

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

3  
4 **Wednesday, July 1, 2020**

5 **5:00 p.m.**

6 **Conducted Electronically**  
7

8 ***ATTENDANCE***  
9

10 **Members Present:** Acting Chair Chris Coutts, Sue Ryser, Jesse Allen, Douglas Rhodes, Bob  
11 Wilde, Dan Mills

12  
13 **Staff Present:** CED Director Michael Johnson, Senior City Planner Matthew Taylor, City  
14 Planner Andy Hulka, City Attorney Shane Topham, Deputy City Recorder  
15 Heather Sundquist  
16

17 **Others:** Delmas Johnson, Dimond Zollinger, Holly Mullen, Jesse Stewart  
18

19 **WORK MEETING**  
20

21 In the absence of Chair Graig Griffin, Acting Chair Chris Coutts called the Work Meeting to order  
22 at approximately 5:00 p.m.  
23

24 **1.0 Planning Commission Business.**  
25

26 **1.1 Review Business Meeting Agenda**  
27

28 The agenda items were reviewed and discussed.  
29

30 City Planner, Andy Hulka presented the first item and stated that the matter was on last month's  
31 agenda. The request is for a Conditional Use Permit for a wireless telecommunication facility at  
32 8800 South King Hill Drive #A. The matter was continued to allow the applicant additional time  
33 to work with the property owner and local residents on issues that were raised. Mr. Hulka reported  
34 that two items are being considered. The first is the conditional use for the wireless  
35 telecommunication facility. The other includes reductions in the minimum yard requirements for  
36 public use. A map of the subject property was displayed. It was noted that there is currently an  
37 underground facility. The property is in the F-1-21 zone.  
38

39 Mr. Hulka stated that there may be some changes to the proposed site plan. What is proposed is a  
40 new facility with an above-ground entrance. The new above-ground entrance will have an antenna  
41 on the roof that will be approximately 14 feet tall with an additional 10 feet for the antenna above.  
42 The Code does not allow accessory structures to exceed 20 feet in height. The antenna was  
43 proposed to be on top of the roof of the new structure. He noted that roof-mounted antennas are  
44 required to be stealth facilities. Examples of stealth facilities were displayed.  
45

1 Mr. Hulka reported that it is also a requirement that accessory buildings be in the rear yard behind  
2 the structure. In this case, it is proposed in a side yard, which would normally not be allowed.  
3 Because it is a public use, there is an exception in the Code that allows the Planning Commission  
4 to reduce the setback requirements. Mr. Hulka reviewed the recommended conditions of approval  
5 set forth in the staff report.  
6

7 It was noted that the objections primarily pertained to the antenna. Mr. Hulka explained that the  
8 antenna is on private property and there is an easement for the pump station. The applicant, Salt  
9 Lake City, feels that the easement is comprehensive enough to cover this project, which is a  
10 rehabilitation project for the existing station. Some residents disagreed. Staff added an additional  
11 condition of approval that requires the City Attorney to review the request and ensure that adequate  
12 documentation is received.  
13

14 Mr. Hulka reported that the request is for a conditional use, which is entitled to approval. The  
15 Planning Commission can impose reasonable conditions to mitigate any perceived negative  
16 impact. A stealth structure for the antenna could mitigate a negative impact. A condition to  
17 mitigate is intended to demonstrate that within the public utility easement, they have the legal right  
18 to do what is proposed to fully comply with the Code. In response to a question raised, City  
19 Attorney, Shane Topham commented that the easement contains language permitting replacement  
20 of the existing facilities. There are also Land Use, Development, and Management Act  
21 (“LUDMA”) provisions that allow the benefit to be given to the applicant in the event of close  
22 calls. It was noted that a copy of the easement was emailed to the Commission Members for their  
23 review.  
24

25 The issue of disguising the antenna was raised. Jesse Stewart, Deputy Director of Public Utilities,  
26 stated that they intend to paint the antenna green, brown, or camouflage or other color deemed  
27 acceptable to the City. Project Manager, Dimond Zollinger, stated that when he began working on  
28 the project in the Fall of 2019, the design was about 60% complete. They met with the property  
29 owner and proceeded with the design work. Once complete, they discovered that the height of the  
30 antenna was an issue. The property owner did not object to the above-ground structure but asked  
31 that they match the siding and roofing of the building to his home. There was also a drainage sump  
32 on the site and the property owner wanted to place a shed in that location. As a result, the site was  
33 redesigned and the drainage sump moved. Several other features of the site were adjusted as well.  
34

35 Mr. Stewart stated that the height of the antenna was also lowered. The signal was to be relayed  
36 from another facility to their main compound. Doing so allowed them to reduce the height of the  
37 pole. Utilizing a stealth tower in the form of a pine tree was being considered. Although most  
38 costly, the issue was aesthetics. Mr. Zollinger stated that the residents are more concerned about  
39 their views being obstructed than the appearance of the pole. In some cases, poles disguised as  
40 pine trees create more obstruction.  
41

42 Height issues were discussed. After review by the State Engineer, the applicants were confident  
43 that they can place the facility less than 20 feet above natural grade. It was suggested that the  
44 applicants continue to work with the community on how best to camouflage the pole.  
45

1 Senior City Planner, Matthew Taylor presented the next agenda item regarding the Wasatch Rock  
2 redevelopment located at 6695 South Wasatch Boulevard. The area was previously was formerly  
3 a gravel pit. The current zoning is F-1-21 one-half acre residential. Since 2005, the plan for the  
4 property has been for a mixed-use area. The Wasatch Boulevard Master Plan was adopted last  
5 July with the intent being to look at the future of SR-190/Wasatch Boulevard.

6  
7 Mr. Taylor reported that in 2015, the City adopted the Planned Development District Ordinance  
8 and identified three tiers of development intensity. The new zoning ordinance serves as a new law  
9 governing the development of a defined area of land. The zoning map will be changed to identify  
10 this area. A PDD differs from most zoning ordinances and will only be applied to that location.  
11 The development plan requires each phase of the development to conform to what is in the  
12 ordinance. Mr. Taylor described a scenario regarding special residential zoning.

13  
14 Mr. Taylor explained that there is already a General Plan and policies in place with a master plan  
15 as an addendum to the general plan. They have also been to the Architectural Review Commission  
16 several times. The matter was before the Commission tonight because the applicant requested a  
17 public hearing and there are outstanding issues to be addressed. Staff did not feel that the matter  
18 was ready to move forward for a positive recommendation. Noticing issues were discussed. It  
19 was noted that the general noticing standards were followed for this meeting. A continuance was  
20 sought because there are still engineering details to be worked out. The Public Works Department  
21 also would like to be able to provide a positive recommendation. Outstanding issues pertained to  
22 drainage, storm drainage issues. Site reclamation also needed to be done.

23  
24 Mr. Taylor reported that over the last year, the project has changed in terms of the size, scale, and  
25 location of the buildings. The primary street and internal driveways have also been amended from  
26 Architectural Review Commission feedback. As a result, the earlier drawings do not match the  
27 current site plan.

28  
29 There were many public comments submitted with concerns about traffic. Mr. Taylor suspected  
30 that a revision will be needed to the Traffic Study and there was uncertainty in terms of what the  
31 Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) will allow in the future. Efforts were being made  
32 to set up a meeting with UDOT to confirm possibilities regarding the access to the south.

33  
34 Mr. Taylor reported that shared parking is available on the site and is encouraged. Staff continued  
35 to work on the Shared Parking Analysis.

36  
37 Overall, the proposed development fulfills the objectives of the General Plan but he wanted to  
38 provide a detailed analysis. There is also a disparity in terms of the affordable housing  
39 requirements. Staff would continue to work with the applicant on that issue. Staff continued to  
40 work with the City of Holladay, UDOT, and the Salt Lake and Sandy Water District.

## 41 42 **1.2 Additional Discussion Items.**

43  
44 Mr. Taylor was asked to address the Gateway Overlay District and the sensitive lands area and  
45 describe how the proposed development conforms to both. Sue Ryser recalled that when the  
46 project was first submitted, the applicants promised to provide five different elevation drawings.

1 Before proceeding to the public hearing, she wanted to see the applicants provide the elevation  
2 drawings from the northwest corner at street level as well as the southwest corner at street level.  
3 Mr. Taylor explained that staff had some older elevations that were submitted previously and are  
4 substantially different from the current site plan. Sue Ryser was of the opinion that the  
5 Commission has the obligation to provide that information to the public and noted that this project  
6 is substantially different from any other. She wanted to make sure that the public can visualize the  
7 concept.

8  
9 It was acknowledged that the residents recognize that there is going to be increased traffic on that  
10 north side. Links were provided for information on specific plans and are updated as new  
11 information comes in. Another round of mailers will be sent out as well to allay any  
12 misconceptions. Mr. Taylor stated that public comments can be submitted through the website but  
13 direct email was the best method. Mr. Taylor reported planned to create a project-specific website  
14 with the same information.

15  
16 **2.0 Adjournment.**

17  
18 *Commissioner Mills moved to adjourn the Work Session. Commissioner Ryser seconded the*  
19 *motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.*

20  
21 The Work Session adjourned at approximately 6:00 p.m.

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

3  
4 **Wednesday, July 1, 2020**  
5 **6:00 p.m.**  
6 **Conducted Electronically**  
7

8 ***ATTENDANCE***  
9

10 **Members Present:** Acting Chair Chris Coutts, Sue Ryser, Jesse Allen, Douglas Rhodes, Bob  
11 Wilde, Dan Mills  
12

13 **Staff Present:** CED Director Michael Johnson, Senior City Planner Matthew Taylor, City  
14 Planner Andy Hulka, City Attorney Shane Topham, Deputy City Recorder  
15 Heather Sundquist  
16

17 **Others:** Delmas Johnson, Dimond Zollinger, Holly Mullen, Jesse Stewart, Adam  
18 Davis, Sharon Turner, Thomas Henroid, Jory Walker, Ryan Hales, Serra  
19 Lakomski, Scott Schoonover  
20

21 **BUSINESS MEETING**  
22

23 In the absence of Chair Graig Griffin, Acting Chair Chris Coutts called the Business Meeting to  
24 order at approximately 6:00 p.m.  
25

26 **1.0 Welcome and Acknowledgments.**  
27

28 Chair Coutts welcomed those in attendance and read the opening statement regarding the reason  
29 for the electronic meeting.  
30

31 **1.1 Ex Parte Communications or Conflicts of Interest to Disclose.**  
32

33 There were no conflicts.  
34

35 **2.0 General Public Comment**  
36

37 There were no public comments.  
38

1   **3.0    Business Items**

2  
3       **3.1    (Project CUP-20-009) A Public Hearing and Possible Action on a Request**  
4       **from Dimond Zollinger (Salt Lake City Department of Public Utilities) for a**  
5       **Conditional Use Permit for Wireless Telecommunication Facility (Roof-**  
6       **Mounted Antenna) and a Reduction to the Minimum Yard Requirements for**  
7       **a Public Use at 8800 South Kings Hill Drive #A in the F-1-21 - Foothill**  
8       **Residential Zone.**  
9

10   City Planner, Andrew Hulka, presented the staff report and stated that the request is for a  
11   Conditional Use Permit for a wireless telecommunication facility and a reduction to the minimum  
12   yard requirements for public use at 8800 South Kings Hill Dr. #A. The property is located off of  
13   a private lane and pertains to a water pump that is currently underground and serves four units in  
14   the subdivision. Photos of the site were displayed. He noted that there is an existing pump station  
15   on the site that is currently underground. The request is for an update to the existing facility with  
16   new equipment, part of which is an above-ground entrance structure with stairs for maintenance  
17   workers to access the facility. An antenna was also proposed on top of the structure. The privately-  
18   owned residential property is located in the F-1-21 Foothill Residential zone.

19  
20   Mr. Hulka reported that the proposed structure will be in the same location as the existing facility.  
21   There are plans for additional retaining, a storage shed for the property owner, and a gas-powered  
22   generator. An updated site plan will be coming from the applicant who has worked with the  
23   property owner to find a different location for the gas generator to allow additional parking or  
24   storage space.

25  
26   Mr. Hulka showed a rendering of the north elevation that will be visible from the single-family  
27   home. The proposed structure is about 14 feet tall on the lower end and because the property  
28   slopes on one end the height on one end will be slightly greater. What is proposed is a 14-foot tall  
29   structure with an antenna of up to 10 feet tall. What is proposed is a communications antenna for  
30   the Water Department that will allow them to remotely monitor water quality, water pressure, and  
31   the status of equipment at the station. Mr. Hulka presented images of the proposed antenna and  
32   another Salt Lake City pump station with an antenna.

