



PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING AGENDA

Department of Community and Economic Development
Meeting Date: September 2, 2020

NOTICE is hereby given that the **Cottonwood Heights Planning Commission** will electronically hold a work session meeting at approximately 5:00 p.m., and a business meeting beginning at approximately 6:00 p.m., or soon thereafter, on **Wednesday, September 2, 2020**. In view of the current COVID-19 pandemic, **this meeting will occur only electronically**, without a physical location, as authorized by the Governor’s Executive Order 2020-05 dated March 18, 2020 and related legislation enacted by the Utah Legislature since that date. (See the attached written determination of the chair or acting chair of the Planning Commission that conducting this meeting with a physical anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location). The public may remotely hear the open portions of the meeting through live broadcast by connecting to <http://mixlr.com/chmeetings>.

To View the Work Session: Each citizen desiring to view the Work Session must register in advance to view the online video broadcast at the following link:

https://cwh.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_wATNdPRfTYWzTv92Q3b0Nw

To View or Participate in the Business Meetings: Unlike in past Planning Commission business meetings during the current pandemic, citizens now will be able to make live verbal comments during the “General Public Comment” or public hearing portion through the City’s online video broadcast via Zoom. Each citizen desiring to make a citizen comment must register in advance to view or participate in the online video broadcast at the following link:

https://cwh.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_Q8dbt8ILRcySR_HKsl22BA

Each registrant will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the online video broadcast, and registrants who have entered the online video broadcast “waiting room” will be admitted one at a time for purposes of making comments to the Planning Commission. Public comments also may be given in writing by submitting the comments via email to mjohnson@ch.utah.gov by 5:00 p.m. on the meeting date. In the interest of time and those attending the meeting live, however, **submitted written comments** will be entered into the record and distributed to the Planning Commission but **will not** read at the public meeting.

5:00 p.m. WORK MEETING

1.0 Planning Commission Business

1.1. Review Business Meeting Agenda

The Commission will review and discuss agenda items.

1.2. PDD-19-001

A discussion of project PDD-19-001, a request from AJ Rock, LLC, for an ordinance and zone map amendment for approximately 21.5 acres of property located at 6695 S. Wasatch Blvd.

6:00 p.m. BUSINESS MEETING

1.0 Welcome and Acknowledgements

1.1. Ex parte communications or conflicts of interest to disclose.

2.0 General Public Comment

General public comments will be read into the record following the procedure detailed above.

3.0 Business Items

3.1 (Project ZMA-20-002)

A public hearing to receive comments and make possible recommendation to the City Council on a request from Thurmond Dressen (on behalf of Joe Coccigmiglio) for a zoning map amendment to rezone 0.23 acres of property at 6632 S. Highland Dr. from R-1-8 (Residential Single-Family) to RO (Residential Office).

3.2 (Project ZTA-20-005)

A public hearing to receive comments and make possible recommendation to the City Council on a city-initiated request for a minor technical edit to the "Applicability" section of the outdoor lighting ordinance (19.77.030).

3.3 (Project PDD-19-001)

A public hearing to receive comments and make possible recommendation to the City Council on a request from AJ Rock, LLC, for an ordinance and zone map amendment for approximately 21.5 acres of property located at 6695 S. Wasatch Blvd. utilizing the city's Planned Development District (PDD) ordinance and changing the zoning designation from F-1-21 (Foothill Residential) to PDD-2 (this is a zoning designation prepared specifically for the subject property by the applicant, within the guidelines of chapter 19.51 of the city zoning ordinance).

Continued from the August 5, 2020 Public Hearing

4.0 Consent Agenda

4.1 Approval of Planning Commission Minutes

- August 5, 2020 Planning Commission Minutes

5.0 Adjourn

Meeting Procedures

Items will generally be heard in the following order:

1. Staff Presentation
2. Applicant Presentation
3. Open Public Hearing (if item has been noticed for public hearing). Written public comment received prior to the meeting will be read into the record.
4. Close Public Hearing
5. Planning Commission Deliberation
6. Planning Commission Motion and Vote

Planning Commission applications may be tabled if: 1) Additional information is needed in order to act on the item; OR 2) The Planning Commission feels there are unresolved issues that may need further attention before the Commission is ready to make a motion. **NO agenda item will begin after 9 pm** without a unanimous vote of the Commission. The Commission may carry over agenda items, scheduled late in the evening and not heard, to the next regularly scheduled meeting.

Submission of Written Public Comment

Written comments on any agenda item should be received by the Cottonwood Heights Community and Economic Development Department prior to the start of the meeting to be read into the record. Comments should be emailed to mjohnson@ch.utah.gov. Comments received after the start of the meeting will be distributed to the Commission members after the meeting.

Notice of Compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations or assistance during this meeting shall notify the City Recorder at (801) 944-7021 at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. TDD number is (801) 270-2425 or call Relay Utah at #711.

Confirmation of Public Notice

On Wednesday, August 19, 2020 a copy of the foregoing notice was posted in conspicuous view in the front foyer of the Cottonwood Heights City Offices. The agenda was also posted on the City's website at www.cottonwoodheights.utah.gov and the Utah public notice website at <http://pmn.utah.gov>.

DETERMINATION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION CHAIR CONCERNING AN ANCHOR LOCATION

Pursuant to UTAH CODE ANN. 52-4-207(4), the chair (or acting chair) of the Cottonwood Heights Planning Commission hereby determines that conducting this Planning Commission meeting at an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location. The World Health Organization, the President of the United States, the Governor of Utah, the Salt Lake County Mayor and Health Department, and the Mayor of this city have all recognized that a global pandemic exists related to the new strain of a coronavirus named SARS-CoV-2. Due to the state of emergency caused by the global pandemic, I find that conducting a meeting at an anchor location under the current state of public health emergency constitutes a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the location. According to information from state epidemiology experts, Utah is currently in an acceleration phase, which has the potential to overwhelm the state's healthcare system.

Signature

Date

DATED THIS 19TH DAY OF AUGUST, 2020 Paula Melgar, City Recorder



PLANNING COMMISSION STAFF REPORT

Zone Map Amendment – 6632 S. Highland Dr.

Meeting Date: September 2, 2020

Staff Contact: Samantha DeSeelhorst

Associate Planner & Sustainability Analyst

Summary

Action Requested:

Rezone from R-1-8
(Residential Single-Family) to
RO (Residential Office)

Recommendation:

APPROVE

Applicant:

Thurmon Dressen
(On behalf of Joe
Coccimiglio)

Project #:

ZMA-20-002



Aerial View

Context

Subject Property:

6632 S. Highland Drive

Property Owner:

Joe Coccimiglio

Acres:

0.23

Parcel #:

22-21-432-008-0000



Street View

Zoning & Land Use

Current Zoning Designation
R-1-8 (Residential Single-Family)

Proposed Zoning Designation
RO (Residential Office)



Adjacent Uses



Land Use Designation
Residential Office (No Change)



Analysis

Request

An application has been made by Thurmond Dressen on behalf of Joe Coccimiglio, to rezone 0.23 acres of property at 6632 S. Highland Dr. from R-1-8 (Residential Single-Family) to RO (Residential Office). The applicant is requesting approval of the rezone to allow new types of uses (those allowed in the Residential Office zone) at this address.

General Plan

The General Plan Land Use Map indicates that this area is planned to be Residential Office. Chapter 19.35 of Cottonwood Heights City Code states:

Residential Office:

The RO zone is intended to provide for the conversion of existing blocks of dwellings to small offices in order to stabilize adjacent residential areas and prevent the intrusion of non-compatible commercial uses. This zone is intended to function as a transitional zone between existing residential and traditional commercial uses by preserving the residential scale, intensity of use and ultimate design of the project.

The request to rezone the property to RO (Residential Office) is consistent with the City's General Plan.

Zoning Ordinance

The RO (Residential Office) zone allows the following uses:

19.35.20 Permitted uses.

Permitted uses in the RO zone are as follows:

A. Single family dwelling.

19.35.30 Conditional uses.

Conditional uses in the RO zone are as follows:

A. Medical, optical, dental offices and clinics for health professionals, with the exception of after-hours care, overnight care or traditional medical retail stores, with a maximum gross floor area of 5,000 square feet on any one floor and 10,000 gross occupiable square feet;

B. Administrative, general or professional offices containing no more than 5,000 square feet on any one floor and 10,000 gross occupiable square feet;

C. Home occupations;

D. Mixed residential housing as defined in this chapter, provided that the mix of uses is consistent with permitted and conditional uses in this chapter;

E. Planned unit development;

F. Church;

G. School;

H. Retail sales secondary to office uses with no exterior or storefront displays;

I. Studios for an artist, designer, writer, photographer, sculptor or musician;

J. Child or adult day care facilities, with no overnight or after-hours care;

K. Residential facilities for elderly persons;

L. Medical clinics, provided that no after-hour or overnight care shall be permitted;

M. Reception center;


- N. Planned unit development;
- O. Twin homes; and,
- P. Bed and breakfast.

It is important to note that if the zone map amendment is approved, the zoning ordinance still requires all new uses, except for single-family dwellings, to receive a conditional use permit. New business types in the conditional use list above will require Planning Commission approval before receiving a business license.

19.35.60 Setbacks/yard requirements.

The setbacks and yard requirements in the RO zone are as follows:

- A. The minimum yard along a street shall equal the front yard required in the least restrictive adjacent residential zone.
- B. Minimum side yards of 25 feet and rear yards of 30 feet shall be required for those portions of a structure in an RO zone abutting a residential zone. For lots adjacent to a non-residential use, the minimum setback shall be ten feet for side yards and 20 feet for rear yards.
- C. The minimum front, rear, and side yard setbacks for two-story buildings with commercial activity occurring on the second floor shall be at least 100% of the height of the principal structure, when adjacent to a residential zone.



