

**From:** [John Annunziata](#)  
**To:** [Jake Warner](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Support of Rezoning of #zone 03-20-5825  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 3, 2020 7:24:04 PM

---

I'd like to include this email in the public record to show support for the request by DAI to rezone approximately 10.07 acres at 11228 South 700 East (#ZONE-03-20-5825).

As a resident of Sandy and resident within 500 feet of the proposed rezoning, I support the rezone request for the following reasons:

The request is consistent with Chapter 7: Housing of the General Plan. The proposed site plan shows a mix of housing types, with both townhome and twin-home units. Providing a variety of housing types is in line with:

*Diverse and quality housing —This provides the community with the opportunity for a variety of housing types and densities. This also ensures a range of housing options to accommodate an aging population and young growing families. The City should encourage a range of housing opportunities targeted towards all segments of the community when considering new development and redevelopment.*

Concerns of adjacent properties —This plans takes into consideration the adjacent single-family homes on both the south and west property lines of the proposed project has been carefully considered. DAI has spent at least six months meeting with the adjacent property owners to recognize any concerns and then address them accordingly in the site plan. Preserving the existing views of the east mountains. DAI addressed this concern by limiting the height of the new units and increased the rear setback.

Economic reality - The current property has been vacant for an extended period of time and is an eye sore to the community. The proximity to 700 East limits the economic feasibility of building on the current zoning. A previous developer proposed a similar plan for the site which indicates the current proposal from DAI is one of the full viable options for the site. I would rather see the site developed with the current proposal than stay vacant for an extended period of time.

Thank you for considering these points and, again, I encourage Sandy City's approval of the proposed rezone (#ZONE-03-20-5825).

Sincerely,

John and Lauren Annunziata

11175 South Farnsworth Lane

--



**JOE SALISBURY**

*Partner*

---

Direct [801.508.5514](tel:801.508.5514) | Office [801.495.3414](tel:801.495.3414) | Cell [801.870.1810](tel:801.870.1810)  
Exchange Place | Building B  
14034 South 145 East, Suite 202 | Draper, Utah 84020  
[Joe@DALutah.com](mailto:Joe@DALutah.com) | [DALutah.com](http://DALutah.com)

**From:** [John Annunziata](#)  
**To:** [Jake Warner](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Re: Support of Rezoning of #zone 03-20-5825  
**Date:** Thursday, June 4, 2020 3:28:49 PM

---

Dear Jake

Something I neglected to add in my email I completely understand that you are in a difficult position but the virtual chat function in the last meeting was distracting and did not add any benefit to the call. It created a toxic atmosphere and made it uncomfortable for supporters of the initiative. It would be helpful to keep the discussion focused on the proposed initiative and not every issue facing Sandy. It's a waste of time to listen to people drone on about issues not relevant to this issue.

Thanks again  
John Annunziata

On Wed, Jun 3, 2020 at 7:24 PM John Annunziata <[johannunziata1@gmail.com](mailto:johannunziata1@gmail.com)> wrote:

I'd like to include this email in the public record to show support for the request by DAI to rezone approximately 10.07 acres at 11228 South 700 East (#ZONE-03-20-5825).

As a resident of Sandy and resident within 500 feet of the proposed rezoning, I support the rezone request for the following reasons:

The request is consistent with Chapter 7: Housing of the General Plan. The proposed site plan shows a mix of housing types, with both townhome and twin-home units. Providing a variety of housing types is in line with:

*Diverse and quality housing —This provides the community with the opportunity for a variety of housing types and densities. This also ensures a range of housing options to accommodate an aging population and young growing families. The City should encourage a range of housing opportunities targeted towards all segments of the community when considering new development and redevelopment.*

Concerns of adjacent properties —This plans takes into consideration the adjacent single-family homes on both the south and west property lines of the proposed project has been carefully considered. DAI has spent at least six months meeting with the adjacent property owners to recognize any concerns and then address them accordingly in the site plan. Preserving the existing views of the east mountains. DAI addressed this concern by limiting the height of the new units and increased the rear setback.

Economic reality - The current property has been vacant for an extended period of time and is an eye sore to the community. The proximity to 700 East limits the economic feasibility of building on the current zoning. A previous developer proposed a similar plan for the site which indicates the current proposal from DAI is one of the full viable options for the site. I would rather see the site developed with the current proposal than stay vacant for an extended period of time.

