

From: [Michael Johnson](#) on behalf of [Matthew Taylor](#)
To: [Michael Johnson](#)
Subject: Fw: [EXT:]Fwd: AJ Rock Development
Date: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 2:09:34 PM

Matt Taylor
Senior Planner
Cottonwood Heights City
(801) 944-7066
mtaylor@ch.utah.gov

From: Lynne Guenigault <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, July 19, 2020 12:01 AM
To: Matthew Taylor <MTaylor@ch.utah.gov>
Subject: [EXT:]Fwd: AJ Rock Development

Dear Sir,
Please ensure that our comments and photographs are included in the upcoming public hearing minutes.
Many thanks,
Lynne Guenigault.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Mike Guenigault <[REDACTED]>
Date: Sat, Jul 18, 2020, 8:25 PM
Subject: AJ Rock Development
To: Mtaylor@ch.utah.gov <Mtaylor@ch.utah.gov>
Cc: [REDACTED]

Dear Sir.

We live at [REDACTED] S Heughs Canyon Drive and our property backs onto Wasatch Drive. We would like to bring to your attention how busy and dangerous the parking situation is on this road. We have already had one accident caused by the amount of cars now parking on both sides of Wasatch during both ski season and hiking in Heughs Canyon. We have attached two photographs which were taken on the 25th April 2020. The photos were originally sent to the HOA of Canyon Cove who relayed the concerns to Holladay Police Department. As you can see, cars are parked both parallel and nose in, which means they reverse back out into oncoming traffic, runners and bikers. It is only a matter of time until we have a serious accident caused by this situation. Also note, due to the amount of cars parked in this area, people are now walking in the road as well (see attached photo). During ski season the cars are on both sides of the road starting at the traffic lights and backing up along Wasatch to the entrance of Canyon Cove. Apart from my main concern about safety, this has also increased the amount of noise and trash being dumped in this area, which is now a fire risk during the

summer.

The volume of cars driving and parking on this section of Wasatch is already at a dangerous level and cannot support increased volume due to the new AJ Rock development. We are not opposed to the development, but would strongly recommend looking at alternative egress onto 6200S by adding a second traffic junction near the entrance to the existing gravel pit, which would be safer for all.

Regards,
Mike & Lynne Guenigault.

If you have any questions concerning this email, please contact me on [REDACTED].

EXTERNAL ATTACHMENT: Only Open if you trust this sender.





From: [Tom Stephens](#)
To: [Matthew Taylor](#); [Michael Johnson](#)
Subject: [EXT:]Wasatch Rock Redevelopment Project Application
Date: Tuesday, July 28, 2020 10:29:20 AM

Mike, Matt, below are my comments as respects the Wasatch Rock development application. My preference would be to send these comments directly to all the planning commissioners, but apparently they either do not have city email addresses or these addresses are confidential. So, besides making my comments part of the public record, I would appreciate it if you read these comments at the next planning commission.

Thanks much,

Tom Stephens

Dear Planning Commissioners,

Having reviewed the pertinent information for this project, I think it best, instead of repeating or elaborating on many of the same critiques already presented, that I approach this matter from a planning commissioner perspective, given my experience as a planning commissioner in a neighboring city for a period of over six recent years.