33  
34   Mr. Hulka explained that the ordinance requires a stealth facility for the wireless antenna. He  
35   referenced the definition of a stealth facility, which is camouflaged to blend in with its  
36   surroundings to be indistinguishable by the casual observer from the structure on which it is placed  
37   or the surroundings in which it is located. Examples of stealth facilities include antennas that are  
38   disguised as flagpoles, indigenous trees, rocks, or architectural elements.

39  
40   Mr. Hulka stated that the structure proposed to be located in the side yard of the single-family  
41   home. Typically, detached structures such as sheds or a detached garage are not allowed in a side  
42   yard, but because this is for a public facility, there is an exception in the Code that allows the yard  
43   requirements to be reduced by the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission cannot  
44   authorize a reduction in the yard requirements if the rule for additional height is in use. In this  
45   case, it is not. A reduction will not be authorized unless evidence is presented that establishes that  
46   the reduction will not under the circumstances of the particular case be detrimental to the health,

1 safety, or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity or be injurious to property  
2 or improvements in the vicinity. Staff received a substantial amount of public comment.

3  
4 CED Director, Michael Johnson reported that he would read verbatim the public comments  
5 received by email prior to 5:00 p.m. today. The comments would be emailed to the Commission  
6 Members after they are read into the record. Comments received after 5:00 p.m. would be emailed  
7 to the Commission but not read into the record. Mr. Johnson reported that the matter was originally  
8 scheduled for a public hearing on June 3 and continued. Because that meeting was not held, the  
9 residents were not able to physically be present to comment. Mr. Johnson read the comments from  
10 the June 3 meeting as well as those received after June 3.

11  
12 *Theodora Sakata* expressed concern over a recent department of public facilities request to place  
13 a wireless telecommunications facility at 8800 South Kings Hill Drive. She has received few  
14 details on what the facility will entail, what construction will be required, and zoning and  
15 environmental details. As a homeowner/resident without air conditioning, the local trees play an  
16 important role in keeping their property habitable in the summer. She believed that such an  
17 installation would create a visual blight on the landscape and threaten property values. She  
18 questioned what type of machinery is required to make improvements on the drinking water pump  
19 and if this will set a precedent for other uses that are similarly zoned.

20  
21 *Dean Moncur* reported that VHF communication is not less susceptible to hacking than cell phone  
22 or wireless systems using strong passwords. He believed that VHF communications are less secure  
23 than Wi-Fi and cell systems. He expressed opposition to the proposed antennae.

24  
25 *Jason Ehrhart* reported that he taught Science of Crypto during his work in the high-tech industry  
26 and worked for Netscape when the initial protocol SSL/TLS was invented. During that time, he  
27 worked with many organizations within the security industry. He has worked on security projects  
28 in the financial services and healthcare industries as well. Mr. Ehrhart stated that the networking  
29 stack should not matter if it is done by a wired connection or wireless such as a radio or Wi-Fi.  
30 During the second Iraq War, 128-bit symmetrical keys were broken and the National Security  
31 Agency (“NSA”) no longer recommends them for use in security matters. He explained that a  
32 determined hacker can break wired or wireless signals given enough time and effort. The  
33 Department of Defense (“DOD”) manages this risk by compartmentalizing each access point. If  
34 such a determined attacker manages to gain access to the network, it has access to nearly nothing  
35 else in the network. He stated that if a person manages to gain access to the pump station, it would  
36 be rather obvious especially because it sits in his neighbors’ yard. He believed access to a wireless  
37 signal can happen from a living room and be somewhat less obvious. He was in favor of an  
38 underground internet connection, which would be considerably less expensive and equally secure.  
39 He was aware of the neighbor whose yard this would directly impact and he was not happy with  
40 the proposal.

41  
42 *Kevin Farley* reported that he moved to his current property in 2015 mainly due to the existing  
43 trees in the neighborhood and on his property. He was opposed to the idea of having trees trimmed  
44 to maintain antennae reception and believed it was aesthetically undesirable and does not blend in  
45 with the natural surroundings.

1 *Tyler Harris* stated they have operated in good faith with the Water Department throughout the  
2 project; however, they remain unwilling to budge on the addition of some equipment. They feel it  
3 is extremely unnecessary and will potentially harm their property value. He indicated that they do  
4 not wish to hold up progress on the majority of the project but are not willing to accept what is  
5 proposed without a fight. He explained that they still oppose the addition of an antenna and will  
6 be discussing legal options and hiring legal counsel to represent them going forward. The Water  
7 Department discussed possible locations for their backup generator but he had not received a final  
8 answer as to the placement.

9 Mr. Johnson reported that the following comments were received before June 3.

10  
11 *Tyler and Jessica Harris* are residents of Kings Hill Drive, which is the subject property. Salt Lake  
12 City Water plans to install a building with a large roof antenna and gas-powered generator adjacent  
13 to their property. He emphasized that it is not a utility yard and is where his children play. The  
14 pump house services four homes and the contract is very clear. It is only intended to serve his  
15 small community. They have never had an outage cause them to go without water or had anyone  
16 attempt to tamper with the facility. He believed the proposal is not only a significant investment,  
17 but fiscally irresponsible, exceedingly inconvenient, and potentially dangerous. He expressed  
18 opposition to the request.

19  
20 *Suzanne Harris* identified herself as the current and original homeowner of 8800 South Kings Hill  
21 Drive #A. The pump house in question has existed on her property during the entire 40 years she  
22 has lived at this location. She has gone through considerable expense over the years to provide  
23 the Water Department with easier access to and around the pump house. They have done their best  
24 to work with Dimond Zollinger to reach a mutually beneficial agreement on the renovation. She  
25 understood that a main door and improved stairway is in the best interest of the City's employees  
26 and was willing to make that concession on their behalf. However, a tall antenna is out of the  
27 question and this type of unsightly technology has never and will never be welcomed or necessary  
28 in her small, secluded, and secure community. She believed there was no basis for a security  
29 argument and opposed the addition of a generator as well as the antennae.

30  
31 *Kevin Farley* gave his address as 8763 South Kings Hill Drive adjacent to the property in question.  
32 He asked if his driveway will be used for access to construction and wondered where they park.  
33 He also asked if the antennae require trees on his property to be trimmed or limited if it will restrict  
34 his ability to modify his home or garage in the future, whether it will attract lighting, and if the  
35 new pump house will generate noise. He also asked if there will be an interruption of utilities  
36 during construction.

37  
38 *Hallie and Matt Yurick* expressed opposition to the wireless telecommunications facility being  
39 placed at 8800 Kings Hill Drive #A.

40  
41 *Michelle Lewis* was confused as to how the project can be proposed without the consent of the  
42 homeowner. She expressed concern with what this abuse of power will mean for their  
43 neighborhood.

44  
45 *Nicholas Chachas* gave his address as 8800 Kings Hill Drive #B and was opposed to the  
46 installation of the proposed antennae. He stated that they purchased their home to get away from

1 these types of things. He believed that if communication is a necessity, there must be a more  
2 modern and appropriate way as it will disrupt their view and is unsightly. Communication had  
3 been done personally by the Water Company and paid for with tax dollars. He stressed that the  
4 proposed antennae is not acceptable.

5  
6 *Dean Moncur* was strongly opposed to the proposed antennae located at 8800 Kings Hill Drive  
7 #A. He stated that the home has existed over four decades without the proposed antennae, which  
8 is neither necessary nor desired. He understood and accepted the possible risk of not having water  
9 to a few homes in the event of an outage. He opposed the unwanted and unneeded antennae.

10  
11 *Jackie McDowell* expressed opposition to the proposed telecommunications antennae going up on  
12 a private home without the homeowner's consent and was unsure as to how it could even be  
13 considered.

14  
15 *Jason Ehrhart* gave his address as 8795 Kings Hill Drive and asked why the proposal cannot  
16 include an in-ground internet connection that would cost far less and be far less intrusive to a  
17 private household. He believed a direct connection would be a less expensive option. Since  
18 communication no longer goes over airways, it would be a higher security solution as well.

19  
20 *Freddy Fredrickson* asked the City to reconsider the obstruction caused and beauty lost by adding  
21 an unnecessary tower in Smith Canyon. He has lived at the Mouth of the Canyon for 15 years and  
22 enjoys its beauty.

23  
24 Commissioner Ryser asked if the pump station only serves four homes why so much is being  
25 invested.

26  
27 Mr. Hulka stated that the present station is several decades old and there are concerns regarding  
28 having underground access and general updating. He believed the antennae is part of a wider,  
29 larger system Salt Lake City utilizes for monitoring all of their facilities.

30  
31 Commissioner Ryser asked for clarification regarding the expense being put into the project for  
32 only four homes.

33  
34 *Jesse Stewart* from Salt Lake City Public Utilities reported that they examine their infrastructure  
35 and how it affects their workers as well as general public health and safety. Workers visit the site  
36 multiple times per week and with the SCADA system, they would be able to see the site remotely.  
37 If an additional trip were necessary, they would have an advanced warning to do so. He pointed  
38 out that although there are only four customers, they take their health and safety seriously. This  
39 not only provides the necessary culinary water but the fire flow needed. Updating the pump station  
40 is addressed based on their condition. He explained that the station would be replaced with new  
41 pumps, piping, and a new SCADA system brought above ground for worker and community safety.  
42 It is a critical piece of infrastructure and aging is also taken into consideration. It is visited at least  
43 once per week regardless of whether there is a full entrance or not.

44  
45 Commissioner Wilde expressed concern with the language in the easement regarding the right-of-  
46 way. It specifies that the easement may be used for installation, maintenance, replacement, and

1 repair of the pump station. Based on what currently exists, he questioned whether the proposed  
2 antennae is a replacement.

3  
4 Mr. Stewart stated that once they touch the pump structures, they must meet current codes and  
5 standards. Water codes as well as electrical code issues must be met. He confirmed they are not  
6 replacing it as-is and are replacing it to meet additional codes and to address worker safety.

7  
8 Commissioner Wilde noted that on pages 7 and 8 of the staff analysis the application is described  
9 as “generally compliant”. He believed that meant that they may be generally compliant but not  
10 specifically compliant. Based on the proposed verbiage and the fact that it is not compliant, there  
11 was some question as to whether they want to overlook what the ordinance states and agree that  
12 close is good enough. He asked how they will decide on future applications when the standard  
13 will be what is written or decide that close is good enough.

14  
15 Mr. Hulka believed the intent was not to push anything through and stated that the language is  
16 standard in staff reports. The report referred to how much the height of the antennae would need  
17 to be reduced to meet the standards. They would comply with the conditions, which are certified  
18 by an Engineer and determined to meet stealth facility requirements. Staff will ensure that all  
19 appropriate requirements are met.

20  
21 Commissioner Coutts reviewed staff’s conditions and wanted to make sure that the following are  
22 considered:

- 23  
24 1. A building permit must be obtained from the City prior to construction of the  
25 facility.
- 26  
27 2. As part of the building permit application, the applicant must submit a Certificate  
28 from a licensed Professional Engineer certifying that the design of the facility meets  
29 all applicable standards, including, but not limited to electrical safety, material, and  
30 design integrity, seismic safety, etc.
- 31  
32 3. The antennae must be designed as a stealth facility, which is camouflaged to blend  
33 in with its surroundings to such an extent that it is indistinguishable by the casual  
34 observer from the structure on which it is placed or the surrounding in which it is  
35 located. The antenna may be disguised as a flagpole, designed as part of an  
36 architectural element such as a steeple or chimney, or otherwise camouflaged with  
37 materials and colors that blend in with the surrounding area as approved by the  
38 Planning Commission.
- 39  
40 4. On no more than one occasion within six months after the facility has been  
41 constructed, the Planning Commission or Planning Department may require the  
42 color be changed if it is determined that the original color does not blend in with  
43 the surroundings.
- 44  
45 5. The roof-mounted antenna shall not vary from the height requirements for  
46 accessory structures in the F-1-21 zone. The distance from the top of the antenna to

1 the average natural grade of the above-ground entrance structure must not exceed  
2 20 feet.

- 3
- 4 6. Continuous outside lighting of the facility is prohibited.
- 5
- 6 7. Any existing landscaping disturbed or removed during the construction process  
7 must be repaired or replaced by the applicant.
- 8
- 9 8. All utility lines on the lot leading to the accessory building and antenna structure  
10 shall be underground.
- 11
- 12 9. The applicant shall provide proof of legal right to build in the existing pump station  
13 easement or appropriate owner's consent to build as proposed, subject to approval  
14 of the City Attorney.
- 15

16 Commissioner Ryser asked if an additional condition should be added regarding what is  
17 appropriate for a stealth antenna.

