

From: [John Annunziata](#)
To: [Alison Stroud](#); [Kris Nicholl](#); [Monica Zoltanski](#); [Marci Houseman](#); [Zach Robinson](#); [Cyndi Sharkey](#); [James Sorensen](#); [Jake Warner](#); [Brooke Christensen](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Rezoning of Farnsworth Farms
Date: Monday, November 16, 2020 5:48:10 PM

Dear Common Council Members,

I am writing to you in support of the proposal submitted by DAI for the rezoning of Farnsworth Farms. To date I have attended 2 community feedback sessions, 2 Planning Commission meetings and 1 Common Council Meeting regarding the re-zoning over the past 12 months. At this point in time I considered myself well versed in both sides of the subject. I live within 500 feet of the proposed project and received an invitation by the Planning Commission/Common Council to participate in the process.

During each step of this process objections on traffic, water pressure, safety, school overcrowding, density of the project, ingress/egress of traffic, etc. have been raised by community members. After each meeting the feedback was taken into consideration by DAI and reflected in each subsequent proposal. This includes concerns by the Planning Commission during the first session. Some of the revisions include reduction in the number of townhomes/density, increase in open space areas, increased parking, changes in the aesthetic to reflect the heritage of the site, community gardens and the addition of a community center. I believe DAI has made a good faith effort to go beyond public hearings and get feedback from the community. Many comments have been made on social media that DAI is just in it for the money. The revisions to the last proposal have increased the cost of the project and I assume reduced DAI's return on investment. This means the DAI has taken into consideration the concerns of the community at the detriment to their bottom line.

There have also been comments regarding the neighbors on the westside of the project only acting in their self-interests. I am interested in the outcome of this project and participated because I was invited. At times I have questioned if my self interest has blinded my objectivity. The last Planning Commission meeting confirmed that an impartial panel of experts have unanimously supported the proposal (7 support vs 0 objections). This is a reversal from the 1 to 6 unfavorable recommendation during the first Planning Commission meeting. This indicates all the concerns expressed earlier have been addressed and supported by a panel of experts.

During the last Planning Commission meeting several comments were made by members that resonated with me and are worth bringing to your attention. This proposal offers a variety of options for young families/millennials that are currently priced out of the market in Sandy by an overabundance of expensive single-family homes. It also offers options for "empty nesters" that wish to downsize. In addition, a comment was made that this proposal offers a nice transition from the "industrial" feel of the Senior Living Community on the northside to the single-family homes on the southside. One of the Planning Commission members asked about a "survey" that was conducted regarding community feedback. Once it was revealed that the survey was conducted by one member of the Council and not endorsed by the entire Council the "survey" was quickly dismissed. I recommend the Council do the same. The most noteworthy comment made during the meeting is that rezoning to a PUD gives the city more control over the development and aesthetic of the project. I believe the Common Council should receive a binding agreement from DAI in addition to the rezoning so they follow through with their commitments.

At this point all concerns made by the community have been addressed and answered by the experts on the Planning Commission. The 7 to 0 vote by the Planning Commission confirms that my support of this project is not just self-interest but the best solution for this property and the community. This proposal is a realistic solution to the challenges of the economics and proximity to 700 East. I strongly endorse the rezoning of Farnsworth Farms and encourage you to do the same.

Respectfully,

Lauren and John Annunziata
11175 South Farnsworth Lane

From: [Mark Ciullo](#)
To: [Jake Warner](#)
Cc: [Brooke Christensen](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Farnsworth Questions and City Questions
Date: Monday, November 16, 2020 2:52:11 PM

Hi Jake,

You've been helpful in the past and I had spoken with Joe Salisbury last week. There were some questions that are still open that I had and I wanted to reach out to you as some of them are likely city related. I was hoping you could help me figure out who to speak with regarding getting answers to these questions. Here is an outline of the remaining questions:

1. Has sub-district zoning been considered on this property? i.e. - instead of all PUD10, could there be other zoning placed on the outside units?
2. Will there be any restrictions on non-residential use in this new zoning? How would that be controlled or legally applied?
3. Have there been crime and fire impact studies done, and are there details available for me to review?
4. Have there been utility studies conducted, and specifically is there information available to show that my community should not be concerned? (water, stormwater, electric, etc.)
5. Traffic - I understand new traffic lights have not been approved by UDOT, but has there been consideration for traffic studies and modification of light timing? It's terrible already making lefts out of this community and I want to know what has been looked at (most people I know leave the community to a regulated street corner, or make leave the community in a way that only requires right turns right now as it is because lefts are not easy or safe).

Thanks in advance for helping me figure out who to contact regarding these issues.

Mark Ciullo
476 E Wilde Cherry Way

From: [John Crofts](#)
To: [Jake Warner](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] In Support of Farnsworth Farms Proposed Development
Date: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 12:26:28 AM

To Whom It May Concern,

I'd like to add my voice in support of the new development that is being proposed for the Farnsworth Farms area on 700 E.

The proposal as I understand it would bring some much needed affordable housing to the Sandy area while staying true to the character and values of the community.

My wife and I have lived in Sandy for almost 16 years (since 2004) and we love this community for its beauty and the great people who we call neighbors. We appreciate how the city has tried to walk the fine line between bolstering economic development but not overdeveloping the area. We love the open spaces, but recognize the need to grow and improve our city which requires trade offs at times in filling in some areas that had previously been open.

I've really noticed lately how inaccessible housing prices have become in our area. It's nice to have home prices appreciate significantly and our community grow in stature—I think we all value this. However, because of the increasingly elevated housing prices, many younger families are being priced out.

I've noticed that our area has gotten progressively older and how there are fewer young kids in our neighborhood. This gentrification of the area is preventing many family members from being able to live close to one another and receive the support that they often need while raising young families. My brother in law and his young family for example currently live in Eagle Mountain—far from where most of the rest of us are—just because houses in our area are so far out of range.

I worry that when my own kids, now 12 and 9 leave the house and start families of their own, that they won't be able to afford living near us and that we may be forced to consider leaving this area for one with a greater mix of housing in order to support them and be near them.

I love the idea of mixing in more of these well-executed, community-oriented developments into our area of the valley where these younger families can be close to the support systems of their extended families.

We feel like this new community accomplishes this, and as a result, we encourage you to vote in support of the PUD-10 rezone to allow the project to move forward.

Thank you,

John Crofts
[8044 S Eriqve Way](#)
[Sandy, UT 84093](#)

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Shane Duffin](#)
To: [Alison Stroud](#); [Kris Nicholl](#); [Monica Zoltanski](#); [Marci Houseman](#); [Zach Robinson](#); [Cyndi Sharkey](#); [Brooke Christensen](#)
Cc: [James Sorensen](#); [Jake Warner](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Farnsworth For Rezone
Date: Monday, November 16, 2020 4:08:34 PM

Good evening Sandy City Council Members,

Yes it is me again. Last meeting in regards to the rezone request, you sent the application back to the planning committee for review of a PUD10 rather than the original PUD12. The planning group recognized the work that Nate and Joe of DAI have done in regards to fulfilling their and your requests to reduce the units within the project. After careful deliberation they voted unanimously to send it to the City Council with a positive recommendation to rezone.

I have been for this kind of project as it was already a concept in my head way before the original meeting with Nate in front of the Farnsworth red barn. DAI created the vision I had. They have come up with a great community concept that will allow other families to live in and enjoy our city.

Please don't let the negative voices influence your decision. **Many are not directly impacted.** Some are afraid their children will be left behind at school. This project will not cause overcrowding as reported by a Canyons School District Official. The roads won't be overwhelmed to gridlock as sighted by the independent traffic study. Water pressure will not be reduced in surrounding neighborhoods based on the Sandy City Engineer review. Crime will not increase. The world won't come to an end if built. Far worse things going on right now to be scared about or to stand up for.

