

From: lairdenator@gmail.com on behalf of [Kurt Laird](#)
To: [Jake Warner](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Community #3 (Sandy Woods)
Date: Thursday, April 21, 2022 11:23:48 AM

Jake,

I am writing to comment regarding the above-mentioned development. I reside in the neighborhood just west of the proposed development. I have two concerns about the proposal.

First, the density of the proposed development appears higher than the surrounding neighborhood. I would prefer that it be closer to that of surrounding homes.

Second, I am concerned about the proposed road running from the new development west to 300 East. There are approximately 75 new homes being built along 300 East and with the traffic of those homes, plus the traffic from this new development and the anticipated development of the church property just west of this development, I am concerned that 300 East will be too busy for this residential area. There doesn't seem to be any reason for the road from the new development to 300 East, so I would prefer that the road simply not be inserted (leaving access to the development from 8000 S). Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Kurt Laird

From: [Steve Van Maren-x](#)
To: [Mike Wilcox](#); [Jake Warner](#)
Cc: [Brian McCuistion](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments to the Planning Commission 4/21/22
Date: Friday, April 22, 2022 7:23:00 AM

Gentle persons,

Item 1: no comment

2: High Pointe Shopping Center Sign Theme: The materials do not show where the three signs are located. The updating of the signs will look nicer. Otherwise, the application seems to specify taller signs than allowed.

-- after driving by behind the tour bus, I see there a total of 4 small sign locations. (one on 7800 East)

3. Sunrise Ridge Rezone:

1) too bad this is warranted; care facilities are needed too.

2) PUD 4.75 would be closer to the existing neighborhood than 12 residences to the acre. I ask that you reduce the density. This is at least 3 blocks from State street, the closest street ready to handle traffic increases.

4. Sugarcreek Rezone:

1) I like R-1-10 zoning. It has done great things for Sandy's growth.

2) While not the time now, but as the city works with the applicant, I hope some units on these nice sized lots could be built at a lower cost to feed the entry level market. I am not asking for smaller lots.

5. Amendments to SD(R-2-A) Fluekiger District:

1) I believe I understand the intent. I have two issues with the specifications of the new Zone:

A) the largest lot is 18,000 sq. ft.; this does not justify the animal rights of R-1-20A for all four lots. Section (c).1.c should be R-1-15A as the closest existing Zone. The setbacks and other features of R-1-20 are very close, and the maximum house size is only 1000 square feet smaller.

B) and (c).1.b: this language is confusing to me. I think the intent is to provide a minimum of 10,000 square feet of buildable area on each lot, "for each dwelling and uses accessory thereto." When I read it, I thought it said the lots were required to be 10,000 square feet minimum; this is the standard for R-1-10, and not the intent here, I believe. Please add "of buildable area" before "shall" to the specification.

Thank you for listening.

Sorry for the late delivery, it was found on my computer when I returned home.

Steve Van Maren
Resident