

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

3  
4 **Wednesday, July 15, 2020**

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

6 **Conducted Electronically**  
7

8 ***ATTENDANCE***  
9

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

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

17 **Others:** Adam Davis, Craig Dean, Delmas Johnson, Dimond Zollinger, Holley  
18 Mullen, Jesse Stewart Ryan Hales, Serra Lakomski, Sharon Turner, Tom  
19 Henroid, Jon Dean  
20

21 **WORK MEETING**  
22

23 Acting Chair Chris Coutts called the Work Meeting to order at approximately 5:00 p.m. She read  
24 a statement regarding conducting the meeting from an anchor location.  
25

26 **1.0 Planning Commission Business.**  
27

28 **1.1 Review Business Meeting Agenda**  
29

30 CED Director, Michael Johnson reported that it is necessary to formally elect a new Chair and  
31 Vice Chair as Commissioner Griffin is no longer on the Planning Commission. Staff  
32 recommended that Commissioner Coutts step into the Chair role. The matter was to be addressed  
33 during the Business Meeting.  
34

35 Chris Coutts was nominated to serve as Chair and Jesse Allen as Vice Chair for the Work Meeting.  
36

37 The agenda items were reviewed and discussed.  
38

39 City Planner, Andy Hulka presented the first agenda item regarding a wireless telecommunications  
40 facility. He stated that a request was received for an upgrade to an existing pump station that is on  
41 residential property. It is currently underground. Salt Lake City is proposing to upgrade the facility  
42 to the current standards, which includes what is currently underground. They plan to build an  
43 above-ground entrance with a communications antenna above to communicate with the Water  
44 Department facilities and systems.  
45

1 At the last meeting, the Commission asked the applicant to provide more detail on their proposal  
2 to make the antenna a stealth facility. They would make a presentation at the Business Meeting.  
3 The applicant's suggestion was to provide a camouflage paint scheme on the antenna, which they  
4 feel is the least invasive option. They felt that doing an architectural element or a tree or a flagpole  
5 would be more visually obstructive.

6  
7 Jesse Allen declared a conflict of interest. City Attorney, Shane Topham stated that by law it is  
8 only necessary for a Commission Member to disclose a conflict of interest publicly at the  
9 beginning of the meeting. That would not prevent him from participating in the discussion or vote.

10  
11 The next agenda item involved the A.J. Rock gravel pit submission. The intent tonight was for the  
12 applicant's Traffic Engineer to address the Commission and focus mainly on the impacts. Few  
13 comments were received on the item with over 50 received for the Trails Master Plan. Procedural  
14 issues were discussed. Chair Coutts commented that because so many comments were received,  
15 there may be a lot of questions and issues to be discussed.

16  
17 Mr. Johnson stated that there is another outstanding policy issue that needs to be discussed beyond  
18 tonight. They need time to review submittals received the previous night as well, which require  
19 internal review. There will also need to be a substantial discussion on affordable housing, which  
20 he did not suggest take place tonight. Issues not addressed tonight could be tabled to the next  
21 meeting.

22  
23 Mr. Johnson described proposed changes to the height elevations for the condominium tower. The  
24 drawing was modified to be consistent with the number of units that are proposed. Revised grading  
25 and utility plans were also provided. Staff reached out to the City of Holladay and discussed shared  
26 issues. The Utah Department of Transportation ("UDOT") will reach out regarding traffic access  
27 and intersection access on SR-190.

28  
29 Chair Coutts commented that based on the comments received at the last meeting, UDOT was  
30 unified in terms of access, ingress, egress, and potential traffic issues. Mr. Johnson stated that staff  
31 has not yet had that conversation with them. There had been a call from officials from the City of  
32 Holladay to continue to look at what access rights the property has through the Walker property to  
33 the south if any. That was a legal question they wanted the applicant to respond to. There was  
34 also a condemnation on the Walker property where UDOT took control of access points and  
35 property that eliminated some of the potential access to the south.

36  
37 In response to a question raised regarding ingress and egress to Gun Club Road, Public Works  
38 Director, Matthew Shipp stated that beyond construction it was not anticipated that the  
39 development will have any access to the Gun Club other than the pedestrian or native trail that is  
40 planned to go in. Aerial photographs of the area were displayed and the proposed changes  
41 described. The Park and Ride area was discussed as well as other parking areas. He stated that  
42 the area typically sees a significant impact only 25 days per year in this location. There was  
43 concern expressed regarding impacts during peak demand days when there is a lot of ski traffic.  
44 From a planning perspective, staff tries not to plan for the 25 days to avoid overbuilding  
45 infrastructure. The traffic analysis was noted.

1 Mr. Shipp described the engineering details for the gravel pit site. Staff was asked to review the  
2 request and come up with a determination of the feasibility of the condominium project at a glance  
3 based on submittals provided. Updates of changes in building locations and sizes on their grading  
4 plan had been received. There was no recommendation for approval or denial at this time since  
5 the request was only recently received. Mr. Shipp presented current concerns including a proposal  
6 to change the grading and alignment of Wasatch Boulevard and concerns with Gun Club Road. It  
7 was noted that nothing was glaring from an engineering perspective on what can or cannot be done.  
8 Currently, the buildings are being used to retain hillsides. Other issues will be addressed as the  
9 engineering design progresses. The engineer from McNeil Engineering prepared the civil site plan  
10 and the City has concern with stormwater and how it is contained. The concern was that it could  
11 leach out onto the hillside and come out elsewhere. The applicant will need to show how they will  
12 deal with the stormwater. Although feasible, it would be necessary for staff to conduct an  
13 additional review.

14  
15 Because the site is in a sensitive lands area and used as a gravel pit, Chair Coutts asked about the  
16 grade of the area being developed. Mr. Shipp stated that there is a great deal of latent fill materials  
17 on the site that need to be removed down to the native ground/bedrock. There will be different  
18 requirements for the road and the building. Slope issues on the site were discussed. Mr. Shipp  
19 stated that one concern was the proximity to the City boundary. Because this is a sensitive lands  
20 area, the City will need to take certain steps.

21  
22 Mr. Johnson presented the Commission with an overview of a City-initiated proposal to consider  
23 the Bonneville Shoreline Trail, Trailhead, and Access Plan. For many years, the City has had a  
24 conceptual alignment for the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. The U.S. Forest Service previously  
25 performed an Environmental Impact Study and Salt Lake County and other regional committees  
26 mapped out a conceptual alignment for the entire Bonneville Shoreline Trail. They have, however,  
27 never analyzed how to get people onto the trail once it is built. A portion of the Bonneville  
28 Shoreline Trail grant money received will be used to draft a Master Plan dedicated to trailhead  
29 access. The goals for the property are to identify and provide sufficient regional, secondary, and  
30 local access points and define what they should look like. The proposed plan provides those  
31 details. The long-term vision for the trail is that it will run 200 miles and connect communities  
32 and counties. It will serve as a regional community level amenity.

