:simonhar@icloud.com> > Sent: Thursday, December 29, 2022 1:11 PM To: Fowler, Amy <amy.fowler@slccouncil.com <mailto:amy.fowler@slccouncil.com> > Subject: (EXTERNAL) 2100 Reconstruction Project</p> <p>Hi, I have been following the discussions for the work planned in 2024 for 2100 South and I see that the options are now down to two. Please note that I am strongly in support of the option to reduce the traffic lanes and improve the environment for pedestrians and cyclists. This is a once in a generation opportunity to improve the area where we live and make us of all the local parks, restaurants and coffee shops. Please let le know if you also share this vision for our wonderful part of Salt Lake City ? Simon Harrison</p>
12/29/2022 23:05	Harold H Sears	2100 So. "Main St" for Sugarhouse options	<p>yes, I agree - Option 2 is better. Not sure where the current volume of E-W car traffic will move to after this - more cars on 1700 So? Re: bike traffic. Bikes moving through S.House, have a E-W route on Sugarmont , BUT bikes do NOT have a clear route to/from Parley's Bike Trail from the E. end of the Sugarmont/Lt.Rail route . There's a dicey 1/2 block west of Highland/11th E, then another tricky route to the Parley's Trail. I'm sure this can be improved. Also, getting through Sugarhouse N-S from the so. end of the McClelland Trail, through Sugarhouse is now tricky AND dangerous. I'd love to know what the Master Plan suggests for these trouble spots!</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
1/3/2023 10:29	Lindy Burton	Strongly oppose re zoning mouth of Emigration Canyon	<p>Dear Councilman Dan Dugan, I am writing to express my own and my families strong opposition to rezoning the mouth of the canyon to allow a student housing development. We have lived in, and loved the canyon as our home for thirty years. Having a development at the mouth of the canyon would negatively impact the canyon residents in many ways. 1- The canyon traffic and those pulling out onto the canyon road already can endanger the many runners, walkers and bikers who love the canyon. To have students living at the mouth, who will be adding not only a big increase in their own traffic, but add their friends and people who want to party in the canyon is irresponsible. One would think the last thing the city would want is too add more drinking and reckless driving in the canyon. 2-Our canyons add to the beauty and tranquility of our city. Putting a student housing project at the mouth of the canyon changes the tone and experience coming up the canyon and is a nuisance. 3-The people who live in the canyon HATE this idea. This is our home. Imagine if someone were to put a development at the doorstep of your neighborhood that would negatively impact you every time you left your house to go to work or to do anything in the city. We drive the canyon road every day, sometimes multiple times a day and to put an eyesore where there now is nature and peace is like stealing something from the residents here. Before you vote, please think about how you would feel if you had lived your life in the canyon. People who choose to live in Emigration canyon have made a conscious choice to be away from the developments of the city. We pay a price for that and are happy to do so. This development would destroy the reasons that brought us up here in the first place. Please do not let a developer's greed take precedence over the quality of our lives. Thank you, Lindy Burton</p>
1/3/2023 10:30	Jennifer Michas	re-zoning of 2 lots at the mouth of Emigration Canyon	<p>I'm a resident of Emigration Canyon, and I strongly oppose the re-zoning of the two lots at the mouth of the canyon. There is already too much traffic, and there are too many cyclists, runners, etc.. To introduce even more traffic makes no logical sense. Logistically, there would be no safe way to have such a large development without the need for a stop sign or stop light, and it's ridiculous to impede traffic at the mouth of the canyon. If there was ever a fire, residents would have a hard time safely evacuating. Please DO NOT re-zone these lots. Thank you for your time. Best, Jennifer Michas</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
1/3/2023 10:31	Timothy Beals	PLNPCM2022-01106	<p>I am writing to express my opposition of the proposed zoning variance noted above that would occur at the bottom of Emigration Canyon. I have lived in the canyon for decades and have worked at the University for the whole time so I commute through that area routinely. Additionally, I have cared for the cyclists who have been injured in that area of the bottom S curve of the canyon. The idea of adding hundreds of cars to the daily ebb and flow of that particular area is ill conceived at best. The owners regret owning property adjacent to high density housing where there is a 13 story building and an adjacent radio tower - all things that were known when the parcel of defined and purchased. High density housing at the neck of the back up route for calamity on I-80 and on the most heavily cycled highway in the state should not be supported and is, frankly, illogical. The massive student housing projects being built along Foothill currently are going to affect the canyon traffic for recreation as it is and maintaining a reasonable escape from city density is something that the broad community values and it should be protected by the city planners. It would be a net negative change for the local community. The proposal states that it would not cause ill elects to the single family housing WEST of the property, but conveniently fails to mention what it would do to those similar neighborhoods EAST of the property. Please, do not support the proposed zoning change. Tim Beals Emigration Canyon resident</p>
