

EXHIBIT F.1

Questions Associated with and Possible Adjustments to the Draft Code for ADUs & Extended Living Areas (to be discussed with Planning Commission)

Submitted by Planning Commissioner Dave Bromley

- 1) Did staff prepare any exhibits of typical smaller lots to depict how feasible it is for an owner of a smaller lot to build a detached ADU or detached Extended Living Area? If so, they were not provided.
 - a) Exhibits showing a typical 8,000 sq. ft. lot, 10,000 sq. ft. lot, and 11,000 sq. ft. lot would go a long way to illustrate the feasibility of building a detached ADU or detached Extended Living Area structure.
 - b) This exercise may highlight the difficulty of building detached accessory dwellings on smaller lots, as well as identify probable maximum sizes of such units.
- 2) Section 21-11-1(d)(3) *Property Description*
 - a) **Question:** What is the purpose of this section?
 - i) As Section 21-11-1(d) is subjecting all ADU (attached or detached) to this portion of the proposed ordinance then all ADU applications (attached or detached) are required to provide architectural elevations and an interior layout of the dwelling with the location of all smoke and carbon monoxide detectors. Additionally, the interior layout of the primary dwelling and ADU (as applicable) shall identify the use of each room and the proportion that is proposed to be used as an ADU.
 - b) **Possible Adjustment:** Depending on the purpose of this section, it may be more appropriate to restrict the applicability of this section [21-11-1(d)] to attached ADUs for providing all the information detailed in the section; however, limit the detached ADUs to providing architectural elevations and an interior layout with the location of all smoke and carbon monoxide detectors to the proposed detached ADU. Requiring a homeowner to provide the interior layout of their existing, private primary home in order to build a detached unit may be seen as an unnecessary administrative hurdle during the planning phase but may be appropriate during the building permit phase. If the Planning Commission agrees with this an adjustment to this section should be recommended to the City Council.
- 3) Section 21-11-1(e)(1) *Number Permitted*
 - a) **Question:** Just to clarify, this section of the code provides limitations regarding the number of ADUs and creates the following restrictions:
 - i) One detached structure (ADU or Extended Living Area) per property/parcel.
 - ii) If there's a detached ADU on the property/parcel then no additional attached ADUs may be constructed on the property/parcel.
 - iii) The number of attached Extended Living Areas on an eligible property/parcel is unlimited and is additional to the one detached unit (ADU or Extended Living Area).
 - iv) Is this understanding correct as detailed above?
 - b) **Possible Adjustment:** Determine whether the Planning Commission is okay with the allowed number of ADUs and Extended Living Areas as provided in the ordinance draft. If not, provide an alternative recommendation to the City Council.