33  
34 The proposed three access points were identified as the gravel pit, the Ferguson Canyon overflow  
35 lot, and another on the south side of the City. It was recommended that an existing small parking  
36 lot on property owned by the U.S. Forest Service be expanded to serve as a very limited capacity  
37 trailhead access point. Other local access points were also identified. Constraints included  
38 property ownership. It was noted that in the proposed plan, local access means no parking, very  
39 little signage, and few amenities. It was clarified that eminent domain cannot be used for trail  
40 amenities and that was not part of the City's plan or vision.

41  
42 **1.2 Additional Discussion Items.**  
43

1 **2.0 Adjournment.**

2

3 *Commissioner Rhodes moved to adjourn the Work Session. Commissioner Ryser seconded the*  
4 *motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.*

5

6 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 15, 2020**

5 **6:00 p.m.**

6 **Conducted Electronically**  
7

8 ***ATTENDANCE***  
9

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

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

17 **Others:** Adam Davis, Craig Dean, Delmas Johnson, Dimond Zollinger, Holley  
18 Mullen, Jesse Stewart Ryan Hales, Serra Lakomski, Sharon Turner, Tom  
19 Henroid, Jon Dean  
20

21 **BUSINESS MEETING**  
22

23 Acting Chair Chris Coutts called the Business Meeting to order at approximately 6:00 p.m.  
24

25 **1.0 Welcome and Acknowledgments.**  
26

27 Chair Coutts welcomed those in attendance and read the opening statement regarding the current  
28 COVID-19 situation.  
29

30 **1.1 Ex Parte Communications or Conflicts of Interest to Disclose.**  
31

32 Jesse Allen declared a conflict of interest regarding CUP 20-009 and stated that his architectural  
33 firm has an active contract with the applicant. As a result, he will recuse himself from the vote.  
34

35 **2.0 General Public Comment**  
36

37 There were no public comments.  
38

39 **3.0 Business Items**  
40

41 **3.1 Election of Planning Commission Chair and Vice-Chair.**  
42

43 Chair Coutts reported that Graig Griffin has stepped down as Chair, which leaves the Chair and  
44 Vice-Chair positions open.  
45

1 *Commissioner Wilde nominated Chris Coutts to serve as Chair. Commissioner Mills seconded*  
2 *the motion. Vote on motion: Jesse Allen-Aye, Sue Ryser-Aye, Craig Bevan-Aye, Dan Mills-*  
3 *Aye, Bob Wilde-Aye, Chair Coutts-Aye. The motion passed unanimously. Commissioner*  
4 *Douglas Rhodes was not present for the vote.*

5  
6 *Commissioner Wilde moved to nominate Jesse Allen to serve as Vice-Chair. Commissioner*  
7 *Mills seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Jesse Allen-Aye, Sue Ryser-Aye, Craig Bevan-*  
8 *Aye, Dan Mills-Aye, Bob Wilde-Aye, Chair Coutts-Aye. The motion passed unanimously.*  
9 *Commissioner Douglas Rhodes was not present for the vote.*

10  
11 **3.2 (Project CUP-20-009) A Public Hearing and Possible Action on a Request**  
12 **from Dimond Zollinger (Salt Lake City Department of Public Utilities) for a**  
13 **Conditional Use Permit for a Wireless Telecommunications facility (Roof-**  
14 **Mounted Antenna) and a Reduction to the Minimum Yard Requirements for**  
15 **a Public Use at 8800 South Kings Hill Drive #A in the F-1-21 – Foothill**  
16 **Residential Zone. Continued from the July 1, 2020 Public Hearing.**  
17

18 City Planner, Andrew Hulka presented the staff report and stated that the request is for a  
19 Conditional Use Permit for a wireless telecommunication facility and a reduction to the minimum  
20 yard requirements for a public use. The public use is a pump station for the Water Department at  
21 8800 South Kings Hill Drive #A. He stated that no new information has been added. Mr. Hulka  
22 stated that one of the conditions is that the highest point of the antenna cannot exceed what is  
23 allowed in the zoning ordinance, which is 20 feet above existing grade. What is proposed is an  
24 above-ground structure for an above-ground entrance to an underground pump station facility with  
25 a communications antenna on top. At the last meeting, the Planning Commission asked for  
26 additional information on what the Water Department would do to ensure that this is a stealth  
27 antenna to minimize the visual impact on the neighborhood.  
28

29 Deputy Director of Public Utilities, Jesse Stewart, was present with Project Manager, Dimond  
30 Zollinger who was available by telephone. Holly Mullen who does Public Engagement and  
31 Delmas Johnson from JUB Engineers were also present. Mr. Stewart discussed the stealth antenna  
32 proposals, the engineering and operations project scope, how they plan to stealth the antenna, and  
33 the conditions of approval.  
34

35 Mr. Stewart discussed the following three phases of the engineering elements and scope of work:  
36

- 37 • Replace aging infrastructure;
  - 38 • Perform SCADA telemetry; and
  - 39 • Backup power.
- 40

41 Mr. Stewart stated that replacing aging infrastructure will involve replacing outdated pumps and  
42 piping components and put it into an above-ground entrance. The concrete vault will remain the  
43 same, which is where most of the components are. He stressed that worker safety is of utmost  
44 concern as well as reliability for the community.  
45

1 Mr. Stewart reported that this is part of the larger distribution system which has 92,000  
2 connections. Their goal is to ensure reliability in terms of culinary and fire pressure, water quality,  
3 and updating compliance with electrical and safety codes.

4  
5 The SCADA telemetry and stealth antenna will monitor the pump station only, which is not  
6 connected to the SCADA control center. It will improve operations and maintenance because  
7 operators will realize that there is an issue without having to rely on a resident to report a water  
8 quality or pressure issue.

9  
10 Mr. Stewart reported on outreach efforts that have taken place and stated that numerous site  
11 meetings were held with prospective residents and stakeholders. Several written comments were  
12 also received and responded to and flyers were distributed. With regard to trees, they currently  
13 have no plans to remove or trim trees in the vicinity. Some small shrubs will be impacted and will  
14 be addressed as part of the site rehabilitation. Concerning antenna height, it will be no more than  
15 20 feet above grade.

16  
17 Mr. Stewart stated that they will be working exclusively within their two project easements. He  
18 pointed out that the original meeting with the Planning Commission was postponed allowing them  
19 to better address stakeholder concerns. They would continue to work with the residents including  
20 Mr. Harris regarding generator placement.

21  
22 Mr. Stewart next identified the project easements and stated that the construction project will  
23 remain with the easements to make replace the infrastructure and make improvements to bring it  
24 up to current standards. It was proposed that the pole and antenna be painted a camouflage brown  
25 to provide the least visual obstruction. Other options were also considered that were believed to  
26 be out of place and out of proportion with the structure. Photos of other pump stations were  
27 displayed. Mr. Stewart discussed the nine conditions of approval set forth in the staff report.

28  
29 Commissioner Wilde considered what is proposed to be a significant enhancement to what exists  
30 currently. Mr. Stewart was asked if it is possible to improve the pumps below ground. Dimond  
31 Zollinger stated that the pumps are underground and everything inside the vaults or underground  
32 will remain underground. The only portion that is above ground will be the entry for ease of  
33 access.