I have respect and an appreciation for all of you as the job you signed up for is not easy. I have seen that first hand. Your willingness to take on and make hard decisions based on the good of the city and your constituents is commendable.

I don't have much fight left in me so please vote **Yes** to rezone to a PUD10 and let me my fellow neighbors and DAI move forward.

Thank you for your consideration.

Shane Duffin

From: [Chrissy Gilbert](#)
To: [Jake Warner](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Farnsworth Farms Project
Date: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 12:15:29 PM

To Whom It May Concern,

My husband and I have lived in Sandy City for 21 years. We have witnessed the evolution of the City over the past couple decades and hope to see it continue to grow and develop in a thoughtful and sustainable fashion.

I am writing to express my support for the proposed development at the Farnsworth Farms property. I have been following this application for the past year and feel the design is much nicer today than originally proposed. I commend the developer for taking the time to listen to the ideas of all Sandy City residents - both of those who live immediately adjacent to the property as well as of those who don't live as close.

It's rare for a developer to put this much thought and effort into making a project meet the needs of so many people. I appreciate that they've created a housing product that caters to our aging population as well as another housing type that meets the needs of younger families in Sandy. Our city has a lack of both housing types so I'm excited to see a project like this be considered.

Additionally, I appreciate that they have removed some homes off 700 East from their original proposal, opening up the community for all to enjoy. This open space along 700 East will break up the long wall of housing located both north and south of this project. It will allow all residents of Sandy City to enjoy the open space when driving by.

The amenities they have proposed are outstanding and unlike we typically see from similar developments.

I recommend you vote for this project and allow it to move forward.

Thank you for your consideration.

Chrissy Micek

From: [Jody H](#)
To: [Jake Warner](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] comments for Farnsworth Farms rezone application
Date: Monday, November 16, 2020 10:17:28 PM
Attachments: [Dear Sandy City Council.docx](#)

Jake

I plan to attend the meeting but have a commitment that may require me to leave before I am able to make a comment. So I am emailing you my comments. And would like them to be read into the minutes.

If I am not able to make my comment am I allowed to have a neighbor read them for me?

My comments are attached

Thanks
Jody Hadfield

Dear Sandy City Council
My name is Jody Hadfield
I live at 722 E Sandy Dunes Dr
Sandy UT 84094

I am writing you all to let you know how I feel about the Farnsworth Farms rezone request application from DAI.

I have been against this much density from the first notice that we were sent!

I believe the survey that Council woman Zoltanski did also shows that 80% of the people that responded feel the same way I do. That a PUD 12 or even PUD 10 (which is what is before you now) is too many units! **They wanted a single-family housing development!**

Why weren't these survey results given to the planning commission? In the meeting 2 weeks ago, these results were brought up and the planning commission said they hadn't seen them.

Looking at the other projects that DAI is currently working on there are 3 in Sandy, with 2 of those being about a mile away from Farnsworth Farms. 6 projects in Draper and 5 in Herriman, several in Bluffdale etc. They seem to be the king of town homes. But several of the sandy developments are single family, which fit better into the neighborhoods. If DAI wants to develop the property, I believe they could do it in a way that would fit better into the surrounding neighborhoods.

One of my biggest complaints is that there are 36 units that are rear loading, which means they don't have even a small driveway. There are 65 guest parking spots and even though that is more than required by Sandy City ordinance, I believe that is not enough. Especially considering that this development has no connection to the surrounding neighborhoods, and there is no parking along 700 East.

I have asked this question at every meeting- **Where will guests park if all the spots are filled?**

I have visited several different townhome developments recently and each time the guest parking was all but full, and cars were on the main streets outside of the complex.

If you go back and listen to all the meetings that have been held on this matter, you would hear the majority of the comments were against this rezone. The only ones who seem to be for it are the 8 homes directly to the west, that DAI personally met with and catered their design to.