1/3/2023 10:32	John I Manfredi	Rezoning Petition Number: PLNPCM2022-01106	<p>Dan Dugan: As a resident of the St. Mary's neighborhood of Salt Lake City, I wish to state my opposition to the request to rezone the two properties at 3052 E Emigration Canyon Road from Foothills Residential District to High Density Multi-Family Residential District. Since the property was purchased by the current owners under zoning regulations that have not changed, granting the zoning map amendment would be inappropriate absent a compelling need for the rezoning. I have not heard of nor can I imagine any such compelling need. In fact, in my view the amendment would lead to changes that negatively impact the quality of life in the city, particularly for those residents near the property. Thank you, John Manfredi</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
1/3/2023 10:33	Marcella Woiczik	Zoning	<p>Hello I am writing to express my opposition of the proposed zoning variance noted that would occur at the bottom of Emigration Canyon. I have lived in the canyon for ten years, and commute through this area daily on my way to Primary Children's and Shriners where I work.</p> <p>The idea of adding hundreds of cars to the daily ebb and flow of that particular area is ill conceived at best. The owners regret owning property adjacent to high density housing where there is a 13 story building and an adjacent radio tower - all things that were known when the parcel of defined and purchased. High density housing at the neck of the back up route for calamity on I-80 and on the most heavily cycled highway in the state should not be supported and is, frankly, illogical. The massive student housing projects being built along Foothill currently are going to affect the canyon traffic for recreation as it is and maintaining a reasonable escape from city density is something that the broad community values and it should be protected by the city planners. It would be a significant negative change and impact for the local community.</p> <p>The proposal states that it would not cause ill effects to the single family housing WEST of the property, but conveniently fails to mention what it would do to those similar neighborhoods EAST of the property. Please, do not support the proposed zoning change. Marcella Woiczik, MD Emigration Canyon resident</p>
1/3/2023 10:34	Murphy M	Emigration canyon zoning amendment	<p>Rezoning the single family properties into use as apartments is simply dangerous. Not only to the new tenants but to all the Utahns that enjoy hiking, biking and running up immigration. Even now without an additional 1000+ residents in the canyon the roads are inadequate to provide safe access for biking or running. Adding more traffic will simply exacerbate the danger for anyone traveling the road. We do not want or need more expensive apartments in our valley!</p>
1/3/2023 10:35	Kk Hoogland	Stop Emigration Canyon rezone	<p>Dear City Council, Please vote no for the rezone at the mouth of Emigration. That area is a hub for all of SL to access Bonneville Shoreline Trail or to cycle up Emigration Canyon Rd. It is a busy clogged area (zoo, This is the Place). I think it will be unsafe for people recreating to have so many more cars going up the canyon, even just 1/10 of a mile. Please vote no. Sincerely, KK Hoogland</p>
1/3/2023 10:36	Iona Grosshans	Proposed zoning change	<p>I'm a resident of the St Mary area, this part of the city is my neighborhood – and to build a high rise structure at the mouth of Emigration Canyon, essentially ruining the area with more traffic than is sustainable, is nothing more than greed on the part of the developer. New student housing is already being built farther East - at Foothill and Sunnyside – imagine the traffic/smog/congestion when that immense project is finished. Please City Council members – does this proposal make any sense at all? Please, please deny the zoning change. Iona Grosshans</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
1/3/2023 10:37	Hilary Silberman	3052 E Emigration Canyon Re-Zoning request Petition PLNPCM2022-01106	<p>To Whom it May Concern, I am writing to voice my concern and opposition for the request to rezone this property at the base of Emigration Canyon for high density housing. I am a resident of Emigration Township and have lived in the canyon on the main canyon road for 25+ years. I am very familiar with the issues of traveling and living on the canyon road. As it is, Emigration canyon road cannot handle the traffic it sees with residents, those coming up canyon to go to Ruth's or Emigration Brewing , Sunday drivers, road rallyers, runners, walkers, ross country ski trainers and cyclists. This section of the canyon is busy and congested already. Adding 800 + more vehicles to the mix, especially in the summer and winter