EXHIBIT F.2

- i) Consider allowing 2 detached units (ADU and/or Extended Living Area) on lots that are 40,000 sq. ft. or larger (possibly consider allowing the 2nd ADU and/or Extended Living Area via conditional use permit so neighbors get a voice). Also, consider allowing 1 detached unit (ADU or Extended Living Area) and 1 attached ADU on lots smaller than 40,000 sq. ft.
 - ii) Alternatively, consider allowing 1 detached unit (ADU or Extended Living Area) and 1 attached ADU.
- 4) Section 21-11-1(f)(1)a. *Entrances*
 - a) **Possible Adjustment:** This portion of the ordinance limits entryways for ADUs and Extended Living Areas so that their entrance doors are not visible from the street or front property line. There are lots where the strict application of this ordinance will limit door locations that otherwise should be allowed. For example, Corner lots and other lots with unique features/issues (e.g., topography). Determine whether the Planning Commission should recommend to the City Council certain allowable exceptions to this ordinance and/or providing for other options, such as Director approval, in order to obtain approval for an alternative front door location.
- 5) Section 21-11-1(f)(1)b. *Design*
 - a) **Possible Adjustment:** A portion of this section of the code states that attached ADUs or Extended Living Areas don't need to be connected internally to the primary residence; however, it mandates that they must be connected to the existing living area of the home by a common wall (minimum width of 50% of the perimeter of the addition) and not connected through a breezeway or non-habitable space (e.g., garage, storage area, mechanical room). The Planning Commission should determine whether it agrees with this limitation. If not, consider recommending to the City Council appropriate modifications to the wording and/or provide for alternative avenues to obtain approval, such as Director approval or obtaining a Conditional Use Permit, in order to avoid strict adherence to this ordinance.
 - i) Consideration(s):
 - (1) Requirement to connect to the existing living area is too restrictive.
 - (2) Requirement that the structure not be connected through a breezeway or non-habitable space is too restrictive.
 - (a) Allowing breezeway or garage connections can prevent structurally difficult and expensive additions (it's already extremely costly to build an attached ADU or attached Extended Living Area on a property). Forcing a common habitable wall might make it architecturally impossible to build a ground-level elder-care suite without destroying the primary home's roofline or layout.
 - (3) Requirement that at the connection be at least 50% of the perimeter of the addition is too restrictive (also, not sure it's even possible as the code is written). For example, if an addition is a square (e.g., 20x20), its perimeter is 80 feet. To share 50% of its perimeter with the main house, it must share 40 feet of wall. A square cannot share two whole sides with a flat wall of a primary house unless it wraps around a corner.
- 6) Section 21-11-1(g)(3)
 - a) **Question:** This section states that exterior lighting shall direct illumination downward and lighting shall not extend beyond the property. Assuming this means that a light on the ADU or Extended Living Area cannot spill any light beyond the property, it seems this wording may be too rigid. Does it need to be modified?

EXHIBIT F.3

- b) **Possible Adjustment:** Recommend alternative wording to the City Council. Soften the language to reflect standard "Dark Sky" or nuisance ordinances.
- 7) Section 21-11-1(g)(7)
 - a) **Question:** This section simply states that ADUs shall be designed consistent with the design of the single-family dwelling. Does this mean a single-story home cannot have an ADU (attached or detached) or Extended Living Area (attached or detached) that is 1.5 or 2 stories?
 - b) **Possible Adjustment:** If the existing draft of the code restricts the design in this manner, the Planning Commission should determine whether it's okay with restriction or recommend alternative language to the City Council. Restricting detached ADUs to a single story on lots with single-story homes may eliminate space-efficient designs like carriage houses over garages.
- 8) Section 21-11-1(g)(8) *Development Standards (a table of standards is provided in the draft)*
 - a) **Possible Adjustments:**
 - i) **Minimum Property Size** = 11,000 square feet or larger
 - (1) The Planning Commission should determine whether it's okay with this lot size restriction. If not, provide an alternative recommendation of lot size to the City Council.
 - (a) Consideration(s):
 - (i) Most small lots that have existing homes constructed on the lot are situated on the lot in ways that will naturally preclude the construction of a detached ADU or detached Extended Living Area; therefore, the other sections of the code will naturally preclude the construction of an excessive number of detached units throughout the city (if the lot constraints don't preclude a large number of these detached units the high construction costs will). (**Note** – *it would be nice to have some diagrams provided by city staff detailing current conditions on typical small lots within the city in order to visualize this issue*).
 - ii) **Location** = Rear and side yards, and behind the front plane of the home
 - (1) The Planning Commission should consider whether the "behind the front plane of the home" restriction for lots less than 40,000 sq. ft. should be modified.
 - (a) Consideration(s):
 - (i) Leaving the restriction will not impact most lots less than 40,000 sq. ft. with existing structures on the lot because it simply isn't possible to locate a detached ADU or a detached Extended Living Area within any area in front of the front plane of the home on most smaller lots given the location of the existing primary dwelling unit.
 - (ii) This restriction may, however, limit the creativity associated with newly built developments that aren't limited by the location of an existing structure. There are tastefully built structures within developments around the country that have detached ADUs in front of the front plane of the primary home.
 - (iii) What are the drawbacks associated with just adhering to the existing lot setbacks associated with the property?
 - iii) **Maximum Size of a Detached ADU** = footprint of detached ADU is limited to 75% or less of the primary dwelling unit or no larger than the maximum square footage allowed for an accessory structure under LDC 21-11-2(a)(2) if this code section results in a smaller square footage than 75% of the primary dwelling unit; therefore, this accessory structure table will