Aerial View with RO setbacks

19.35.080 Maximum height of structures.

In the RO zone, structures shall not exceed a height of two stories or 35 feet, whichever is less.

19.35.130 Landscaping requirements.

B. All developments in the RO zone shall provide a landscaped buffer, not less than eight feet in width, with trees planted no less than 30 feet on center, between any commercial development and any residential use or vacant land in a residential zone. This requirement can be included within the side and rear setbacks of the RO zone.

19.35.140 Architecture review.

A. The ARC shall review the design of projects in the RO zone under its purview for design compliance. The ARC shall be especially concerned with new buildings, or revitalization of older buildings, and their relationship with adjacent existing neighborhoods. The intent of the ARC review shall be to minimize effects on adjacent neighborhoods and to provide architectural continuity to help make an attractive and coherent community. In addition, the ARC shall ensure that reciprocity between buildings is achieved where possible, and shall ensure that alignment of buildings is consistent with established patterns of construction in the area and that architectural styles and themes are consistent and identifiable as appropriate for the zone and its surroundings.

B. Revitalization or conversion of existing buildings, regardless of the proposed use, shall not alter the established residential characteristics of the existing building. The ARC may, at its discretion, impose requirements on the proposed use of existing buildings in the RO zone to achieve continuity in architectural design.

Although no new development is proposed at this time, it should be noted that any future development will need to meet all applicable requirements of the zoning ordinance. A new commercial development would need to be reviewed by the Planning Commission for site plan and conditional use approval and by the Architectural Review Commission for a Certificate of Design Compliance. A new building would need to meet all height and setback requirements of the RO zone, as well as all parking, landscaping, and outdoor lighting requirements of the code.

Zone Map Amendment Procedure

19.90.010 Amendment procedure.

*A. The city council may, from time to time, amend the number, shape, boundaries or area of any zone or any regulation within any zone or any other provisions of the zoning ordinance. **The city council may not make any amendment authorized by this section unless the amendment was proposed by the planning commission or was first submitted to the planning commission for its recommendation. To become effective, zoning amendment applications which have received the positive recommendation of the planning commission must first receive the favorable vote of not less than a majority of the entire membership of the city council.***

B. Zoning amendment applications which receive a recommendation of denial by the planning commission shall thereafter be considered by the city council.... The city council, after review of the recommendation of the planning commission, may affirm, reverse, alter or remand for further review and consideration any recommendation made by the planning commission.

Staff Conclusion

The request to amend the zone map from R-1-8 (Residential Single-Family) to RO (Residential Office) is consistent with the goals of the General Plan and is consistent with adjacent land uses along Highland Drive.

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward a **RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL** to the City Council.

Conclusions - Findings for Approval

- The proposed zoning is compatible with the goals of the General Plan.
 - The application was made pursuant to 19.90 of CH City Code.
 - A public hearing was held in accordance with local and state requirements.
-

Model Motions

Approval

I move that we forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council for project ZMA-20-002 based on the findings listed in the staff report dated September 2, 2020

- List any other findings or conditions for recommendation of approval...

Denial

I move that we forward a recommendation of denial to the City Council for project ZMA-20-002

- List findings for negative recommendation...
-

Attachments

- Applicant Narrative

Thank you for your consideration in rezoning, this will be a great addition to the area I also live in Cottonwood Heights just on the other side of Highland (2167 e 6720 s) We will not increase street parking, traffic, noise in the area thank you! I have answer questions below paragraph by paragraph

The proposed amendment is in line with the general plan of the area, most of the same area has been rezoned to the commercial office zoning.

Currently no plans to develop the area, if we do it would be the interior space of the garage, this would result in no need for industrial work trucks, and we have plenty of space onsite to park any works that would help in this effort if we decide to remodel the garage.

There should be little to no affect on the area, no additional parking, traffic, lights, or noise. We would fit in like the other commercial lots on the street.

No affect to public, health, or safety. We have lots of parking off the street and are not looking to do a bunch of construction.

Currently zoned as a residential single family, with it being on the busy street of Highland drive the Commercial zoning is a better fit for the city and community.

Other large commercial offices have gone in on the same street, not making it ideal for a single family home.

Having the street constantly zoned commercial would be a great benefit to the community allow more options of business, this has been an area of huge growth in that location of the last few years.

Summary

PROJECT NAME: ZTA-20-005 – Outdoor lighting – technical amendment
REQUEST: Zoning Text Amendment
APPLICANT: Cottonwood Heights City
RECOMMENDATION: Approve

Background & Request

The final adopted version of the recently adopted outdoor lighting ordinance (zoning ordinance chapter 19.77) requires a minor technical amendment to clarify the applicability of the ordinance standards in both residential and commercial applications. This intent was originally presented to the Planning Commission and City Council and has been the intention of the ordinance since the original draft. An error was made in the final ordinance which incorrectly limits the ordinance to single-family residential projects.

Proposed Amendment

The following is the proposed amendment to 19.77.030:

19.77.030 – Applicability

A. Conformance required. Any new outdoor lighting ~~in a single family zone~~ shall be installed in conformance with the provisions of this Chapter. In any situation where there is a conflict with federal or state regulations, and/or applicable sections of adopted building code, the more restrictive provisions shall apply.

B. Modifications to existing structures or land uses. New additions to buildings, or areas of expanded land use, ~~in a single family zone~~ shall comply with the requirements of this chapter.

C. Routine Maintenance. ~~In a single family zone:~~

1. Repairing any component of a light fixture, except the lamp, is permitted for all existing outdoor lighting fixtures; and
2. Lamps shall be replaced in accordance with the provisions of this chapter; provided however, if no lamp exists which complies with this Chapter, then the fixture shall be replaced.

1 **MINUTES OF THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY**
2 **PLANNING COMMISSION WORK MEETING**

3
4 **Wednesday, August 5, 2020**
5 **5:00 p.m.**
6 **Conducted Electronically**
7

8 ***ATTENDANCE***
9

10 **Members Present:** Chair Chris Coutts, Craig Bevan, Jesse Allen, Bob Wilde, Douglas Rhodes,
11 Dan Mills

12
13 **Staff Present:** CED Director Michael Johnson, City Planner Andy Hulka, Deputy City
14 Recorder Heather Sundquist, City Attorney Shane Topham
15

16 **WORK MEETING**
17

18 Chair Chris Coutts called the Work Meeting to order at approximately 5:00 p.m. She read a
19 statement regarding conducting the meeting electronically from an anchor location.
20

21 **1.0 Planning Commission Business.**
22

23 **1.1 Review Business Meeting Agenda**
24

25 The agenda items were reviewed and discussed. CED Director, Mike Johnson stated that Graig
26 Griffin who was represented Council District 2, resigned from the Commission, creating a
27 vacancy. Staff has advertised for a replacement with two applications having been received.
28

29 Mr. Johnson reviewed the Bonneville Shoreline Trail Access Plan and stated that the last
30 meeting ended with comments being read into the record and several remained. Staff was now
31 able to add attendees to the meeting who can share their comments. Written comments will be
32 acknowledged and provided to the Commission but not read into the record. Both agenda items
33 were continued public comments from previous meetings. Public comments at tonight's
34 meeting would be timed and limited to three minutes.
35

36 Mr. Johnson reported that the City's Parks, Trails, and Open Space Committee makes
37 recommendations to the City Council for projects upon request. They recommended approval
38 of the proposed plan to the City Council. Public comments from the February Open House were
39 also attached as an appendix to the plan.
40

41 A question was raised regarding the parking and trailhead access points. The Parks, Trails, and
42 Open Space Committee identified five potential local access points, all of which are not
43 necessary. He explained that the intent of the local access points is as a convenience for the
44 neighborhood residents. Regional traffic and parking in these locations were of concern and
45 need to be considered. Neighborhood access points need to be identified and formalized. Chair
46 Coutts questioned whether it would be easier to deny the access points. Mr. Johnson pointed

1 out that there are funds available from the County for potential property acquisition. From a
2 functional perspective it is important for the City to provide recommendations for local access.
3 He did not want to miss out on potential opportunities.
4

5 A question was raised as to whether other local access points were evaluated. Mr. Johnson
6 stated that he only conducted an inventory of trails in the area and the impact needs to be
7 addressed. Parking and traffic issues were discussed.
8

9 Commissioner Wilde asked if any property owners near the access points have offered to sell
10 their property or allow it to be used. Mr. Johnson stated that one property owner requested a
11 meeting in this regard.
12

13 Chair Coutts asked about the potential to post signage in the neighborhood. Mr. Johnson stated
14 that signage at the local access points may be considered. He explained that the intent was not
15 to draw attention to the access points. The importance of having a Master Plan in place was
16 stressed.
17

18 Chair Coutts suggested that the Commission continue the matter if there is a high demand for
19 public commentary. Mr. Johnson stated that there is a great deal of public concern about traffic
20 at the Ferguson Canyon Trailhead where there is a lot of traffic and very limited parking. At
21 their next meeting, the City Council will address short-term solutions for traffic management in
22 the area. He explained that specific improvements included in the 2008 Contractor Agreement
23 with Salt Lake County will be required. For that reason, the trailhead was shown. Another
24 suggestion was to provide wayfinding signage to encourage people to park in specific areas
25 rather than drive up to the trailhead and circulate back down.
26

27 Mr. Johnson reported that originally there were more amenities at the local access points and
28 much of the feedback involved the need to minimize them as much as possible. There was also
29 feedback about making sure that the design of the trailheads matches the natural environment in
30 the area. There is a prevailing concern that traffic will overwhelm these areas. While the trail
31 access points are important, they want to minimize the concerns that exist.
32