1. **Pay close attention to the comments and critiques received** – If the majority of those commenting on this project are against it, there are good reasons why this is the case. Rezoning and the drafting of a governing ordinance are purely legislative acts and consequently planning commissions are granted wide discretion in affecting the outcome and should heed the collective wisdom of those providing comments.
2. **Cottonwood Heights General Plan and Wasatch Blvd General Plan** – do these guiding documents explicitly validate the density, intensity of use and height that the developer wants? These documents present a long term vision for the city. They are *not* zoning ordinances. They do not grant the developer any right to quickly moved forward with the desired project.
3. **“Highest and best use of the property”** – This phrase is commonly used by developers to add legitimacy to projects. Of course this phrase makes sense for the applicant, but for the city, this phrase implies that if the city does not “buy in” now, an irreversible loss will occur. That’s nonsense, of course. Subsequent developers will have observed the first effort and will present proposals more palatable to the City and residents.
4. **Draft PDD ordinance** – make the effort to personally review it carefully. Drafting an ordinance is difficult and requires a second and third set of eyes – especially yours.
5. **Increased density and increased intensity of use are expected in the gravel pit area** – but increased intensity, height and density fall along a continuum. Re-zoning from single family to attached townhomes, for example, represents a large increase in density. Increasing density to hundreds of apartments, high rise condo units and hotel rooms represents an exponential increase in density *and* intensity of use. Where on this continuum is the “sweet spot” for the City and residents?
6. **Context** – it is all a matter of context when it comes to appropriate density, intensity, use and

height. What is appropriate and visually acceptable for the Cottonwood Corporate Center, The Intermountain Medical Center area in Murray and the Sandy City Center, to give a few examples, can be wildly inappropriate for the foothills of the Wasatch Mountains.

7. **Traffic studies are based upon a number of assumptions so be very careful** in accepting the study's conclusions. Who chose the traffic engineering firm and who paid for it? Millcreek recently changed its ordinance so that it is now the city that chooses the traffic and parking engineering firm from a pool of qualified firms.
8. **Long term traffic issues** – will the piecemeal development of the gravel pit, as this project represents, worsen traffic congestion to the point that future planners and leaders of Cottonwood Heights will be unable to mitigate?
9. **What is the scope of the traffic study** – just this project or for the full gravel pit area? How long ago was the traffic study commissioned? What is its time horizon? Apparently the City has commissioned one or more traffic studies that deal with SR-190 / Wasatch Blvd. What are the conclusions of these studies?
10. **Precedents** – this issue cannot be over-emphasized. If you allow a 128' tall condo building with this development, *it will be impossible* to moderate the proposed heights of other projects in the gravel pit.
11. **How is maximum height calculated** – from the natural grade of the land or from some other point? Does maximum height include parapets, fire walls, decorative architectural features, roof top HVAC structures?
12. **Comparing maximum heights with Holladay and Millcreek, two peer cities:** The new Millcreek City Center ordinance allows for maximum allowable height is 75'. The Cottonwood Mall Redevelopment in Holladay, after much controversy, litigation and a citizen initiative, allows for a maximum height of 80' in one part of the project, with an additional 10' allowed for rooftop HVAC.
13. **Architectural drawings and marketing videos provided by the applicant** – they always present a wide angle perspective that flattens and shortens the perceived height and bulk of the buildings. A high degree of skepticism is warranted.
14. **Avoid nibbling around the edges** – if the project is fundamentally undesirable from your perspective, state that sentiment. Otherwise the applicant will be encouraged to be quickly back before the planning commission with only minor changes that you will again likely find unsatisfactory. Express your expectations, so that the next iteration will be very substantially different in scope and intensity.
15. **Recommending denial of the rezone application does not result in any loss of a property right.** The developer / owner can submit to the City a preliminary subdivision plat application, based upon the current zoning, right at this moment in time and it will be approved, as required by state law if it meets the city's subdivision code.

Your work on this rezone application and proposed project is highly consequential. Caution, skepticism, adequate study and paying serious attention to those in opposition will pay large dividends to the City.

Sincerely,

Tom Stephens

████ Adonis Drive
Millcreek, UT 84124

From: [Michael Johnson](#) on behalf of [Matthew Taylor](#)
To: [Michael Johnson](#)
Subject: Fw: [EXT:]N. Gravel Pit/ Wasatch Blvd
Date: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 2:09:40 PM

Matt Taylor
Senior Planner
Cottonwood Heights City
(801) 944-7066
mtaylor@ch.utah.gov

From: Audrey Anderson <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, July 29, 2020 5:17 PM
To: Matthew Taylor <MTaylor@ch.utah.gov>
Cc: Audrey Anderson Pines <[REDACTED]>
Subject: [EXT:]N. Gravel Pit/ Wasatch Blvd

Dear Mr. Taylor,

I was not given notice about the public comment period for the zoning change request for the N. Gravel Pit/ Wasatch Blvd. I wanted to send on some of my thoughts.