34  
35 Chair Coutts opened the meeting to public comment. There were no public comments.

36  
37 Procedural issues were discussed. Chair Coutts stated that at the conclusion of the last public  
38 hearing, it was recommended that condition number four be modified to specify 12 months rather  
39 than six.

40  
41 ***Commissioner Ryser moved to approve Project CUP-20-009 subject to the following:***

42  
43 ***Conditions:***

- 44  
45 ***1. A building permit must be obtained from the city prior to construction of the***  
46 ***facility.***

- 1  
2       **2.     *As part of the building permit application, the applicant must submit a certificate***  
3       ***from a licensed professional engineer certifying that the design of the facility***  
4       ***meets all applicable standards for the facility, including, but not limited to:***  
5       ***electrical safety, material, and design integrity, seismic safety, etc.***  
6
- 7       **3.     *The antenna must be designed as a stealth facility, which is camouflaged so as to***  
8       ***blend in with its surroundings to such an extent that it is indistinguishable by the***  
9       ***casual observer from the structure on which it is placed or the surrounding in***  
10       ***which it is located. The antenna may be disguised as a flagpole, designed as part***  
11       ***of an architectural element such as a steeple or chimney, or otherwise***  
12       ***camouflaged with materials and colors that blend in with the surrounding area***  
13       ***as approved by the Planning Commission.***  
14
- 15       **4.     *On no more than one occasion within 12 months after the facility has been***  
16       ***constructed, the Planning Commission or the department may require the color***  
17       ***be changed if it is determined that the original color does not blend with the***  
18       ***surroundings.***  
19
- 20       **5.     *The roof-mounted antenna shall not vary from the height requirements for***  
21       ***accessory structures in the F-1-21 zone. The distance from the top of the antenna***  
22       ***to the average natural grade of the above-ground entrance structure must not***  
23       ***exceed 20 feet.***  
24
- 25       **6.     *Continuous outside lighting of the facility is prohibited.***  
26
- 27       **7.     *Any existing landscaping disturbed or removed during the construction process***  
28       ***must be repaired or replaced by the applicant.***  
29
- 30       **8.     *All utility lines on the lot leading to the accessory building and antenna structure***  
31       ***shall be underground.***  
32
- 33       **9.     *The applicant shall provide proof of legal right to build in the existing pump***  
34       ***station easement or appropriate owner’s consent to build as proposed, subject to***  
35       ***approval of the City Attorney.***  
36

37 ***Findings:***

- 38
- 39       • ***The proposed use described in the report is a conditional use in the F-1-21 – Foothill***  
40       ***Residential zone.***
- 41
- 42       • ***A public hearing was held in accordance with local and state requirements.***  
43
- 44       • ***The use will comply with the intent, spirit, and regulations of this title and will be***  
45       ***compatible with and implement the planning goals and objectives of the city.***  
46

- 1 • *The use will be harmonious with the neighboring uses in the zoning district in which it*  
2 *is to be located.*
- 3
- 4 • *Nuisances which would not be in harmony with the neighboring uses will be abated by*  
5 *the conditions imposed.*
- 6
- 7 • *Protection of property values, the environment, and the tax base for the city will be*  
8 *assured.*
- 9
- 10 • *The use will comply with the city's general plan.*
- 11
- 12 • *The proposed facility is compatible with the height and mass of existing buildings.*
- 13
- 14 • *The proposed facility will be located in a position to provide visual screening to the*  
15 *greatest extent practicable.*
- 16
- 17 • *Existing vegetation on the site will be preserved to the greatest extent practicable.*
- 18
- 19 • *The facility does not create an unreasonable adverse impact on the City's mountain*  
20 *viewsheds or other scenic resources.*
- 21
- 22 • *Staff will verify compliance with all imposed conditions upon review of the required*  
23 *building permit application.*
- 24
- 25 • *Appropriate buffering will be provided to protect adjacent land uses from light, noise,*  
26 *and visual impacts.*
- 27
- 28 • *The architecture and building materials are consistent with the development and*  
29 *surrounding uses, and otherwise compatible with the City's general plan, subdivision*  
30 *ordinance, land use ordinance, and any applicable design standards.*
- 31
- 32 • *The reduction of minimum yard requirements for the accessory structure will not, under*  
33 *the circumstances of this particular case, be detrimental to the health, safety or general*  
34 *welfare of persons residing in the vicinity, or injurious to property or improvements in*  
35 *the vicinity.*
- 36

37 *Commissioner Bevan seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Commissioner Wilde-Abstained,*  
38 *Commissioner Allen-Abstained, Commissioner Mills-Aye, Commissioner Ryser-Aye,*  
39 *Commissioner Bevan-Aye, Chair Coutts-Aye. The motion passed unanimously with two*  
40 *abstentions.*

1           **3.3     (Project PDD-19-001) A Public Hearing to Receive Comments on a Request**  
2           **from AJ Rock, LLC for an Ordinance and Zone Map Amendment for**  
3           **Approximately 21.5 Acres of Property located at 6695 South Wasatch**  
4           **Boulevard Utilizing the City’s Planned Development District (PDD)**  
5           **Ordinance and Changing the Zoning Designation from F-1-21 (Foothill**  
6           **Residential) to PDD-2. (This is a zoning designation prepared specifically for**  
7           **the subject property by the applicant, within the guidelines of Chapter 19.51**  
8           **of the City Zoning Ordinance.) (Continued from the July 1, 2020, Public**  
9           **Hearing).**

10  
11 Senior City Planner, Matthew Taylor, reported that the above matter was presented at the last  
12 meeting. Some of the items addressed included policies contained in the General Plan, the  
13 Wasatch Boulevard Master Plan, and other planning documents, which established the foundation  
14 for a rezone that is similar to what is proposed by the applicant. The Commission previously  
15 discussed the mechanism of the Planned Development District as an ordinance amendment with  
16 adoption of a Development Plan that will guide each phase of the development.

17  
18 Mr. Taylor reported that staff recommended a continuance on a number of outstanding issues and  
19 presented the changes made since the last meeting. He explained that the project website contains  
20 a staff policy analysis that formally examines policies that have been adopted over the years. It  
21 was believed that this application meets the policies of the City. Staff also would make  
22 recommendations on the proposed ordinance. It was estimated that 90% of the recommendations  
23 have been posted online and are available for review.

24  
25 Mr. Taylor stated that a few issues remained to be worked out with the applicant regarding  
26 language addressing sensitive lands exceptions. He explained that this is not the typical sensitive  
27 lands area as it is a gravel pit reclamation site. Language should be included regarding exceptions  
28 for slopes, cuts, and fills. Affordable housing provisions were to be discussed in further detail  
29 when the applicant provides a suggested ordinance proposal. Staff recommended the matter be  
30 tabled to allow for that discussion to take place.