33 Mr. Johnson explained that grant funds were received to construct the parking portion of the
34 plan. An Open House was scheduled for October to begin taking public feedback on the design,
35 wayfinding, and traffic flow.
36

37 Commissioner Mills asked how many different trails there are off of the proposed trail.
38 Mr. Johnson explained that there are several informal trails on private property including the
39 Ferguson Canyon and Deaf Smith Canyon, which is a popular area but no legal public access to
40 it. He stated that there is not much natural opportunity to wander off outside of those two
41 canyons.
42

43 Mr. Johnson discussed the gravel pit project and presented a list of the outstanding items
44 presented at the last meeting regarding issues to be addressed before making a staff
45 recommendation. They included the following:
46

- 1 • A policy analysis consisting of goals and objectives from various Master Plans, the
2 General Plan, other City policy documents, and a staff analysis regarding compliance of
3 the development proposal.
- 4 • Finalize a draft of the written ordinance. Two of the outstanding items included
5 provisions to sensitive lands such as mitigation of hazards, fault activity, slope stability,
6 and liquefaction potential. Mitigation for each needs to be properly addressed in the
7 ordinance.
- 8 • Affordable housing provisions. The original proposal included a senior living
9 component that would satisfy that requirement. A determination was made that it must
10 be affordable to below-market-rate households. The applicant had since revised their
11 affordable housing proposal and are now proposing a strict below-market-rate housing
12 project, eliminating the senior housing component, and incorporating the affordable
13 units into the apartment building. No change to the footprint was proposed.
- 14 • Additional coordination with the City of Holladay and the Utah Department of
15 Transportation (“UDOT”). One of the primary concerns was access. There was concern
16 that traffic from the proposed development would flow through the intersection and
17 cause congestion and other issues. Additional access points were identified.

18
19 Mr. Johnson reported that staff met with representatives from the City of Holladay who
20 reiterated their concerns with traffic and how to disburse vehicles through the site while waiting
21 for the southern portion of the pit to be developed. The applicant has subsequently met with the
22 City of Holladay and provided the needed documentation.

23
24 Mr. Johnson recommended that the public hearing be continued. Staff felt that they are close to
25 being prepared to make a preliminary recommendation. He suggested that they hold an extended
26 Work Session at a future meeting and begin to work through the details.

27
28 Chair Coutts mentioned that in her review of the PDD, and specifically the interface with
29 Wasatch Boulevard, she found that if there is parking against Wasatch Boulevard the berms will
30 be 10 feet. She asked that that be addressed. Mr. Johnson stated that there is a parking area and
31 a previous rendering was updated to show a berm in the area.

32
33 Concern was raised about the number of rentals in Cottonwood Heights. Mr. Johnson stated
34 that from a planning perspective that is not of concern. He commented that less redevelopment
35 is seen in strictly residential ownership areas. Significant redevelopment takes place in busier
36 commercial corridors. High-density development was recommended in the area. The project
37 also includes a mix of rentals and condominiums. Affordable housing is a significant portion of
38 the PDD and providing 10% of the units as affordable is often in the form of rental units. He
39 explained that the affordable units must be affordable to households making 50% or less of the
40 area median income.

41
42 **1.2 Additional Discussion Items.**

43
44 **1.3 Exparte Communication or Conflicts of Interest to Disclose.**

45
46 There were no conflicts of interest disclosed.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7

2.0 Adjournment

Commissioner Wilde moved to adjourn. Commissioner Bevan seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

The Work Session adjourned at approximately 6:00 p.m.

1 **3.0 BUSINESS ITEMS**

2
3 **3.1 (Project GPA-20-002) – A Public Hearing and Possible Recommendation to**
4 **the City Council on a City-Initiated Proposal to Adopt a Bonneville Shoreline**
5 **Trail Access Master Plan as an Addendum to the Cottonwood Heights General**
6 **Plan. (Continued from the July 15, 2020 Public Hearing).**
7

8 Mr. Johnson presented the staff report and gave a brief overview of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail
9 Access Master Plan. He noted that a lot of feedback had been received from the public. He
10 clarified that the Master Plan does not contemplate the alignment of the trail itself. The trail
11 alignment was established conceptually prior to City’s incorporation. He felt it was important to
12 understand how people will access the trail and determine what type of access will best
13 accommodate the anticipated users. The Bonneville Shoreline Trail Access Master Plan
14 establishes such plans in a formal document.
15

16 Mr. Johnson reported that the purpose of the plan is to identify the number and types of access
17 points needed to accommodate active transportation or recreation traffic on the trail. It should also
18 address what each of the access points should look like to accommodate traffic on the trail. He
19 noted that the Bonneville Shoreline Trail is a regional trail system and as a result, the plan would
20 examine only the portion within Cottonwood Heights. Although it had not yet been constructed,
21 it was a City priority dating back to the 2005 General Plan.
22

23 The Bonneville Shoreline Trail Access Master Plan recommends three different types of access
24 points including the following:
25

- 26 • Regional;
 - 27 • Secondary; and
 - 28 • local.
- 29

30 Regional access points would include adequate parking facilities, amenities such as restrooms or
31 benches, and drinking fountains. They would allow vehicular traffic to park and then use the trail.
32 The plan proposed three regional access points consisting of the following:
33

- 34 • The gravel pit (6900 Wasatch Boulevard);
 - 35 • The Big Cottonwood Canyon Pull Off; and
 - 36 • The Ferguson Canyon Overflow.
- 37

38 Secondary access points included smaller vehicular access points. Mr. Johnson noted that there
39 was a U.S. Forest Service property that was previously identified by the Forest Service as a
40 potential secondary trail access.
41

42 The local access points would be scaled back with pedestrian access only. The intended use was
43 for neighborhood access and was not intended to accommodate vehicular traffic or parking.
44 Mr. Johnson was aware of the concerns about vehicles parking near local access points. He noted
45 that not all of the access points shown on the map would be implemented. There were potential
46 areas to consider to meet the recommendation of one access point per mile.

1
2 Mr. Johnson reported that the Master Plan looked at opportunities and constraints at each of the
3 sites and provides conceptual layouts and details for the designs. He noted that the Ferguson
4 Regional Access Point was currently known as the Ferguson Overflow Lot. Mr. Johnson shared
5 background information on this area. In 2008, the City entered into an agreement with Salt Lake
6 County, where the County purchased the property with Open Space funds. The City agreed to
7 install and maintain improvements on the property. Improvements in the agreement were listed as
8 a parking lot, a restroom, and a public park. The City was still obligated to complete the
9 improvements and recently received grant funding to build out the parking portion of the area
10 within the next 12 months. Mr. Johnson believed this area made sense as a regional access point
11 because the City was already contracted to build it out.

12
13 Mr. Johnson discussed possible improvements for the local access points. He noted that they
14 would be minimal and may include a small trash can and a sign indicating trail access. He
15 explained that many neighbors in the future trail areas used informal or social trails that existed.
16 However, many were on private property. He felt it was important to plan for neighborhood-level
17 access to eliminate this issue.

18
19 The rest of the plan was available and had been presented previously. Mr. Johnson reported that
20 the Master Plan went into different design recommendations, backgrounds, some of the policy
21 documents, and shared details of the goals and objectives. He noted that at the July 15, 2020
22 meeting, live comments were not permitted. Emails were submitted and made part of the public
23 record. Not all of the emails were read at that time. Mr. Johnson recommended reading the rest
24 of the comments received prior to the July 15, 2020 meeting before acknowledging email
25 comments submitted since that time.

26
27 Gary Millet reported that he lives on Prospector Drive and during the late spring, summer, and
28 early fall, traffic, and parking in front of his home is an issue. He stated that it is annoying and
29 dangerous to have wall-to-wall cars lined up on both sides of a two-lane street. Although there is
30 parking next to the trailhead, it is quickly filled up, and visitors chose to park closer to the canyon
31 rather than use the designated parking lot below. He reported there are no parking signs or Permit
32 Parking Only signs in the area. In addition, he noted that beer cans, food wrappers, and general
33 debris are frequently left on his lawn.

34
35 Mr. Millet previously contacted Christine Mikell, Mike Johnson, and City Manager Tim Tingey,
36 asking why the City could not post “No Parking” signs in the neighborhood. He shared their
37 responses. Council Member Mikell indicated that she sent a photo to the Major and Mr. Tingey.
38 She noted that they had been working hard to create more parking near Wasatch Boulevard.
39 Pending approval, they hoped to build a 75-car overflow parking area. Mr. Tingey responded that
40 they were working through a federal process to direct funds to the development of an overflow
41 parking area for the Ferguson Canyon Trail. If funding is finalized, the design process and
42 construction would likely begin early next year and would provide 61 spaces. Mr. Johnson
43 highlighted the process of completing an application and getting it before the City Council for
44 consideration. Mr. Johnson expected it to take 90 days with no guaranteed outcome.