EXHIBIT F.4

typically override the calculation and result in a smaller maximum calculation than 75% of the primary dwelling unit..

- (1) Assuming a detached ADU or detached Extended Living Area structure is classified as an Accessory Structure (it's not clear whether this assumption is correct), and would, therefore, be subject to the size restrictions detailed in LDC 21-11-2(a)(2) the Planning Commission should determine whether it's okay with this restriction or if an alternative recommendation to the City Council should be made.

(a) Considerations:

- (i) It's not likely that a smaller lot would run up against a size restriction associated with accessory structures – the available/buildable portion of the lot not occupied by the primary structure simply won't provide sufficient space.
- (ii) Larger lots, particularly lots with an "A" designation (Farm Animal Rights) that also have a barn, will frequently max out the lot associated with accessory structures..

(b) Alternatives:

- (i) Provide a separate table for larger lots (at least R-1-40 and possibly R-1-20) that allows the owner to build a detached ADU or detached Extended Living Area without being restricted by the size of other non-habitable accessory structures built on the property.
 1. Larger sized structures should be allowed for properties with an "A" designation (Farm Animal Rights).
 2. This table should, however, provide a limitation on maximum lot coverage.
 3. The applicability of this table could be applied via a Conditional Use Permit.
- (ii) Other???

iv) Building Height and Setbacks from Side and Rear Property Lines

- (1) Question = There are two lines for this item within the table – what is being proposed here?
- (2) Similar to item #7 above, the Planning Commission should determine its position on the allowable height of the detached ADU or detached Extended Living Area structure and provide an alternative recommendation to the City Council regarding property height and setbacks.

(a) Consideration(s):

- (i) What are the drawbacks associated with adhering to the building height and setback restrictions within the existing residential code pertinent to the property? It's extremely rare that someone will spend a great deal of money to do something that's distasteful and potentially devaluing of their property.
 1. To provide greater flexibility there could be reduced setbacks for structures no taller than a predetermined height (possibly 15' for R-1-12 or smaller and 20' for R-1-15 or larger).
 - a. A minimum setback should be determined for rear yards and side yards.
 - b. This setback could be stepped to a greater amount as the height of the structure increases until the structure met the existing standard setbacks of the zone the property is located within. When this occurs the structure could revert to the maximum height of such zone.

EXHIBIT F.5

9) Section 21-11-1(h) *Conversion*

- a) **Possible Adjustment:** As per Wasatch Advocates for Livable Communities suggestion, the Planning Commission Should consider recommending to the City Council that the code provide an amnesty provision unpermitted accessory structures that could become safe, code-compliant housing under an amnesty provision.

10) Section 21-24-4 This section states all detached ADUs need to meet the minimum parking space requirements of Section 21-24-8(b)

- a) **Question:** This section does not include detached Extended Living Area structures is this because the parking associated with the detached Extended Living Areas are part of the primary dwelling's parking?

11) Section 21-24-8(b) *Table of Parking Requirements by Land Use Category*

- a) **Question:** The table states that no additional parking space is required if the property is located within a Station Area Plan. Should this complete reduction be allowed if the property has already received a reduction in required parking associated with the primary structure? Also, if we do provide a parking exemption, should this be limited to detached ADUs that are less than 650 sq. ft. and then require 1 parking stall for detached ADUs greater than 650 sq. ft.?
- b) **Possible Adjustment:** The Planning Commission should determine whether to make an alternative recommendation to the parking requirements detailed for properties located within a Station Area Plan.