31  
32 Mr. Taylor reported that revised and consistent drawings have been received and were posted to  
33 the City’s website. He noted that a refined Parking Analysis was included in the staff report.  
34 During the Work Session it was mentioned that a technical issue has been corrected. He explained  
35 that the Shared Parking Analysis shows how peak demand between the various sites will not be  
36 exceeded per the parking standards put forward by the applicant.

37  
38 Mr. Taylor reported that the City has reached out to the City of Holladay and listened to their  
39 concerns. Much of the public comment received the previous week involved traffic impacts, which  
40 staff recommended be addressed tonight. Traffic Engineer, Ryan Hales from Hales Engineering  
41 was present to provide the rationale behind their findings. One major issue involved how much  
42 traffic impact there will be into the proposed access. The proposal shows all that all of the traffic  
43 will access Wasatch Boulevard as it intersects the existing Wasatch Boulevard close to SR-190. It  
44 was noted that there is an emergency access planned through the Walker property to the south as  
45 well.

1 Mr. Taylor stated that as the southern gravel pit redevelops, some traffic will bleed through this  
2 site. That topic was discussed with the City of Holladay and could be explored with the Traffic  
3 Engineer. They were also looking at the potential for traffic access to the south. Staff was in the  
4 process of scheduling a meeting with the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) to discuss  
5 the access points to the south. A Corridor Agreement had been drafted and it was determined that  
6 continued dialogue can take place.

7  
8 Mr. Taylor reviewed some of the revised drawings, including the Revised Site Plan that includes  
9 landscaping. This was compared to the other site plan that shows fault lines and other constraints.  
10 Mr. Taylor noted that the footprint of the condominium building has changed and the hotel location  
11 was moved as well. An additional retail pad was also were included and Pad B was split into two  
12 buildings. The Architectural Review Commission (“ARC”) reviewed the proposal and there was  
13 discussion about emphasizing the internal green space as an essential gathering area to create a  
14 plaza feel and to capitalize on what is not buildable. The proposal now aligns with policies to  
15 create an interconnected street system connecting to the main thoroughfare.

16  
17 Mr. Taylor stated that another major design change is along Wasatch Boulevard where angled  
18 parking and roundabouts are planned. Other proposed changes made to the site plan were  
19 identified. The updated building height elevations were presented. There was a discrepancy in  
20 unit counts from July 1 that had been corrected. That caused the applicant to propose an additional  
21 parking layer and increase the building height. Changes to the Shared Parking Analysis as well as  
22 the main elevation height were identified and grading issues were discussed. It was noted that the  
23 applicants are proposing to extend the steep slope to a 35 to 40 percent grade.

24  
25 Adam Davis with the Rockworth Companies discussed progress made since the last meeting. They  
26 have worked with staff to get consistent drawings and move forward with the engineering. He  
27 reported that the condominium height has been reduced by two stories. The footprint was spread  
28 out to allow for fewer levels of parking. The current proposal includes three levels of parking with  
29 10 stories for a total of 13 stores.

30  
31 Mr. Hales presented the Traffic Report and Impact Study findings and addressed questions raised  
32 at the last meeting. He explained that there is not a primary access as shown on the site plan to  
33 SR-190 that comes out at Wasatch Boulevard. The intersection was revised to a T-intersection.  
34 The traffic circulation pattern was described. The desire was to provide sufficient capacity in the  
35 roadway cross-section and additional parking on the interior road.

36  
37 Mr. Hales noted that numerous comments were raised about access to Gun Club Road. He clarified  
38 that they do not plan to have access to Gun Club Road at any point in the project. He identified  
39 steep slopes on the east side of the project. The area where people park adjacent to the parking lot  
40 and on the road creates an enforcement issue. He suggested sporadic and continued enforcement  
41 of the area and stated that it narrows the roadway.

42  
43 Mr. Hales next addressed SR-190 and stated that UDOT has classified it as an Access Category 3  
44 roadway. SR-190 carries a lot of traffic and is a five-lane road. In order for traffic to continue to  
45 flow as efficiently as possible, the accesses along the corridor need to be controlled. To do this,  
46 UDOT has identified every road that is under their jurisdictional control. An Access Category 3

1 designation means that there is signalized spacing and no unsignalized access along the roadway.  
2 The posted speed limit on SR-190 is 50 MPH. Wasatch Boulevard is a two-lane road and the  
3 posted speed limit is 40 MPH. There will be no direct access to SR-190. Mr. Hales reported that  
4 there has been recent discussion about a multi-modal site to be located in the gravel pit that will  
5 include buses traveling up the canyons.

6  
7 Mr. Hales stated that they are looking at the peak traffic hours between 7:00 and 9:00 a.m. and  
8 4:00 to 6:00 p.m. It was determined that the traffic volumes are 35% higher during the evening  
9 peak hours. At the T-intersection coming out at Wasatch Boulevard and the short segment to SR-  
10 190, they were able to achieve levels of service for existing and 2024 conditions. They were  
11 deemed adequate and meet UDOT's level of service demands and requirements. The primary  
12 focus is the project-related traffic on the north end. The simulation model was addressed in greater  
13 detail. It was conducted 10 times as it is a statistical model to get an average of the maximum  
14 queue length to identify problems. Level of service issues were analyzed.

15  
16 Mr. Hales next analyzed traffic on the roadways and the Average Daily Traffic ("ADT"). He  
17 explained that Traffic Engineers typically analyze roadway traffic volumes to determine how many  
18 lanes are needed. Mr. Hales discussed the pertinent ADT values in this case. He pointed out that  
19 a standard two-lane road can handle about 10,000 ADT. He estimated that the gravel pit is not  
20 expected to be developed for the next 15 to 20 years. He identified three intersections going into  
21 the gravel pit. From the Trip Generation Memo, it was estimated that during the peak hour there  
22 will be 347 trips with 30% expected to the south. In terms of cut-through, they estimated 1,000 to  
23 2,000 daily trips to the site.

24  
25 A question was raised about queue depth or length on the road going to SR-190. Mr. Hales  
26 explained that in the northbound direction they are looking at a queue length of about 250 feet,  
27 which is the project access or Wasatch Boulevard going to the T-intersection. They estimated the  
28 maximum queue length to be about 250 feet or shorter. He offered to present the simulation model  
29 at a future meeting.

30  
31 A question was raised about whether the assumptions based on the South Gravel Pit are in keeping  
32 with UDOT's future direction and the reasonableness of the assumptions in terms of the  
33 signalizations in the south gravel pit. Mr. Taylor stated that they are planning to have three  
34 intersections. That has been further vetted through the master planning process on the site. They  
35 are helping UDOT identify a location for the mobility hub. CED Director, Michael Johnson  
36 informed Mr. Hales that as part of the Environmental Impact Study and Access Corridor  
37 Agreements being drafted, UDOT may be willing to consider other options. Mr. Johnson stated  
38 that UDOT's design standards for intersections include one being fully signalized and two that  
39 would be something less than that standard. Staff felt that more flexibility would be allowed by  
40 UDOT depending on the final details. He considered the current layout to be in line with UDOT  
41 standards.