45

1 Mr. Millet did not understand why living near a trailhead should condemn his property and
2 neighborhood to constant traffic and parking issues. He asked that the Commission quickly pass
3 an appropriate parking policy to force canyon visitors to park in designated spots or on Wasatch
4 Boulevard. He also suggested constructing appropriate parking spaces with shuttle transportation
5 to accommodate Ferguson Canyon users.
6

7 Kelli Orchard reported that she has been a resident of Cottonwood Heights for 30 years and has
8 lived on Prospector Drive for 25 of those years. She lives one block from the Ferguson Trailhead
9 and had noticed a significant increase over the past two years with traffic and parking near and
10 around her neighborhood. She has Permit Parking Only signs in front of her home but hikers park
11 six feet from the signs and believe this is acceptable. In some areas of Prospector Drive, hikers
12 park on both sides of the street, making it difficult for cars and people to navigate through the
13 neighborhood. Ms. Orchard believed that no parking should be permitted on neighborhood streets.
14 She also expressed concerns regarding dogs and the Ferguson and Bonneville Shoreline Trails.
15 She noted that dogs need to be on-leash but this is not happening. A neighbor was bitten by a dog
16 that was off-leash on the Ferguson Trail last year. She commented that does not feel safe on the
17 trail with small children. Ms. Orchard also wanted to know why tonight's meeting was not listed
18 or mentioned in the City newsletter. None of her neighbors had heard about the meeting, the
19 Bonneville Shoreline Trail, or the possibility of increased traffic and parking in the neighborhood.
20

21 The Liepinis Family commented that they live on Timberline Drive. Their neighborhood is
22 concerned about connecting the Bonneville Shoreline Trail to the Ferguson Canyon Trail because
23 it will overpopulate the cul-de-sac and trailhead, creating a dangerous environment for hikers and
24 neighborhood residents. They were opposed to the proposed plan because of increased traffic.
25 They noted that Ferguson Canyon already experiences extensive traffic from hikers daily and they
26 had counted 200 cars visiting the Canyon in a single weekend. Ferguson Canyon had limited
27 parking and despite explicit signs across the cul-de-sac, hikers continue to park alongside homes
28 in the neighborhood. Connecting the two trails would create an increase in traffic, guests, and
29 patrol. The Liepinis Family also raised concerns about the safety of connecting the two trails and
30 noted that hikers often walk on the main road rather than the sidewalks. They noted that while
31 rules are set, guests rarely followed them.
32

33 Lynn Parker stated that the idea of improving access to the Bonneville Shoreline by adding
34 additional access points is positive in theory but trying to add restrooms, parking, and drinking
35 fountains does not make sense. The proposed access points exist in tightly packed residential
36 areas, off of residential streets that were designed for local traffic only. Proposed access areas,
37 such as Mountain Cove Circle, South Kings Hill Drive, 8335 South, Golden Oak Drive, and
38 Ferguson at Prospector could cause serious damage to property values in the area. Ferguson at
39 Prospector is already developed with parking spaces, a small amphitheater, trash cans, and
40 drinking fountains. In the year since the access point was developed, visitors had created numerous
41 problems for property owners in the area. Traffic is heavy and many visitors park illegally, make
42 messes, and leave dog droppings everywhere, despite clean up materials being provided.
43

44 The popularity of Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons created traffic issues for Golden Hills
45 residents attempting to access or cross Wasatch Boulevard. Not only did visitors to the canyons
46 block passage across Wasatch Boulevard but they often attempted to circumvent traffic by driving

1 through neighborhoods at high speeds. Ms. Parker noted that much of the Bonneville Shoreline
2 Trail is not physically accessible to everyone. Most of the trails in the Golden Hills area of the
3 Bonneville Shoreline are difficult to hike, wet and icy in the winter, rattlesnake infested, slippery,
4 rocky, and sandy. The trails are dangerous and the taxpayers have repeatedly had to pay for rescue
5 operations. Well-developed bike and walking areas have already been developed throughout the
6 Greater Salt Lake City area. Ms. Parker believed that hiking and recreational areas already exist
7 in the Cottonwood Canyons, adjacent to the existing parking areas, which did not sit next to private
8 homes. She preferred that money be spent on providing safer access across Wasatch Boulevard or
9 Big Cottonwood Canyon Road, along with maintenance, snow removal, adding restrooms to
10 existing parking lots, signage, and lighting. She believed that creating additional access to the
11 trails would create more problems.

12
13 Margie Jensen reported her concerns regarding the development of access areas. She noted that
14 she was unable to find a detailed map in the Master Plan of the trail from Ferguson south.
15 Ms. Jensen was strongly opposed to the development as she found the plan to be of concern.

16
17 Nicole Zeigler stated that she lives east of Wasatch Boulevard on Escalade Avenue. She moved
18 from downtown Salt Lake City to have greater access to the mountains. She found it frustrating
19 to learn how little access to trails there is above the neighborhood. Ms. Zeigler noted that the roads
20 and parking lots are often crowded. She supported developing the Bonneville Shoreline Trail and
21 creating several access points, both local and regional. She suggested there be a pedestrian bridge
22 over the widened road on Wasatch Boulevard. A pedestrian overpass would create additional
23 options for access to the Bonneville Shoreline Trail in the neighborhood and eliminate the need
24 for visitors to drive and park in the area. It would also make Golden Hills Park more accessible to
25 families that live west of Wasatch Boulevard.

26
27 Melissa Fields reported on behalf of the Parks, Trails, and Open Space Committee (“PTOS”). She
28 stated that the Bonneville Shoreline Trail planning and promotion had been a priority of the all-
29 volunteer Cottonwood Heights PTOS since it was formed nearly two years ago. Several PTOS
30 members contributed directly to the development of the proposed Access Plan. Those efforts
31 included the following:

- 32
33
- 34 • Participating in a site tour of the open space urban infrastructure along the eastern edge of
 - 35 the city where the Bonneville Shoreline Trail alignment had been proposed;
 - 36 • Attending multiple meetings to provide feedback to Blu Line designs, and
 - 37 • Helping facilitate the Bonneville Shoreline Trailhead and Access Plan open house, hosted
 - 38 at City Hall on February 20, 2020.

39 In addition, Blu Line Design shared two versions of the plan with the greater PTOS Committee to
40 garner more feedback. The PTOS endorses the Bonneville Shoreline Trailhead and Access Plan
41 for how it will naturally funnel users arriving by car to amenity-heavy regional trailheads and
42 provide lower profile access points for neighborhood users arriving by foot or bike. The plan will
43 also help meet a PTOS goal of creating greater connectivity between existing trails in the City.

44
45 Richard Muller reported concerns about the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. He noted that his family
46 has lived at Top of the World Drive for 20 years. During that time, he had seen a negative impact

1 on the neighborhood as the result of increased traffic, litter, dog waste, and parking issues at the
2 Ferguson Trail. He felt that further development of trails and trail access would continue to
3 degrade the neighborhood, reduce the enjoyment of homes, and create safety issues within the
4 community. Mr. Muller believed that the proposed development should be strongly opposed by
5 community representatives. Growth in Salt Lake County had caused increased traffic and issues
6 with current trails and he did not want those issues to be brought closer to home. He felt that the
7 issues were evident at the Ferguson, Bell Canyon, Mountain Olympus, and Neffs Canyon
8 Trailheads. He noted that cars often spill out of designated parking spots and fill the streets. The
9 residents of Cottonwood Heights who reside on or around Top of the World and Prospector Drives
10 adamantly oppose the Bonneville Shoreline Trail as well as a primary local access point within the
11 neighborhood. Mr. Muller stated that the desire for mountain access should not come at the
12 expense of residents who have chosen the area as their home. Should the Bonneville Shoreline
13 Trail be required, he believed that trail access should be provided only at the north or south ends
14 in undeveloped areas that will leave long-term residents unharmed.

15
16 Rick and Paula Jensen addressed the proposed plan for the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. They noted
17 that homeowners who live in the area should not need to deal with additional traffic, noise, and
18 congestion. They believed that should the project continue, the dirt parking lot at the bottom of
19 the hill on Prospector needs to be expanded and improved. Additionally, the parking on
20 Timberline should be eliminated and replaced with a bus stop for small commuter buses to reduce
21 the amount of foot traffic. They felt it would eliminate 90% of the traffic with cars driving up and
22 down Timberland and Prospector looking for a parking spot. They also felt that the ‘Permit
23 Parking Only’ signs should be extended another block south on Prospector to eliminate the hazard
24 of cars parking at the top of the hill. The Jensens believe that the planned switchback and walkway
25 to exit up the hill at 7800 South Prospector should be eliminated. This access point will drop
26 walkers off 100 yards past the Timberline access to Ferguson, meaning they would need to
27 backtrack along Prospector to Timberline Drive.

28
29 Rick Russell reported that he had to endure a constant flow of visitors. He currently lives on
30 Prospector Drive and had lived near the Ferguson Trailhead for over seven years. Mr. Russell felt
31 that additional access points would create more issues within the neighborhood. He believed most
32 hikers would find a place to park, even if it was done illegally. The parking along Prospector
33 Drive is dangerous not only for passing cars but also for hikers who often used the road as a
34 pathway. Parking and littering would always be of concern and he felt that no resident should
35 have to deal with a constant flow of foot and bicycle traffic through their neighborhood. He was
36 opposed to adding more access points to the Bonneville Shoreline Trail.

37
38 Shelly Muller commented that as a resident and taxpayer of Cottonwood Heights she had deep
39 concerns regarding decisions relating to the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. She mentioned that her
40 family had lived on Top of the World Drive for 20 years. During that time, they had seen a negative
41 impact on the neighborhood as the result of increased traffic, litter, dog waste, and parking issues
42 at the Ferguson Trail.