I live in Cottonwood Heights and would like to have been involved and believe many others would as well.

It's a big jump going from single family zoning to either of the options you have on the boards for the N. Gravel pit. I think the more aggressive plan should be scrapped without another thought. Its too much to shove in that space and most of the ideas are inappropriate for this area.

The 1st plan might work, if it's not too many floors, and you make them include the promenade and bike path the citizens of Cottonwood Heights were promise.

I also noticed you gave them permission not to follow the low lighting for above Wasatch Blvd? That's not OK. Its very important to keep with the regulations Cottonwood Heights has set to keep the "Dark sky" lighting.

This is a sensitive ear quake zone, have all the studies been looked at? Another reason to keep development on a smaller scale.

I think all development of the either gravel pit should be postponed until they can gain access to the 6200 S /Wasatch Blvd. or you will be destroying one of the most beautiful treasures of the east side and that is Wasatch Blvd. and the wonderful multi use road it is. We are hoping to get the speed limit down on this road the entire length and to keep the natural curves and not expand beyond 3 lanes.

Are the Home owners going to be compensated for such a huge change in plans?
[Realtor.com](https://www.realtor.com) now has a rating for noise pollution, which you represent the citizens of Cottonwood Heights, I hope you are keeping our property values, health and lifestyle in mind as you look at these plans for not only the Gravel Pits but the corridor as well.

I appreciate you time and hope you will share this with everyone.

Best,
Audrey Pines

From: [Michael Johnson](#) on behalf of [Matthew Taylor](#)
To: [Michael Johnson](#)
Subject: Fw: [EXT:]Development
Date: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 2:09:53 PM

Matt Taylor
Senior Planner
Cottonwood Heights City
(801) 944-7066
mtaylor@ch.utah.gov

From: Jake Brown <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Saturday, August 1, 2020 4:20 PM
To: Matthew Taylor <MTaylor@ch.utah.gov>
Subject: [EXT:]Development

Hi, I just wanted to my concern, or perhaps better put my disgust, with the plans for the new development(s) near 70th South and Wasatch Blvd. In all honesty I have never written a letter to anyone at any level of our Government concerning any matter, but this is absurd. I strongly urge you to hold off on moving forward with this, and somehow get a better feel for the level of opposition against this. I have never seen anything like it in my life. It is mind blowing to see the complete consensus of opposition towards this development. I have spoken with neighbors who have never agreed on a single thing in their life that are in 100% agreement as far as how much they oppose this. Please for everyone's sake, at the very least postpone any decisions in this matter. Respectfully, Jacob Brown

From: [Michael Johnson](#) on behalf of [Matthew Taylor](#)
To: [Michael Johnson](#)
Subject: Fw: [EXT:]Ingress/egress proposal for the new quarry development plan
Date: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 2:10:12 PM

Matt Taylor
Senior Planner
Cottonwood Heights City
(801) 944-7066
mtaylor@ch.utah.gov

From: Ryan Erickson <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, August 2, 2020 2:34 PM
To: Matthew Taylor <MTaylor@ch.utah.gov>
Subject: [EXT:]Ingress/egress proposal for the new quarry development plan

Hello,

I hope this email finds you well. My name is Ryan Erickson, I am a new Canyon Cove resident at [REDACTED] Canyon Crest Drive. I received a paper in my mailbox today informing me of the ingress/egress plan for the new development that will take over after the quarry to my south is finished. It states that the ONLY purposed route of entry and exit for this massive purposed development is the small, single lane road, already in use where Wasatch reconnects to Wasatch at that light. If this is true, I believe this is a horrible plan! This road is NOT big enough to handle that kind of traffic, it has an abrupt blind turn as soon as you merge, and many many outdoor enthusiasts use Wasatch right there to bike, jog, or hike. When you get that amount of people trying to squeeze through such a bottle-neck drivers and/or pedestrians will get hurt.