12) Section 21-37-6 "E" Definitions (r)

- a) **Possible Adjustment:** This section states "Extended living area (detached) means additional and accessory living facilities detached from a primary single family dwelling that contains a kitchen, bathroom, sleeping areas, or other habitable areas designed for use by the occupants of the primary dwelling on a non-rental basis."
- i) The inclusion of the broad terminology of "or other habitable areas" will inadvertently capture structures, such as a workshop, pool house, or home office (and other structures), that often contain bathrooms, kitchens or kitchenettes, and other entertaining areas. If these structures are classified as detached Extended Living Areas then the property/parcel will not be able to build a detached ADU or a detached Extended Living Area with sleeping areas because only one detached ADU or detached Extended Living Area are allowed on a property/parcel.
- ii) The Planning Commission should determine whether to recommend to the City Council that "or other habitable areas" should be deleted from the sentence.

13) Sections 21-7-2 & 21-8-2 *Table of Uses*

- a) **Question:** What does the designation of S1 refer to? There isn't a legend that details what this means (or any of the other items in the tables).

EXHIBIT F.6

From: [Cameron Duncan](#)
To: [Melissa Anderson](#); [Mike Wilcox](#); [James Sorensen](#); [dbromley@ensignproperties.com](#); [Ron Mortimer](#); [Eyisha Malieitulia](#); [wrigley.steve@gmail.com](#); [Britney Ward](#); [Craig Kitterman](#); [Daniel Schoenfield](#); [Darien Alcorn](#); [David Hart](#); [Ivan Hooper](#); [Jake Warner](#); [Jennifer George](#); [LaNiece Davenport](#); [Sarah Stringham](#); [Travis Ackermann](#); [Brian McCuiston](#); [Cameron Duncan](#); [Clinton Spencer](#); [Cache Hancey](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] ADU notes
Date: Thursday, August 6, 2026 9:31:06 AM

CAUTION: Do not click links, open attachments, or reply, unless you recognize the sender's email address!

ADU notes

Melissa and our awesome planning staff, thank you for your efforts in putting this proposed ordinance together. This is the most 'planning' it feels like we have done in my time with the PC. Y'all are great to work with!

Dave thank you for your efforts in reviewing and giving thoughts on what to discuss and possible recommendations to the city council.

I know we will not all be in complete agreement and the council will only be taking our recommendations but I feel it's important we provide them with our vision and reasoning. I enjoy serving with you all and trust your final recommendations.

Sorry I could not meet in person I am in the last leg of my cross county odyssey!

1. Exhibits would be helpful to show challenges to existing smaller lots.
2. Property description - I agree requiring the home owner to include existing residence for a DADU is a bit much. Floor plans and elevations at a min. Why show smoke detectors and carbon monoxide at this phase, wouldn't that be part of the building permit same as egress windows ect.
3. Number of units permitted - I feel one internal ADU and one detached on larger lots. No more than 2. If a larger A zone property owner wants multiple units they would have the option to subdivide.
4. Entrances - I agree with Dave. This could limit corner lots and unique topography. We have seen where a smaller house sits on a larger lot and the owner subdivides off the larger part. The remaining lot and house would could be difficult to do a DADU or IADU without facing the front. Maybe the corner lot designs a single car garage for an IADU above the garage.
5. Design - I agree with Dave I think this could be a big barrier. If a house has a carport and the owner builds a detached garage with a breezeway they wouldn't be allowed to put the ADU above the garage. Connection to habitable area. I could see on larger lots having an attached ADU on the garage side. I am assuming the garage is not habitable? I feel that would prohibit someone from adding onto the garage side of the house with maybe a third car garage for the ADU. I agree with Dave this is too restrictive. And I think the number of properties is very limited.
6. Lighting - Does this requirement apply to primary units? My thought is the same applies

EXHIBIT F.7

to the ADU and the primary residence. I like the dark sky for all properties it's very easy to get lighting options that meet this requirement.