18

19 Holly Mullen, Communications and Public Engagement Manager for Salt Lake City Public  
20 Utilities, emphasized that they do this regularly with neighborhoods and communities in terms of  
21 coming to a consensus. She visited the site with Dimond Zollinger to meet with the Harris family  
22 to discuss the proposed project. She stated that Ms. Zollinger has continued to meet with the  
23 Harrises and others in the area and are committed and understand that these types of issues cannot  
24 be forced. She stated that they are committed to working with the residents.

25

26 Commissioner Allen expressed concern with adding language about the community. He  
27 understood the intent to gain consensus from neighbors and making sure it is appropriate. He was  
28 unsure how to quantify what is meant by neighbors and consensus. He believed the language was  
29 too vague. He suggested that the color be evaluated after 12 months to allow the neighbors to  
30 evaluate and understand what is most appropriate.

31

32 Commissioner Ryser agreed with the idea of 12 months and suggested it return to the Planning  
33 Department rather than the Planning Commission. City Attorney, Shane Topham stated that the  
34 Planning Commission can delegate to staff.

35

36 Commissioner Wilde believed what has been presented does not rise to the level of a stealth  
37 facility. Commissioner Allen stated that the concern comes down to the antennae and the  
38 technology involved, which is not within the purview of the Commission. He asked if there is a  
39 professional that could evaluate the technology to verify that the antenna is the best method moving  
40 forward.

41

42 The applicant confirmed that they have had discussions with industry experts who confirmed that  
43 this is a technology used throughout their system. The system runs from Cottonwood Heights to  
44 the Salt Lake Airport and includes multiple pump stations. What is proposed is standard for the  
45 system and industry.

46

1 In response to a question raised, Mr. Topham confirmed that he prefers to reference the easement  
2 document. The inclusion of a concept replacement, whether that includes the concept of  
3 refurbishment or upgrade, would be the issue. An easement is the type of property interest that he  
4 believed to be the overarching theme. He stated that the fact that they are having this discussion  
5 shows that there is some grey area. Ultimately, the question is whether the Commission feels  
6 comfortable with the conditions being imposed and is willing to address the anticipated detrimental  
7 effects. Doing so will allow a pathway forward for the City to make the final decisions.  
8

9 Commissioner Rhodes asked about the recommendation that the City meet with homeowners to  
10 reach a solution. He believed it was the four homeowners the antennae would serve who were  
11 opposed to it.  
12

13 Mr. Hulka stated that Salt Lake City has met with the neighborhood and immediate property  
14 owners on several occasions. He spoke with Tyler Harris who stated that they do not want the  
15 antennae. Mr. Hulka reviewed the proposed conditions with Mr. Harris who declined to make a  
16 recommendation due to their opposition to the antennae. Relocation of the generator was  
17 suggested.  
18

19 Mr. Topham pointed out that there is not a requirement under State law for all residents to be happy.  
20 Instead, the Planning Commission is charged with looking at the application, determine the  
21 reasonably anticipated detrimental impacts of the application, and decide if conditions can be  
22 imposed to reasonably mitigate them. He would be hesitant, if asked, to say that getting the  
23 consensus of all residents should be asked of the applicant. The Commission is charged with  
24 making the difficult decision under the conditional use.  
25

26 Commissioner Wilde did not consider what is proposed to be a stealth facility. The City has  
27 indicated that they will complete the upgrades and come back and check on it later. He suggested  
28 that the City define a stealth facility.  
29

30 **MOTION:** Commissioner Wilde moved to table the matter until the next meeting. Commissioner  
31 Mills seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Commissioner Ryser-Aye, Commissioner Mills-Aye,  
32 Commissioner Wilde-Aye, Commissioner Allen-Abstain, Commissioner Rhodes-Aye, Acting  
33 Chair Coutts-Aye. The motion passed unanimously with one abstention.  
34

35 **3.2 (Project PDD-19-001) A Public Hearing Request from AJ Rock, LLC, for an**  
36 **Ordinance Amendment, Zone Map Amendment, and Approval of a**  
37 **Development Plan for Approximately 21.5 Acres of Property located at 6695**  
38 **South Wasatch Boulevard Utilizing the City’s Planned Development District**  
39 **(PDD) Ordinance and Changing the Zoning Designation from F-1-21 (Foothill**  
40 **Residential) to PDD-2 (this is a zoning designation prepared specifically for**  
41 **the subject property by the applicant, within the guidelines of Chapter 19.51**  
42 **of the City’s Zoning Ordinance).**  
43

44 Senior Planner, Matt Taylor presented the staff report and stated that the above is a request from  
45 AJ Rock, LLC, for an ordinance amendment, zone map amendment and approval of a development  
46 plan for approximately 21.5 acres of property located at 6695 South Wasatch Boulevard utilizing

1 the City's Planned Development District (PDD) Ordinance and changing the zoning designation  
2 from F-1-21 (Foothill Residential) to PDD-2. It was noted that the PDD-2 is a zoning designation  
3 prepared specifically for the subject property by the applicant, within the guidelines of Chapter  
4 19.51 of the City's Zoning Ordinance. The subject property is commonly called the AJ Rock  
5 gravel pit.  
6

7 Aerial photographs were presented. Mr. Taylor stated that the gravel pit has outlived its usefulness  
8 as a gravel pit operation and the developer is now looking at a redevelopment proposal. The zoning  
9 allows for one-half acre lots. Mr. Taylor stated that that often when these types of zones are put  
10 in place, they do not wish to expand conforming rights to a property owner that may be rendered  
11 non-conforming. Because this area is essentially a clean slate, it provides tremendous opportunity  
12 for the Cottonwood Height community to fill the facility and land use needs that are not currently  
13 met within the existing fabric of the City. Potential land uses and businesses appropriate areas  
14 include hotels, restaurants, clubs, coffee shops, art galleries, bookstores, and other retail businesses  
15 similar to that of Park City's Main Street.  
16

17 In addition to the General Plan, Mr. Taylor stated that the City has developed another Master Plan.  
18 It was adopted specifically by the City Council last July as an appendix to the General Plan. A  
19 graphic from the plan was reviewed. He explained that the plan depicts the gravel pit developed  
20 as a walkable urban space. Other ideas promoted in the plan include mountain recreation park  
21 features such as mountain biking, rock climbing, lift gondola, day lodge, food, beverage and retail  
22 services, recreation park, hotels, connective street network and that the development is a mix of  
23 housing, office and retail. Transit options were described.  
24

25 Mr. Taylor depicted highlights and stated that the aesthetic embrace of the natural hillside should  
26 be merged with urban building materials and design that is suitable for a bustling place with  
27 commerce and mixed-use development. The plan includes the development of a streetscape that  
28 is inviting to pedestrian, walkers, and encourages active transportation as well as building  
29 frontages, which engage the public, create interest, and human connection. He confirmed that the  
30 full Master Plan is available online.  
31

32 Mr. Taylor reported that the City adopted a tool called the Planned Development District (PDD)  
33 in 2015 that was intended to be a redevelopment tool. It has three tiers with Tier 1 being the most  
34 intense use. The typical land use designation includes a zoning ordinance that is a collection of  
35 laws that are codified and organized to give clear instruction to the limits and rights a piece of  
36 property has in developing a site. The PDD consists of zones or zoning ordinances that do not yet  
37 exist. The General PDD Ordinance gives direction and organization for creating a PDD zone  
38 providing basic standards when created.  
39

40 Mr. Taylor stated that there are a number of other goals and objectives and staff's feature report  
41 will provide an analysis of each. Much of what the developer has proposed aligns with the goal  
42 list. Because they are creating a unique zone to facilitate the proposed development, it also seeks  
43 to involve the public. In May and July of 2019, the developer and applicant-initiated community  
44 workshops that can be found on the City website. Staff has been through multiple substantial  
45 updates and introductory meetings with both the Planning Commission and the Architectural  
46 Review Commission to get to the current first public hearing stage. He described the public notice

1 process and confirmed that courtesy mailings only go out at the time of public hearings as they are  
2 costly. This is typically the only time staff sends an actual piece of mail to property owners.

3  
4 Mr. Taylor stated that they will be recommending a continuance and do not ask the Planning  
5 Commission to make a recommendation. He explained that moving forward, the Planning  
6 Commission will serve as is an advisory body on this issue to the City Council who will  
7 recommend a policy change. He believed that further discussion needs to take place to clarify how  
8 many would be allowed. Many of the uses on the site have shared parking and he believed it is a  
9 good tool for urban planning to allow daytime and nighttime uses to share parking spaces.

10  
11 Refinements to the proposed ordinance were next discussed. Mr. Taylor stated that there are a  
12 number of items staff desires to amend in the ordinance or propose amending in the ordinance.  
13 Additional coordination with the City of Holladay, UDOT, and the Metropolitan Water District of  
14 Salt Lake and Sandy was desired. This is an initial public hearing where staff can lay out details,  
15 the public can share concerns, and the Planning Commission can identify key issues. He confirmed  
16 that all of the plans are available on the Cottonwood Heights Planning Commission agenda website  
17 where a quick link will be added in the near future.

18  
19 Mr. Taylor reviewed the proposed plan and stated that the hotel and retail pads have moved east  
20 to west and the developer has indicated that it is partly due to COVID-19 with less demand in the  
21 hotel industry. He stated that there are a number of site constraints limiting the developer's ability  
22 in terms of building placement and the potential for the site as well as with the Salt Lake Aqueduct.  
23 A visual plan was described.

24  
25 Mr. Taylor reported that the applicant has given much thought to landscaping and asked for an  
26 amendment to make it consistent with the current site plan. The area between the condominiums  
27 and apartments will be a hillside area and where the gravel pit site reclamation will occur. The  
28 developer has proposed to grade the slope and level it to more of a 2:1 slope. He confirmed that  
29 engineering questions will be reviewed at the next meeting. An elevation profile was reviewed.  
30 The Architectural Review Commission ("ARC") granted a Certificate of Design Compliance after  
31 several modifications were made in late April and have recommended supplemental design  
32 guidelines that will enhance the current guidelines.

33  
34 The Commission next reviewed two cross sections of upper Wasatch Drive. Mr. Taylor stated that  
35 the ARC feedback provided direction on how to transform the street into a more urban, walkable  
36 area where pedestrians can interact with the façades of the buildings. Bike lanes are proposed  
37 along with angled parking as reviewed by the City's Traffic Engineer. He explained that the lower  
38 cross section would cross through the Salt Lake aqueduct open space. A trail system connecting  
39 to the upper areas of the site and will be integrated through the internal bicycle system. Signage  
40 was discussed.

41  
42 Mr. Taylor stated that the Sensitive Lands Ordinance will apply and further explore how to deal  
43 with post gravel pit slopes exceeding 30%.

44  
45 Access onto Wasatch Boulevard was next discussed. Mr. Taylor stated that both gravel pits must  
46 be considered when planning access into traffic. SR-190 is UDOT-controlled with limited access

1 due to intersection spacing guidelines. It was staff's impression that a full intersection off of SR-  
2 190 will not be allowed due to the proximity to an already existing intersection. A Traffic Study  
3 was conducted by Hales Engineering and revised after the size of the project was scaled back  
4 reflecting fewer traffic trips than originally proposed. Currently, the Traffic Engineer projects 43  
5 vehicle trips per day, which is 26% less than the original proposal. Peak times showed 347 trips  
6 per hour or roughly five trips per minute. Staff was still unclear on access points south of the site.  
7 Staff recommended a continuance.

8  
9 Tom Henroid from Rockworth Companies was present representing AJ Rock, LLC. He agreed  
10 with the recommendation by staff for a continuance. They would like a list of comprehensive  
11 items needed to get staff at a level where they are comfortable making a recommendation. They  
12 have responded to the Planning Commission, City Planners, Public Works comments, and the  
13 ARC who forwarded a favorable recommendation for their design theme, landscape, and  
14 streetscape design. He confirmed that there has been a recent design change to the hotel pad and  
15 Pads A and B as COVID-19 has negatively affected the hospitality industry. A current site plan  
16 was presented. Mr. Henroid stated that they are in the process of providing a Grading, Utility and  
17 Landscape Plan to unify the current plan.

18  
19 Mr. Henroid addressed deficiencies and wanted to put forth that there are no slopes on the site that  
20 are not disturbed.

21  
22 Architect Jory Walker stated that they have worked on numerous similar projects and are able to  
23 say that the slope is non-existing.

24  
25 Mr. Taylor explained that they do not disagree but this is a technicality and there is a need to  
26 determine how to deal with a technical ordinance. They should draft an ordinance  
27 recommendation that circumvents technical language. It is not a commentary on the validity but  
28 on the technicality.

29  
30 Mr. Henroid stated that they are interested in knowing the scope of the Revised Traffic Study  
31 aligning with the UDOT access standards.

32  
33 Chair Coutts believed that the objective is to determine what the City, Planning Commission, and  
34 City Council need to see to confirm a complete application.