43
44 Stuart Browne and Nina Shaw purchased their home on Timberline Drive in November 2019 and
45 at that time were unaware of the trail expansion. They believe the expansion of the trail connecting
46 it to other trails would benefit the community at large. However, they had concerns that the trail

1 expansion would bring an additional influx of cars seeking parking. Cars often park illegally on
2 the street and in driveways and police are regularly called to ticket violators. The influx of cars
3 and people would create congestion on Timberline that was not conducive to a suburban street.
4 They asked that the Commission consider banning any trail parking on Timberline Drive. They
5 supported the proposal for additional parking between Prospector Drive and Wasatch Boulevard.
6 Mr. Browne and Ms. Shaw shared concerns regarding noise. With additional traffic on the
7 Bonneville Shoreline Trail, noise could become an issue. They asked that the trail be located high
8 enough on the hill parallel to Timberline as to not disturb the residents.
9

10 Sydney Shaw expressed concerns as a Cottonwood Heights citizen and mother living on
11 Quicksilver Drive. She believed the Bonneville Shoreline Trail Access will be detrimental to the
12 safety of homes and young children in the neighborhood. She stated that she lives below the area
13 where an access point is planned and directly above where cars will park. She already has
14 unwanted traffic below her home, with visitors looking into the yard and through the windows at
15 her children. She asked the Commission to take into consideration what this could mean for those
16 living in the area. She commented that a new access point and trail was not worth more than the
17 safety of the neighborhoods and children living there.
18

19 Vladimir Makarov reported that free access to public land is of paramount importance. He stated
20 that there was a natural access to Deaf Smith Canyon via Golden Hills Canyon Road, which had
21 been used by locals for more than 30 years. The road was private but he noted that people have
22 the right to walk on it to get to public land. Mr. Makarov suggested that Golden Hills Canyon
23 Road coming off Kings Hill Drive be considered as a local access opportunity along with Golden
24 Oaks Drive. He shared the benefits of the areas, which includes short and easy access to Deaf
25 Smith Canyon, favorable grades, and the areas are well-known and appreciated by local residents.
26 Mr. Makarov also noted potential setbacks such as ownership, nearby homes, and existing uses.
27 He reported that the Golden Oaks Drive access point did not provide access to Deaf Smith Canyon.
28 Pronouncing the road as a local access opportunity with limitations to vehicular traffic would serve
29 the well-being of the neighborhood.
30

31 Bob Desmond reported that his family lives adjacent to the cul-de-sac identified as Local Access
32 Site 7 on the south end of Kings Hill Drive. They are opposed to the development of a local access
33 point in this location and at other local sites identified in the plan. He believed regional access
34 points identified in the plan provided adequately spaced Bonneville Shoreline Trail access without
35 the need to disrupt the local neighborhood. The south end of the neighborhood, where two of the
36 local sites were identified is narrow, hilly, and leads into a dead end. Mr. Desmond believed the
37 sites were not suitable for access as described in the plan and he opposed local access development
38 in the neighborhood. He also felt that local trail access points, including the Kings Hill Drive cul-
39 de-sac, would become magnets for locals and non-locals and degrade the integrity and aesthetic
40 value of the neighborhood. Mr. Desmond also expressed concerns that service access to the homes
41 would be impaired. He noted that there are already issues with trash pick-up, deliveries, and snow
42 removal due to the limited size of the cul-de-sac and the steep, narrow streets around it.
43 Mr. Desmond believed the cul-de-sac could not accommodate ingress and egress from any
44 additional traffic or parking. He stated that there was a safety risk to families and properties in the
45 path of these local access sites. Additionally, Mr. Desmond felt that property values in the
46 neighborhood will be negatively impacted.

1
2 Debbie Tyler stated that while the Bonneville Shoreline Trail has been in the works for decades, it
3 is imperative that issues relative to parking be addressed prior to approving trailheads. She stated
4 that living near Ferguson Trail allowed her to see issues like illegally parked cars, foot traffic,
5 trash, and loose dogs. This did not make for a desirable neighborhood. She asked that trailheads
6 not be approved in the City unless ample parking is provided. Ms. Tyler noted that many cars
7 avoid the lower parking area and circle until they find a spot closer to the trail. She noted that
8 Ferguson Canyon has become an unofficial dog park. Unless the trail is monitored, the on-leash
9 dog rules were not being followed. She noted that the proposed dog park that is tied in with the
10 Ferguson Trail parking will quickly fill up with dog owners and cut down on parking for the trail.
11 Ms. Tyler was opposed to the idea of a regional Bonneville Shoreline Trailhead at Ferguson Trail.
12

13 Kings Hill Place neighbors expressed concerns with local access to the Bonneville Shoreline Trail
14 at the end of Kings Hill Place. They noted that Kings Hill Place is a short double dead-end street
15 with numerous driveways and residential cars already on the street. Both of these factors limit
16 space for additional parking. The trail access from Kings Hill Place will be narrow and will not
17 provide room for the proposed bench, waste receptacle, and signage without encroaching on the
18 adjacent private properties. This access point was not needed when the proposed regional trailhead
19 Access Site #9 was only 3 to 4 tenths of a mile away. For these reasons, the Kings Hill Place
20 location was poorly suited for a local access point. Residents shared concerns about the increased
21 traffic, noise, and trash issues that will be created and asked that the Commission reconsider this
22 site. They felt that of the recommendations for five local access points throughout the Golden
23 Hills neighborhood, Sites 4 through 8 are unnecessary and contradictory to the guideline of one
24 local access point per mile of trail. The distance between Sites 4 and 8 was barely a mile and there
25 was no need to have five access points in the residential area. They asked that City funds not be
26 wasted on acquiring access to any of these sites as it would create endless problems for the
27 residents. Instead, they asked that those funds be focused on the proposed regional trailhead access
28 to the south of the neighborhood where there are not any homes.
29

30 Ginni Brown reported that she has been a resident of Wasatch Boulevard for 35 years. She noted
31 that traffic congestion, noise, and litter are out of control. She stated that the neighborhood cannot
32 handle the number of people, cars, bikers, hikers, and dogs that go along with the Bonneville
33 Shoreline Trail. Ms. Brown was strongly opposed to the Bonneville Shoreline Trail being in the
34 area. She believed it will devalue properties and noted that traffic is already an issue.
35

36 Hannah Montoya Lazar reported that she is a homeowner on Timberline Drive, which backs
37 directly onto the existing Ferguson Canyon Trail. She supported and appreciated access to nature
38 for the community and stated that the plan for the park looked promising. However, she shared
39 reservations about the plan to make Ferguson Canyon a regional trailhead for the Bonneville
40 Shoreline Trail. She brought up issues related to parking as enforcement relies on residents calling
41 on the City to enforce parking violations. She believed that all trail parking should be in the
42 overflow lot. Timberline Drive should be Permit Parking Only and Cottonwood Heights must
43 enforce the rules with stiff fines. Ms. Lazar suggested the fine revenue be used to repave the road.
44 She noted that car traffic has made the road less safe and enjoyable for residents and created
45 resentment within the community. She also commented that the trail extension will cut across the
46 hillside that is visible from Timberline Drive. This will change the view, impact property values,

1 and increase foot traffic in a highly visible and audible way. She did not support an extension that
2 would negatively impact the peace and privacy of the neighborhood. She believed the trail should
3 be extended in a way that preserves the natural beauty of the hillside and respects the residents.
4 Ms. Lazar felt that if the Ferguson Overflow Lot becomes the sole place for parking at this access
5 point, there needs to be clear signage on Prospector and Timberline that there is no public parking.
6 She also expressed disappointment with local officials who planned the meeting without making
7 any effort to inform the residents impacted by these changes. Ms. Lazar reported that she reached
8 out to her District Forest City Council Member multiple times but had not received a response.
9

10 Jagdish and Surjit Gill reside on Timberline Drive and commented that they moved into the area
11 to enjoy retirement in peace and quiet. They stated that the Ferguson Canyon is directly in front
12 of their home and there is a lot of vehicular and foot traffic. Concerns were raised about visitors
13 bringing unleashed dogs that run on neighborhood yards. Additionally, they noted that car
14 windows had been broken and visitors often park in front of neighborhood homes. If the
15 Bonneville Shoreline Trail is built in front of their home, they felt it would increase car and foot
16 traffic, which will increase potential illegal activities. It would also ruin the peace and quiet of the
17 neighborhood and reduce home values.
18

19 Jake Nicholson reported that he and his wife live on South Kings Hill Drive, the cul-de-sac at the
20 south end of Kings Hill Drive, identified as Local Access Point Site 7. Their home is adjacent to
21 the proposed trailhead and they asked the Planning Commission to reconsider selecting Sites 7 and
22 8 as well as 4 through 8 to connect the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. They shared several reasons
23 for this. Regional Site 9 is just a few tenths of a mile to the south and would provide ample space
24 for parking and amenities while avoiding the need for cars to come through the neighborhood. The
25 analysis report specified that a local access point is needed every 1 to 1.3 miles but the Ferguson
26 trailhead to proposed Site 9 is only a little over a mile. Big Cottonwood Canyon, Ferguson, and
27 Site 9 together would provide sufficient access to the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. The cul-de-sac
28 and area at proposed Site 7 are very steep and difficult for emergency vehicle access, snow
29 removal, and mail delivery. It also is unsafe to back out of driveways with additional cars in the
30 area. Additionally, there were concerns over increased traffic, noise pollution, trash, dog waste,
31 and crime. Mr. Nicholson believed that local access would turn into regional access by word of
32 mouth and social media. The proposed local access points would become known and
33 overcrowded. He questioned the appropriateness of having trailheads so close to residential homes
34 and noted that the trails leading Site 7 and 8 cross large abandoned mine tailings, which could be
35 hazardous to citizens.
36

37 James Bunger questioned whether the City was making the right decision by inviting millions of
38 fellow Utah residents to congregate along a small stretch of the east side. Mr. Bunger wanted to
39 be a good neighbor but overuse of the neighboring canyons would result in loss of control of the
40 congestion created by a Bonneville Shoreline Trail and local access points. He believed there
41 would be an increase in public safety costs with little compensation for them. Mr. Bunger noted
42 that the development will impact the nesting owls and other wildlife in the area and leave a
43 permanent scar on the side of the mountain. He felt this would diminish the quality of life for
44 those impacted. He noted that virtually all of the trail and access point plans involve the use of
45 private land. Mr. Bunger wondered how that land would be acquired and asked if the acquisition
46 would diminish property values. He felt there would be a loss of privacy, seclusion, security, and

1 property values. Mr. Bunger believed the proper role of Cottonwood Heights should be to develop
2 public, rather than private lands, for residential use. He felt that since the vast majority of
3 congestion would come from residents outside of Cottonwood Heights, the proposed development
4 would shift value from local residents to residents outside of the City. He urged the City to reverse
5 its position and oppose the development of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail and associated access
6 points.