will be a treacherous nightmare. This would also have a significant impact on the environment and resources in terms of creek preservation, wild life and additional noise, air and light pollution. The developers have indicated that they want to develop this as student housing. That seems far fetched and disingenuous to me. This is not University housing and I am not sure how they would control who moved in. Would they put limitations on who can live in this housing? I am pretty sure that would not be legal to discriminate towards other interested renters. Therefore, I believe it is a ploy to get the rezoning passed to appear to be fulfilling a need related to the University of Utahs' housing shortage. These developers are looking to make money off this property plain and smple, with no regard of the negtaive impact it may have in the environment or community . The base of Emigration Canyon is no place for high density housing. Thank you for your time,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Hilary Silberman Hilary Silberman she/her</p>
1/3/2023 10:37	Odilia McLeod	Proposed amendment request to rezone lots in Emigration Canyon	<p>Hello Council Members, I am writing to you today with regard to the proposed amendment request to rezone two lots that are currently zoned single family, at 3052 E Emigration Canyon Road from FR-2/21 to RMF-75 High Density Multi-Family Residential.</p> <p>https://www.sl.gov/PLANNING/2022/12/15/OPENHOUSE-01106/ Please, please do NOT accept this rezoning request! Salt Lake City and surrounding areas are becoming a crowded, congested, and unappealing place to live. We already have to deal with the air quality and inversions, adding more people, cars, etc will only make that worse too. Everywhere one drives today, any available space (even minimal) now has some apartment building either being built or already in place. I counted 8 of these in a short 10 minute drive along 2100 South and Highland Drive to name a few. It also seems that there are more apartment buildings than people to fill them! Our streets are already in a very deteriorated shape and more traffic is unsustainable. There is a point where what benefits the many needs to override the greed of the few. We are at that point! Please keep our roads and traffic manageable, our air clean, the infrastructure sustainable, and this valley an attractive place to live. Thank you for your time and consideration. Best, Odilia McLeod</p>

Date/Time Opened	Contact Name	Subject	Description
1/3/2023 12:54	Melinda McIlwaine	Emigration Development/D6	<p>I am an Emigration resident. We are in the county so I am not sure you represent us. However, I am very concerned about the petition PLNPCM2022-01106 for an apartment building near the mouth of Emigration. I have sent a comment to the email of Kristina Gilmore at the planning commission regarding this project. Consider what exists in the Northeast quadrant of Salt Lake and at the mouth of Emigration. We have the hospitals, new family housing, the zoo, This is the Place, Research Park, several schools, foothill hiking and bicycle traffic. Isn't that enough? Adding 800 or so people and their cars to our already over wrought Canyon is a bad idea. As you may know Emigration Creek dried up three summers ago. The disturbance to the creek from a development of this kind would be extreme. The additional traffic as well. As home owners we are subject to the constraints of FCOZ. I find it remarkable that a development of this size would pass muster. There is the ongoing problem of wildlife cityscape interface at play here as well. We can't continue to build out this valley. We don't have the water! Please, I ask you as a city council member. Do not support these development plans. Thank You, Melinda McIlwaine</p>
1/3/2023 12:56		Rezoning/D2	<p>Developers are displacing families! Please help us fight to keep family homes intact on our City's West Side. Similarly against the Rezone on Chicago Street!!</p>
1/3/2023 13:01	Beverly Hanson	2100 South Plan/D5	<p>Happy New Year! Just a quick note to express my support of the 3-lane plan for the 2100 South re-work. It's the safest option for that area, and best for the local businesses in my opinion.</p> <p>Thanks for all you do, Beverly Hanson Wag more...bark less 🐾</p>
1/3/2023 13:03	Tena Rohr	Rezoning Petition/D6	<p>Greetings Councilman Dugan: I am writing to voice my concerns over the re-zoning of the mouth of Emigration Canyon, Petition Number: PLNPCM2022-01106. Emigration Canyon is very tightly packed and the sewer system is aging and unreliable. The system will need to be upgraded before any new developments could be initiated. There is a lot going on in that area. Lots of hiking, biking, dog walking... The zoo and This is the Place monument are right there. Adding apartment buildings will make this area terribly congested. We also must be cognizant of the creek, which has been overused and drying up in recent years. The over use of the creek relates directly to wildlife, who have always needed the water in the creek and the undeveloped land in the mountain, valley and along the riparian corridor. The land at the mouth is not underutilized, it is habitat. The mouth of Emigration Canyon does not need big apartment buildings. I oppose the re-zoning, Tena Rohr</p>