35  
36 Mr. Henroid recognized the refinement of the shared parking and the need for further discussion  
37 regarding the PDD Ordinance and affordable housing. It was confirmed that there are 80 proposed  
38 condominiums with 285 apartments on 21.5 acres.

39  
40 Commissioner Ryser questioned the traffic increase and future growth. Mr. Taylor stated they  
41 have a rough projection of how traffic travels through this site onto upper Wasatch Boulevard and  
42 how much runs west or south.

43  
44 Ryan Hales from Hales Engineering, stated that while evaluating traffic for the project, several  
45 questions were raised. He explained that due to a previous lawsuit with UDOT, there are identified  
46 access points along SR-190 that need to be taken into account. Based on those points, ongoing

1 discussion with UDOT, and the location to the south of the gravel pit, unplanned future land uses  
2 were considered and remaining issues need to be worked out with UDOT. In the evaluation done  
3 for the project, they identified how much traffic will be on the proposed project's segment of the  
4 road and found that there is reserved capacity built into the cross section. Additional traffic from  
5 the south development can plan from the subject property to Wasatch Boulevard.

6  
7 Commissioner Allen commented that it is possible to make assumptions on what the future  
8 development demand will be based on the project and others in calculating the impacts they would  
9 have. He believed it did not fully address the concern.

10  
11 Mr. Taylor noted that additional project views were not enclosed as they no longer include multiple  
12 proposed buildings and are no longer accurate or relevant. Mr. Henroid confirmed that they will  
13 supply a complete rendering of the proposal with multiple views.

14  
15 Mr. Johnson read into the record the public comments received by email prior to the 5:00 p.m.  
16 deadline. The comments would be emailed to the Commission Members after they are read into  
17 the record. Comments received after 5:00 p.m. were to be emailed to the Commission but not read  
18 into the record. He noted that as in a live meeting, comments will be limited to three minutes for  
19 an individual and five minutes for a group.

20  
21 Patricia Waller: Kindly register our family's strong opposition to approval of any proposal for an  
22 ordinance amendment, zone map amendment and the development of the property located at 6695  
23 South Wasatch Boulevard, at least as it is being proposed. This location holds the zoning  
24 designation of F-1-21 (Foothill Residential) for very specific reasons, including and especially the  
25 safety of its residents. Our neighborhood (Canyon Cove) already has very limited access capacity  
26 and that combined with the very steep topography of this area makes it very difficult for emergency  
27 vehicles to access our area. Therefore, I advise against any attempt to introduce access into Canyon  
28 Cove from any development south as introducing any ancillary traffic on the intersection of  
29 Wasatch Boulevard and Utah State Road 190 would be catastrophic to the flow in that area. Please  
30 feel free to contact me directly if there is any additional information that I may be able to  
31 provide or to further discuss this issue.

32  
33 Brett Mathews: The request by AJ Rock to rezone 6695 South Wasatch Boulevard from F-1-21  
34 to PDD-2 should be denied because it lacks multiple ingress / egress points. Clearly a project of  
35 this size must have multiple access points. Denying this request until UDOT grants a "temporary"  
36 access point off of SR-190 will signal to UDOT the importance of the need for multiple access  
37 points. I say temporary because it can be closed and relocated when the southern part of the gravel  
38 pit is developed and access to that southern part is created off of SR-190.

39  
40 Additionally, the sheer size of this project alone dictates that if there is to be only one access point  
41 then it must be on SR-190. If the only access point for this property is to be off of Wasatch  
42 Boulevard it will be a disaster given how close it would be to the SR-190/Wasatch Boulevard  
43 intersection, and how busy the park-and-ride lot is during the winter months. Avoid this disaster  
44 by requiring the developer get access to SR-190 before proceeding with the rezoning request. If  
45 you decide to ignore all the sound reasoning you've been given to deny this rezoning request, and  
46 decide to grant it, then please add this one condition - When the southern part of gravel pit starts

1 being developed and it's accessible from SR-190 that any access point from this property to  
2 Wasatch Boulevard be closed (or will be for emergency traffic only).

3  
4 In closing, I'm not anti-development. But rather feel that the health and wellbeing of citizens is  
5 equally important to that of development. Neither needs to sacrifice and will not be if this rezoning  
6 request is denied until the developer gets access to this property from SR-190.

7  
8 Tracy Bagley: My family and I are horrified to hear about the development plans at the mouth of  
9 Big Cottonwood Canyon. The gateway to our gems of canyons will be destroyed. Many of us  
10 moved up here to get away from congestion and enjoy the wildlife and quality of life. Please  
11 register a strong NO from us!

12  
13 Mark Tucker: I just wanted to reach out and voice my opinion about AJ Rock's proposed  
14 development south of our neighborhood. If what I'm hearing is correct, there would be only one  
15 entrance and exit to the site using our neighborhood roads. While I'm all for development and  
16 sustainable grown, if what I've learned is correct about just one entrance and the exit is true, that's  
17 insanity.

18  
19 I don't know if you've noticed or witnessed what's been going on along Wasatch Boulevard  
20 recently with the BST connected to Heughes Canyon Trailhead or this past winter with cars parked  
21 almost to the golf course, but the sheer amount of traffic Wasatch is bearing right now has hit  
22 critical mass. It's past inconvenient, it's become dangerous to especially for those riding their  
23 bikes. Please reconsider rezoning this property until further options for traffic flow can be studied  
24 and teased out.

25  
26 Ellen Burelle: Please read the following public comment at tonight's City Council Meeting.  
27 Regarding the AJ Rock PDD request, I am opposed to the high-density nature of the project and  
28 the lack of adequate egress ingress within the current plan. The public health of surrounding  
29 residential neighborhoods, whether they fall within Cottonwood Heights city limits or not, should  
30 be the paramount concern for the city council above incoming tax revenues for the City. The needs  
31 of public health and safety for walking, bicycling as well as protection from the air, noise, and  
32 light pollution created by large commercial multi use projects such as this one. Also, the north  
33 gravel pit would be the ideal location for UDOT's intended Intermodal transportation hub  
34 associated with the LCCEIS. Because of its closer proximity to I-215 than the south gravel pit, it  
35 would be less disruptive to Residential neighborhoods and create less air pollution.

36  
37 Scott Woller: Kindly register our family's strong opposition to any proposal that would involve  
38 high-density housing near 6200 South/gravel pit just north of the mouth of Cottonwood Canyon.  
39 The addition of high-density housing there is UNSAFE. The neighborhood roads in Canyon Cove  
40 (the neighborhood just north of the 6200 South gravel pit) are TOO STEEP for emergency  
41 vehicles. There have been prior attempts of developers to access our neighborhood in the fashion  
42 that is proposed that have FAILED ON THE GROUNDS OF SAFETY.

43  
44 I advise against any attempt to introduce access into Canyon Cove from any development south as  
45 introducing any ancillary traffic would be UNSAFE. The Wasatch Boulevard intersection with  
46 Utah State Road 190 is far too congested and the introduction of high-density housing would only

1 degrade the fragile ecosystem at the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon. Please feel free to contact  
2 me directly if there is any additional information that I may be able to provide.

3  
4 Jerry Gill: Having just been informed about the development of the north area of the “gravel pit”  
5 area at 6695 South Wasatch Boulevard, we have grave concerns about the impact of increased  
6 traffic on many hundreds of residents just east of Wasatch Boulevard between this development  
7 and the I-80/ I-215 interchange.

8  
9 Apparently, the only entrance and exit point planned for the development is at the north end of the  
10 property, which will naturally funnel directly onto Wasatch Boulevard, a narrow stretch of road  
11 with only one lane in each direction already overused by vehicular traffic, despite the I-215  
12 freeway. Today’s volume of traffic on that section is already of significant concern for the safety  
13 of cyclists and pedestrian traffic (notably the school children that regularly jog in the bike lanes  
14 and occasionally dart across the road, presumably during their P.E. classes). Adding hundreds  
15 more vehicles every day will inevitably lead to a tragic result.

16  
17 If indeed traffic to and from this development is expected to increase by thousands of vehicles in  
18 coming years, the many residents in the area, whose only access points to their neighborhoods are  
19 T-junctions at Wasatch Boulevard with STOP signs, will face substantial traffic congestion.

20  
21 It is disappointing to see Cottonwood Heights make decisions that have a significant negative  
22 impact on Holladay residents with no intention to communicate clearly and in a timely manner  
23 with those residents. It is also disappointing to see Holladay City seem to agree to a traffic plan  
24 that empties Cottonwood’s tax-generating new development onto an overloaded, narrow, and  
25 thoroughly unsuitable road, which, as mentioned above, currently serves as the only access point  
26 to many hundreds of Holladay residents. I assume those Holladay residents will also be paying  
27 for the repair and upkeep of Wasatch Boulevard to handle the hundreds and hundreds of additional  
28 vehicles. Cottonwood Heights, Holladay, and UDOT need to come up with a plan to direct the  
29 traffic onto SR-190, and to delay the project until all parties can agree a solution that eliminates  
30 the increased use of Wasatch Boulevard.

31  
32 Jamison Gordon: I am a lifelong resident of Holladay City in the Heughs Canyon neighborhood  
33 just north of your proposed development at the AJ Rock gravel pit. I am deeply concerned that  
34 the current proposal is grossly inconsiderate of your Holladay neighbors and poses a significant  
35 public safety concern. The proposal as it currently stands would attract massive amounts of traffic  
36 and pollution while directing the majority of the cars directly onto Wasatch Boulevard northbound  
37 past my house and several nearby neighborhoods. As you may know, there are many trailheads  
38 along Wasatch Boulevard which attracts hundreds of hikers and bikers every day. The parking lot  
39 across the street is overflowing with cars lined up all the way to the entrance of Canyon Cove  
40 during the ski season. There are many children, bikers, runners, and pedestrians who would be  
41 endangered by a large uptick in cars traveling through the narrow one lane highway as you have  
42 proposed. There is also no room to widen Wasatch Boulevard which would require approval by  
43 Cottonwood Heights, Holladay, East Millcreek, and Salt Lake City and would not be a welcomed  
44 change. Cottonwood Heights and Holladay City have both attracted residents for the high-quality  
45 residential neighborhoods in the foothills. It seems that this proposal invites too much industrial

1 development while negatively impacting all surrounding neighbors. The proposed development  
2 is not wanted by residents or neighbors. Please hear our concerns and act accordingly.

3  
4 Gabe Haley: I am a homeowner and would like the following opinion to be shared with the City  
5 Council Members prior to their vote this evening on the AJ Rock, LLC request for rezoning to  
6 PDD-2 at 6695 South Wasatch Boulevard.

7  
8 Cottonwood Heights City Council members, please do not approve re-zoning of the property at  
9 6695 South Wasatch Boulevard. For the reasons listed below, please keep the current zoning  
10 designation of Foothill Residential (F-1-21). If you will not vote to retain the zoning as Foothill  
11 Residential, I implore you to delay the vote to a later date to ensure the developer has adequately  
12 addressed all of the outstanding issues as outlined below and in the staff report and the staff has  
13 had ample opportunity to research and respond to the developer's proposals. Maintaining the  
14 zoning of this area as Foothill Residential (F-1-21) and developing it under that zoning would  
15 achieve the goal of beautifying the existing gravel pit area while also eliminating the negative  
16 impacts on safety, the environment and living standards as listed below.

17  
18 Reasons to maintain the current Foothill Residential zoning:

- 19  
20 1. Excessive traffic due to 418 residential units, 140 hotel rooms and business traffic will be  
21 detrimental to current residents, wildlife, scenery, and outdoor recreation.  
22  
23 a. The current Traffic Mitigation Strategy is not an acceptable plan. As discussed in  
24 the Planning Commission Staff Update Memo (dated July 1, 2020), direct access  
25 to SR-190 will not be permitted. Creating an extension of Wasatch Boulevard just  
26 north of the intersection with Millrock Drive/SR-190 will overwhelm both Wasatch  
27 Boulevard north of that point as well as the current intersection at Wasatch/Millrock  
28 Drive/SR-190. The current traffic study declares that SR-190 will have to have  
29 more lanes added to support this development. Moving the ingress/egress point to  
30 Wasatch Boulevard will not mitigate that requirement and will only overwhelm  
31 Wasatch Boulevard north of that point.  
32  
33 b. The additional traffic from this development will create significant hazards to the  
34 current residents, outdoor recreationalists, and wildlife along Wasatch Boulevard.  
35 Wasatch Boulevard is one of the most popular outdoor recreation routes in the  
36 entire greater Salt Lake area. The additional traffic congestion will severely  
37 diminish this incredible resource through reduction in safety due to increased  
38 pedestrian/automobile incursions and increased air and sound pollution. All of  
39 these dangers also apply to the native wildlife that still thrive alongside the low-  
40 density neighborhoods currently in the area. The current infrastructure does not  
41 support high density development of this type and to allow it to progress will create  
42 major additional burdens on the local residents, City and State as well as eliminate  
43 incredible natural resources that people throughout the valley enjoy.  
44  
45 2. Large high-density development will destroy the natural beauty that is the hallmark of the  
46 Wasatch Front and Cottonwood Heights.