7
8 Joe and Christine Massey reported they are owners of land south of the proposed Timberline Trail
9 access point. They were concerned to see their property listed as a portion of the trail, especially
10 considering how close it is to their backdoor. The 8.44 acres, which was intentionally
11 undeveloped, is used regularly by their family and purchased to ensure that the land remains in its
12 natural state. As residents of the area in question, they wanted to voice their opposition to the
13 proposed access locations for the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. The Masseys felt that creating access
14 points in a residential area would have an unfavorable impact on the community. They stated that
15 the current canyon trailhead off of Timberland was already poorly managed and created traffic
16 hazards for children. Adding additional trail access points would exacerbate the problems. They
17 felt that the plan should focus on using government or BLM land exclusively in this area and not
18 infringe on private land. They suggested creating an access point in Big Cottonwood Canyon on
19 government land. This would give the state the desired connection without adversely impacting
20 the community. The Masseys commented that the City of Cottonwood Heights has lost touch with
21 what was best for the constituents.

22
23 Unknown reported that the project was brought to their attention by a concerned neighbor. They
24 were previously unaware of open houses or notices regarding plans to create new trailheads and
25 trail accesses through the neighborhood. They had many reasons to oppose the plans, specifically
26 with regard to the proposed #3 regional trailhead. They were also opposed to a pavilion, signage,
27 restrooms, and furniture as well as related paths placed in and through the Prospector
28 neighborhood. They had searched for nearly one year to find the kind of neighborhood they
29 wanted to live in. They specifically did not want to live next to a trailhead and paid more money
30 for a lesser view to have the privacy and tranquility they desired. The proposed regional trailhead
31 directly behind their home would elevate noise levels, increase foot traffic, and decrease their
32 privacy, security, and view. A fence would be needed to maintain some degree of privacy and to
33 prevent visitors from looking into their home. They believed that the trailhead access off of Big
34 Cottonwood Canyon Road would be better suited as it would avoid negatively impacting existing
35 neighborhoods and homeowners. For example, two proposed regional trailheads, #1 and #9, would
36 not disrupt neighborhoods the way that the #3 proposed regional trailhead would. If a third
37 regional trailhead was needed, they felt it would be worthwhile to thoroughly explore the southern
38 or northern sides of Big Cottonwood Canyon Road rather than unnecessarily and negatively impact
39 an existing neighborhood.

40
41 Kelly Calder stated that he and his wife live on Prospector Drive. Their property is 1 ½ blocks
42 from the local access point to the Ferguson Canyon Trailhead. They have experienced firsthand
43 the unpleasantness of having a trail access point in their neighborhood. They believed the
44 Ferguson Canyon Trailhead development was an example of problems caused by a trailhead in a
45 residential neighborhood. Mr. Calder believed that the City had made an effort to reduce impacts
46 on surrounding neighborhoods by adding parking in the area. However, the trailhead invites

1 people from all over the valley to congregate in the neighborhood. He noted that community
2 literature concerning trailhead access referred to local access points as being established to serve
3 City residents. He felt this was untrue as people come to the Ferguson Canyon Trailhead from all
4 over the valley. Mr. Calder noted that he often sees out of state license plates parked in front of
5 his home. Without significant parking established at access points, the neighborhoods will become
6 a secondary parking lot. Mr. Calder believed the City must enforce no parking laws on streets in
7 the vicinity of the trailheads. He also informed citizens of what they can expect living near a
8 trailhead. Those expectations included continuous parking on both sides of the street, dog
9 droppings, dirty diapers, beer cans, soda cans and trash on the grass. He also saw people lounging
10 on lawns, cars being parked overnight, reduced visibility on the streets, and traffic hazards.

11
12 Kent Maraffio commented that he lives on Quicksilver Drive and is opposed to the Master Plan,
13 particularly the regional access point, including the proposed Ferguson Trailhead upgrade. He saw
14 no reason for the citizens of Cottonwood Heights to be saddled with the cost of construction for
15 parking and parks as well as the cost of continued general maintenance. The increase in foot and
16 vehicular traffic was not something he believed was in the best interest of the community,
17 especially with the economic impacts of COVID-19. He stated that if a plan of this nature were to
18 be implemented and paid for by Salt Lake County or the State of Utah, only parking should be
19 developed with access to the parking lots coming directly from Wasatch Boulevard or other major
20 roads. Mr. Maraffio believed there should be no increase in vehicle traffic in existing
21 neighborhoods. He suggested that if the plan was allowed to move forward, the parks and facilities
22 should be removed from regional access points. He considered the added cost of upkeep to be
23 unnecessary.

24
25 Leslie Rinaldi reported that she lives at Kings Hill Drive with her partner James Matthewson. They
26 are avid hikers and chose to live in Cottonwood Heights due to the proximity to the foothills.
27 Ms. Rinaldi voiced her enthusiastic support of the development of trail systems that will provide
28 more access to the foothills above Cottonwood Heights. Having read the Bonneville Shoreline
29 Trail Master Plan, she found it to be well done and hoped it would be adopted. She stated that the
30 main issue seemed to be land ownership that blocks access to public lands. She felt that easements
31 could be negotiated with landowners to deal with access across private parcels. As for parking
32 and additional traffic, Ms. Rinaldi felt this would be an issue regardless, as the population of the
33 Salt Lake Valley continues to grow. She felt that a higher population indicates the need for more
34 access points to allow citizens greater access to outdoor recreation. Ms. Rinaldi and
35 Mr. Matthewson asked that the City adopt the Bonneville Shoreline Trail Access Master Plan as
36 an addendum to the Cottonwood Heights General Plan.

37
38 Mary Sinden reported that she and her family live on Kings Hill Drive and own a half cul-de-sac
39 property adjacent to the proposed trailhead at the end of Kings Hill Drive, identified as Local
40 Access Site #7. They were opposed to the development of local access points #7 and #8 and Sites
41 #4 through #8 connecting with the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. Ms. Sinden asked that the Planning
42 Commission reconsider the selections as the access points were not needed, given that proposed
43 Regional Trail Access Site #9 is only 3 to 4 tenths of a mile south in an undeveloped area. Analysis
44 reports showed that local access is needed every 1 to 1.3 miles. The distance between Site #4 and
45 #8 was barely 1 mile. The distance to Site #9 would accommodate with little added distance.
46 Ms. Sinden also noted that emergency vehicle access to homes in the immediate area would be

1 impaired with the addition of a trailhead. She stated it is already challenging for fire trucks to turn
2 around in the cul-de-sac without any additionally parked vehicles. She also noted that with more
3 visitors, fire hazard concerns would increase. Ms. Sinden stated that the cul-de-sac is on a steep
4 incline where many vehicles attempt to turn around in one fell swoop. Vehicles are often unable
5 to complete turns or skid in winter, which threatens property damage. Ms. Sinden noted that the
6 surrounding area is also difficult for mail delivery, garbage removal, snow removal, and
7 emergency vehicles.

8
9 She reported that a major factor in purchasing property in the area was due to how quiet the
10 neighborhood is. Her concern was the increase in traffic, noise, and crime. She believed people
11 would gather and crime will increase if the plan is approved. Local access will become non-local
12 through word of mouth and social media. She referenced situations in the past where she had been
13 forced to call the police for interventions when groups started bonfires on the hillside at night and
14 parties occurred.

15
16 Sam Fisher referenced the Bonneville Shoreline Trail Master Plan, Figure 1.3.2. It showed
17 Ferguson Canyon Overflow as a proposed regional access point but failed to mention ongoing
18 concerns and issues regarding parking. He described the behavior of what he called a typical
19 recreational enthusiast who came to Ferguson Canyon. This included driving in circles to look for
20 a parking spot. He noted that only when all parking spots on surrounding streets were full would
21 visitors drive down to the overflow. He had experienced traffic congestion as cars drive around
22 looking for parking and guests to his home were not able to park on the street. Mr. Fisher also
23 noted issues such as unleashed dogs and dog droppings on his yard and on sidewalks, trash left in
24 his yard, and cars blocking the neighborhood mailbox. Mr. Fisher requested that the no parking
25 area be extended further down Prospector Drive to Aerie Cove and for the City to determine a
26 better parking solution for Ferguson Canyon before considering it a potential regional access point
27 for the trail.

28
29 Yumi Memmott reported that she and her neighbors wanted to voice their opinions on local access
30 locations, such as Mountain Cove Circle, Site #4, 8335 South, Site #5, Golden Oaks Drive, Site
31 #6, South Kings Hill Drive, Site #7, and Kings Hill Place, Site #8. She found the proposal
32 offensive. Ms. Memmott stated that several questions came to mind when she first heard the
33 proposal. She wondered if those working on the proposal had lived in such a neighborhood if
34 research had been done, if neighbors had been spoken to, and if crime rates will increase.
35 Ms. Memmott mentioned potential issues with parking, policing, unleashed dogs, and blind spots.
36 She noted that property taxes in the area are expensive to protect the neighborhood. However, it
37 seemed they were being used to serve those who do not live in the neighborhood. She asked that
38 the City protect the neighborhood residents.

39
40 Yvonne Spencer stated that it was risky to add parking facilities in the middle of private properties
41 owned by families. She believed property values will be negatively affected and traffic will
42 increase. This would pose a threat to residents who use the streets to bike and jog.

43
44 Zachery Prince trusted community representatives to do what is right and moral for the
45 neighborhood. The attached email was a duplicate and had already been read into the record.