7. Design consistent - yes the ADU should match the style of the home. I don't like the idea that a single store home has a two story ADU, but I think for simplicity it would be better to stick to the underlying buildable area. If a property owner could build a two story primary residents or add a second story then the DADU should be allowed to be two story. If I had a single story home with a carport, I could remove the carport and add a garage with a second story ADU or a detached garage with a second story ADU. As long as it meets the lots setbacks, heights, and lot coverage.
8. I agree with Dave. Just because a property has the right to add an ADU it's expensive and not everyone wants to be a landlord. I would support all lot sizes allowing DADU's if they meet the lots setbacks, heights, and lot coverage. Location - same thoughts if it meets the lot buildable area I'm ok. There are some very nice developments that have carriage houses or casitas in the 'front yard'. Especially on the larger lots. Max size - I agree with Dave, I think most lots less than 11,000 wouldn't have the property to add a DADU larger than 75% and still meet the lot coverage. On larger lots with other outbuildings this needs a closer look or an updated table. I think of some of the larger detached garages we have allow over the years. If someone wanted to add a second story ADU would these lot coverage preclude that? Building heights and setbacks. I think stick with the lots buildable areas and heights. If a property owner could expand their primary residence by either footprint or height, then I think the ADU should be allowed in those areas.
9. Agree - structure needs to meet building codes but could be converted.
10. No comment
11. Parking - agree, no double dipping on parking reductions, but I like the idea for smaller ADU's studio or one bedroom. Larger ADU's could have one stall reduced.
12. I agree, it limits a few properties and could be vague.

Sent from my iPhone



**Wasatch Advocates
for Livable Communities**

August 5, 2026
Sandy City Planning Commission
Sandy City Hall
10000 Centennial Parkway, Sandy, UT 84070

Dear Chair and Commissioners:

On behalf of **Wasatch Advocates for Livable Communities (WALC)**, thank you for the work already underway to bring Sandy into compliance with SB 284's detached accessory dwelling unit (DADU) requirements. We support this ordinance and believe that Sandy City has the opportunity to craft an ordinance that will result in these much-needed smaller-scale homes getting built, not just check a compliance box.

When homeowners can build backyard cottages without jumping through excessive hoops, more of them will be able to contribute to the incremental growth of their community, creating housing that blends into neighborhoods while meeting real community needs: seniors looking to downsize in place, young families and local workers seeking more affordable options, intergenerational households, and more. All at virtually no cost to the city.

As drafted, several provisions of Sandy's ordinance will significantly reduce the opportunity for these homes to be built. We respectfully ask the Commission to consider the amendments below before sending a final recommendation to the City Council.

Who We Are

WALC is a network of neighbors across the Wasatch Front helping our region stay vibrant, welcoming, and full of opportunity for people at every stage of life. We work with residents, local leaders, and policymakers to advance practical, evidence-informed policies that support expanding housing choices and creating neighborhoods connected to jobs, schools, and daily needs.

We focus on solutions that work: in communities across Utah and across the country, and we offer technical support grounded in data, research, and real-world experience to help local governments. Our goal is to help your community understand what's proven effective, what challenges to anticipate, and how policies can be tailored to local conditions. WALC's core priorities include expanding housing choices, supporting walkable and connected neighborhoods, aligning land use and transportation decisions, and ensuring growth benefits both current and future residents.



**Wasatch Advocates
for Livable Communities**

We believe Sandy has an opportunity not only to comply with state law, but to go further: adopting a DADU ordinance that makes backyard cottages practical, accessible, and financially feasible for Sandy homeowners.

What the Research Shows

Our review of ADU policy across the country — academic literature, case studies of high-producing cities, and conversations with practitioners — points to three consistent drivers of ADU construction: removing red tape and unnecessary zoning barriers, giving homeowners clear information and a streamlined process, and pairing flexible rules with incentives for affordability.