42  
43 In response to a question raised, it was reported that there is not a signal at the intersection exiting  
44 the project. A question was raised by Commissioner Allen regarding how much traffic would need  
45 to increase in order for a signal to be required. Mr. Hales stated that they would analyze the left-  
46 hand movement but it would need to be significant enough to warrant putting in a traffic signal.

1 He stated that the intersections are very close together so he did anticipate the need for one. A  
2 roundabout in this location was considered but ultimately not recommended.

3  
4 Commissioner Mills asked how it will impact the Heughs Canyon neighborhood based on how the  
5 traffic is routed. Mr. Hales reported that there will be a lot of impact on the neighborhood to the  
6 north. He explained that traffic typically takes the path of least resistance so much of the traffic  
7 will move west and north toward I-215. He did not expect there to be a significant impact on  
8 SR-190 to the south.

9  
10 Chair Coutts asked what input Mr. Hales has received to date from UDOT on the Access Plan.  
11 Mr. Hales noted that they had several meetings with UDOT and discussed access to the property  
12 to the south. He explained that the project can work independently of having access to the south  
13 because they will have their own access at some point. UDOT reviewed the analysis and their  
14 preference was to have the one-half mile spaced corridor, one signalized intersection, and two  
15 other right-in and right-out accesses. He commented that UDOT has been supportive to this point  
16 but additional input was desired from the Planning Commission to relay back to them.

17  
18 Chair Coutts opened the public hearing.

19  
20 John Bloom reported that he has lived in Utah for 15 years and is a professional geologist licensed  
21 in Utah and California. He has worked as an engineering geologist conducting geologic hazard  
22 evaluations along the San Andreas fault. A.J. Rock property is located within the special studies  
23 area designated by the Utah Geological survey and sensitive lands area designated by the City of  
24 Cottonwood Heights. A recent geologic hazard evaluation at the A.J. Rock site has located  
25 principal earthquake faults and several subsidiary faults. He indicated that during an earthquake,  
26 these faults would result in intense ground shaking and rupture. He believed additional geologic  
27 and geotechnical investigations are needed to fully assess the impacts posed by all of these hazards  
28 and is too premature to rezone the property.

29  
30 Dave Clark identified himself as President of the Old Mill Homeowners Association Board. His  
31 property is nestled among 88 homes between Wasatch Boulevard and Big Cottonwood Canyon  
32 Road. He explained they have spoken up several times regarding the impact the proposed  
33 development would happen on the surrounding community. The height at the northeast portion of  
34 the property was of concern and he strongly urged the Commission to limit its height and the  
35 potential increase in traffic.

36  
37 Dan Gibbons reported that he has listened to the entire hearing and after discussion with his  
38 constituents, he believed Cottonwood Heights, the City of Holladay, and UDOT need to give more  
39 consideration to future access points along SR-190. Consideration of the estimated capacity for  
40 all access points was suggested as well as possible development of the Walker property to the  
41 south.

42  
43 Mr. Gibbons explained that A.J. Rock has long-standing easements giving access onto SR-190.  
44 The property is not landlocked and access has always been along SR-190 and never on Wasatch  
45 Boulevard. He believed that the rationale that the developer has no rights of access and using that  
46 to insist on a new intersection on Wasatch Boulevard makes no sense legally. He explained that

1 the Hale traffic study was completed in December of 2017 before Solitude began charging skiers  
2 for parking and before parking at the mouth of Little Cottonwood Canyon was closed. A new  
3 traffic study was suggested. Mr. Gibbons stated there should be consideration of making one or  
4 more roads one way and suggested making the entire development one way with entrance only on  
5 Wasatch Boulevard with all egress onto SR-190.

6  
7 Taylor Jeppson was opposed to high-density buildings in Canyon Cove and has lived there since  
8 1985.

9  
10 Tom Stephens considered a continuance to be the correct course of action. He recently learned  
11 about this application through the Next Door app. He is currently a member of the Millcreek  
12 Planning Commission and helped draft Millcreek's commercial, mixed-use, and multi-family  
13 ordinances. He believed he has a lot to offer in the way of comments and advice to the Planning  
14 Commission and ultimately to the City Council but needs time to review the staff reports and  
15 additional information.

16  
17 Will McCarvill stated that the Gateway Overlay District limits building heights to 45 feet. The  
18 proposal is seeking heights in excess of 150 feet. The developer shows a relocation of Wasatch  
19 Boulevard that goes through the center of the subject property. Until the south end of the gravel  
20 pit is developed, he questioned if the proposed north end only has one access to Wasatch  
21 Boulevard. He expressed concern with traffic.

22  
23 Rick S. stated that there cannot simply be only one exit on the north side.

24  
25 Leslie Kovach would like the rezone request to be denied since this development does not meet  
26 the development requirements of the City. As proposed, she believed it would add traffic and  
27 pollution to the Wasatch Boulevard area.

28  
29 Scott and Patricia Woller reported that their family strongly opposes approval of any proposal for  
30 an ordinance amendment, zone map amendment, or the development of property located at 6695  
31 South Wasatch Boulevard, as proposed. This location holds the zoning designation F-1-21 for  
32 very specific reasons, including the safety of residents. Mr. Woller advised against any efforts to  
33 introduce access Canyon Cove and stated that ancillary traffic on the intersection of Wasatch  
34 Boulevard and SR-190 would be catastrophic to the flow in that area.

35  
36 There were no further public comments. Chair Coutts stated that the public hearing would remain  
37 open.

38  
39 Chair Coutts expressed concerns regarding traffic from the ingress and egress with UDOT's  
40 cooperation and believes it needs further consideration. Moving forward with submittals to the  
41 City, she recommended the inclusion of the PDD Ordinance density charts, uses, and separation  
42 of parking percentages. She would prefer to see a continuation of the multi-use trail that is part of  
43 the UDOT process and an easement or potentially public use on the trail and the access being  
44 considered for the Bonneville Shoreline Trail.

1 Mr. Davis stated that on their latest concept site plan, lot summary, land use, densities, and parking  
2 associated with each of those lots are included. He confirmed that a street-level plan will be  
3 available at the next meeting.

4  
5 Commissioner Mills asked for detail regarding erosion and remediation.

6  
7 Mr. Davis pointed out with the latest submission, their Landscape Architect included additional  
8 information with regard to slope reclamation, seeding, and the steeper slope process. The  
9 renderings requested by Commissioner Ryser will provide a view of the gateway coming from the  
10 north headed south. While there are parking lots there, they have adequate landscaping and  
11 buffering. A landscaping plan was displayed.

12  
13 Commissioner Bevan believed that most of the public comments questioned what residents will  
14 see from their neighborhoods and access from the south. He was unsure that a south access was  
15 necessary which was why they have a Traffic Engineer and studies.

16  
17 Mr. Davis confirmed they have had multiple meetings with UDOT concerning the southern access.  
18 While there is a current easement across the Walker property to access the site, all of their  
19 conversations with UDOT have pushed for the T access they have designed. Currently, UDOT  
20 has taken the position that that access is for emergency ingress and egress for emergency vehicles.