Thank you for considering these points and, again, I encourage Sandy City's approval of the proposed rezone (#ZONE-03-20-5825).

Sincerely,

John and Lauren Annunziata

11175 South Farnsworth Lane

--



**JOE SALISBURY**

*Partner*

---

Direct [801.508.5514](tel:801.508.5514) | Office [801.495.3414](tel:801.495.3414) | Cell [801.870.1810](tel:801.870.1810)

Exchange Place | Building B

14034 South 145 East, Suite 202 | Draper, Utah 84020

[Joe@DALutah.com](mailto:Joe@DALutah.com) | [DALutah.com](http://DALutah.com)

**From:** [LISA CADDY](#)  
**To:** [Jake Warner](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Farnsworth Farm Development  
**Date:** Friday, May 29, 2020 9:12:06 AM

---

Please submit the following comment in regards to the rezoning request for the Farnsworth Farm Development.

Little by little these R-1-40A zones become rarer and rarer. Once they are gone there is no going back. There is no similar zone in the immediate area that they are looking to change it to. The current zone allows for one home for every 40,000 sq. feet with large animal rights. That's like 1 house per acre. The new zone would allow for 12 residences per acre. WOW what an increase! Living shoulder to shoulder with no space to live. This property is just larger than 10 acres it should remain as it is currently zoned. Do the math, that a lot of cars, traffic on 700 e, 11000 S and 10600 S. Before you know it the history of Sandy will be rezoned as unrecognizable! We will become just another suburb. This is so disheartening to see this property go but I get it. It should at least resemble similar zones that surround it. I have to chuckle when I saw what they considered "open space"!

Thank you  
Lisa Caddy  
10241 S Weeping Willow Dr.  
Sandy UT

**From:** [Jeff Davis](#)  
**To:** [Jake Warner](#)  
**Cc:** [Brooke Christensen](#); [Monica Zoltanski](#); [Shana Davis](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Re: Farnsworth Rezone Information  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 2, 2020 11:43:12 PM

---

Jake,

Thank you for hosting the Neighborhood Meeting on May 18 regarding the rezoning request of Farnsworth Farms property at 700 E and about 11200 South. I have lived for 22 years on 465 E (2 blocks west of the remaining 10-acre orchard) on land that orchard farmer John Farnsworth sold around 1996 to Woodside Homes and Ivory Homes for development of R-1-10 homes (including mine). It is a great neighborhood. I used to see Mr Farnsworth out my window on his tractor caring for his property. I would sometimes walk over to the fenceline and visit with him. I remember asking him if he planned to sell the rest of his orchard. He said his children probably would sell at least part of it, but he hoped they would keep at least part of the orchard because if times get tough "you can always eat apples". I have known his children Sherri, Leo, and Randy as they have lived nearby for part or all of my 22 years here. They are good people. So I want the family to be able to sell their land, but disapprove of the extreme zoning change from R-1-40A to PUD 12.

Mr Farnsworth passed away in 2002, I believe, a few years after I bought one of the lots from the portion of the orchard he sold to Woodside Homes. After he passed on, the family sold another chunk of the orchard and it was zoned to R-1-10 lots (just as the portion sold to Ivory/Woodside around 1996).

I think most neighbors expected that the final 10 acres would be sold someday, and perhaps rezoned from R-1-40A down to R-1-10 to match the prior portions sold around 2005 and 1996. This would be a reasonable rezoning. Rezoning to PUD-12 is a shocker. What is the point of zoning, if after someone purchases property, the neighboring zoning can be so radically changed? It would make zoning meaningless and unreliable.

Thank you for allowing me to ask two questions on the May 18 Neighborhood meeting. Previously on the meeting, it was said that UDOT plans to install a median on 700 E just east of the 10 acre property, and northbound traffic on 700 E will not be able to turn left (west) into the 10 acre development.

My first question was "When does UDOT plan to install the median on 700 E?" Someone on the call that you had unmuted (from Sandy City?) replied that UDOT had indicated the median will be installed "imminently".

My second question was "Has anyone done a traffic study to determine where the traffic heading northbound on 700 E that cannot turn left into the 10 acre property will go in order to enter the property?" If the rezoning is approved, and 116 units are built there, where will 116 vehicles (or more) go each day so they can enter?