- 1  
2 a. The large and tall buildings as well as large parking lots will always stand out as an  
3 eyesore on the side of the beautiful mountain and one of the highlights of  
4 Cottonwood Heights, the entrance to Big Cottonwood Canyon. No amount of  
5 landscaping can cover up large and tall buildings and empty spaces created by  
6 parking lots. The current zoning would mitigate this because the single-family  
7 homes on larger lots are able to easily able to blend into the side of the mountain  
8 with mature landscaping.  
9
- 10 b. The light pollution created by this development will destroy the low light zone  
11 currently enjoyed by residents in the area and a feature that currently adds to the  
12 beauty of this part of the valley. While this alone is reason enough to question the  
13 approval of this development, under no circumstances should this development be  
14 allowed to proceed with any exception to the current reduced lighting standards  
15 east of Wasatch Boulevard. The City Council should not allow that exception and  
16 require the developer to prove how they are able to develop the property with all  
17 necessary safety precautions while following the reduced lighting standards. The  
18 additional traffic brought in by the development will also add to the light pollution  
19 east of Wasatch Boulevard, further reducing the natural beauty of this area.  
20
- 21 3. Additional high-density development will create further infrastructure nightmares for the  
22 City of Cottonwood Heights and surrounding areas.  
23
- 24 a. Cottonwood Heights is already wrestling with major infrastructure hurdles that are  
25 creating huge headaches for the City staff and destroying the quality of life of  
26 Cottonwood Heights residents. The traffic congestion being experienced  
27 throughout the City, particularly on Wasatch Boulevard between Big Cottonwood  
28 and Little Cottonwood Canyons is a perfect example of this. Because the City of  
29 Cottonwood Heights cannot control the popularity of the two canyons nor the City  
30 as it is currently developed, all you can do is respond to the current situation. The  
31 part of Wasatch Boulevard in question (north of the Millrock Drive/SR-190  
32 intersection) is already overwhelmed with traffic and unsatisfactory parking on  
33 peak outdoor recreation days in the summer and winter. You have the opportunity  
34 now to stop additional new infrastructure problems and the associated devastation  
35 they create for local residents by leaving the area zoned as Foothill Residential.  
36
- 37 b. Early on in the developer’s proposals they were intending to align their location  
38 with the future UDOT transit hub. The transit hub will no longer be co-located  
39 with the development. As this was one of the most appealing features of this major  
40 development, in consideration of driving a major development like this to where it  
41 will most benefit the residents of Cottonwood Heights as well as make use of the  
42 already planned development of infrastructure, you should not approve the re-  
43 zoning this property and encourage the developer to pursue their development  
44 where it will be co-located with the new UDOT transit hub.  
45

1 In addition to the above-mentioned issues, the developer has failed to adequately address a number  
2 of issues. For all of these reasons, please vote to keep the area at 6695 South Wasatch Boulevard  
3 zoned as Foothill Residential (F-1-21). If you do not agree with my arguments that lower density  
4 residential development (as currently zoned) is better for the City and its residents, you should not  
5 vote to rezone this land until the developer has adequately resolved all of the outstanding issues.  
6 Do not allow the developer's failure to properly plan in advance turn into another nightmare and  
7 financial burden for the City of Cottonwood Heights and its residents. Delay this vote until the  
8 developer has solved the traffic issues, amended the building plan to fall within the light  
9 restrictions east of Wasatch Boulevard, addressed the planned shortfall of parking spaces, provided  
10 more concrete preliminary engineering drawings, provided consistent development plans, solved  
11 the proposed regulating zoning ordinance conflicts, and solved the affordable housing issue.

12  
13 John and Marsha Olson: We are extremely opposed to the proposed density development at the  
14 gravel pit above Wasatch Boulevard. We just moved into the Canyon Ranch condominiums a year  
15 ago, and we love the area the way it is, with beautiful homes and great neighbors. Please help us  
16 oppose the proposal.

17  
18 Sue Mak: I am one of the residents living in Canyon Cove neighborhood. I am writing to let you  
19 know that I am strongly against the proposed development on the north side of the gravel pit.  
20 There are so many cars park at Heughs Canyon Trailhead, Mount Olympus Trailheads, UTA  
21 parking lot, and Wasatch Boulevard by skiers and hikers currently. I do not think adding additional  
22 8,000 to 10,000 automobiles is feasible. It will create significant amount of pollution to our  
23 neighborhood and put our families in danger especially for those who with asthma or breathing  
24 problems. The additional noise and pollution will destroy our beautiful mountains and  
25 neighborhoods we cherish so much. I believe the development will impact the quality of our life  
26 dramatically and really hope that you can stop it and make Cottonwood Heights city a great place  
27 for all of us.

28  
29 Thank you for your time and consideration. I really hope that my family can continue to live in  
30 a quiet, beautiful, and healthy neighborhood. Please feel free to reach out to me if you have any  
31 questions.

32  
33 Lisa and Scott Mietchen: Since 1992, I have lived in the Canyon Cove neighborhood, north of the  
34 proposed gravel pit development. I love Canyon Cove and we raised our children here, but it has  
35 some unique issues. As you know, our neighborhood is in a unique situation being the ONLY  
36 residential neighborhood that will be directly bordering the development, but not located in  
37 Cottonwood Heights where the development will be built.

38  
39 My greatest concern is the significant traffic problem that will be created by the current  
40 development plan. The one proposed development egress that will be located on the bend at  
41 Wasatch Boulevard, east of the light, will not work. Canyon Cove residents will not be able to  
42 exit our neighborhood to go south without tremendous trouble. We are completely landlocked and  
43 that intersection is our only route south. The distance between the bend and the intersection is  
44 small. There's no conceivable way to efficiently move traffic through that space with this new,  
45 additional egress.

1 In the wintertime, that intersection is already extremely congested with skier vehicles parked along  
2 Wasatch Boulevard. I am an inveterate skier, but this past winter it was the worst ever in our 15  
3 years living here. It was a regular occurrence to have an entire lane going southbound near the  
4 light that was filled with parked vehicles. They parked IN THE right-hand lane. Not to mention  
5 parked vehicles going both north and south on the side of the road. Going north, vehicles were  
6 typically parked all the way back, on both sides of Wasatch, to the entrance of Canyon Cove Drive  
7 - hundreds of cars.

8  
9 In the summer, there are cars parked on both sides of Wasatch Boulevard, as hikers trek up the  
10 Heughs Canyon trail. There have been many days we've counted 60 to 70 plus cars parked along  
11 Wasatch Boulevard while people hike. The traffic issue of the proposed development troubles me  
12 greatly. I understand there are issues with what UDOT will allow, but Cottonwood Heights, with  
13 UDOT's help, **must** find another solution. One terrible solution is not the answer. The Canyon  
14 Cove neighborhood cannot be locked out of our only route south.

15  
16 The link below is a video a friend took this past winter. It was a typical weekend ski day. Although  
17 I liked that these cars were out of Big Cottonwood Canyon, I'm sure you can see this would be a  
18 major problem traffic in the area increases from the new development. Thank you for considering,  
19 and sharing, this email with the Planning Commission. We look forward to a better solution.

20  
21 Peter Crowley: With the daily overflow of parking from the 6200 South Wasatch parking lot up  
22 and down Wasatch Boulevard north of 6200 South in the winter, how is the plan going to handle  
23 the inevitable overflow into their parking lot? What plans are there to facilitate cars and people in  
24 and out from the property onto Wasatch Boulevard? Ample sidewalks? Any changes to the road  
25 as it makes its bend to 6200 South? Will there be additional future entrances into the properties  
26 farther south from the light at 6200?

27  
28 Kera Savage: I write you today as a concerned citizen. It was recently brought to my attention  
29 that there is a push to rezone the existing Foothill Residential Zone at the north end of the Gravel  
30 Pit on 6695 South Wasatch to a multi-use zone. There are a number of concerns I have with the  
31 proposal including: increased traffic on Wasatch Boulevard, pedestrian safety, light, and air  
32 pollution, as well as effect on natural surroundings. I assume that this is seen as an opportunity to  
33 expand business and residential opportunities in a desirable part of the valley, but the reason it is  
34 desirable is precisely what this development will strip from the area: natural beauty and proximity  
35 to nature. It will make getting to and from Big Cottonwood Canyon more difficult and eventually  
36 deter people from frequenting this area, hurting all businesses future and present. Far from  
37 encouraging business development and economic success, it will be seen as an eyesore that is  
38 difficult to navigate and people will do their shopping and exploring elsewhere. Not to mention  
39 the impact on joggers, cyclists, hikers, and people simply parking to enjoy the beautiful sunset  
40 views. We will be losing one of the last places in the valley that allows people to sit back and  
41 enjoy all greater Salt Lake City has to offer without ever leaving the city. This development is  
42 shortsighted and will eventually end up hurting everybody it was intended to help. Please  
43 reconsider rezoning this area to multi-use and leave it residential only. Thank you for your time.

44  
45 Suzan Jones: I am a homeowner and long-time resident of the City of Holladay. My house is  
46 located in the Canyon Cove development just above Old Mill golf course. I am writing to inform

1 you of extreme opposition to the proposed multi-use development that is being planned on  
2 Wasatch Boulevard on land owned by AJ Rock, LLC.

3  
4 Canyon Cove is a neighborhood of single-family homes and has been since before I moved here  
5 20 years ago. As you know, our neighborhood streets are already straining from traffic and parking  
6 for the Heughs Canyon trail and the Mount Olympus trail, congestion from the park-and-ride,  
7 trucks from the gravel pit, golfers driving to the Old Mill course, and other traffic to the area. The  
8 additional density of a mixed-use development would inflict too much additional pressure on our  
9 neighborhood, it's streets, and city services.

10  
11 Local government needs to be responsive to its constituents and we are united against this  
12 development. If it proceeds, then clearly new civic leaders and planners will be required for  
13 Holladay and Cottonwood Heights. I will be closely following developments regarding this.

14  
15 Douglas Shelby: By way of introduction, we are Walker Development, LLC, which owns the  
16 property adjacent to the east and south of this proposed project.

17  
18 There has been a great deal of planning, engineering, and a number of site-restriction studies to  
19 produce the documents submitted by A.J. Rock. The proposed plans show the extension of  
20 Wasatch Boulevard going onto our property at a site of A.J. Rock's choosing. Walker was not  
21 personally consulted with concerning the alignment of this road, nor asked for input from A.J.  
22 Rock, its engineers, or city staff. We object to any planning which is binding on Walker in the  
23 future. We recognize that a zoning change is required for A.J. Rock to move ahead with the  
24 anticipated use of their planned development. We have no objections. However, for the  
25 foreseeable future, the mining and other processing done in producing aggregate products on  
26 Walker property will continue. Consequently, A.J. Rock, the Planning Commission, and  
27 Cottonwood Heights City will have responsibility for any and all arising complaints. We ask that  
28 in future documents which show illustrations of Walker property, please include current, existing  
29 aggregate facilities, and thus reflects a more accurate representation to future residents.

30  
31 Jenny Tempfer: I currently live in Canyon Cove, specifically 6504 Canyon Cove Place, and as a  
32 resident I would like to strongly oppose the rezoning proposal for the Foothill Residential Zone  
33 proposed by AJ Rock. As a resident located just above Wasatch Boulevard, this proposal directly  
34 affects me and I have serious concerns regarding foresee able issues and safety.

35  
36 I would be surprised if you haven't seen all the cars parked (some illegally) along Wasatch  
37 Boulevard from the Park and Ride during the ski season. This not only has brought about  
38 congestion along Wasatch Boulevard and our neighborhood, it is extremely unsafe. I've personally  
39 witnessed individuals getting in and out of their car with their ski gear almost getting hit by a car  
40 driving by. I've also witnessed a car door almost taking out a biker when parked on Wasatch  
41 Boulevard near the Park and Ride lot. I would suggest you contact Holladay City regarding the  
42 illegal parking as well. There have been numerous concerns about the parking on the street that  
43 have been addressed with the City. You cannot allow for Wasatch Boulevard to be anything but  
44 a residential zone. People already dangerously pass the speed limit.