DAI says that they reached out to several residents who live east of 700 E but they didn't get an answer. They did not even try to contact the several people that they said they would in the last city council meeting.

I urge you to listen to the majority of the concerned voting Sandy residents and vote against this proposed rezone!

Thank you for your time and thank you for your service to our community!
Jody Hadfield

From: [Laura Lunceford](#)
To: [Jake Warner](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] FW: Farnsworth Farms
Date: Sunday, November 15, 2020 11:42:39 PM

(Just so you know, Jake. I also sent to the city council members.)

I feel like I've sent comments in over and over again about this, but the re-zoning of Farnsworth Farms issue keeps being resurrected so now I need to comment once again.

First, I don't know how many council members read the Salt Lake Tribune, but this article may be the best argument yet about why this re-zoning application should be voted down. To quote from the article *'the state should put aside its "smart growth" strategies of higher-density homes around business centers in favor of what they call "smart sprawl."*

Utah urged to build more single-family homes

<https://www.sltrib.com/news/2020/11/15/is-smart-sprawl-way-grow/>

This is essentially what I, and the majority of respondents have been arguing for since this first came to our attention. While some people would prefer that the acreage stay the same, most of us were arguing for a much lower density than the PUD-12 re-zone the developer was asking to get approved. The City Council originally sided with the residents on this matter and when it went to the Planning Commission originally, they sent it back to the City Council with a 'negative recommendation', based on all of the issues brought up by residents.

The Planning Commission agreed with concerns about high-density housing in an area that is made up of mostly single family homes with yards, and this type of density would be problematic for a variety of reasons. It doesn't match the surrounding area, and (whether the developer agrees or not), it will only add to the traffic congestion on both 114th South and 700 East. The other traffic issue that no one brought up at the time is that these streets will only become more clogged with increased population over time. If it's this bad now, how much worse will it be 5 years from now? Or 10?

Bottom line, the Planning Commission agreed with the residents that this type of high density housing was not in keeping with the area and would be more appropriate on the west side of I-15 where there are a number of high-density housing developments. Other issues which were important then (and still remain of concern) were overcrowding of schools, and the need more infrastructure to support high density housing as proposed. I would ask you to remember that you're not just making a decision for today's population (and schools, and traffic and general quality of life), you're making a decision that will have far-reaching and long-term ramifications in the future. It should not be made without more thought and consideration than it has had to date.

We sat in on the first Neighborhood meeting with the developer (who pretty much got an earful from residents that evening) and then the first City Council Meeting on the Farnsworth Farm. We then sat in on the Planning Commission Meeting that resulted in sending the re-zone back to the City Council with a 'negative recommendation'. Most of us thought that the developer would likely

go back to the drawing board and consider all of the concerns expressed and re-submit a new application for a re-zone at a much lower density, but what happened was nothing like that and was totally unexpected, not only to those of us logged on to the meeting, but most of the City Council members as well.

Between the first neighborhood meeting, the first City Council Meeting and the Planning Commission meeting, the developer apparently just decided to come back and ask for approval (with new site drawings) for a PUD-10. The City Council seemed unable to come to any kind of conclusion as to how this revised request for approval from the developer for a totally re-imagined PUD-10 should be handled.

Since the Farnsworth Farms re-zone was the last item on the City Council agenda, those of us who wanted to be a part of the discussion were on a Zoom call for more than 5 hours, just waiting for the Farnsworth Farm item to be addressed. Most people had dropped off long before 11:30PM, so there was virtually no one still logged on to the meeting who might have wanted to be heard from. Everyone who submitted written comments was told to request that their they be read into the record at the meeting, but no one on the Council seemed willing to do that – and no wonder at that hour. They, along with everyone else were tired of sitting on an endless Zoom meeting. Had I been able to, I would have asked that the Farnsworth Farms agenda item be moved to later City Council meeting and be put closer to the beginning of the agenda so those who wanted to be heard from would have the opportunity to do so.