Will they flip a "U turn" at 110th, where children in my neighborhood cross to attend Altara Elementary and Alta HS? If so, that is not in the best interests of Sandy to approve 116 units to flip U turns at a school crossing each day.

Will they cut through my neighborhood to get to 110th South where they can then turn right

on 700 E to access the 10-acre property?

If I was heading north on 700 E, returning from CVS Pharmacy, Harmon's, Maverick gas station, Draper Peaks, or any number of places those residents will go, or even if I was coming east on 114th from the Trax Station, or I-15, or Home Depot, and I knew I could not turn left into the 10-acre property, and if U-turns at 110th and 700 E were prohibited (or I preferred to avoid them), my alternative would be to cut through the neighborhood to the west of the 10-acre property (my neighborhood) most likely either via O'Henry Road or Oak Brush to cut north to get to 110th So. Again, it is not in the best interest of Sandy to put 116 or more vehicles cutting through neighborhoods each day in a hurry to access their own home.

On the call, after I asked my second question, someone unmuted (from Sandy City) stated that the person who could answer if such a traffic study had been done, had left the call. I was asked if I would like follow up information and my question answered after the call. I said yes, and that you Jake had my email address (sanwingo@comcast.net) and whoever was following up could obtain my email from you Jake and provide the answer. However, I have received no follow up.

Jake, has anyone reached out to you as promised on the call to indicate if a traffic study has been performed to determine where that traffic will go if it cannot turn left on 700 E?

If we have 10 lots (R-1-40A) on that property, or even 30 or so lots (R-1-10) on that property, that would be much fewer vehicles flipping U turns at children's school crossings or cutting through one neighborhood to get access to their homes.

Thank you. Please let me know who will tell me/us if such a study was performed and what are the results. Thank you for your help.

Jeff Davis

Sent from my iPhone

On May 22, 2020, at 4:21 PM, Jake Warner <jwarner@sandy.utah.gov> wrote:

To those interested in the Farnsworth Farms rezone application,

This email is intended as a response to everyone that has emailed me regarding the Farnsworth Farms rezone application. There has been a lot of interest in the proposed rezone, and I apologize for not responding to everyone individually. Many have asked for documents associated with the project. I have attached the Neighborhood Meeting Presentation that I shared at the neighborhood meeting, the Neighborhood Meeting Summary, and the notice for the June 4<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission meeting.

The rezone application is scheduled to be presented to the Planning Commission on June 4<sup>th</sup>. The Planning Commission will make a recommendation to the City Council.

The City Council makes a final decision regarding the rezone application. An approved rezone changes the set of rules that apply to use of a property, but does not grant approval for a specific project. The plan submitted with the rezone application is conceptual, and provides a sense of the type of project intended to be developed. If the proposed rezone is approved, a developer would need to submit a new application for a subdivision/site plan. They would be required to submit full plans for the development of the property with the subdivision/site plan application. Once staff has reviewed the development plans, they are presented to the Planning Commission for approval. Notices are mailed for each Planning Commission and City Council meeting to property owners within 500' of the property.

Thanks,

[<image001.jpg>](#)

**Jake Warner, AICP**  
Long Range Planning Manager

---

10000 S. Centennial Pkwy. | Sandy, UT 84070  
o: 801.568.7262  
[jwarner@sandy.utah.gov](mailto:jwarner@sandy.utah.gov)

[sandy.utah.gov](http://sandy.utah.gov)

[<image002.png>](#)

[<image003.png>](#)

<!--[if !vml]-->

[<image004.png>](#)

<!--[endif]-->

[<image005.png>](#)

[<image006.png>](#)

<Neighborhood Meeting Presentation-Farnsworth (5.18.20).pdf>

<Neighborhood Meeting Summary 5.18.20.pdf>

<PC Notice-Farnsworth (5.20.20).pdf>



**From:** [Shane Duffin](#)  
**To:** [Jake Warner](#)  
**Cc:** [Brooke Christensen](#); [James Sorensen](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Farnsworth Farms Zoning Meeting  
**Date:** Thursday, June 4, 2020 2:26:02 PM

---

Hello Jake,

My name may be familiar as I back up to the orchard and am one of the folks that "will" be impacted by this development and fully support it.

I respectfully ask and hope that this meeting forum will not allow for the chat function to be active as it was very negative and distracting and also comentors be moderated to the topic at hand not street, education or crime issues. Time was wasted in the last meeting with topics that are not a function nor are managed by Sandy city.