Cities that lead on the first strategy — by-right approval, no minimum lot size, generous size and height allowances, reduced setbacks, and narrow or eliminated owner-occupancy rules — see measurably more ADUs actually get built. Every added layer of discretion, documentation, or restriction is a point where a willing homeowner drops out of the process. All of this means that public servants and the broader workforce, young families, and seniors struggle to find affordable homes in the community they want to come home to. Sandy has the opportunity to change this by creating new housing options, like ADUs, in your community.

Measured against that evidence base, several provisions in the current draft will make it harder for Sandy residents to build ADUs without a corresponding public benefit:

Lot Size

The draft sets the minimum lot size at 11,000 square feet, which is SB 284's statewide floor, but not a number Sandy chose. Other Utah cities lowered their minimum below that figure long before the state required anything. Layton has permitted detached ADUs on lots as small as **6,000 square feet** since 2021, Millcreek's current ordinance sets an **8,000-square-foot minimum**, and Clearfield sets **no minimum lot size**. Herriman, Farmington, Syracuse, and Murray all set their DADU lot-size threshold at **10,000 square feet**. We'd ask the Commission to treat 11,000 square feet as a starting point, not a ceiling, and revisit it as part of the ordinance's next iteration.

Setbacks & Height

Every foot of setback directly shrinks the footprint available for a functional cottage layout. West Jordan requires just **6 feet from rear and interior side property lines**, a meaningfully smaller setback requirement that still leaves adequate separation from neighboring structures. Sandy's draft requires an expanded, full-zone setback to build above 15 feet, which isn't how comparable Utah ordinances treat height. For example, Draper simply ties DADU



**Wasatch Advocates
for Livable Communities**

height to the underlying zone's main-building height limit, with no separate setback trade-off required to build taller.

Design Requirements

Draft provisions requiring the DADU's exterior materials, roof pitch, and architectural style to match the primary dwelling add real cost and complexity. For homeowners on a tight budget, a design-match mandate can be the difference between a feasible project and one that's priced out entirely, without any corresponding benefit to how the ADU functions or how it's experienced by neighbors, most of whom won't see it from the street.

No Path for Unpermitted Units

The conversion allowance only covers legally permitted accessory structures built before October 1, 2026. Sandy almost certainly has existing unpermitted accessory structures that could become safe, code-compliant housing under an amnesty provision.

Owner-Occupancy Documentation

The draft requires a deed, government ID, notarized affidavit, and proof from tax returns, voter registration, and three utility bills, with no defined exceptions for military service, medical care, or a professionally managed rental. **This is one of the heaviest owner-occupancy verification packages we've seen in a Utah ordinance, and it will discourage otherwise-eligible homeowners before they start.**

One-ADU-Per-Lot Cap

Sandy's draft allows only one ADU per lot — internal or detached, not both — which mirrors the current default in most Utah cities but **forecloses a real housing-production opportunity: a homeowner who has already built out a basement unit gets no path to add a second, smaller unit even where the lot and infrastructure could support it.** We'd encourage Sandy to treat this as an area worth revisiting rather than assuming the one-per-lot default is the only option, particularly on larger lots where both units could comfortably meet setback and parking standards.

Restoring Parking Flexibility

Excessive parking mandates are one of the most common and most avoidable barriers to affordable housing production. A single required stall can add tens of thousands of dollars to a project, consume yard space that would otherwise fit the unit itself, and make an already-tight



**Wasatch Advocates
for Livable Communities**

lot infeasible altogether. **Sandy waiving that requirement for DADUs proposed within a Station Area Plan is exactly the kind of evidence-based, low-cost policy change that unlocks real production, and we'd welcome a conversation about extending a similar approach citywide.**

We also want to credit the draft's 75%-of-primary-dwelling-footprint allowance, which is a more workable buildable footprint than several peer ordinances offer and gives homeowners real flexibility to design a functional one-bedroom layout rather than a cramped studio. Sandy has chosen to lead in this regard and we encourage you to do so in other areas as well.