1 Becky and Melissa McDermott reported their concerns regarding the Bonneville Shoreline Trail
2 Access Master Plan. They heard about the issue from a neighbor and wished there had been more
3 public notice of the proposal. They felt that the proposed parking area was a good idea on paper
4 but unrealistic for the neighborhood. Ms. McDermott noted that there is already a lot of traffic on
5 Wasatch Boulevard year-round. She believed more cars turning onto Prospector Drive will lead
6 to more accidents and congestion. When their lots were purchased on Quicksilver and Timberline
7 near Ferguson in 1984, they never imagined all of the traffic that would pass through the
8 neighborhood. The proposed ‘no parking’ on Timberline would force cars to pour out onto
9 surrounding streets. Currently, the trailhead for Ferguson Canyon not only affects people living
10 on the surrounding streets but increased traffic throughout the neighborhood. She noted that foot
11 traffic has also increased and wondered if home values were taken into account. Ms. McDermott
12 was not in favor of the project.

13
14 Dennis and Edy Wright commented that the Golden Hills neighborhood is under attack.
15 Ms. Wright wondered why anyone would want five local access points within a few miles. She
16 also stated that this increased the risk of a child being taken. She asked Mayor Petersen and staff
17 to review the Bonneville Shoreline Trail issue in favor of the neighborhood.

18
19 Richard Abbott, a 49-year Cottonwood Heights resident, was opposed to the Bonneville Shoreline
20 Trail access points in the residential areas east of Wasatch Boulevard. He felt that the proposal
21 degrades the nature of that part of the City. Mr. Abbott moved to the area because it was a beautiful
22 and quiet neighborhood but allowing the access points would turn Top of the World Drive and
23 Kings Hill Drive into a parking lot for those who are not residents of Cottonwood Heights. He
24 noticed that residents on Timberland Drive, where there is access to the Ferguson Canyon
25 Trailhead, had experienced parking problems due to hikers and dog walkers. He hoped the City
26 would learn from prior errors. There are several access points up Big and Little Cottonwood
27 Canyon for hikers without passing through residential areas.

28
29 Mr. Johnson reported that all comments received prior to the July 15, 2020, Planning Commission
30 Meeting had been read. He listed the names of those who submitted written comments after that
31 meeting as follows:

- 32
33
- 34 • Tyler Anderson;
 - 35 • Dean and Libby Hague-Smith;
 - 36 • Nancy Hardy;
 - 37 • Sinead Hogan;
 - 38 • Audrey Pines;
 - 39 • Rudy RuteMiller;
 - 40 • Larry Walker; and
 - 41 • Hallie Yurick.

42 The emails were sent to the Planning Commission Members and would be posted publicly.

43
44 Chair Coutts noted that the public comment period remained open. Mr. Johnson confirmed that
45 those wishing to speak had not previously commented.

1 Patricia Dennis lives on Top of the World Drive and stated that her home abuts the valley behind
2 where the access trail to Bonneville Shoreline is mapped on the plan. She believed something
3 should be listed in the City newsletter with a link to all Commission Meeting information. After
4 listening to the public comments, Ms. Dennis believed if a vote were taken, most residents would
5 vote against an expansion. At best, she felt they would agree to a regional trailhead with a shuttle
6 to provide access to hikers. She noted that crime is on the rise at Olympus Trail because of the
7 cars were parked there. Ms. Dennis noted that during the Business Meeting, a comment was made
8 regarding the fact that local access points will not be heavily advertised. Ms. Dennis believed
9 people in the neighborhoods know where they can access the trails without additional signage.
10 She commented that she believed the property could be shut down because it is private property,
11 however, the City Attorney had done a front-page spread about prescriptive easements.
12 Ms. Dennis wondered if the City Attorney was wrong and wanted to know if access can be locked
13 on a trail that has existed since 1947.

14
15 Chair Coutts felt that the comments received were consistent throughout. She acknowledged that
16 there was a lot of concern regarding access in the neighborhood. Chair Coutts stated that if the
17 Commission felt they had heard all of the overarching issues, they could close the public comment
18 period. She reported that the item would come up again because the Commission would make a
19 recommendation on the issue and pass it on to the City Council where there would be an additional
20 opportunity for public comment. Chair Coutts asked the Commissioners whether they needed to
21 hear additional comments to help form a recommendation. Commissioners felt they had been
22 adequately informed and did not feel the need to hear additional public comments.

23
24 There were no further public comments. Chair Coutts closed the public hearing.

25
26 Chair Coutts opened up the discussion to the Commission and stated that local access points make
27 this a difficult issue. Chair Coutts noted that she had heard a fair amount of support for regional
28 access points, which was promising, although obvious issues exist at the Ferguson Canyon
29 Trailhead. The Ferguson Canyon Trailhead was shown in the plan as an access point, along with
30 a sketch of improvements to the lower parking area and the addition of a dog park. Chair Coutts
31 noted that neighborhood access points are an issue, but as someone who used the trails, she would
32 not want to lose the ability to walk to the trails. Driving to a trailhead when it is nearby is a difficult
33 concept but she understood that formally including it in the access plan made it an option. She
34 stated that there was a lot of good in the Bonneville Shoreline Trail Access Master Plan but
35 recognized that the neighborhood access points are problematic.

36
37 Commissioner Mills agreed with Chair Coutts and had heard largely unanimous support for the
38 idea of the trail but noted the concerns about access. Commissioner Mills wondered if there were
39 other municipalities along the Bonneville Shoreline Trail that had come up with unique solutions
40 to these issues. He wondered if it would be possible to have neighborhood access but restrict on-
41 street parking. Commissioner Mills noted that residents could have hanging parking permits for
42 their guests. He wondered if this would be a burden from an enforcement standpoint. He also
43 noted that if 'no parking' signage was continued down far enough, visitors would have to go to the
44 regional access points unless they live in the neighborhood.

1 Mr. Johnson stated that there was a permit parking provision in the City Ordinance that is allowed
2 to be implemented by petition. There were a few instances where the City had prohibited all on-
3 street parking due to ski and restaurant traffic. He believed there were policy options that could
4 be complementary to the recommendations in the plan.

5
6 Commissioner Bevan considered parking enforcement to be an issue. He asked if enforcement
7 was another task the police would be responsible for or if it would come down to code enforcement.
8 Commissioner Bevan did not think a private contractor would be appropriate. However, if parking
9 was not being enforced, a sign would not be helpful. Chair Coutts noted that signage at the regional
10 trailheads that specify 'No Neighborhood Parking' would be a deterrent as opposed to something
11 to enforce. Commissioner Bevan believed it would need to be properly enforced. Mr. Johnson
12 noted that at the next Council Meeting on August 18, 2020, one of the discussion items would be
13 related to traffic and parking issues in the Ferguson Canyon area. He would update the
14 Commission at the next meeting on how that discussion plays out.

15
16 Chair Coutts asked Mr. Johnson if the Council had already seen the plan from the Parks, Trails,
17 and Open Space Committee. He stated that the committee made their recommendation but the full
18 plan was not being taken forward to City Council until they have the Commission's
19 recommendation as well. Commissioner Mills stated that when the City Council has an
20 opportunity to work on the enforcement side, concerns could be reduced. Chair Coutts mentioned
21 that there had been a lot of comments about difficulties with cul-de-sacs. She noted that areas on
22 the south end of the neighborhood are very hilly and steep. There are also a lot of dead-end streets
23 that make vehicular access difficult.

24
25 ***Commissioner Wilde moved to approve the Bonneville Shoreline Trail Access Master Plan with***
26 ***an amendment to remove local access points.***

27
28 The Commission discussed the idea of limiting local access points to the two that are most
29 appropriate and what a suitable number of local access points would be. It was noted that there
30 was a long stretch between Ferguson and Little Cottonwood Canyon.

31
32 ***Commissioner Wilde withdrew his motion.***

33
34 Chair Coutts noted that the reason to show the regional access points in the Master Plan was so
35 that in future the City could procure what is needed for the Bonneville Shoreline Trail to move
36 forward. Mr. Johnson noted that if there was ever a rezone or development application on one of
37 the locations identified, a developer may be asked to provide amenities.

38
39 A question was raised as to whether the Access Plan specifies that only two or three of the local
40 access points were recommended. Mr. Johnson clarified that one is needed every 1 to 1.3 miles
41 and that the possible locations are not necessarily essential or recommended. Commissioner Wilde
42 felt good about regional points and a single local point. The Commission Members agreed that it
43 is important to leave options open regarding local access points.