Thank you for hosting and your consideration of my concerns.

Best regards,

Shane Duffin

**From:** [Steve Hobbs](#)  
**To:** [Jake Warner](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Orchards at Farnsworth Farms  
**Date:** Friday, May 29, 2020 3:49:54 PM

---

Jake -

PLEASE PASS THIS ALONG TO APPROPRIATE CITY COUNCIL AND OTHER CITY LEADERS

I participated in the May 18 virtual neighborhood meeting. Thank you for appropriately handling an emotional call and keeping the group focused (not easy to do in person or virtually).

I am a senior executive in a global consulting firm and relocated from San Francisco to Sandy about 5 years ago. We chose a home in the Farnsworth Farms subdivision as we needed to live in a "less congested" neighborhood and community from what we had in San Francisco. The proposed 116 units vs the current zoning (~10) would create significant congestion and adversely impact the quality of life that many of us initially chose when selecting Sandy and this particular neighborhood as a place to live.

I appreciated your insights and comments during the re-zoning discussion. I know that there is a ugly history related to the Farnsworth family and the development of the farm properties after Leo's father passed away. My other concern relates to the economic considerations of the parties involved. Under the proposed plan, the Farnsworths, developers and Sandy City would benefit greatly. It's unclear to me what the economic impact (both long and short term) to the neighboring property owners would be. Seems to me that a development plan with fewer dwellings could minimize the adverse impact on neighboring parties and still provide an acceptable return to the major stakeholders.

Greed is a powerful force in the world today. I'm hopeful the city officials take a balanced approach to their deliberations.

Steve Hobbs  
[shobbstone@gmail.com](mailto:shobbstone@gmail.com)  
552 E Johns Way  
Sandy, UT  
408.550.4471

**From:** [Candi Jenkins](#)  
**To:** [Jake Warner](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] High density housing 700 East  
**Date:** Monday, June 1, 2020 4:24:13 PM

---

Hello,

I am writing to let you know that I oppose the housing that is proposed for the Farnsworth Farms location. Thank you.

**From:** [Laura Lunceford](#)  
**To:** [Jake Warner](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Apologies for the length of this, but I believe it's important to get insight into what can (and has) happened with out of control growth and high-density housing in our neighboring county to the south.  
**Date:** Thursday, June 4, 2020 3:12:18 PM  
**Importance:** High

---

A young woman posted on NextDoor that they had recently moved to this area from a high density area in Utah County so they could have more open space, much, much less traffic and a better place for their kids. I grew up in Utah County, so I have some idea about what happened when green space (orchards, fields, etc.) began to disappear. Once upon a time, when I was a child (and dinosaurs roamed the earth), the city and most of the county were covered with fruit orchards, vegetable farms, livestock and open spaces. Our family owned 4 orchards there. It was pretty much a paradise for kids, plenty of safe, open spaces there for our exploration and play. And joy, what's life without a little of that - especially these days.

I know, nostalgia is great, but we all know nothing can stay the same. Little by little, developers began buying up those orchards because it was simply more lucrative for the farmers to sell than to continue farming. It's backbreaking work and always feast or famine. Most, like my father, would have preferred working in his orchards until he breathed his last breath, but unfortunately his health deteriorated to the point where he could no longer farm. This was about 5 or 6 years before developers started paying enormous sums of money to farmers for their orchards. Farmers became multi-millionaires virtually overnight and most of them held out until it was just too good to pass up. Just like this situation, the developers will *always* want to build as many houses on each property as possible, it's just business and they get a greater return on their investment. The sums of money paid for these properties continued to increase as the land became more scarce and they managed (quite easily) to get those lands re-zoned for more and more housing density.

This was just the beginning back in the late 70's, and this trend continue unabated today. I almost never go down to Utah County anymore now that my parents are gone, but I know any of you who do traverse down there for work or anything else, would attest to the fact that you'd rather drive in rush hour traffic in SL County than drive down State Street (or 800 North, or 800 South, or Center Street, or University Parkway any day of the week and at any time of the day. It' absolutely horrific. In retrospect, it now seems as if no one even thought about the ramifications of such out-of-control growth. It's not very much of a stretch to picture that type of congestion surrounding the area proposed here on 7<sup>th</sup> East.