21  
22 In response to a question raised regarding the process with the City of Holladay, Mr. Davis reported  
23 that the City of Holladay has attended some of their community meetings and had conversations  
24 early on. Cottonwood Heights has an upcoming meeting and planned to respond to comments that  
25 come out of that meeting.

26  
27 Mr. Johnson confirmed that staff met with representatives from the City of Holladay and will share  
28 those comments.

29  
30 Commissioner Ryser was excused from the remainder of the meeting.

31  
32 *Commissioner Mills moved to continue project PDD-19-001 to the August 5, 2020 Planning*  
33 *Commission Meeting. Commissioner Wilde seconded the motion. Vote on motion:*  
34 *Commissioner Wilde-Aye, Commissioner Allen-Aye, Commissioner Mills-Aye, Commissioner*  
35 *Bevan-Aye, Chair Coutts-Aye. The motion passed unanimously. Commissioner Ryser was not*  
36 *present for the vote.*

37  
38 **3.4 (Project GPA-20-002) A Public Hearing and Possible Recommendation to the**  
39 **City Council on a City-Initiated Proposal to Adopt a Bonneville Shoreline**  
40 **Trail Access Master Plan as an Addendum to the Cottonwood Heights General**  
41 **Plan.**

42  
43 Mr. Johnson recommended that given the bulk of citizen comments, that any formal vote not be  
44 taken at the present time. The next meeting would allow the opportunity for citizen comment to  
45 be made via Zoom.

1 Mr. Johnson presented the staff report and reported that the above matter is for a possible  
2 recommendation to the City Council on a City-initiated proposal to adopt a Bonneville Shoreline  
3 Trails Access Master Plan as an addendum to the Cottonwood Heights General Plan. It is also  
4 available for review on the City's website. Staff planned to include a brief article in the City  
5 newsletter informing residents of the proposed plan.  
6

7 Mr. Johnson reported that the plan does not look at the trail alignment itself. The Bonneville  
8 Shoreline Trail has been envisioned since the City's incorporation. Access to the trail is one of  
9 the most critical components allowing ease of use and safety. The goal of the plan is to identify  
10 the type of access and number needed, potential location for those points, and how those should  
11 be designed and function. He stated that they will then identify opportunities and constraints for  
12 all of the points as well as funding sources.  
13

14 Mr. Johnson indicated that a conditions analysis has been completed as well as a needs assessment  
15 identifying goals and making recommendations. The trail is a regional trail extending beyond Salt  
16 Lake County. Completing the trail through Cottonwood Heights would fill in a missing piece of  
17 that trail network. Staff identified three regional access points, which include parking  
18 accommodations and restrooms. Mr. Johnson reported that the property owned by the U.S. Forest  
19 Service could serve as a small pull-out lot and has been included as a potential small trail access  
20 point in their studies and analysis. A secondary access is located between a regional and local  
21 access. They realize that not all of the local access points are needed, but they are potential  
22 locations that present some level of opportunity and are possible options.  
23

24 Mr. Johnson identified each access point broken down with opportunities and constraints provided.  
25 He stated that the gravel pit is an obvious location. The Big Cottonwood Canyon pullout owned  
26 by the U.S. Forest Service was envisioned as a secondary access. The Ferguson Canyon overflow  
27 was also being considered. The County purchased the property in 2008 with Open Space  
28 Preservation Funds with the City contributing a small amount of the purchase price. An Interlocal  
29 Agreement was signed between Salt Lake County and Cottonwood Heights that committed the  
30 City to installing improvements on the property. Improvements listed include trailhead parking  
31 for the Bonneville Shoreline Trail, a public park, and a restroom facility with trail access.  
32 Mr. Johnson explained that the City is obligated through an Interlocal Agreement with the County  
33 to construct the improvements on the site. The fourth site being considered was a church meeting  
34 house with a large amount of parking so there could be an opportunity for utilization of the lot.  
35 Undeveloped property could potentially provide access up to the trail alignment. The north Little  
36 Cottonwood pull off was also discussed as a possible site. A visual layout was presented.  
37

38 The Ferguson Canyon overflow lot was discussed in detail. Mr. Johnson stated that the agreement  
39 with Salt Lake County commits the City to installing the improvements or being substantially  
40 underway by the end of 2021. Conceptual site design has been completed. The City has obtained  
41 grant funding to complete the parking lot, but funds were not yet in place to fully build out the  
42 park area. It would serve as a trailhead location to utilize Ferguson Canyon and ease the burden.  
43 Examples were previewed.  
44

45 Mr. Johnson noted that the recommendations come from the Needs Assessment. A public open  
46 house was held in February of 2020 at City Hall and resulted in much of what is presented in the

1 plan. Goals and objectives include a minimum of two regional access points, at least one of the  
2 four miles of trail, and four local access points. He emphasized that the design was done properly  
3 and in a manner that is appropriate for the level of access they are providing.  
4

5 Staff recommended the potential trailhead locations, typical amenities found at each, and  
6 additional details discussed previously. He emphasized the use of natural landscape. Funding to  
7 be considered was available in the staff report.  
8

9 Mr. Johnson recommended that no formal vote be taken now given the bulk of citizen comments.  
10 Tabling the matter to the next meeting will allow the opportunity for citizen comment to be made  
11 via Zoom. He confirmed that staff is following the same format with the City Council and are  
12 trying to find a way to improve the meeting format.  
13

14 Commissioner Wilde expressed interest in reviewing public comment via email and eliminating  
15 the need to read each individually.  
16

17 Commissioner Bevan referenced the Parleys Canyon Trail and stated that it has several local access  
18 points and a lack of designated parking.  
19

20 Commissioner Mills was in favor of anything that allows the public to be heard but supported  
21 increasing meeting efficiency. He believed there should be additional access available without the  
22 inconvenience of increased neighborhood traffic. A multi-pronged access will decrease the load  
23 for everyone.  
24

25 Chair Coutts was of the opinion some of the trailhead parking areas are well camouflaged but also  
26 create a safety problem.  
27

28 Chair Coutts opened the public hearing.  
29

30 Scott Gifford reported that his family objects to the possibility of access being granted at the end  
31 of Mountain Cove Circle for the development of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. He pointed out  
32 that there are approximately 100 parking spots on the LDS church property that will be used to  
33 access the trail. There is already a speeding issue along On Top of the World Drive and a deaf  
34 child lives in this section of the neighborhood. He stated that the last thing they need is a trailhead  
35 with hundreds of cars per day speeding by on a very straight neighborhood road. If a local access  
36 is created, members of the LDS church will feel entitled to park in the parking lot since it is their  
37 lot, which will create a congested mess. Mr. Gifford emphasized his opposition to local access  
38 being granted, especially at the end of Mountain Cove Circle.  
39

40 Larry Larsen reported that he lives on Timberline Drive and does not support the proposed  
41 Bonneville Shoreline Trail section going south of Ferguson Drive, as proposed. It would only  
42 create traffic congestion and other problems including excessive traffic and parking along narrow  
43 streets. He supported a public paved path along Wasatch Boulevard when it is improved as that  
44 plan is not a sidewalk, but a path. He suggested it be called the Bonneville Shoreline Trail. He  
45 was not in favor of the City spending tax dollars on the proposed trail.  
46

1 Paul Garner reported they have lived on Kings Hill Drive for 43 years. He is an avid biker, hiker,  
2 and walker. People accessing their backyards have included deer hunters and partiers. He did not  
3 understand the need for the trail considering the cost. Dog waste was also of concern and he  
4 questioned who would be cleaning up after animals and the trash left behind. There is not enough  
5 parking for more than two or three cars at each site and he estimated that 90% of users will drive  
6 cars to access the trail. He believed that access should only be from the large outside of  
7 neighborhood access points.