Something this big is worth doing it right the first time! I am sure developers and investors want this project to be done as quickly and cheaply as possible however safety needs to be the number one factor with no room to cut corners. The amount of cars moving through the purposed ingress/egress with be too much. There is already a big entrance in use that the quarry already uses, why not continue to use it!?!? However if this is the only entrance/exit used it will also get backed up and cause injuries. I suggest they also build another entrance or two with their own designated turning lanes as to not back up the flow of regular traffic that is on Wasatch.

If you have any questions or comments I would love to speak more with you. Feel free to email me back or call/text me on my cell, [REDACTED]

Thank you for reading this

,
Ryan Erickson

From: [Michael Johnson](#) on behalf of [Matthew Taylor](#)
To: [Michael Johnson](#)
Subject: Fw: [EXT:]Pit Development
Date: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 2:10:08 PM

Matt Taylor
Senior Planner
Cottonwood Heights City
(801) 944-7066
mtaylor@ch.utah.gov

From: Sherry Britt <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, August 2, 2020 8:21 AM
To: Matthew Taylor <MTaylor@ch.utah.gov>
Subject: [EXT:]Pit Development

Do not build houses and condos in the gravel pit. To much congestion and noise now.
No one monitors Wasatch blvd speed or noice. Thank you

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

From: [Michael Johnson](#) on behalf of [Matthew Taylor](#)
To: [Michael Johnson](#)
Subject: Fw: [EXT:]AJ Rock development
Date: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 2:10:47 PM

Matt Taylor
Senior Planner
Cottonwood Heights City
(801) 944-7066
mtaylor@ch.utah.gov

From: Lee Archer <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, August 3, 2020 12:12 PM
To: Matthew Taylor <MTaylor@ch.utah.gov>
Subject: [EXT:]AJ Rock development

My wife & I live on 6200 So. & the traffic going east & west on 6200 is already unmanageable. Lots of cars and trucks going East & West all day. You folks need to scale this development back about 80%. Don't further compromise the quality of life in the South Holladay area.

Thanks, Charles L. (Lee) Archer & Leslie C. Archer
[REDACTED] East 6200 So, Holladay, Utah, 84121

From: [Michael Johnson](#) on behalf of [Matthew Taylor](#)
To: [Michael Johnson](#)
Subject: Fw: [EXT:]AJ development
Date: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 2:10:32 PM

Matt Taylor
Senior Planner
Cottonwood Heights City
(801) 944-7066
mtaylor@ch.utah.gov

From: Mildred Martensen <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, August 3, 2020 10:00 AM
To: Matthew Taylor <MTaylor@ch.utah.gov>
Cc: Dan Gibbons <dgibbons@cityofholladay.com>
Subject: [EXT:]AJ development

Holladay City Council

Re: AJ proposed development

As residents of Holladay City, we have no choice in the final decision of what Cottonwood Heights decides to do with the AJ property.

We can however, demand that what they do does not negatively impact our city. Wasatch Boulevard is now a recognized recreational center for the entire Salt Lake Valley and for out of town and out of country visitors. Canyon Cove is completely residential and should be able to remain as it is.

If Cottonwood Heights decides to develop (at anywhere near the proposed volume of occupancy) then their only responsibility is to insure that the traffic created has a completely new ingress and egress pattern that is handled solely through their own city! They must create access to the development through their own residential areas – not through Holladay's.

We can only demand that our property is not negatively impacted and that it remains an access to recreational use and safe access to our homes.