Clearly the Farnsworth family got an good offer from DAI, because this is a relatively large, and (thus far) piece of undeveloped land and that is enormously valuable now (and it likely got cost prohibitive to continue farming). I'm just guessing here, but I would assume that such a sale is contingent on getting this 10+ acre property re-zoned so they can put 12 units per acre on the full parcel. While that may likely be the best decision for the owners, and it is absolutely the most lucrative decision for the developer, we all need to make sure that this doesn't become such high-density. At the neighborhood meeting, it was (quite reasonably, I think), suggested that if you want to re-zone this land, take a less dense approach and cut your density in half. Perhaps a bit more than half the number (60?) of homes on this acreage, rather than 117 'units'. It would fit the area much better, even if a bit less dense than the developers would like and maybe a bit more dense than the

residents, but how about we take more time on this while the residents of Sandy get more details about this project so all parties can determine if a reasonable compromise is possible. That is unlikely to be 117 units. I'm assuming people who live on 700 East, or 110<sup>th</sup> South are concerned that overflow parking (without enough 'guest parking' specified in the development) will end up being all over surrounding streets. Also, remember that there is no way to keep these units from being used as rentals and everyone knows what that means in terms of neighborhood pride.

Also, it seems clear that the Farnsworths seem to be on board with this re-zoning, but in many cases, sellers often end up having no control over what is built on that land, nor the density. I can only surmise that the developers already had a plan to do just what they are proposing before they even approached the Farnsworths about purchasing their property. All of that is perfectly legal and perfectly okay in the abstract. But residents in this area don't deal in the abstract. We deal in traffic that already backs up through the entire intersection. We already know that 700 east is going to be torn up (again) for utilities, etc. We already know that construction vehicles and contractors are going to be constantly in and out of that area for many months. That's just during the first phase of construction. We lived through years of construction when we moved to a house that was the first one built on the street. There's unbelievable dirt, noise and general disruption of your lives. Heavy trucks and machinery are chewing up the pavement, our water lines were constantly full of dirt from the construction, and we would even have construction debris clogging the sewer lines. Depending on how this is built, you should be prepared for water shutoffs at various times. And that's just the beginning.

However, if you don't want traffic in Sandy (both on 700 East and the now horrific 114 South) to turn into the nightmare they have in pretty much all of Utah County, then you need to make your voices known. No one really cared about such things back in the 70's in Utah County, so all these developments (with no matching infrastructure to support the increase, nor traffic considerations, or additional city services, these things just sailed through the approval process.

You don't even have to guess as to who footed (and still foots) the costs for building out all the necessary additional infrastructure - from electrical / gas / water and sewer to roads. In Utah County, their idea of solving the problem was to just kept widening State Street. And it remains that way today. Does anyone have any plans for widening 700 East? How about 110<sup>th</sup> South? How? When? So if you don't really mind increased traffic, noise, and paying for everything that will go into supporting this higher density, like additional police, more schools, more street maintenance, more water, more firefighting capability, more of everything - that's certainly your prerogative.

Personally, I find that less than ideal for our quality of life. To all of us who spent untold hours managing to gather an astronomical amount of signatures to force that last horrible tax bill to be suspended so it would be placed on the ballot, you can attest to the power citizens can exercise to change an outcome that they disagree with. It just takes a lot of voices and plenty of participation. The things that affect us most take place on a local level. And this proposed re-zoning feels like a very bad decision with very little input from residents.

Sandy City needs to re-think their current requirement that only those who live within 300 – 500 feet from the proposed development /request to re-zone should be notified.

A high-density housing project like this one will eventually affect everyone who lives in Sandy.

Anyone who uses 700 East. Anyone who uses 114<sup>th</sup> South to enter or exit the freeway. Anyone

trying to turn left into such a project across 700 East (That will have 2 gates, so traffic backs up even further). I can't wait to see all the cars making U-turns in between 114<sup>th</sup> and 110<sup>th</sup> South in order to get into their residences) All the residents who live for many miles around this site will be affected to one extent or another. One high density development necessarily will lead to more and more of these. Developers will find every square foot of land and try to build as many houses on it as possible.