By the time I finally logged off out of frustration with what turned out to be one of the most confusing and disorganized discussions I've ever seen. It seemed that no one on the council had a definitive answer to what they should do to address the dilemma of approving a PUD-10 that was really an approval for a PUD-12. Discussions went on and on and one about what they should do and no decision had been made by the time I logged off. I found out later that instead of doing what the process calls for and denying this request outright and sending it back to the developer to start the process again with a lower density re-zone request, the council sent it back to the Planning Commission for their 'input'.

Much to my surprise, it turned out that the Planning Commission then sent it back with a positive recommendation to the City Council for their approval as a PUD-10. If there was a notice with a Zoom link for that Planning Commission meeting, I unfortunately didn't see it. Once I found out, I was very concerned about their decision. Not only was this not what the overwhelming percentage of residents wanted, it appeared that the developer had managed to find a way to skirt both the rules and the process to get a (still high-density) re-zone approved without going through the requirement of re-starting the process with a new re-zoning request.

It was made clear to all of us that, even though the developer was 'promising' that they would never go over a PUD-10 density, what the City Council would be approving would forever be a PUD-12 re-zone, because whatever density the developer had originally submitted for approval, it can't be changed in the middle of the process. But that is exactly what has happened here. The developer did not start over with a new request for PUD-10 re-zone (or any other density). I'm still not sure why the City Council took this approach and chose not to simply deny the developer's request outright.

That would have been the right thing to do. Instead, it seemed like they ducked the issue altogether by sending it back to the Planning Commission. Regardless of the problem of not sticking to your own protocols, the fact of the matter is that the issues that were stated many times from the first neighborhood meeting to now are not suddenly going to be made more palatable to residents by approving a PUD-12 (10).

Most residents would have accepted a PUD-6 and many others wondered why this needed to be a PUD at all. Why couldn't the developer simply request a re-zone to an R-6 and simply build single family homes that match the surrounding areas? None of us that were unhappy with a PUD-12, were any happier with a PUD-10 that was re-submitted with lovely drawings and 26 less units. It is still much too dense and this is still not the area for this type of high-density development. I think they were trying to dazzle and impress everyone with their beautiful new design, but the site designs were never the issue.

Once again, after all of these meetings of various kinds, from the first 'neighborhood meeting' to this next City Council meeting, I'm once more urging the City Council to do what they should have done once the PUD-12 proposal was sent back with a negative recommendation from the Planning Commission – they should deny the re-zone and start the process again. We either have a method of handling re-zones, or it's just a free-for-all, where the developer doesn't take 'no' for an answer and simply bypasses the process and comes back to the City Council with a revised site plan showing a lower density, (but the original request still being approved as a PUD-12).

This isn't even a matter of not trusting the developer. We all heard them swear that no matter what, they would not build at any higher density than a PUD-10. It was more upsetting that residents (and the City Council for that matter) were blindsided by a new proposal and site drawings that had not gone through the proper process, but simply re-imagined and stamped as a PUD-10. All this being done, it seemed, with the hope that the City Council would disregard the residents negative perception of high-density housing and approve it at a PUD-10, even though virtually all the residents were thinking it would be more appropriate as a PUD 6 or just rezoning it for R-6.

If you would please take a few minutes to click on the link above and read the article from the front page of Sunday's Salt Lake Tribune, you can find out about how high-density housing is falling out of favor due to a number of issues. Perhaps most importantly the uncertainty of Covid, but also just for the ability to live in less dense housing areas with more room – both inside and out. No one knows when things will go back to normal and people are rapidly moving out of high density areas both from our own urban areas, as well as from out of state. These days, people are looking for homes with more distance from neighbors, more interior space to accommodate dedicated office and/or space for on-line learning for kids – but also more yard place for their children and themselves. Being confined for long periods of time in high-density housing doesn't just feel unsafe to people these days, it's not conducive to our mental health.

