



Sandy City, Utah

10000 Centennial Parkway
Sandy, UT 84070
Phone: 801-568-7256

Meeting Minutes

Planning Commission

Dave Bromley
Michael Christopherson
Monica Collard
Ron Mortimer
Jamie Tsandes
Cameron Duncan
Jeff Lovell
NH Rather (Alternate)
Daniel Schoenfeld (Alternate)

Thursday, June 4, 2020

6:15 PM

On-line meeting

Meeting procedures are found at the end of this agenda.

The June 4, 2020 Sandy City Planning Commission meeting will be conducted via Zoom Webinar. Public comment may be allowed after the presentation of the particular item by the Staff and Applicant, as directed by the Planning Commission Chairman. Each speaker is allowed two minutes. Citizens wishing to comment must access the meeting via the Zoom Webinar link below and must use the "raise hand" feature. The call-in number is for listening only. If a citizen is unable to attend a meeting via Zoom, he or she may e-mail the Planning Director at bmccuiston@sandy.utah.gov by 3:00 PM the day of the Planning Commission meeting to have those comments distributed to the Commission members and/or have them read into the record at the appropriate time.

Register in advance for this webinar:
<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88575038835>

After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the webinar.

Or join by phone:

Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):

US: +1 346 248 7799 or +1 669 900 6833 or +1 253 215 8782 or +1 312 626 6799 or +1 929 436 2866 or +1 301 715 8592

Webinar ID: 885 7503 8835

Webinar Password: 819205

FIELD TRIP

[20-172](#) Field trip for Planning Commission members

Attachments: [6-4-20 map.pdf](#)

6:15 PM REGULAR SESSION

Welcome

Pledge of Allegiance

Introductions

- Present** 7 - Commissioner Dave Bromley
Commissioner Monica Collard
Commissioner Ron Mortimer
Commissioner Jamie Tsandes
Commissioner Michael Christopherson
Commissioner Cameron Duncan
Commissioner Daniel Schoenfeld
- Absent** 2 - Commissioner Jeff Lovell
Commissioner NH Rather

Public Meeting Items

- 1. [CUP-05-20-5](#) Hunt Accessory Apartment (Conditional Use Permit)
[854](#) 10069 S. Rockview Dr.
 [Community #21- Falcon Hill]

Attachments: [Staff report, documents and map.pdf](#)

Claire Hague presented this item to the Planning Commission.

Elwin Hunt further presented this item to the Planning Commission.

Michael Christopherson asked if the applicant had read and was comfortable with the staff report.

Elwin Hunt said yes.

Cameron Duncan asked if the applicant was going to be using 100% of the basement and about the layout.

Elwin Hunt explained that they were using the entire basement and further explained the layout design.

Michael Christopherson opened this item to public comment.

Steve Van Maren is in favor of the reduced square footage in the staff report.

Michael Christopherson closed this item to public comment.

Monica Collard thought that the accessory apartment was a good size.

A motion was made by Monica Collard, seconded by Ron Mortimer that the Planning Commission approve a Conditional Use Permit for Lynette and Elwin Hunt to allow for an 1207 square foot accessory apartment on the property located at 10069 S. Rockview Dr. based of the three findings and four conditions detailed in the staff report.

- Yes:** 7 - Dave Bromley
 Monica Collard
 Ron Mortimer
 Jamie Tsandes
 Michael Christopherson
 Cameron Duncan
 Daniel Schoenfeld

- Absent:** 2 - Jeff Lovell
 NH Rather

2. [CUP-05-20-5
849](#) Haislip Accessory Structure (Conditional Use - Increased square footage, height, and setback waiver)
801 E. Silver Sage Dr.
[Community #12]

Attachments: [Staff report, documents and map.pdf](#)

Claire Hague presented this item to the Planning Commission.

Michael Christopherson asked for clarification on what is allowed and the setback waiver in the staff report.

Claire Hague explained what the applicant is allowed by right and explained the different requests.

Jason Haislip, the applicant, further presented this item to the Planning Commission.

Michael Christopherson asked if the applicant had read and was comfortable with the staff report.

Jason Haislip explained that he was.

Monica Collard asked if there was a second accessory structure on the property and if it will be removed once the new one is approved.

Jason Haislip said yes and that once the new one is built the old one will be taken down.