Sincerely,

Dean Martensen & Mildred Martensen
[REDACTED] Heughs Canyon Way

From: [Michael Johnson](#) on behalf of [Matthew Taylor](#)
To: [Michael Johnson](#)
Subject: Fw: [EXT:]AJ Rock proposals
Date: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 2:10:39 PM

Matt Taylor
Senior Planner
Cottonwood Heights City
(801) 944-7066
mtaylor@ch.utah.gov

From: Jeffrey Anderson <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, August 3, 2020 11:56 AM
To: Matthew Taylor <MTaylor@ch.utah.gov>
Subject: [EXT:]AJ Rock proposals

Please,
We know how this would be. We know what we would lose. In all earnest, I plead with you to save for us, and our heritage, the space we have today. We have already lost so much. The ultimate value of these properties would be lost forever. We need your courage .

Thank you

From: [Michael Johnson](#) on behalf of [Matthew Taylor](#)
To: [Michael Johnson](#)
Subject: Fw: [EXT:]AJ Rock Gravel Pit Development
Date: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 2:10:55 PM

Matt Taylor
Senior Planner
Cottonwood Heights City
(801) 944-7066
mtaylor@ch.utah.gov

From: Wayne Xia <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, August 3, 2020 3:09 PM
To: Matthew Taylor <MTaylor@ch.utah.gov>
Subject: [EXT:]AJ Rock Gravel Pit Development

>
> Please stop this development until traffic impact is resolved including ingress/egress problems.
>
> Sent from
A concerned resident
[REDACTED] canyon crest drive, salt lake city, ut 84121

From: [Michael Johnson](#) on behalf of [Matthew Taylor](#)
To: [Michael Johnson](#)
Subject: Fw: [EXT:]Gravel pit development
Date: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 2:10:00 PM

Matt Taylor
Senior Planner
Cottonwood Heights City
(801) 944-7066
mtaylor@ch.utah.gov

From: Charlie Ayers <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, August 2, 2020 6:38 AM
To: Matthew Taylor <MTaylor@ch.utah.gov>
Subject: [EXT:]Gravel pit development

Hello:

We are writing to express our opposition to current plans for development of the gravel pit at 6695 S. Wasatch Blvd.

We live just north of the gun club road, in Canyon Cove. While residing here for the last 25 years, we have seen the area surrounding our neighborhood become highly developed, with increasing traffic on Wasatch Blvd, at trailheads, and, particularly, at the massive development at 6200 S and I-215. The lack of sidewalks and bike lanes through the latter has hindered our ability to travel away from our neighborhood on foot or bike greatly.

The AJ Rock proposed development would contribute greatly to a loss of the characteristics that brought us to Holladay, with excessive noise, congestion, and pollution, especially in combination with a planned transportation hub to the south of that.

Sincerely,

Charles and Susan Ayers
[REDACTED] Heughs Canyon Dr.

From: [Dave Schreiner](#)
To: [Michael Johnson](#)
Subject: [EXT:]opposition the proposed AJWasatch Rock Redevelopment Plan
Date: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 3:37:11 PM

5 Aug 2020

Mr. Johnson,

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed AJ Wasatch Rock Redevelopment Plan. We recently moved last month to Holladay, UT from out of state and were not made aware of this redevelopment plan until after we got settled in. From my review of the information on this redevelopment plan – I see a lot of issues and challenges that will adversely impact our immediate neighborhood and the immediate vicinity in general.

I see this redevelopment as a motivation of profit and uncontrolled urban sprawl on the part of the City of Cottonwood Heights. This development plan has out of date environmental impact studies, will lead to immense bad traffic conditions, and will be a drain on natural resources, bring increased pollution, crime, and degrade the overall quality of life.

The City of Cottonwood Heights has a legal/moral responsibility to the well-being, safety, and proper oversight of their citizens and surrounding communities. Do not be blindsided by future potential city revenues at the sake of others that will not directly benefit from it.