I urge you to consider every issue brought up by concerned residents very carefully before you approve this proposal. The majority of the responses and comments you have received are not in favor of this and the housing market seems to be changing quite radically these days. Single family houses on this 10-acre parcel would be highly desirable – the demand for them would only increase

over time.

Best regards,
Laura Lunceford

From: [Cathy Spuck](#)
To: [Jake Warner](#)
Cc: [Zach Robinson](#); [Brooke Christensen](#); mzoltansky@sandy.utah.gov; [Alison Stroud](#); [Cyndi Sharkey](#); [Marci Houseman](#); knichols@sandy.utah.gov
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] Affordable Housing
Date: Wednesday, November 11, 2020 11:57:58 AM

Jake,

Due to a computer issue in my home, I wasn't able to comment during your part of last night's meeting, so thanks for the clarification. I appreciate your efforts to report the situation and the ways to improve it. I know it is impossible to factor all the variables into statistics.

As a former teacher and a resident living on the edge of historic Sandy, I am concerned about the number of residents who are living in situations that have adverse effects on their relationships, health, and learning. Much of the lower-income housing is concentrated in one area and some of it is not well maintained. Many multifamily households work out well, some are very stressful, and may even increase the calls for first responders and code enforcement. I also worry about those who can't afford to continue to live in Sandy and need to move to areas that are even less desirable.

Your answers to my questions confirmed my suspicions that the numbers of residents in the low-income sectors are greater than will show up in even the best-conceived methods of collecting data.

Thanks,

Cathy Spuck

On Wednesday, November 11, 2020, 10:18:54 AM MST, Jake Warner <jwarner@sandy.utah.gov> wrote:

Cathy,

A "household" is everyone that lives in a dwelling unit (house, condo, apartment, etc.). A household may include multiple families. Multiple families in one house would show up as one household. It also raises the income reported for that household because everyone's income is counted together. You bring up a good point, because it's important to also understand that part of the story is that more people are living together as housing prices increase.

The housing costs used in the analysis are supposed to include all costs. Lot rents, HOA fees, and utilities should be considered part of the housing costs.

Thanks,

Jake Warner, AICP
Long Range Planning Manager

10000 S. Centennial Pkwy. | Sandy, UT 84070o: 801.568.7262jwarner@sandy.utah.gov

sandy.utah.gov

From: Brooke Christensen <bchristensen@sandy.utah.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, November 10, 2020 9:15 PM
To: Jake Warner <jwarner@sandy.utah.gov>
Subject: Fwd: [EXTERNAL] Affordable Housing

Can you help me with an answer?

Brooke Christensen

Sandy City Council District 1

801.455.0800

Begin forwarded message:

>

>

> From: Cathy Spuck <balmertoslc@yahoo.com>

> Date: November 10, 2020 at 7:30:50 PM MST

> To: Brooke Christensen <bchristensen@sandy.utah.gov>

> Subject: [EXTERNAL] Affordable Housing

>

>

>

>

> Can you ask if the household income is figured on all the residents? We have many multigenerational families living in one household because they can't afford for each generation to have a home. Does that raise the # of households that appear to be in the median category? Also are lot rents and HOA dues figured into the costs?

>

> Thanks,

>

> Cathy

>

>

From: [Ranee Stam](#)
To: [Jake Warner](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Regarding Farnsworth Farms Rezoning
Date: Tuesday, November 17, 2020 10:32:21 AM

To Our Sandy City Planner,

My husband and I have had the opportunity to see the new neighborhood design proposed for the Farnsworth Farms property on 700 East. All of my and my husband's family live in Sandy. Just to give you a little background, we lived in Sandy for over 20 years before we moved away for a couple years. We really missed being close to everyone (and the ski slopes) so we just moved back in June. We bought a house right off of 700 East just north of the Farnsworth property. We drive past this property all the time.