Jamie Tsandes asked if the proposed structure will be primarily for storage.

Jason Haislip explained that the only purpose is for storage of his RV and other storage items.

Cameron Duncan asked about the trees and if the project will impact them or if they need to be removed.

Michael Christopherson clarified the location of the structure.

Michael Christopherson opened this item to public comment.

Steve Van Maren is concerned about the setback requirements and think they should only allow for a six-foot waiver.

Kate Shoenhalls is opposed to this item and has concerns about the run-off mitigation, if they will be allowed to use it for other activities and construction hurting or destroying the roots of the mature trees in her back yard behind the proposed structure.

Michael Christopherson closed this item to public comment.

Claire Hague responded to the public comment's questions.

Brian McCuiston said the city has an urban forester that could look at the trees, depending on the motion.

Michael Christopherson asked Darien Alcorn where that consideration fits with the power the Planning Commission has.

Dave Bromley asked about the concerns for the storm water run-off mitigation.

James Sorenson explained that the City code requires the property owners to maintain and store all storm water on the property.

Darien Alcorn, City Attorney, explained that if there is an impact that needs to be mitigated then a condition needs to be added in order to mitigate the impact which would be the comparison of the three-foot wavier and the six-foot wavier.

Michael Christopherson asked if the property owners have a duty to protect and preserve the neighbors tree roots or are the setbacks designed to account for that anyway.

Darien Alcorn explained that it would be hard to determine but as a private property owner you do have obligations to adjacent private property owners.

Jason Hailsip further responded to questions.

Michael Christopherson re-opened this item to public comment.

Linda, Kates Shoenhalls neighbor, had concerns about bad code/code violations and height of the structure.

Michael Christopherson reclosed this item to public comment.

Daniel Schoenfeld is comfortable with the height and square footage but thinks no wavier should be given and the applicant should stay with the nine-foot setback.

Monica Collard explained that she is having a hard time with the setback waiver for both side and rear and asked about the height of the neighboring trees and if they are putting in a concrete pad or if one is already there.

Cameron Duncan explained that the trees look about thirty or forty feet tall.

Monica Collard said she would be comfortable with a setback wavier but nothing less than six feet.

Dave Bromley said with neighbors opposed he is not comfortable with the setbacks of three feet but is okay with the height of the structure.

Cameron Duncan is okay with the size but does think that they should have to stick with the nine-foot setback.

Dave Bromley asked if they could do a motion where they allow the height but have the setback wavier be between six to nine feet, that way the applicant has some leeway in the placement of the structure.

Jamie Tsandes explained that someone has the right to trim or cut roots of a tree if it encroaches on their property and thinks that in the motion there needs to be a condition that an arborist must be hired to clean cut the roots.

Michael Christopherson asked if they have that ability if they are not allowing a setback

wavier.

Darien Alcorn clarified that when looking at a CUP that is larger or taller, often the consideration of nearby foliage is taken into consideration when deciding what the impact is and if it is being mitigated.

Dave Bromley thinks that the neighbors who are concerned about the height and setbacks are to the north and behind the property, so the Planning Commission could impose a setback waiver on the west side to have better functional access to the garage.

A motion was made by Jamie Tsandes, seconded by Daniel Schoenfeld that the Planning Commission approve a Conditional Use Permit for Jason Haislip for the property located at 801 E. Silver Sage Dr. to allow for an accessory structure as described in the application materials based on the findings and five conditions and condition six be modified as follows:

6. To not allow a rear setback waiver and the side setback be as low as three feet but not closer than three feet to the west property line.

And included an additional condition as follows:

7. That the property owner hires an arborist during construction to make sure the tree roots and branches are clean cut, protected, not ripped.

Yes: 6 - Dave Bromley
Monica Collard
Ron Mortimer
Jamie Tsandes
Michael Christopherson
Daniel Schoenfeld

No: 1 - Cameron Duncan

Absent: 2 - Jeff Lovell
NH Rather

Public Hearing Items

3. [CODE-04-20-5844 PC](#) Jolley Pharmacy (2nd Request) - Proposed Amendments to the SD(Carnation) Zone
Amend Title 21, Chapter 19 - Special Development (SD) Districts, Section 20 - SD(Carnation), of the Sandy Municipal Code

Attachments: [Staff Report.pdf](#)
[Exhibit A.pdf](#)
[Exhibit B.pdf](#)

Michael Wilcox presented this item to the Planning Commission.