8  
9 Claude McKinney did not believe there needs to be trailheads on the Bonneville Shoreline Trail  
10 between the two Canyons. If trailheads are decided upon, he hoped it would be secured at the LDS  
11 church located at 8100 South Top of the World Drive. He expressed concern with overhead  
12 parking spilling onto access streets occupying both sides of the roadway with bumper to bumper  
13 vehicles for many blocks. He stated that Timberline has been designated with permit only parking  
14 near the Ferguson Canyon Trail spilling onto Prospector Drive. He was firmly opposed to having  
15 any local access trailhead established and if it is decided upon, he encouraged consideration be  
16 given to the nearby residents. One solution would be not to give trailhead access to the Bonneville  
17 Shoreline Trail between the Canyons and only access the trail at the mouth of both Canyons, where  
18 there is ample parking. The second solution would make any streets near any local trailhead permit  
19 only and enforce parking violations. The third solution would make trailhead parking in the lots  
20 at the mouth of the Canyons and shuttle hikers and bikers to the local trailheads. The fourth  
21 solution would be in addition to solution two would waive 50% or more of all property tax for  
22 residents on the affected streets.

23  
24 Erica and Greg Moore identified themselves as homeowners in the Top of the World  
25 neighborhood. Ms. Moore expressed their strong opposition to the placement of the proposed  
26 access points four, five, and six located within their neighborhood. She believed it would result in  
27 several hundred, if not thousands, of extra cars and unprecedented heavy traffic throughout the  
28 neighborhood. She expressed concern with the impact it would have on the streets that do not  
29 contain the infrastructure to support such traffic. The Ferguson Trailhead already causes severe  
30 congestion and blind turns creating unsafe conditions. Of the three entry streets from Wasatch  
31 Boulevard, two do not have a stoplight for protected turns. Noise pollution was also of concern.

32  
33 Marilee Christensen, a Timberline Drive resident, expressed concern that this meeting was not  
34 mentioned in the July edition of the newsletter. She questioned their ability to add input without  
35 notification. She was adamantly opposed to her neighborhood becoming a regional trailhead as it  
36 is already inundated. What is proposed would bring thousands more driving, biking, and walking  
37 past their homes. She believed it will devalue their properties and the proposed trail is too close  
38 to homes from Big Cottonwood to Little Cottonwood Canyons. She encouraged the Commission  
39 to sit at her home and witness those who are already using Ferguson Trail. Even with the proposed  
40 parking lot near Wasatch Boulevard, she believed people will still park near her home so they can  
41 park as close to the trailhead as possible.

42  
43 Zona Maraffio, a Quicksilver Drive resident, was opposed to the parking area being considered  
44 near her home and any others along the bench. There are many already accessing the Ferguson  
45 Trailhead and what is proposed would create an additional influx of activity. There is a financial

1 burden that would come with it. She suggested leaving the property in its natural state and wild  
2 with no costly upkeep.

3  
4 Afshin Kazemini reported that the proposal does not provide enough space for visitors to park.  
5 Having a trail access in the neighborhood would create a burden on residents and present an  
6 increased traffic risk for children in the area. He believed there would a potential for theft and  
7 home invasions since most homes do not have a barrier from the trail. He suggested that with the  
8 trail that parking be accessible through the Wasatch Boulevard rather than the neighborhood.

9  
10 Debra Harmer expressed her opposition to the proposal.

11  
12 Lawrence McGill reported that are located between the two accesses and would appreciate having  
13 a trail much more there than a housing development.

14  
15 Michael and Pamela Wims who live on Quicksilver Drive were opposed to the proposed project.  
16 The neighborhood is an established, relatively quiet residential area and with the existing Ferguson  
17 Canyon entrance nearby, they already experience significant vehicular and pedestrian traffic.  
18 Hikers cut through private property and climb down steep terrain to residential property. They  
19 have even walked onto their driveways. What is proposed would greatly exacerbate the problems  
20 they already experience.

21  
22 Andrew Riddle stated they have resided at Prospector Drive for the past 16 years and are greatly  
23 opposed to the Bonneville Shoreline Trail and accesses in the vicinity of their neighborhood. He  
24 believed it would increase traffic, noise, crime, pollution, and the overall reduction in quality of  
25 life and property value. Traffic is very bad at times and runs the entire length of the neighborhood.  
26 If the plan is adopted, he will no longer be able to live in his neighborhood. He believed that with  
27 the implementation of the Ferguson Canyon Trailhead, the City will be on the verge of destroying  
28 a very desirable neighborhood.

29  
30 Brooke Sasser stated that she lives adjacent to the proposed local access site number seven and is  
31 strongly opposed to this location as well as access site number eight. They currently live at the  
32 end of a street with a no thru traffic and what is proposed would greatly impact the quiet and safety  
33 of the neighborhood. She was concerned with the year-round traffic the access points will create.  
34 As with the Ferguson Canyon Trailhead, most are not neighborhood residents and cleanliness,  
35 safety, and noise pollution are of concern to them. She explained that her frustration lies with the  
36 City disrespecting its residents and changing the feeling of a safe, quiet neighborhood.

37  
38 Charles McNall, a Timberline Drive resident, appreciated being within walking access of a  
39 trailhead. While he supports the completion of the Bonneville Shoreline Trail completion, he did  
40 not support a larger parking area at a lower overflow. The current overflow lot only causes more  
41 speeding on his street and the upper lots have been an excellent place for break-ins. He preferred  
42 there be no overflow, but if it must be added, he strongly suggested that the main trail parking lot  
43 be eliminated and leave the break-ins, late-night drug users, and loud pipe motorists closer to  
44 Wasatch Boulevard.