44
45 ***Commissioner Wilde moved to approve GPA-20-002, Bonneville Shoreline Trail Access Master***
46 ***Plan and forward it to the City Council, subject to the following conditions:***

- 1
2 1. *Only one of the shown local access points is required to be implemented or*
3 *constructed.*
4
5 2. *A recommendation shall be added to the Master Plan to convert parking currently*
6 *at the Ferguson Canyon Trailhead into accessible parking only for use of the*
7 *amphitheater, with all trail parking relegated to Regional Trailhead Site #3.*
8

9 *Commissioner Bevan seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Commissioner Allen-Aye,*
10 *Commissioner Mills-Aye, Commissioner Rhodes-Aye, Commissioner Bevan-Aye,*
11 *Commissioner Wilde-Aye, Chair Coutts-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.*
12

13 3.2 **(Project PDD-19-001) A Public Hearing to Receive Comments on a Request**
14 **from AJ Rock, LLC, for an Ordinance and Zone Map Amendment for**
15 **Approximately 21.5 Acres of Property Located at 6695 South Wasatch**
16 **Boulevard Utilizing the City’s Planned Development District (PDD)**
17 **Ordinance and Changing the Zoning Designation from F-1-21 (Foothill**
18 **Residential) to PDD-2 (this is a Zoning Designation Prepared Specifically for**
19 **the Subject Property by the Applicant, within the Guidelines of Chapter 19.51**
20 **of the City Zoning Ordinance. (Continued from the July 15, 2020, Public**
21 **Hearing.**
22

23 Mr. Johnson presented the staff report and addressed issues presented at the last meeting as well
24 as current updates including the following:
25

- 26 • The policy analysis outlined in the current staff report and published on the City website.
27 Staff looked at all relevant policy documents, master plans, and General Plan references to
28 the site and compared them to the current proposal. The analysis had been substantially
29 completed and was included in the staff report.
30 • Implement all staff recommendations in a proposed written ordinance to accompany the
31 rezone. Two of the major outstanding items were: sensitive lands provisions (particularly
32 related to the grading of certain areas and areas with certain slopes) and mitigation needed
33 (geologic hazards, slope stability, liquefaction, and other sensitive land hazards). The goal
34 was to ensure that all issues were properly addressed and mitigated in the plan and the
35 ordinance.
36 • Affordable housing provisions. The previous submission included a recommendation for
37 senior housing that staff found did not properly meet the Below Market Rate language for
38 affordable housing in the PDD ordinance. The applicant changed their proposal in that
39 regard. Instead of proposing senior housing, they were now proposing the inclusion of two
40 Below Market Rate units in the apartment building. The language and details were still
41 being worked out and changes were ongoing.
42 • Revised and consistent drawings. A few changes had been made over the last few
43 meetings. Additional updates would show the removal of a senior housing building.
44 • Additional coordination with the City of Holladay and UDOT. Staff met with
45 representatives from the City of Holladay to better understand their perspectives and
46 concerns, which related to traffic impact and access challenges. The applicant reached out

1 to Holladay City Staff to provide details on the project. That information was published
2 on the City website. UDOT was focused mainly on access points and the potential of using
3 Wasatch Boulevard for future access. The main access proposed was to branch off of the
4 6200 South intersection and Old Wasatch Road and extend through the site. The future
5 plan was to connect that road into the southern gravel pit development. Concerns were
6 raised that traffic from the site would load onto one intersection point until the property is
7 redeveloped. The applicant proposed an emergency access that looped around the existing
8 ski shop in the area. Staff met with UDOT and asked if there was flexibility to use what
9 was proposed as emergency access as regular access. That could potentially disperse the
10 traffic impact through the area. It was possible that using the emergency access as a regular
11 access would be allowed on a temporary basis. Permitting for this issue may need to be
12 undertaken by UDOT.
13

14 Mr. Johnson reported that staff had reached the point in the process where a lot of outstanding
15 items were being addressed. He recommended that a longer Work Session take place at the
16 September Planning Commission Meeting. He felt it would allow Commissioners to gain a better
17 understanding of the details. In the meantime, staff would continue to work on existing issues.
18 From there, the project could be put together as a full package. Mr. Johnson reported that the
19 intention was to have it ready by the September Commission Meeting, with 1 ½ to 2 hours devoted
20 to a Work Session. This would allow necessary analysis to be done so the Commission could
21 make a recommendation over the next few meetings.
22

23 Mr. Johnson noted that Senior Planner, Matt Taylor had previously served as the Project Manager.
24 However, Mr. Taylor had taken employment elsewhere and was no longer with the City. The
25 applicant, Adam Davis joined the project discussion. He noted that a lot of progress had been
26 made in the last two weeks. Mr. Davis provided renderings for the Commission to view. He
27 reported that comments were received from the City Engineer on the project. He discussed the
28 renderings provided to the Commission and stated that they were intended to depict mass and
29 height. Mr. Davis reported that the architecture shown was not representative of the buildings. A
30 great deal of time had been spent developing architectural guidelines and standards. However, the
31 purpose of the renderings was to demonstrate the height and massing of the buildings.
32

33 Mr. Davis identified ongoing gravel pit operations, the existing ski rental shop, an apartment
34 building located on the eastern portion of the site, a smaller retail building, two mixed-use
35 buildings, two retail pads, the hotel, and the condominium building on the rendering. He noted
36 that work had been done on the footprint of the condominium but the updated footprint was not
37 shown in the current rendering. The building would be one story lower and would now be in an
38 “L” shape. He reported that some of the discussions with the architect related to connectivity
39 between the condominium and the apartment building. They were working to integrate those
40 changes into the rendered images. He believed one of the advantages of the design was the varying
41 height and massing throughout the project. He noted that because the hotel had switched places
42 with the retail buildings, it would provide better visibility for the retail buildings and allow for
43 better variation of height and massing.
44

45 Mr. Davis showed the high, low, and street-level perspectives of the project to the Commissioners.
46 He noted it was important to look at landscaping and parking. There had been concerns raised by
47 the Commission about being able to see surface parking along SR-190. Mr. Davis believed the

1 rendering showed there would be enough separation thanks to a rock gabion wall that would
2 separate parking from the landscaped area. In addition, there would be elevation, a berm, and
3 plantings to shield parking but allow visibility for the buildings themselves. He noted that as you
4 travel further south, there will be more parking. There would also be parking in front of the mixed-
5 use buildings, on the west side of the retail buildings, and in a parking field between the hotel and
6 retail buildings. Mr. Davis noted that the berms would not be quite 10-feet but they would do an
7 adequate job of screening the parking.

8
9 Mr. Davis also noted that in the previous Work Session, there had been a comment about the grade
10 of the buildings. He reported that the site was a gravel pit and everything had been graded out.
11 Most of the site, especially on the west side and the commercial side, was to be filled to raise the
12 existing grade. There would be berming along SR-190 to screen and shield the parking. Mr. Davis
13 hoped the renderings provided the Commission with a better understanding of the height, massing,
14 and layout of the project.

15
16 Commissioner Bevan commented that the buildings have visual and massing interest. Mr. Davis
17 stated that when traveling southbound, the project design allows visitors to see Big Cottonwood
18 and Ferguson Canyons. He noted that the building heights are well below what is allowed under
19 the General Plan. Commissioner Mills' main concern was that motorists can see the tops of the
20 mountains as they drive north and south.

21
22 Commissioner Allen referenced a comment he made during the Work Session about grading. He
23 stated that the design seems to berm more on the south end where there is a five-foot grade
24 difference between the road and the parking lot. He commented that this does not seem
25 problematic with the additional landscaping. Commissioner Allen was pleased to see that the
26 rendering was accurate with what was proposed.

27
28 Chair Coutts asked Mr. Davis if the senior living building in the original proposal was going to be
29 part of the submittal. Mr. Davis responded that it would not. After long conversations, they chose
30 Below Market Rate for rental apartments rather than senior living. The original idea was to build
31 a separate standalone senior living building but as the project moved forward, they were changing
32 the unit mix. There would be Below Market Rate units in the apartments. The area where the
33 senior living building was proposed would include additional surface parking. He noted that this
34 change would be seen ahead of the Work Session.

35
36 Chair Coutts asked if removing the senior living building would open up opportunities to rework
37 the mass of the condominium building. She noted that it is the largest building and is right up
38 against a residential area. Mr. Davis did not believe it opened up opportunities but stated that this
39 could be looked at further. He reported that it would be challenging to move the condominium
40 due to a fault line as well as concerns surrounding grades and parking. Mr. Davis noted that there
41 were several constraints on the site itself. Chair Coutts shared her appreciation that Mr. Davis was
42 willing to consider the concept.

43
44 Chair Coutts opened the public hearing.

45
46 Mr. Johnson read the names of the following individuals who submitted written comments:

- Audrey and Jeffrey Anderson;
- Charles and Leslie Archer;
- Charles and Susan Ayres;
- David Boettger;
- Sherry Britt;
- Jacob Brown;
- Ryan Erickson;
- Lynne Guenigault;
- Mo Khodadad;
- Dean and Mildred Martensen;
- Dave and Kristin Schreiner;
- Tom Stephens; and
- Wayne Xia.

Patricia Dennis wondered about the parking garage structure. She wanted to know how much parking there would be and asked about accessibility. She noted that there wasn't anything in the plan regarding those issues and wondered if they could be spoken to.

Chair Coutts stated that Ms. Dennis was referring to a proposed parking structure for the Cottonwood Canyons and that was not a part of this proposal. The current proposal was for the northernmost 21 acres of land. What Ms. Dennis was discussing was a potential future development. Mr. Johnson noted that they were working extensively with UDOT and other property owners in the area. He noted that the northern portion of the gravel pit is not ideal for that type of parking structure. Mr. Johnson stated that there would be updates on the project later on but confirmed that it was not part of this particular proposal.

There were no further public comments. The public hearing was remained open.

Commissioner Allen asked if there had been an update on discussions with the City of Holladay. Mr. Davis reported that they provided the City of Holladay with all of the plans and they were being reviewed. They would be following up with them before the next Work Session.

4.0 CONSENT AGENDA

4.1 Approval of Planning Commission Minutes.

- **July 1, 2020, Planning Commission Minutes**

Commissioner Rhodes moved to approve the Planning Commission Minutes from July 1, 2020, with edits submitted by Chair Coutts. Commissioner Wilde seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Commissioner Allen-Aye, Commissioner Mills-Aye, Commissioner Rhodes-Aye, Commissioner Bevan-Aye, Commissioner Wilde-Aye, Chair Coutts-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

1 **5.0 ADJOURNMENT**

2

3 *Commissioner Bevan moved to adjourn. Commissioner Wilde seconded the motion. The motion*
4 *passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.*

5

6 The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:41 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the*
2 *Cottonwood Heights City Planning Commission Meeting held Wednesday, August 5, 2020*

3
4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes
7 T Forbes Group
8 Minutes Secretary

9
10 Minutes Approved: _____