

October 11, 2019

Sandy City Planning Commission

RE: Bell Canyon Cove Development and Rezoning, I am in favor of allowing the rezoning which allows the development of the 4.5 acres.

I live in the neighborhood of the Bell Canyon Cove Development and attended the October 2, 2019 Community Meeting conducted by Jake Warner. There were 2 reasons I attended the Community Meeting:

1. I heard that the property owners who were selling and developing their property were being treated very poorly and I wanted to see to what extent.
2. I am concerned about my property ownership rights and feel the need to always defend them.

I feel that the City Council's decision to allow a development has to balance between two positions:

1. Preserve the property owner's right to have control over and make decisions about their own property use.
2. Neighboring property owners have to be protected from unfair or unjust impact.

The Bell Canyon Cove Developers presented a plan that is reasonable and also consistent with almost all other neighboring properties.

The few neighbors who attended did not present a single reason why the development unfairly or unjustly impacted their use of their property. The few attending neighbors put up a big smoke screen of reasons, but none showed an unfair or unjust impact.

It must be noted that about 15 households were at the meeting and voiced their objects, however, there are 423 other neighbors who didn't see a concern nor reason to attend, the assumption is that the rest of the 423 other neighbors did not feel that the development unfairly or unjustly impacted them. By far, most neighbors had no objections to the development.

I would like to also mention that up until last year I was the Community Coordinator for Community #26. I have never seen such rudeness by the few attending neighbors as I saw at this meeting. Included in this group are 3 City Council candidates, Jim Edwards, Monica Z and Dea Theodore.

### **Addressing Each Position:**

#### **Argument for Allowing the Development:**

If the community is defined as 10600 South to 11400 South, and 1700 East to 2125 East. I realize some of the few neighbors who attended live outside this area, these specific boundaries allow for specific household counting, if the few neighbors want to expand the area, fine, it would add to the numbers and benefit the Bell Canyon Cove Developer's argument.

1. The proposed development of 15,000 sq ft lots (.34 acres) is reasonable and this size of lots has been previously approved by the City Council. I counted all of the houses in the community and 297 lots are 17,424 sq ft, (.4 acres) or smaller. By comparison, there were only 126 lots greater than 17,424 sq ft (.4 acres). 70% of the lots were approximately the same size or smaller than the proposed Bell Canyon Cove Development. The property owner ought to be allowed to exercise their property rights and move forward with the development.

### **Arguments for Rejection of the Development.**

1. Traffic: Poor Argument. The few neighbors first and best argument was traffic. As a Community Coordinator I would often hear this argument and would tell the attendees not to bother with this argument. Sandy City has been managing traffic since 1871, and they have plans to contain it if the development is allowed. Also, Sandy City population has tapered off, so this development is replacing lost population. For example 20 years ago I had 7 living in my household, now there are just 2 of us, I went from 5 cars to 2 cars.
2. Horse Ownership. Poor Argument. How does it affect the few neighbors if Bell Canyon Cove has horses on the property or not? It doesn't affect the few neighbors who attended.

I somewhat understand the emotional position of the few neighbors, they are seeing reduction in horse ownership, and maybe feel that the development of this property would negatively impact horse ownership.

True, however, the uncomfortable fact is that horse ownership is decreasing even if the property is not development, and why should the developing property owner lose their right to benefit from their investment just so the few neighbors can take a stance against diminishing horse ownership.

To prove my point, think of a movie or TV series from our childhood where horse were a main part, e.g. Bonanza, Mr. Ed or John Wayne movies. Now try to think of one today. Our kids are not seeing horses on TV or in the movies, and Hollywood tries to serve our interests, apparently horses are of diminishing interest.

3. This property is valuable horse property: Poor Argument. This was not explicitly stated by the few neighbors, but implied. No one offered to buy the property at market value, none of the few neighbors even remotely hinted that they were interested in buying it. Apparently, even if the lots are big enough for a few horses, too few people are buying city property to board their horses.
4. The development would set a precedent for more development: Poor Argument. The precedent was already set, 95% of the area has already been developed. The precedence was set back in 1975 when the development began, including ¼ acre lots that directly border the proposed development on the north. Then many more lots were developed in the mid 1980's,

and more in the 1990's. This argument comes 40 years too late.

5. Construction of the road and development would cause dirt and noise: Poor Argument.

I would hope that the Sandy City Council will approve the rezoning and allow the property owner to exercise their choice to develop their property.

Regards,

Corey Bodily  
11135 Barrett Park Circle  
Sandy, UT 84092  
801-598-5984

126 7.4 acres  
30%

299 5.14  
-P-70%

1 Acre

43560

5

17424

344

15000

30%

70%

Total

423