The proposed AJ Wasatch Rock Redevelopment Plan:

- Will accelerate adverse traffic conditions that will not be able to recover
- The land site has many geological conditions that cannot safely be developed
- There will be multiple environmental issues that will impact tens of thousands of residents, visitors, tourists, etc on a daily basis
- Has no regard for safety and well being of current/future residents and businesses

In summary – I oppose the proposed AJ Wasatch Rock Redevelopment Plan – and welcome the opportunity to speak with you and the other government officials on this matter. Do the right thing and ensure the beauty of the Wasatch Range remains in-tact.

Respectfully,

David C Schreiner

██████ S Canyon Ranch Rd

Holladay, UT 84121

M [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

COMMENTS REGARDING WASATCH ROCK REDEVELOPMENT

Dear Sir:

I am a long time resident of Canyon Cove and a firm believer in private property rights, and consequently the right of a property owner to the appropriate use of his property including development. And who doesn't think that "development" of the parcel in question will be an improved alternative to the existing abandoned mining operation!

That being said, this proposal should be dead on arrival, simply because of the grossly inadequate arrangement for access. Let's just cut through the crap. Everyone knows that the this nearly 200 acre mining operation someday will all be redeveloped, not just the 20+ acre parcel at hand now. And the only and obvious appropriate access for this whole thing is off SR-190 via an improved, traffic signal controlled intersection (current site of access for the mining ops). So I must say that I am absolutely astonished to read in today's update memo that in your July 29th meeting with UDOT,... "UDOT indicated that the applicant has not initiated the formal approval process for an emergency access onto SR-190." So why does the July 15 "update memo" on page 18 state,...1. Exceptions for access are not granted when there is a reasonable alternate access. Access onto Wasatch Blvd is a reasonable alternative to SR-190 in this situation." Who said that Wasatch Blvd is "reasonable alternative" access? UDOT, the Developer, or CH? And the developer has not even applied yet? This is nonsense. From the opening day of the new development, which will be approved, primary access should be via SR-190. Even if the developer needs to pave a temporary short road through the adjoining property to the south.

Yes, there will be an alternate access onto Wasatch Blvd from the north end of the project, but this should be ATERNATE access, not the primary/only access. It is not "reasonable alternative" primary access for a development containing 418 housing units. According to the Federal Highway Administration's 2017 National Household Travel Survey, the average household makes 5.11 vehicle trips per day. That would be 2136 additional vehicle trips onto Wasatch Blvd per day, not counting 1) existing traffic, and 2) vehicle trips for the commercial/retail portion of the development (I have no clue how to calculate that, but somebody does). During peak hours, we would have cars backed up well beyond the curve on Wasatch Blvd and/or back into the new development probably all the way back to the first traffic circle. I would applaud the CH Planning Commission if it demanded of the applicant a concise analysis of additional traffic onto Wasatch Blvd instead of relying on an lazy, uninformed decree that it's "adequate." Which it clearly is not.

UDOT will approve the access onto SR-190. It has to according to their own regulations (https://www.udot.utah.gov/main_old/uconowner.gf?n=11066229893635233 cited in your July 15th "update memo." Your applicant just hasn't applied! This is pathetic. Furthermore, UDOT approved a new access point for Millrock Office Park years ago. Their access onto Wasatch Blvd wasn't always there. That new access point (making 3 total for the development) does hamper southbound traffic flow on SR-190, stopping traffic every 1-2 minutes depending – I timed it. Without that access point, traffic could flow southbound continuously. So if the traffic flow on the SR-190 thoroughfare can be interrupted at Millrock, it can be done for your applicant, who has been there longer, who already has access onto SR190, and who ultimately will generate far more vehicle traffic.

From: [Andrew Hulka](#)
To: [Michael Johnson](#)
Subject: FW: [EXT:]Wasatch Rock Redevelopment - OPPOSE
Date: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 10:36:49 AM

From: Kristin Schreiner <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 10:27 AM
To: Andrew Hulka <AHulka@ch.utah.gov>
Subject: [EXT:]Wasatch Rock Redevelopment - OPPOSE

Dear Andy,

I am a resident at [REDACTED] S Canyon Ranch Rd., Holladay, which is located nearest the redevelopment area and within the zone most affected by traffic, construction, and tourist activities associated with the project.