We understand there has been a poll or two circulating asking if residents would prefer the zoning to stay the same or if they would be okay with higher density housing. We didn't participate, but we want to take a minute to express our opinion about it. We find these polls very misleading. The beautiful design of the community nor the intent to beautify the area with the new red barn, large lawn area, lines of trees, and community garden boxes are not explained or shown in these polls. We believe if people saw this design, like we have, they would agree that the proposed plan is much more appealing than the current state of the property. It is quite an eye sore with a bunch of weeds and dirt.

The other thing we like is that the developer isn't proposing apartments. The proposed townhomes located toward the front of the property look like individual homes, and they have front porches that are quaint and attractive. Most of the area you see from 700 East is well manicured and attractive for all residents of Sandy City to enjoy. If regular homes were built on the property, we would just see another long expanse of fencing along 700 East, which wouldn't include the beautiful landscaping and trees currently proposed.

The second thing I would like to mention is that Sandy has become very expensive, and it's difficult for young families to afford to buy a home close to their parents. For example, our nephew lives in a townhome in Lehi because he couldn't afford to buy a home near the family in Sandy. He actually commutes back and forth to Sandy so my sister can babysit his little girl. Maybe this new community will help families live closer together.

Just our opinion, but most of the people in our circle agree. We recommend you vote in favor for this project tonight.

Thank you for your time.
Ranee & Clint Stam

From: [Nick Wright](#)
To: [Alison Stroud](#); [Kris Nicholl](#); [Monica Zoltanski](#); [Marci Houseman](#); [Zach Robinson](#); [Cyndi Sharkey](#); [Brooke Christensen](#)
Cc: [James Sorensen](#); [Jake Warner](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Farnsworth For Rezone
Date: Monday, November 16, 2020 5:59:48 PM

Dear Sandy City Council Members.

I would like to reiterate my support for the needed rezone approval for the Farnsworth Farms project submitted by DAI. I have emailed you all prior and expressed my support on the zoom calls. This latest design proposal is frankly "AMAZING". This will be a very desirable planned community that offers so many cool features that we don't have here in Sandy. From the old farmhouse, to the community gardens, to the walking paths, to the beautiful, designed buildings and landscaping. Frankly, we have too many neighbors that live in \$500,000-\$900,000 houses that don't mow their lawns and keep up their yard work (just drive around Farnsworth lane and the adjacent roads). The fact this community will be organized and managed by a strict HOA is very much appealing to me, my wife, and my immediate neighbors (those of us that work hard to keep up our homes and yards in order to beautify our community and increase home values).

I don't even want to think what would happen if say an Ivory Homes, or similar, develop this property. Most important to me & my wife, is the design of the exterior buildings that will be one story and low profile. I bought my house 10 years ago and a big reason was my unobstructed view of the east mountains. I realize this will change one way or another, BUT I appreciate the effort that DAI has taken to ensure the best possible outcome for all of us that border this property. Council Members, those of us that border this property will be THE MOST EFFECTED by what eventually happens to this property. Not the folks on the east side of 700 north, who in the 10 years I have lived here, I have never seen one sitting on a deck or patio enjoying the views to the West. Yes, these folks have a say and I respect their opinions but they border 700 east. If they are in their yards, they are at ground level and looking at their fences. This development will not impact their views.

I also do not feel this will significantly impact traffic on 700 east or the surrounding areas. We are having people join these calls that live 1 plus miles away! How are they more impacted than those of us that live next to it? This development will not negatively impact the schools. DAI have provided all the needed proof and documentation stating otherwise.

In closing, I want to express my sincere gratitude for the service each of you provide to our community. I appreciate all the due diligent and careful consideration you have put into this decision. I STRONGLY feel this development will be an improvement and asset to Sandy.

Thank You
Nick & Daine Wright
11143 So. Farnsworth Lane
Sandy
Cell: 801-541-1599