We're grateful for the Commission's careful consideration of this ordinance and for Sandy's timely work to comply with state law ahead of the October 2026 deadline. We're happy to serve as a resource as this ordinance moves toward a final recommendation.

Respectfully,

Lauren Cole

Policy Manager, Wasatch Advocates for Livable Communities

lauren@wasatchalc.org

EXHIBIT F.12

From: [Tracee De La Cruz](#)
To: [PLAN](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Expressing Support for Sandy's DADU Ordinance
Date: Thursday, August 6, 2026 4:23:51 PM

CAUTION: Do not click links, open attachments, or reply, unless you recognize the sender's email address!

You don't often get email from civcinput@newmode.io. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Sandy City Planning Commission,

As a Sandy resident, I'm writing to ask you to strengthen the city's draft DADU ordinance before it moves forward. I support Sandy's compliance with Senate Bill 284, but I'd like to see the ordinance go further.

Wasatch Advocates for Livable Communities (WALC) submitted a letter to the Planning Commission reviewing the draft ordinance in detail. Their findings point to several places where the current draft goes beyond what state law requires and makes it harder than it needs to be for Sandy homeowners to actually build a DADU — from lot size and setbacks to design requirements, permitting paths, owner-occupancy documentation, and parking.

I'd ask the Commission and City Council to review WALC's recommendations and adopt them as part of the final ordinance. A DADU ordinance that makes it easy for homeowners to build these small homes means more housing options for families like mine — for seniors looking to downsize, young families, and local workers — without changing what makes our neighborhoods work.

Thank you for your consideration.

Tracee De La Cruz

mytiabella@msn.com, 9727 Allison Circle, Sandy, UT, US, 84070

EXHIBIT F.13

From: [James Longstaff](#)
To: [PLAN](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Expressing Support for Sandy's DADU Ordinance
Date: Thursday, August 6, 2026 12:54:37 PM

CAUTION: Do not click links, open attachments, or reply, unless you recognize the sender's email address!

You don't often get email from civcinput@newmode.io. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Sandy City Planning Commission,

As a Sandy resident, I'm writing to ask you to strengthen the city's draft DADU ordinance before it moves forward. I support Sandy's compliance with Senate Bill 284, but I'd like to see the ordinance go further.

I live near Park Lane Elementary and my neighbors' children attend that school. Canyons School District has cited low enrollment as a driving reason to close Park Lane Elementary. I believe strengthening Sandy's draft DADU ordinance will attract more young families my neighborhood which will in turn increase enrollment.

Wasatch Advocates for Livable Communities (WALC) submitted a letter to the Planning Commission reviewing the draft ordinance in detail. Their findings point to several places where the current draft goes beyond what state law requires and makes it harder than it needs to be for Sandy homeowners to actually build a DADU — from lot size and setbacks to design requirements, permitting paths, owner-occupancy documentation, and parking.

I'd ask the Commission and City Council to review WALC's recommendations and adopt them as part of the final ordinance. A DADU ordinance that makes it easy for homeowners to build these small homes means more housing options for families like mine — for seniors looking to downsize, young families, and local workers — without changing what makes our neighborhoods work.

Thank you for your consideration.

James Longstaff

jklongstaff@gmail.com, 2285 10095 South, Sandy, UT, US, 84092

EXHIBIT F.14

From: [Mike Wilcox](#)
To: [Melissa Anderson](#)
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Expressing Support for Sandy's DADU Ordinance
Date: Friday, August 7, 2026 4:33:24 PM
Attachments: [image001.jpg](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)

FYI

Sandy City Logo



Mike Wilcox
Planning Director

10000 S. Centennial Pkwy. | Sandy, UT 84070
o: 801.568.7261 | f: 801.568.7278
mwilcox@sandy.utah.gov

sandy.utah.gov



From: Suzanne Gallegos <civiciput@newmode.io>
Sent: Friday, August 7, 2026 9:00 AM
To: PLAN <plan@sandy.utah.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Expressing Support for Sandy's DADU Ordinance

CAUTION: Do not click links, open attachments, or reply, unless you recognize the sender's email address!