Michael Christopherson clarified exhibit between exhibit A and exhibit B.

Michael Christopherson opened this item to public comment.

Steve Van Maren explained that he is in favor for the drive-up window but not for the parking reduction and recommended having signs for no idling while in line.

Cassandra Shaw Myers is in favor for both window and parking reduction.

Michael Christopherson closed this item to public comment.

Monica Collard said she is okay with parking reduction.

Ron Mortimer thinks the parking reduction is fine.

Dave Bromley explained that he's okay with it but doesn't think that they have a reason to justify it.

Michael Christopherson explained that the Planning Commission hasn't approved parking reductions for other businesses that have a walk-up window in the past, so approving this would be a unique parking requirement waiver.

Michael Wilcox clarified that it would be all businesses in that specific zone because it is a code change and would not just be limited to Jolley Pharmacy.

Michael Christopherson asked for further clarification.

Mike Wilcox further explained the zone and code change.

Jamie Tsandes asked how much the reduction would be.

Mike Wilcox clarified that it would be reduced by 1.5 and net retail footage verses gross square footage.

Ron Mortimer explained that this request is one small unique SD Zone. We should be helping it, not making it harder.

Michael Christopherson said that the retail impact is small because they are a compounding pharmacy, but in the future if the business were to move, would the Planning Commission be okay or want a different business to have that parking reduction.

Dave Bromley agrees with Ron but has concerns about future business and adequate parking.

Ron Mortimer is open to Exhibit A, but just wanted to make a point that this site has been struggling for a long time.

A motion was made by Dave Bromley, seconded by Cameron Duncan that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to adopt the proposed ordinance amendment as shown in Exhibit "B" for the two reasons listed in the staff report.

Yes: 7 - Dave Bromley
Monica Collard
Ron Mortimer
Jamie Tsandes
Michael Christopherson
Cameron Duncan
Daniel Schoenfeld

Absent: 2 - Jeff Lovell
NH Rather

4. [ZONE-03-20-5825](#) Orchards at Farnsworth Farms Rezone
11228 S. 700 E. from R-1-40A to PUD (12)
[Community #11 - Crescent]

Attachments: [Staff report, zoning map and conceptual plan.pdf](#)
[Neighborhood Meeting Summary \(5.18.20\)](#)
[Emails Received \(5.22.20-5.28.20\)](#)
[Emails Received \(5.29.20-6.4.20\)](#)
[Traffic Impact Study \(6.4.20\)](#)

Jake Warner presented this item to the Planning Commission.

Nate Shipp and Joe Salsberry, the applicants, further presented this item to the Planning Commission.

Josh Gibbons representing Ryan Hales, presented the traffic study.

Michael Christopherson opened this item to public comment.

Brook McElmurry has concerns about traffic flow during school hours, also the view from the homes on the west side of the development, overcrowding of schools and high density does not fit in the neighborhood.

Shane Duffin, also representing Nick Wright, are both in favor of the item

Mark Ciullo is in favor for the item and is disappointed that presentation was theory of the end product and not about the rezone itself.

Don Cann explained the history of the site and has concerns about the traffic on 700 East.

Jody Hadfield is concerned on traffic on 700 East and would like to see R-1-8 or R-1-10 zones.

Adam and Jessica Clayton have questions about gates and where visitors of residents will be parking, and if the housing is affordable.

Tyler Herd in favor of development in the area but not a PUD zone. Would like to see any R zone and has concerns about the traffic impact of 700 East.

John Annunziata thinks that applicant should re-evaluate traffic study but is in favor of the item.

Dan Nelson is concerned on water pressure and the development effecting the surrounds neighborhoods.

Laura Lunceford thinks that this item effects more than the 500 foot radius for notices, PUD zones are a nightmare and she is concerned about all the parking ending up on the street. Gates create traffic backup, and she would like to see less density.

Susan Wittig had questions about the children study; turn lanes on 700 East; all the concern is for the west side but no concern for the north side; an 8 foot fence needs to be

done on the north side; and wanted to know how big the town homes will be.

Ashley Rasmussen agreed that this item has too much density and would like to see something lower. School study is low and needs to be looked at again.