1 Not only has Wasatch Boulevard been greatly affected during the ski season, the pandemic has  
2 also created another parking issue along Wasatch Boulevard as well as a neighborhood issue. On  
3 any given weekend since April, there are dozens of cars parked along Wasatch Boulevard in order  
4 to get to the hiking trail. There are a few parking stalls for the trail, but with people out hiking  
5 now more than ever there is a tremendous number of hikers. And when parking stalls are full and  
6 Wasatch Boulevard has dozens of cars parked along the sides, cars start to drive the neighborhood,  
7 often speeding, looking for other places to park. This traffic has put individuals at risk while out  
8 walking because of the speed and hills and turns that obstruct views when driving too fast. In good  
9 conscious, for the safety of individuals you CANNOT let this be rezoned.

10  
11 Eric Kraan: PDD Round 2. I am happy to see the scar of the gravel pit that welcomes the world  
12 to our city begin the metamorphosis into what we can all hope will create a memorable arrival site,  
13 as well as create the initial impression to those travelling through it of arriving/departing a special  
14 place we all call home. The north-side of the Gravel Pit should be thought of as the foyer of our  
15 eastern city entrance, a place where residents, commuters, and recreation seekers can take a deep  
16 breath and feel not only welcomed, but re-energized and excited to finally be here. Sadly, and I  
17 hope I am found wrong through this process of the PDD, but from what the residents of our City  
18 have learned from previous presentations or present plans, the northern piece of the gravel pit will  
19 do no more than blend into the type of development that is already in existence north at 6200  
20 South. It will become more bland buildings to the passer by on the way to a location across our  
21 city, perhaps without ever knowing they had ever arrived at our City. Think about how many  
22 establishments along 6200 South think or claim to be in Cottonwood Heights but are part of  
23 Holladay - even many residents of Cottonwood Heights are unsure where our city starts or ends.  
24 That can change with this one project.

25  
26 It is for this reason that I would like this body, through your powers and duties as the land use  
27 authority of our City, to make the sensible recommendation to the City Council to exercise their  
28 legislative duty through the use of the PDD (a legislative land use decision) and accommodate the  
29 proposed Mobility Hub for the Gravel Pit at this location. A Hub's purpose should be to connect  
30 our community to the regional network, organize and distribute efficiently and effectively human  
31 activity throughout the local transportation network, and more importantly create an effective and  
32 perhaps even dramatic sense of place to people travelling up the hill on 6200 South ensuring that  
33 there is no doubt as to where they have arrived, to Cottonwood Heights. This is a strategic location,  
34 and to blend it into bland land use would not only dilute the value of the City overall; it will devalue  
35 adjacent land's potential.

36  
37 Lisa McFarlane: In addition to the previous email regarding traffic concerns, I would also like to  
38 ask what this development will do to my property value? What of the increased noise and  
39 pollution? These are valid concerns that deserve your attention.

40  
41 (July 1 email) I would like to express my concern as a resident of Holladay City concerning the  
42 proposed development on the Gravel Pit in Cottonwood Heights. This will have a direct impact  
43 on Holladay City, especially my neighborhood of Canyon Cove. With the traffic already  
44 overflowing due to trailhead access and ski bus parking, this new development will only increase  
45 a dangerous situation to not only other vehicles but bikers, runners, and those of us who use our  
46 own neighborhood to walk our dogs and play with our children. I have heard a plan to use the

1 UTA Park & Ride as overflow parking. I would plead with all involved to remember the line of  
2 cars up and down Wasatch Boulevard during ski season; so much so that it hinders visual line of  
3 sight to drive in a safe manner on many days. This is also becoming more and more of an issue as  
4 we are all wanting to enjoy the outdoors and hike the trails using Wasatch Boulevard parking  
5 during the summer months as well.

6  
7 My family is opposed to this "for-profit only" development and ask for reconsideration that takes  
8 into account public safety, fairness, and common decency to one's neighbor. I am sure there is a  
9 reasonable solution that would be mutually beneficial to ALL involved.

10  
11 *Jan Erickson:* I have reviewed your plans regarding the redevelopment of the gravel pit located at  
12 6995 South Wasatch Boulevard. I own a home in Canyon Cove, on the south side of the  
13 subdivision close to the pit itself. I always knew that there would eventually be development there  
14 and generally welcomed it. I am very familiar with the redevelopment of the gravel pit in Sandy  
15 which became Quarry Bend. Rather than a dusty eyesore of a pit, it became a park and walking  
16 trail wrapping around the multi-family development on the north side, all of the way behind Lowe's  
17 and Hobby Lobby. It created big box shopping as well as a gas station and many small retailers  
18 as well. A development such as this would be a wonderful addition to the area.

19  
20 I do have a few concerns I would like to voice regarding the development plans. Quarry Bend  
21 created a large number of townhomes which extended two levels above the ground, but the  
22 development plans for quarry on Wasatch Boulevard call for several high-rise buildings on the  
23 north end of the development, right next to the quiet residential Canyon Cove subdivision. We  
24 bought homes in this area for the solitude and for the views. To build such large developments  
25 right next to a quiet neighborhood seems quite inappropriate. This would destroy our privacy and  
26 our views at the same time. This was never the case in Quarry Bend. No one's privacy or views  
27 were ever affected. We would ask you to reconsider the height of the buildings or place the taller  
28 buildings on the south side of the development rather than the north side. According to your own  
29 policies for redevelopment, the first goal is to consider the existing communities in the area and  
30 the impact thereon. We ask you to consider this in your development of this area. It would not  
31 harm the development or the lucrative nature thereof to simply move the taller developments to  
32 the south side rather than the north.

33  
34 Second, I have quite a concern regarding the entrance to the proposed development. The small  
35 Wasatch Boulevard is not suited for the entrance to such a large development. However, the  
36 substantial 6200 South is. Wasatch Boulevard becomes a bottleneck every winter as skiers flood  
37 the thoroughfare for the canyons. In the summer, it is again a bottleneck filled with hikers for the  
38 Heugh's Canyon trail. The Olympus trailhead is also located in the same area, as is the Old Mill  
39 Golf Course. It is also a frequented by hikers, bicyclists during the day and sightseers parked to  
40 see the City lights at night. It is simply not capable of handling such a massive influx of traffic.  
41 However, 6200 South is.

42  
43 We respectfully request that you make 6200 South the main entrance to the development.  
44 Furthermore, the parking lot on the corner of Wasatch Boulevard. and 6200 South is packed with  
45 cars, especially during the ski season. It simply cannot handle more traffic for a substantial period  
46 during each year. It would be a poor presumption that it could be considered overflow parking for

1 any such development as it cannot handle the flood of traffic it is already deluged with every ski  
2 season. Moving the high-level development to the south side of the area would solve this problem,  
3 as more parking structures could be constructed there.  
4

5 In summary, the redevelopment of the gravel pit can be an incredible addition to the area. Only  
6 slight adjustments are needed. First, in consideration of existing residents, please move the high-  
7 rise buildings further south in the development. Second, please use only 6200 South for all  
8 entrances and exits into and out of the development. This will ensure that is truly a great addition  
9 to the area and for all who have already chosen to call it home. I appreciate your implementation  
10 of these small changes to make an amazing development.  
11

12 Arthur and Diane Walden: We are concerned citizens from the Canyon Cove subdivision of  
13 Holladay that will be greatly impacted by the major development of the gravel pit to the south.  
14 More cooperative planning with Holladay and UDOT regarding our neighborhood should be done  
15 to assess the impact on traffic congestion on Wasatch Boulevard., SR-190, and parking for  
16 skiing/trails.  
17

18 Clearly, access to the development should be much further away 200 feet from the current  
19 intersection of 6200/SR-190 & Wasatch Boulevard. The southwestern edge of the proposed  
20 development is the more appropriate location for access, as it is ~1000 ft south of the 6200/SR-  
21 190 and Wasatch Boulevard. intersection. Anything further north, especially along Wasatch  
22 Boulevard would worsen traffic that has already become very crowded due to additional park and  
23 ride ski traffic and trailhead parking. UDOT and City of Holladay need to be more involved in  
24 the planning of this development. At a minimum, computer simulation of traffic issues should be  
25 done to assess the impact of various development options. Please reject or take no action on this  
26 project until significant cooperative investigation on the impacts of this development with  
27 Holladay city and UDOT have been completed.  
28

29 Merri Lee Zaba: My apologies about the video. Here is a new link that should work. It's a stark  
30 view of the winter ski traffic along Wasatch.  
31

32 Gay Lynn Bennion: I've reviewed the plans for this zoning request on the City's website. I  
33 appreciate that this zoning request represents many hours of work for you and for the planning  
34 commission. Thank you for your involvement. I appreciate the firm commitment in the plans for  
35 affordable housing. When we moved back to Utah from Maryland eight years ago, I was surprised  
36 by the high cost of housing, and prices have only increased. I commend this stand on the inclusion  
37 of affordable housing units.  
38

39 I have spoken with Layne Gordon. She and many of the residents in the Heughs Canyon  
40 neighborhood are concerned the only access to this development will heavily impact their  
41 neighborhood, along Gun Club Road. I hope that you will include another exit point in your final  
42 agreement if this zoning change is to be allowed.  
43

44 Rob Dahle: Over the last several days I have received correspondence and inquiries regarding the  
45 21-acre "gravel pit" development, to include a voice mail from Mayor Peterson I intend to return  
46 this afternoon. So as not to waste everyone's time, I'll reference you to the pasted email sent by

1 District 5 Rep. Dan Gibbons. I think it properly reflects our position. We very much appreciate  
2 you reaching out to us as this development gets underway. The location of the development more  
3 directly impacts the businesses and residents of Holladay than it does Cottonwood Heights. That  
4 said, you are really under no obligation to include us, so the fact that you are willing to collaborate  
5 says a lot about the leadership in your City. We recognize and appreciate your consideration.  
6

7 I think most residents are actually happy to see this area developed. The concern seems to be the  
8 traffic improvement infrastructure currently proposed. Would love to get together with appropriate  
9 staff and officials from Cottonwood Heights, discuss our concerns and consider possible options  
10 that would address our concerns. There is also a concern about the Park and Ride, its present  
11 capacity and challenges that lie ahead as the entire site is developed out. Thank again for your  
12 consideration. We look forward to working with you as development continues.  
13

14 Dwayne and Doralee Freebairn: I am contacting you to express our opposition to the suggested  
15 development of the north end of the gravel pit located at 6695 South Wasatch Boulevard.  
16 Approving this development would adversely affect the Canyon Cove Subdivision. My wife has  
17 respiratory problems and the additional dust caused by construction and the increased traffic would  
18 negatively affect her lungs. We feel that the proposed development exceeds the capacity of the  
19 land and in addition to the increased dust and dirt of developing this area, the projected density of  
20 the project would destroy the ambiance we so enjoy living in the Cove. It would definitely destroy  
21 Holladay's semi-rural character.  
22

23 Susan Goodsell: I am representing the Canyon Ranch Condominiums Homeowners Association  
24 located just north of the gravel pit area. We are against any rezoning of the AJ Rock Gravel Pit  
25 area. We are also against having any access to that area through Gun Club Road. That is a small  
26 neighbor road and would not be conducive to the traffic a development of that size would bring.  
27 We also hope that before you make a final decision on the plans for that development you think of  
28 the beauty of that Wasatch Mountain area and lean more towards more recreational/open green  
29 space areas rather than high density, high rise commercial and housing development. On top of  
30 that, the last thing we need is a thousand more cars on the Wasatch Boulevard corridor.  
31

32 Kevin Hjelm: I would just like it noted that many people in the surrounding neighborhoods  
33 purchased their homes with the understanding that the gravel pit may someday be developed with  
34 single family homes on ½ acre lots and that would be fine. Changing the zoning to put in more  
35 high-density housing and office space was not what I was told when I spent a great deal of money  
36 to move into my neighborhood. I have talked with many of my neighbors and we all feel the same  
37 way. The congestion on the corner of Wasatch is already too much and this project is just going  
38 to drive traffic on to the old Wasatch Road above the Old Mill Golf Course right past a lot of  
39 housing. This is not what the citizens expect from their elected officials and we would hope that  
40 you would take this into consideration and not rezone this plot of land.  
41

42 Diane Wilkins: I am writing to express my significant concern regarding some information I  
43 received today regarding the proposed A.J. Rock rezoning. As a homeowner and long-time  
44 resident of the Canyon Cove community located immediately north of the proposed area, I was  
45 extremely disappointed and distressed to be notified of this change with almost no prior,  
46 unambiguous notification. Indeed, the first flier placed into our mailboxes just a few days ago did

1 not even indicate the date or time of the upcoming meeting. The flier also indicated that no public  
2 comment would be allowed during the meeting itself. Although the flier indicated that members  
3 of the public can submit comments/questions prior to the meeting, insufficient information was  
4 provided in the flier to enable a concerned citizen to actually be able to do so.