I OPPOSE the AJ Rock rezoning and redevelopment plan for these reasons:

- Holladay, which receives no added benefit from the project, absorbs the full load of traffic. We already have unaddressed seasonal traffic and parking issues. This project will only add to these parking, commuting, and traffic issues. I believe a current, competent, and unbiased traffic and impact study will prove this point. I certainly won't pay more taxes to support the necessary infrastructure, receive zero benefit, and realize a negative net benefit.
- UDOT previously denied the developer's proposal for ingress/egress to the major roadway in Cottonwood Heights. This developer's current proposal is merely a response to the lost right of way. It does not make sense for anyone EXCEPT the developer. We cannot allow a developer to dictate the quality of life for the residential tax base. Until we can solve seasonal traffic issues, we cannot add to the burden. Directing traffic from Cottonwood Heights to Holladay (and reducing my property value) IS NOT A SOLUTION.
- If this is a Cottonwood Heights approved project, Cottonwood Heights should solely bear the burden of traffic, road maintenance, infrastructure, increased transients and crime, and all associated expenses/impacts.
- Approval of this plan would pave (pun intended) the way to fully develop the 200+ acre parcel. Stop this action before we all pay the price for a developer's profit. The low-wage service jobs created in no way offset the benefit; it merely creates more community problems. Look to Sarasota County, FL, residents - not the Chamber of Commerce - to understand the miseries created by following this mantra.
- The fact that the area of proposed development falls on a newly-identified fault line should bring pause to the project without further debate.
- Personally, I believe the development of office space and retail was once attractive but has been rendered unnecessary and is now simply egregious. It does not solve for 2020's realities.
- From <https://propertyrights.utah.gov/land-use-and-development/>: "Local governments have wide latitude to adopt and amend zoning ordinances as a part of their authority to promote the public welfare. Unless it can be shown that the zoning ordinance does not advance the

general welfare, or that the ordinance violates constitutional rights or some other controlling statute, the regulation will be upheld." While it is already obvious that this project benefits no one but the developer, I believe with proper due diligence on behalf of our community leaders, not yet conducted, the proposed zoning change and development plan will be shown to a) NOT advance general welfare (only detract from it) and b) will violate controlling statutes (regarding newly found faultlines and water rights).

As final note: Having relocated for work opportunities to Holladay from St Pete Beach, FL, we relished the opportunity to leave the burden of rampant tourism behind. We will NOT accept the development's nor the ski resorts' added traffic burden as a part of residential life in Utah. Florida has annually increased tourism revenues and, as a result, greatly REDUCED the quality of life for its residents. Living with beach bars, tourists' bad behavior and their litter, transients, ever-increasing crime, and the inability to feel safe in our beach community left us only one option: leave the state. I'd have gladly paid the \$1,500 per person in taxes that the FL Chamber of Commerce claims tourism saves each FL resident annually in order to maintain a balance between economic development and the state's treasured way of life. Tourism and redevelopment are not the only answer to economic development. I OPPOSE the AJ Wasatch Rock Redevelopment Plan.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

Best regards,

Kristin Schreiner

██████████ S Canyon Ranch Rd.

Holladay, UT 84121

████████████████████

From: [mokhodadad](#)
To: [Michael Johnson](#)
Subject: [EXT:]AJ Rock
Date: Wednesday, August 5, 2020 4:49:00 PM

Read into the minutes of tonight's public hearing:

Please require the developer to do a new traffic study based on current conditions as they have changed significantly since 2017. As a resident in immediate proximity to the proposed development I assure you that there has been a major increase in traffic and parking in this area in the past few years.

Thank you

Mo Khodadad

Sent from my T-Mobile 4G LTE Device