1 Emery Sasser a nine-year-old, did not want the trail because of all the wildlife that live in her  
2 neighborhood. She feared that a new trail will cause the animals to leave and it will be noisy. She  
3 stated that she also would not be able to play in her front yard due to the traffic.  
4

5 Gary Commagere expressed concern about the proposed regional access and stated that he is a  
6 greatly impacted homeowner. On weekends, hundreds turn onto Timberline Drive trying to access  
7 one of the 16 parking spaces. From there they either go to the upper flow or find easier parking  
8 along both sides of Prospector Drive, which creates a major safety issue and a one-way street. He  
9 believed the plan needs improvement due to the hundreds traveling through their neighborhoods.  
10 He suggested the following:

- 11  
12 1. Absolutely no parking in the current parking lot at Ferguson or any motorized  
13 access to the trailhead. Local traffic only on Timberline and permit only on  
14 Prospector.  
15
- 16 2. Access to the Dog Park up to Prospector should not be allowed as it creates a  
17 nuisance for neighbors and a never-ending stream of hikers. The dogs destroy  
18 parking and owners crossing lawns to shortcut the sidewalk. Any point where the  
19 regional access transits neighborhoods, those owners should have the option to  
20 barrier their property at the City's cost.  
21
- 22 3. With regard to the proposed trail, diagrams show a trail running below Timberline  
23 and as an avid hiker, this is ecologically unacceptable. Access for bikers is needed  
24 where they can climb to the trail or designated trails where they can descend  
25 without the threat of running over hikers.  
26

27 Randy Long was in favor of the proposed Bonneville Shoreline Trail and preserving the urban  
28 interface.  
29

30 Eric Goldstein stated that the desire and need to have ready access must be balanced with  
31 preservation and conservation. Ferguson Trail is scattered with dogs and poop bags spread  
32 throughout. The regional access points are owned by private interests. If the City could purchase  
33 those points to ensure no further development and as a tradeoff having trail access points, he  
34 believed it would benefit everyone and future generations.  
35

36 Mark Barrett lives on the east side of Top of the World Drive and stated that if parking is enforced,  
37 the benefits will far outweigh the negatives.  
38

39 Mike Sasser reported that he lives directly adjacent to the proposed local access site seven and  
40 eight and was strongly opposed to both locations. It would create a huge increase in street parking  
41 and he currently lives with no thru traffic. As the father of young children, he would be concerned  
42 with the year-round traffic and would no longer feel safe letting them play in the front yard. Most  
43 are not residents and his frustration lies with the City disrespecting its residents with a plan that  
44 changes a quiet, safe neighborhood. He considered it unnecessary to include these local sites.  
45

1 Rebecca Good stated that many issues have been going on for too long with no action. No one has  
2 listed the dangers, fears, and frustrations and nothing has been done to address safety and well-  
3 being of those concerned and protection of the watershed. She stated that they cannot use their  
4 backyards as they have no privacy due to large groups of people and dogs. Prospector residents  
5 negotiated through multiple town meetings with the builder that office buildings on faults below  
6 and on Wasatch Boulevard would have gated access only to offices to avoid weekend and evening  
7 parking. Residents declared to Mayor Cullimore, Park and Ride options rather than offices. She  
8 believed he used the trailhead as a front to develop a 70-space Park and Ride lot which resulted in  
9 increased traffic. Ms. Good noted that the safety and welfare of residents are compromised with  
10 Sandy City residents using Wasatch Boulevard as a commuting road that results in backups  
11 throughout the day. She emphasized that they continue to oppose intrusion and access into their  
12 neighborhood by strangers and the Cottonwood Heights Master Plan.

13  
14 Chris and Kat Diener want the City to be successful in creating the proposed resource for them  
15 and the community. They own a home across the street from the current Ferguson Canyon  
16 Trailhead and urged the City Council to change the Bonneville Shoreline Trail Master Plan. The  
17 trail already has an issue with pedestrian access. Mr. Diener pointed out that the streets are used  
18 for overflow parking with dogs and pedestrians walking the roads to access the trail. He stated  
19 that safety is of concern and the land near Wasatch Boulevard is a recipe for disaster. People will  
20 drive part of their group to the trail and then turn around to find a place to park. He stated that the  
21 area is also a rock-climbing site with large vans accessing the area. Trash from the foot traffic is  
22 an issue as is noise and theft.

23  
24 Douglas and Laraine Christensen were opposed to the construction of local access points as it will  
25 create an increase in traffic and noise. They encouraged the City to have more local control and  
26 was disappointed in the leadership. Mr. Christensen encouraged the local access points to be  
27 located at the mouth of the Canyons.

28  
29 Mr. Johnson stated he was on page 30 of 82 citizen comments received. Chair Coutts questioned  
30 whether to stop due to time restraints or continue.

31  
32 City Attorney, Shane Topham stated that there is not a requirement that all citizen comments be  
33 read at the meeting. He explained that reading the remaining comments may be continued at a  
34 future meeting and would be at the discretion of the Planning Commission.

35  
36 Commissioner Allen stated that the upcoming meeting will allow for citizen comment to be given  
37 through Zoom. He asked if there is a way they can maintain consistency with having 82 written  
38 comments and potentially receiving additional comments over the next two weeks.

39  
40 Mr. Johnson stated they are in a transition and will try something different but where it would be  
41 a continuation of the same public hearing, citizens would be given the opportunity to comment  
42 one time. If someone wants to speak in person, they would be welcome to do so. Tonight's  
43 comments were from those with the understanding that they would be read and any future  
44 comments received could be emailed for the Commission to review with an option to call in and  
45 speak in person.

46

1 Mr. Topham suggested an alphabetical list be prepared of those who have commented in writing  
2 to allow staff to reference their comment and confirm that they are given one opportunity to speak.  
3 Commissioner Bevan was of the understanding there have been times where residents have tried  
4 to comment a second time. Commissioner Allen indicated that it is not his intent to limit the ability  
5 to comment but create efficiency given the unique situation of how comments are received. He  
6 was in favor of all present written comments being read.

7  
8 Mr. Johnson suggested sending out an updated procedure prior to the next meeting.

9  
10 Mr. Topham stated that a motion could be made to continue the public hearing to the next meeting  
11 allowing for control over repeated comments. The Chair can adjust the time given to each speaker  
12 from the normal three minutes to something less as long as the speaker is given a reasonable right  
13 to be heard. He explained that the comments received prior to the deadline of the meeting should  
14 be completed at some time as long as the public hearing remains open allowing all to be read and  
15 additional comments to be received through Zoom.

16  
17 Commissioner Rhodes believed they have been generous in ensuring that all are heard.

18  
19 *Commissioner Rhodes moved to continue Project GPA-20-002 public hearing to the beginning*  
20 *of the next Planning Commission Meeting. Commissioner Wilde seconded the motion. Vote on*  
21 *Motion: Commissioner Wilde-Aye, Commissioner Allen-Aye, Commissioner Mills-Aye,*  
22 *Commissioner Bevan-Aye, Chair Coutts-Aye. The motion passed unanimously. Commissioner*  
23 *Ryser was not present for the vote.*

24  
25 **4.0 ADJOURNMENT**

26  
27 *Commissioner Rhodes moved to adjourn. Commissioner Wilde seconded the motion. The*  
28 *motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission. Commissioner Ryser was not*  
29 *present for the vote.*

30  
31 The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 9:00 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 15, 2020*

3  
4

5 Teri Forbes

6 Teri Forbes  
7 T Forbes Group  
8 Minutes Secretary

9  
10 Minutes Approved: October 7, 2020