5  
6 The absence of appropriate and timely notification clearly implies a lack of concern for residents  
7 of the surrounding community during this process. It appears to be a careful attempt to circumvent  
8 public input. With the availability of live interactive video conferencing, certainly there are other  
9 options for enabling appropriate and fair opportunities for dialogue surrounding the proposal  
10 during the COVID19 crisis. I am frankly appalled at the clear disregard for due process. The  
11 current re-zoning proposal appears to be requesting a significant change to the density originally  
12 proposed for this location. The Canyon Cove neighborhood is a typical, quiet, low-density  
13 community located immediately east of Wasatch. The new plans apparently propose:

- 14  
15 • An expanded number of multiple high-rise buildings immediately adjacent to the  
16 community (10, with no adequate boundary between the north side of the property  
17 development and the existing single-family homes in Canyon Cove).
- 18  
19 • Inadequate parking for the proposed high-rise buildings, thereby creating an extremely  
20 high likelihood of forcing parking in a public park-and-ride lot that is already filled to  
21 capacity during ski season and has an associated existing problem with overflow parking  
22 along Wasatch itself.
- 23  
24 • Highly probably future traffic congestion at an inadequately designed intersection of  
25 Wasatch and SR-19.
- 26  
27 • The development's existing dead-end access that has no potential for egress out to SR-19.
- 28  
29 • Increased air particulates due to increased traffic density.
- 30  
31 • Significantly increased noise and lighting during evening hours, which will directly be  
32 impacting the adjacent community's homes.

33  
34 I am eager to hear how the proposed re-zoning plans do NOT create the problems listed above.  
35 While certainly local homeowners such as myself can understand the desire and need to develop  
36 the property, the current re-zoning plans appear to have a significant negative impact on the  
37 existing community. ***To be perfectly clear – I continue to be open to hearing about the proposal  
38 and having my concerns clarified and corrected - particularly if the community's understanding  
39 is in error. However, the current process does not appear to facilitate an opportunity to me to  
40 perform an assessment of the information. With the current information available to me, I am  
41 opposed to the re-zoning request at this time.***

42  
43 Linda Leckman: Thank you for your response. Have you seen Wasatch Boulevard near the ski  
44 parking lot when it is a good snow day? The egress point will be into what is already traffic mess.  
45 It would be great if you follow the suggestion of Dan Gibbons to defer any decision until  
46 collaborating with Holladay leadership.

1  
2 *Mark Wilkins:* Also, the potential for the Gun Club road to become a major road and increase  
3 traffic through Canyon Cove to get to any additional entrances that might arise off Gun Club Road  
4 into AJ Rock's property. This is concerning the AJ Rock rezone issue. I have been given the  
5 following address as where we can view the proposed plans:

6 <https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1vJ-qiw2Ip8XlrGZravU20A-1XGioRlc?usp=sharing>  
7

8 This address does not work even when "upper case i" is substituted for "lower case L". Do you  
9 have a link as to where these plans may be viewed? How can you have a vote on a proposed zoning  
10 change without the plans being reviewed by the public and public comment?  
11

12 As a Canyon Cove resident, I have grave concern as to the rumored density of construction at this  
13 site. Multiple high-rise buildings, inadequate parking, future congestion at an inadequately  
14 designed intersection of Wasatch and SR-19, proposed use of the park and ride lot that is already  
15 overflowing back down Wasatch in the ski season and not just on the weekend, development's  
16 dead end access with no potential for egress out to SR-19.  
17

18 I believe the plans are being intentional hidden from the public under the guise of COVID-19 to  
19 circumvent the public input process. I believe the interests of Canyon Cove (Holladay) are not  
20 being address in the proposed Cottonwood Heights zoning changes. I believe Holladay City  
21 should have coequal input on this proposed zoning change. In fact, it is rumored that all CH cares  
22 about is the increased tax base (all about the money). And the <http://mixir.com/chmeetings> is a  
23 total joke, can't get on that either!  
24

25 *Merri Lee Zaba:* I live in the Canyon Cove neighborhood, north of the proposed gravel pit  
26 development. As you know, our neighborhood is in a unique situation being the ONLY residential  
27 neighborhood that will be directly bordering the development, but not located in Cottonwood  
28 Heights where the development will be built. My greatest concern is the significant traffic problem  
29 that will be created by the current development plan. The one proposed development egress that  
30 will be located on the bend at Wasatch Boulevard, east of the light, will not work. Canyon Cove  
31 residents will not be able to exit our neighborhood to go south without tremendous trouble. We  
32 are completely land-locked and that intersection is our only route south.  
33

34 The distance between the bend and the intersection is small. There's no conceivable way to  
35 efficiently move traffic through that space with this new, additional egress. In the wintertime, that  
36 intersection is already extremely congested with skier vehicles parked along Wasatch Boulevard.  
37 This past winter it was the worst ever in our 15 years living here. It was a regular occurrence to  
38 have an entire lane going southbound near the light that was filled with parked vehicles. They  
39 parked IN THE right-hand lane. Not to mention parked vehicles going both north and south on  
40 the side of the road. Going north, vehicles were typically parked all the way back, on both sides  
41 of Wasatch, to the entrance of Canyon Cove Drive - hundreds of cars. In the summertime, there  
42 are cars parked on both sides of Wasatch Boulevard, as hikers trek up Heugh's Canyon trail. There  
43 have been many day's we've counted 60- 70+ cars parked along Wasatch Boulevard while people  
44 hike.  
45

1 The traffic issue of the proposed development troubles me greatly. I understand there are issues  
2 with what UDOT will allow, but Cottonwood Heights city, with UDOT's help, must find another  
3 solution. One terrible solution is not the answer. The Canyon Cove neighborhood cannot be locked  
4 out of our only route south.

5  
6 The link below is a video I took this past winter. It was a typical weekend ski day. Although I  
7 liked that these cars were out of Big Cottonwood canyon, you can see this would be a major  
8 problem traffic in the area increases from the new development.

9  
10 Thank you for considering, and sharing, this email with the Planning Commission. We look  
11 forward to a better solution.

12  
13 *Jim O'Callaghan:* I've read the notice of a hearing regarding the request from AJ Rock for a  
14 change in zoning. There was no link to information describing the impact of said change, or the  
15 detailed plans that AJ Rock envisions, or if AJ Rock has not identified plans, what CH City  
16 envisions and what the permit enables. Further, the new zoning is critically described as 'prepared  
17 specifically for specific property' conveniently not describing what this is. I reviewed the CH  
18 website and noted that you have requested corrections from AJ Rock (thank you) but couldn't find  
19 detailed plans for their use of the site.

20  
21 My questions then would be:

- 22
- 23 • The uses allowed under the special zoning are quite broad, is there any info that describes  
24 the actual intended use?
- 25
- 26 • If the zoning change will impact local existing residents, what mitigation is required to  
27 address impact, e.g. traffic, noise, lighting, runoff to river, etc.?
- 28
- 29 • What provisions are being made for active transportation (non-motorized) to address  
30 expected increased traffic, speeding, congestion, pollution?
- 31
- 32 • Is CH City providing tax abatements or other incentives to encourage this development?
- 33
- 34 • What impact fees will AJ Rock be required to pay to address the additional burden  
35 (19.51.020 – more concentrated projects) that the development will generate?
- 36

37 *Richard Petersen:* This mail out has been a disaster. The first attempt didn't mention the date of  
38 the meeting, so another mail out was required. Neither mail out really says what the request is.  
39 Just tell us what the applicant wants to do - in so many words. Having said that and researching  
40 19.51, it appears the applicant wants a mixed-use type commercial development, for just 21.5 acres  
41 of the gravel pit. More importantly, when is the entire gravel pit going to be addressed. It is a huge  
42 noise, traffic, broken windshield, dust, and particulate pollution problem. Converting the entire  
43 gravel pit into something worthy of its location along the beautiful Wasatch Front is an opportunity  
44 for Cottonwood Heights to improve our City for the next 100 years. We shouldn't piecemeal the  
45 transition of the gravel pit, we should have a well thought out comprehensive plan. Otherwise we  
46 risk creating another developer-driven blighted area like Fort Union Boulevard or Redwood Road.

1 Don't let the developers screw up a once in a lifetime opportunity to do something great for the  
2 most number of residents.

3  
4 *Chris Sotiriou:* I am writing to provide input, and to voice concern, regarding the proposed Zone  
5 Map Amendment to approximately 21.5 acres of property located at 6695 South Wasatch  
6 Boulevard in Cottonwood Heights. I live in Canyon Cove, the property that abuts to the proposed  
7 property. Like many of my neighbors, I am concerned about what the traffic flow will be along  
8 Wasatch Boulevard—an indispensable access point and the only access point to our residence. As  
9 you may be aware, Wasatch Boulevard has become increasingly congested over the past several  
10 years. For example, during the winter ski months, it is commonplace to see cars parked from 6200  
11 South to the north entry point of Canyon Cove. This creates a lot of havoc because the congestion  
12 cuts both visibility and maneuverability along Wasatch Boulevard. Similarly, in the summer  
13 months, Wasatch Boulevard becomes congested once again as people use it to access Heughs  
14 Canyon.

15  
16 My primary concern is that the proposed development will increase traffic and further burden an  
17 already strained roadway leading our neighborhood. I would like to see a workable plan that will  
18 cause zero to minimal disruption to our neighborhood. One alternative is to convert Wasatch  
19 Boulevard to a one-way road from 6200 South to 4500 South with traffic moving north. Wasatch  
20 Boulevard is an ideal route for bicycles, walkers, joggers, and the like. Having a one-way road  
21 would allow out-door enthusiasts the opportunity to utilize the road safely for bicycling and  
22 running. It makes logical sense because it would provide people with better and safer access to  
23 the Mt. Olympus Trail Head. It would also minimize congestion by cutting out southbound traffic  
24 because motorists could use the 6200 South off ramp when traveling from the north.

25  
26 To clarify, I am not advocating that traffic from the development be routed through Wasatch  
27 Boulevard: rather, 6200 South would remain the workhorse of traffic access to and from the  
28 development. Additionally, the one-way road need not start at 6200 South, although that is  
29 probably the best place to start to effectively eliminate most congestion issues; instead, it could  
30 start after the entry way to the Old Mill golf course.

31  
32 Granted, this alternative might create significant consternation at first because people will have to  
33 travel about fifteen blocks to access the freeway. Nonetheless, this worked well on 11th Avenue  
34 in Salt Lake thirty-years ago when Memory Grove was changed to a one-way street headed west.  
35 Overtime, people got used to the minor inconvenience and gained safer access to the Grove for  
36 bicycling and jogging. Today, 11th Avenue stands as a paragon of excellence for having user  
37 friendly access from the Avenues to Capitol Hill and back.

38  
39 Here too, Cottonwood Heights and Holladay could have the same model that would be friendly  
40 toward non-motor vehicle use and alleviate congestion at the same time. The short-term pain will  
41 be well worth the long-term gain. This would also promote the policy of having more user friendly  
42 alternatives to motor vehicles. Additionally, having only a northbound flow of traffic would  
43 prevent dangerous left-hand turns from Wasatch Boulevard to 6200 South. This would comport  
44 with a recent study from Brigham Young University that concluded that eliminating left-hand turns  
45 would reduce the total number of accidents by 75 percent, or so.

1 I hope that the Commission will consider this as an alternative to merely letting traffic run rough  
2 shod though the pristine foothills along Wasatch Boulevard. A one-way street is an economical  
3 way to alleviate congestion and provide a safe venue for out-door enthusiasts connecting the Mt.  
4 Olympus trailhead to the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon. I appreciate your attention to this  
5 matter.

6  
7 Linda Leckman: I have lived in the Canyon Cove subdivision for 36 years, and I care very much  
8 about this area. Canyon Cove is directly north of the area where you have a request from AJ Rock,  
9 LLC, for a zoning change on 21.5 acres. I understand that development of that area is inevitable  
10 and to be desired compared to the current state of that property. The critical issue is traffic  
11 management, specifically how will that development access Wasatch Boulevard? Having traffic  
12 flow from the development through Canyon Cove subdivision is not an option. This is a residential  
13 area only. Please carefully consider and plan for the large number of cars and the traffic that will  
14 be created with the development.

15  
16 *At Chair Coutts request, the Commission took a brief break from public comments to address*  
17 *Action Item 4.1 after which Mr. Johnson continued reading the public comments.*

18  
19 David Lundquist: Rezoning of the area to multiple use and densities designed through Cottonwood  
20 Heights should be denied due to no multiple South Direct Access on to SR-190 for the first phase  
21 and all subsequent phases for the entire project. The entire development traffic cannot be allowed  
22 to move North on Gun Club Road, Wasatch Boulevard and through all the residential  
23 neighborhoods. Our health, safety, quality of life and property values will be sacrificed. UDOT  
24 denied egress on to SR-190 on the South side will be dead ended. This project needs pre-approval  
25 by UDOT for 3 to 5 direct exits on to SR-190 for the required volume of traffic. SR-190 to I-215  
26 is designed to handle this type of development traffic.