By the way, the developer needs to explain to everyone the difference between an HOA and a PUD. They aren't the same. They both have CC&Rs, but ask anyone who's lived in either and you'll find out how well those are enforced. There are promises of professional management and landscaping and maintenance. That also lasts for a short period of time and then the board is eventually made up of property owners who take over that task without the requisite skills and no idea how to manage contracts for landscaping or maintenance. Almost none of them charge enough in fees to cover major expenses like roof replacements, or road repairs. Then, owners get an additional 'special assessment' to cover the funding shortfall. Those can be in the thousands of dollars per owner.

**From:** [Debbie Mudge](#)  
**To:** [Jake Warner](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] I oppose the high density rezone application for Farnsworth Farms  
**Date:** Monday, June 1, 2020 1:38:42 PM

---

I oppose the high density rezone application for Farnsworth Farms in Sandy. I think it would be bad for the neighborhoods near the Farms to have high density housing.

Thank you,  
Debbie Mudge

**From:** [Wayne Mudge](#)  
**To:** [Jake Warner](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] I oppose the high density rezone application for Farnsworth Farms  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 3, 2020 10:49:52 AM

---

I oppose the high density rezone application for Farnsworth Farms in Sandy. I think it would be bad for the neighborhoods near the Farm, and for the city as a whole, to have high density housing there. The feasibility study for the Reams property showed that the local infrastructure could not support high density housing in that area.

Thank you.

Wayne Mudge



**From:** [DAN B NELSON](#)  
**To:** [Jake Warner](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Public Notice Meeting for Orchards at Farnsworth Farms  
**Date:** Thursday, June 4, 2020 8:11:36 AM  
**Attachments:** [2016-07 Water Pressure Problem \(5\) SS.pdf](#)

---

Jake Warner

I am responding to you about the Public Notice that I received on the Orchards at Farnsworth Farms. The hearing meeting is for the Planning Commission to consider a zone change application submitted by DAI.

In my view, I think my documentation is the most positive data available that supports denying the request to change the existing zone to a new zone requested by DAI.

A little background information about my data. We have a water pressure problem where I live (Crescent Heights @ 11035 S Grapevine Cove #A2101. I have complained about it for several years and I put together a very detailed list of water pressure test (psi) during the summer of 1996. Several times Sandy City personnel came and tested the water pressure and said we didn't have a problem. If you look at the data, it shows the water pressure problem happens mostly at night during the summer months when most watering on city as well as residential property is being done. Sandy City tests were done during work time hours (during the day) and that is when most of the problems don't exist. They finally put a device on the fire hydrant that would keep a running test for a few days that would capture the water pressure all day for several days and it verified my concerns about our water pressure problems.

To my knowledge, Sandy City has never done anything to correct the problem. I finally gave up because I have never been notified that Sandy City would work on the problem and that it ever got fixed.

I would like to ask the members of the Planning Commission a couple questions: Would you like to have water pressure in your home less than 40 psi or even 24 psi at any time during the day? Would you put a request that changes the zoning of a property that further compromises your water

pressure in your home or the citizens of any Sandy City property owner?

I sincerely request that you deny the request to change the zone designation.

Dan B Nelson

Home Owner at 11035 Grapevine CV #A2101

Sandy, UT 84070

801-571-2845

**From:** [Linda Watts](#)  
**To:** [Jake Warner](#)  
**Cc:** [nate@daiutah.com](mailto:nate@daiutah.com)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Farnsworth property re-zone request  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 3, 2020 3:27:56 PM

---

Jake,

We live at Crescent Heights condominiums immediately north of the Farnsworth property. We THANK YOU for your courtesy and clarity in directing the meeting via Zoom on May 4th, and commend Nate for his ability to defuse the irate "neighbor" who demanded information unrelated to the introductory agenda of that meeting. We appreciate DAI's respectful responses.

We would like to urge them to consider reducing the number of units PLEASE! [1] Rather than the eleven front load town homes on the north end, build five or six twin homes like the south and west end, which would make the entire periphery flow more aesthetically. [2] Rather than the six rear load homes on the east side of the open space, extend that open area. Those two changes would thin out the density by eleven or twelve units.... which still is crowded, but breathable.

Another suggestion: Twin homes for entire development designated as a "55+" community, which would alleviate additional overload on schools.

Thank you for the opportunity to express our views. We look forward to the meeting tomorrow evening via Zoom.

Richard and Linda Watts  
11086 S. Grape Arbor Pl., #106, Sandy, UT 84070  
801-641-1334