Katie Atkinson not in favor of this item and would like to see a traffic projection that also includes the traffic for the Challenger school impacting the traffic on 700 East and the PUD zone.

Scott Fielding said that more people should be considered as being affected; is worried about the traffic and the children walking to school; the safety and the bottle neck traffic going into Draper and would like to see a lower density project.

Leo Farnsworth owner of the property is in favor of this item and would like to see the PUD Zone.

Lucy Ortega is concerned about traffic and crime and feels the project is not the same character of Sandy City.

Jody Hadfield asked if the traffic study included the three streets that all come out onto 700 East.

Rick Hoffmann will have five new neighbors and is against high density, okay with smaller development. More neighbors to the south should be considered as affected people. This is the Zone meeting not the concept plan.

Michael Christopherson closed this item to public comment.

Daniel Schoenfeld asked about traffic study.

Jake Warner clarified that it was not required but done by the development team.

Monica Collard explained that this project is beautiful but doesn't think it's right for the land and the density might be too high.

Daniel Schoenfeld is concerned about the zoning, traffic and parking for the surrounding the neighborhood.

Ron Mortimer shared that he thought the traffic would not be super noticeable, but the density is too much.

Cameron Duncan empathizes with citizens and their worries for traffic and thinks the density might be too high.

Daniel Schoenfeld asked if they should table and have them come back or just not recommend this item to the City Council.

Michael Christopherson explained that tabling the item wont change anything on the project and that it is just a positive or negative recommendation.

James Sorensen clarified that either way the applicant can take it to the City Council and that the Planning Commission is just making a recommendation.

Dave Bromley explained that he is concerned about the density, but the product is very

nice, PUD Zones would be fine but with a reduced number of units

Jamie Tsandes likes the project and thinks it looks great but agrees it is too dense for the area.

Michael Christopherson expressed that he is in favor of the proposed density of the project and thinks that Sandy City needs high density housing.

Dave Bromley agrees that Sandy could use more high-density housing but thinks it would be more applicable closer to the freeway.

A motion was made by Monica Collard, seconded by Daniel Schoenfeld that the Planning Commission forward a negative recommendation to the City Council to deny the zone change from R-1-40A to PUD (12).

Yes: 6 - Dave Bromley
Monica Collard
Ron Mortimer
Jamie Tsandes
Cameron Duncan
Daniel Schoenfeld

No: 1 - Michael Christopherson

Absent: 2 - Jeff Lovell
NH Rather

Administrative Business

1. [20-173](#) Planning Commission minutes from 5.21.20

Attachments: [PC Minutes 05.21.2020 \(DRAFT\).pdf](#)

A motion was made by Dave Bromley, seconded by Monica Collard that the Planning Commission approve the meeting minutes for 05.21.2020

Yes: 7 - Dave Bromley
Monica Collard
Ron Mortimer
Jamie Tsandes
Michael Christopherson
Cameron Duncan
Daniel Schoenfeld

Absent: 2 - Jeff Lovell
NH Rather

Sandy City Development Report

Director's Report

Adjournment

Meeting Procedure

1. Staff Introduction
2. Developer/Project Applicant presentation
3. Staff Presentation
4. Open Public Comment (if item has been noticed to the public)
5. Close Public Comment
6. Planning Commission Deliberation
7. Planning Commission Motion

In order to be considerate of everyone attending the meeting and to more closely follow the published agenda times, public comments will be limited to 2 minutes per person per item. A spokesperson who has been asked by a group to summarize their concerns will be allowed 5 minutes to speak. Comments which cannot be made within these time limits should be submitted in writing to the Community Development Department prior to noon the day before the scheduled meeting.

Planning Commission applications may be tabled if: 1) Additional information is needed in order to take action on the item; OR 2) The Planning Commission feels there are unresolved issues that may need further attention before the Commission is ready to make a motion. No agenda item will begin after 11 pm without a unanimous vote of the Commission. The Commission may carry over agenda items, scheduled late in the evening and not heard, to the next regular scheduled meeting.

In compliance with the Americans With Disabilities Act, reasonable accommodations for individuals with disabilities will be provided upon request. For assistance, or if you have any questions regarding the Planning Commission Agenda or any of the items, please call the Sandy City Planning Department at (801) 568-7256