27  
28 The AJ Rock parcel already has direct exit on to highway SR-190 currently being used by his  
29 business and a local ski rental shop. I currently have observed vehicles turning left and right on to  
30 SR-190. Parking for the project is inadequate including the lack of overflow parking on the site  
31 for the first phase development. Also, the lack of a complete development plan for all development  
32 phases has not been prepared for evaluation and public comment. This needs to be provided up  
33 front not five years down the road. This Project Plan has not been thought through all the way.

34  
35 Lack of existing road infrastructure for vehicles to travel along Gun Club Road to the North and  
36 through the local residential subdivisions and along Wasatch Drive cannot handle 8,000 to 10,000  
37 cars per day. Noise pollution will become horrific. How do you sleep with all the additional noise?  
38 We cannot allow the Gun Club Road and Wasatch Boulevard to become a high-speed route,  
39 bumper to bumper traffic, jammed with car exhaust and then we can't even exit our neighborhood  
40 streets. Safety and quality of life for all will be compromised for all by using the local area to the  
41 North of project. This impact everyone down to 33rd South along Wasatch Drive. We have  
42 children in danger from the massive increase in traffic, fuel emissions, road wear and tear and  
43 contaminates.

44  
45 All the neighborhoods in Holladay and Millcreek are impacted negatively by this project. Holladay  
46 gets zero benefit while the local citizens bear all the burdens personally and financially.

1 Cottonwood Heights and AJ Rock materially benefit from this development for years to come. I  
2 urge you to reject this Cottonwood Heights project at this time.

3  
4 Lori Khodadad: I live in Canyon Cove and my backyard abuts the Gun Club Road just over the  
5 hill from the proposed development. I am in favor of a "good" development with amenities that  
6 benefit the majority of the citizens it impacts. However, the traffic flow and access points are of  
7 utmost concern to me. Wasatch Boulevard is not only a busy highway for traffic, but also a highly  
8 used road for outdoor recreation. Between 3300 South and 6200 South there are numerous  
9 trailheads including Mt. Olympus, Bonneville Shoreline, Neffs and Heughs Canyon as well as the  
10 Old Mill Golf Course and bike and running lanes on both sides. It is the main artery for these  
11 types of activities. On any given day during the 2019/2020 ski season the 6200 South Park n Ride  
12 lot was filled to capacity and cars lined both sides of Wasatch as far as the North end of the Old  
13 Mill Golf Course. Cars even parked in the traffic lanes going both directions until signs were  
14 installed making it illegal. During warmer months cars line both sides of the road to hike Mt.  
15 Olympus and Heughs Canyon. A thorough traffic study needs to be conducted taking all of these  
16 factors into consideration. It is unacceptable to add thousands of cars to an already overly  
17 congested road and blind curve where 6200 South and Wasatch meet. Please come up with a better  
18 plan for access to this property for the safety and continued enjoyment of the residents who use  
19 this road.

20  
21 Dan Gibbons: I'm a member of the Holladay City Council representing District 5, which  
22 immediately abuts this proposed project on the north. I recommend disapproval of this application  
23 pending a more in-depth review of the significant access and traffic issues with Holladay City and  
24 UDOT. The developer is proposing to construct a new intersection on north Wasatch Boulevard.  
25 This intersection would be:

- 26
- 27 1. The sole access point for 400+ new dwellings, retail pads and a 140-room hotel.
- 28
- 29 2. Only 200 feet from SR-190; and
- 30
- 31 3. Constructed on the inside of a blind corner, with dramatic elevation change.
- 32

33 The developer's narrative description of the proposed intersection and accompanying drawings are  
34 very non-specific. Would this be a signalized intersection or a three-way stop? What turn lanes  
35 would it have? Note that the traffic study does not address any engineering issues. Note also that  
36 the proposed intersection straddles or sits immediately adjacent to the Holladay City boundary.  
37 To consider approval without considerable input from Holladay City is very problematic. At a  
38 minimum, there are traffic infrastructure issues that may very well impact the Holladay community  
39 disproportionately.

40  
41 Another key issue that must be considered is the future access, including a signaled intersection  
42 and two other access points, that will be available to developer on SR-190. The developer  
43 concedes that: "Future access to all gravel pit redevelopment sites is likely to occur . . . The  
44 property south of this site has three streets (one signalized) planned. When developed . . . [we]  
45 will have access to exit the site through these egress points." (See page 18 and Figure 7). The  
46 traffic study is also specifically predicated on future access to the south: "Based on the projected

1 ADT, it is likely that there will be some reserve capacity for the future development to the south.  
2 . . . it is likely that with their (southern project) accesses to SR-190, the roadway for this project  
3 would receive very little traffic flow . . .” (See Traffic Study Addendum, Page 6).  
4

5 Accordingly, I strongly recommend that the Commission reject, or at a minimum, take no action  
6 on the proposed ordinance and zone map amendments, and preliminary project approval, pending  
7 significant cooperative engagement and discussion with Holladay City and UDOT on the question  
8 of vehicle access. With great appreciation for all you do!  
9

10 Connie Millicam: I have been a homeowner since 1985. I did not receive public notice of this  
11 big development next to the gravel pit. Are the planning permit fees that the City will receive  
12 more important than the lung damage from the dust that is coming off of the gravel pit? My  
13 husband died of lung disease December 30, 2019 and our previous neighbor across the street  
14 required a lung transplant. I cannot believe the gravel pit is still there with the thousands of  
15 building permits that have been issued since we built our house 35 years ago, here. This has been  
16 quite a beautiful area for wildlife and the natural mountains in the background. We cannot handle  
17 the high traffic that this huge development will add to Wasatch Boulevard. Summer brings  
18 hundreds of bicycles on Wasatch Boulevard and slick roads happen during the winter with  
19 dangerous drops off the west side of the road. Please keep me informed of the Planning  
20 Commission’s process as I live in the neighborhood.  
21

22 Valija Avizonis: I am sending this email to voice my concerns over the proposed A.J. Rock request  
23 for zoning change at 6695 South Wasatch Boulevard. My understanding is that all traffic from  
24 this high-density development will exit the area to the north onto Wasatch Boulevard. Traffic  
25 from the development will markedly intensify the already congested traffic in this area of Wasatch  
26 Boulevard. The traffic and parking from skiers in the winter, catching the bus at the park and ride  
27 lot in that area already is a severe safety hazard, now augmented year-round by people parking to  
28 hike Mt. Olympus or Heugh’s Canyon trails. This is extremely dangerous for the runners, bikers  
29 and walkers who use this corridor regularly. Adding an additional 8-10,000 cars will severely  
30 overtax the area and Wasatch Boulevard is wholly inadequate to handle that kind of increase in  
31 traffic.  
32

33 It is time for Utahns to not allow greedy developers to maximize their profits and dump congestion,  
34 road maintenance and traffic issues on city governments. The density proposed will destroy the  
35 character of the area both in Cottonwood Heights and Holladay. Please look thoughtfully at the  
36 proposed development, consider alternatives both to traffic flow and quality of life.  
37

38 Brian Call: As a resident in the Canyon Cove neighborhood, I’m concerned about the new  
39 development in the gravel pit. I do oppose the change from the ½ acre lots to high density uses.  
40 I’m also concerned about the lack of egress from the proposed development onto Wasatch  
41 Boulevard. I’ve been told by other neighbors that all the traffic in and out this development will  
42 flow directly through the Canyon Cove neighborhood and not out on to Wasatch Boulevard. Is  
43 that true?  
44

45 Joel Miller: Your rezone plan for 6695 South Wasatch is exceptionally premature and should at  
46 least await UDOT approval for egress from SR-190. UDOT must know something that you are

1 not telling the affected community, as they are not approving this. If they will not approve egress,  
2 why should you approve this unless there is some sort of personal financial benefit? Furthermore,  
3 access from the south must be likewise available (not as a distant plan), and until this access is  
4 available, the plans for this project must be placed on hold. This rezone plan reads as a favor for  
5 AJ Rock. After sensible logistics related to traffic and parking are intelligently worked out (using  
6 the ski parking areas for overflow parking is misuse of this facility and abuse by the developer),  
7 then a rezone plan can be considered.

8  
9 Lane Gordon: Thank you so much for your assistance in obtaining the AJ Rock proposal. Please  
10 see the attached pictures taken along Wasatch and behind our house. As you can see there is a lot  
11 of traffic at all times with pedestrians, bikers, people in and out of their cars, children, pets, and  
12 hikers. How safe would it be to add thousands of cars daily as this funnels traffic immediately  
13 into Holladay on Wasatch Boulevard where residents live. Something has to be done about the  
14 egress of this proposal. We appreciate your input. Sincerely, Heughs Canyon and Canyon Cove  
15 Residents.

16  
17 Katie Eisenbarth: I have been to meetings and kept up with the plans for the development of this  
18 lot. I am excited to see this area change from an eyesore/hazard into something useful. However,  
19 it has come to my attention that access to this land is going to be on Wasatch road by the light.  
20 This winter, this area was nearly inaccessible due to skiers with cars lining both sides of the road  
21 and traffic from skiing. It left me very late to work, and unable to enjoy where I live. While this  
22 is not necessarily your concern, the idea that it would be acceptable to add more congestion to that  
23 curve is totally unacceptable. The congestion has actually gotten worse now with the pandemic.  
24 We now have cars lining both sides of the road all the way to the golf club as hikers try to access  
25 the trail. I deserve to be able to access my home and enjoy where I live. I am already having to  
26 fight for this due to the trail and ski access. Enough is enough.

27  
28 This has all changed since I moved here three years ago and was not known to me at the time. If a  
29 roundabout/stop sign etc. is out in, will I be compensated for my time I lose everyday stuck in  
30 traffic? Will I be compensated if I have to move because of this? I know this answer is no and  
31 because I live in Holladay and not Cottonwood Heights, I cannot vote on the representatives who  
32 make this decision. My community will continue to fight that access point. We have over a  
33 hundred families with resources in our neighborhood, so please be respectful to our needs.

34  
35 Chair Coutts reminded the Planning Commission that staff's recommendation is that their review  
36 of the application is based on whether the proposal complies with baseline standards of relevant  
37 City plans, codes, ordinances, and development standards. There are outstanding issues as  
38 discussed earlier that remain to be addressed. Staff has recommended the public hearing is  
39 continued to the July 15<sup>th</sup> meeting to allow the applicant to resolve outstanding issues and for Staff  
40 to review response time. She recommended they do not place a date on the continuance if they go  
41 in that direction and base it on the receipt of answers to the outstanding issues as well as staff's  
42 time to review those. Changes to the alignment of the buildings was also a concern.

43  
44 Mr. Johnson stated that from staff's perspective, they were intending to have the Public Works  
45 Director and City Engineer present at the next meeting to discuss their concerns. Publishing  
46 comments and allowing the Commission and applicant to review may allow for further discussion.

1 Chair Coutts asked for clarification regarding the availability of information.

2  
3 Mr. Johnson explained that the City website includes a page specific to the Planning Commission  
4 where all agendas are posted and links to all of the existing plans, reports, traffic studies and  
5 documentation as a part of the packet are located.

6  
7 **MOTION:** Commissioner Wilde moved to continue the item to the next meeting with the  
8 understanding that if the applicant and staff have not resolved the issues they consider to be  
9 necessary, it may be moved to the next meeting. Commissioner Mills seconded the motion. Vote  
10 on motion: Commissioner Ryser-Aye, Commissioner Mills-Aye, Commissioner Wilde-Aye,  
11 Commissioner Allen-Aye, Commissioner Rhodes-Aye, Commissioner Wilde-Aye, Acting Chair  
12 Coutts-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.

13  
14 **4.0 CONSENT AGENDA**

15  
16 **4.1 Approval of Planning Commission Minutes.**

17  
18 **4.1.1 June 3, 2020 Planning Commission Minutes.**

19  
20 *Commissioner Rhodes moved to approve the minutes of the June 3, 2020, meeting with the*  
21 *changes noted. Commissioner Mills seconded the motion. The motion passed with the*  
22 *unanimous consent of the Commission.*

23  
24 **5.0 ADJOURNMENT**

25  
26 *Commissioner Rhodes moved to adjourn. Commissioner Wilde seconded the motion. The*  
27 *motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.*

28  
29 The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 9:31 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, July 1, 2020*

3  
4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes  
7 T Forbes Group  
8 Minutes Secretary

9  
10 Minutes Approved: August 5, 2020