You don't often get email from civiciput@newmode.io. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Sandy City Planning Commission,

As a Sandy resident, I'm writing to ask you to strengthen the city's draft DADU ordinance before it moves forward. I support Sandy's compliance with Senate Bill 284, but I'd like to see the ordinance go further.

Wasatch Advocates for Livable Communities (WALC) submitted a letter to the Planning Commission reviewing the draft ordinance in detail. Their findings point to several places where the current draft goes beyond what state law requires and makes it harder than it needs to be for Sandy homeowners to actually build a DADU — from lot size and setbacks to design requirements, permitting paths, owner-occupancy documentation, and parking.

I'd ask the Commission and City Council to review WALC's recommendations and adopt them as part of the final ordinance. A DADU ordinance that makes it easy for homeowners to build these small homes means more housing options for families like mine — for seniors looking to downsize, young families, and local workers — without changing what makes our

EXHIBIT F.15

neighborhoods work.

Thank you for your consideration.

Suzanne Gallegos

suzannegallegos@gmail.com, 1022 Broken Ridge Court, Sandy, UT, US, 84094

EXHIBIT F.16

From: [Sarah Roberts](#)
To: [PLAN](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Expressing Support for Sandy's DADU Ordinance
Date: Friday, August 7, 2026 11:42:51 AM

CAUTION: Do not click links, open attachments, or reply, unless you recognize the sender's email address!

You don't often get email from civcinput@newmode.io. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Sandy City Planning Commission,

As a Sandy resident, I'm writing to ask you to strengthen the city's draft DADU ordinance before it moves forward. I support Sandy's compliance with Senate Bill 284, but I'd like to see the ordinance go further.

Wasatch Advocates for Livable Communities (WALC) submitted a letter to the Planning Commission reviewing the draft ordinance in detail. Their findings point to several places where the current draft goes beyond what state law requires and makes it harder than it needs to be for Sandy homeowners to actually build a DADU — from lot size and setbacks to design requirements, permitting paths, owner-occupancy documentation, and parking.

I'd ask the Commission and City Council to review WALC's recommendations and adopt them as part of the final ordinance. A DADU ordinance that makes it easy for homeowners to build these small homes means more housing options for families like mine — for seniors looking to downsize, young families, and local workers — without changing what makes our neighborhoods work.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sarah Roberts

sarahconstanceroberts@gmail.com, 443 Bradley Way, Sandy, UT, US, 84070

EXHIBIT F.17

From: [Mike Wilcox](#)
To: [Melissa Anderson](#)
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Expressing Support for Sandy's DADU Ordinance
Date: Monday, August 10, 2026 9:16:03 AM
Attachments: [image001.jpg](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)

FYI

Sandy City Logo



Mike Wilcox
Planning Director

10000 S. Centennial Pkwy. | Sandy, UT 84070
o: 801.568.7261 | f: 801.568.7278
mwilcox@sandy.utah.gov

sandy.utah.gov



From: Leslie Nelson <civicinput@newmode.io>
Sent: Saturday, August 8, 2026 4:16 PM
To: PLAN <plan@sandy.utah.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Expressing Support for Sandy's DADU Ordinance

CAUTION: Do not click links, open attachments, or reply, unless you recognize the sender's email address!

You don't often get email from civicinput@newmode.io. [Learn why this is important](#)

Dear Sandy City Planning Commission,

As a Sandy resident, I'm writing to ask you to strengthen the city's draft DADU ordinance before it moves forward. I support Sandy's compliance with Senate Bill 284, but I'd like to see the ordinance go further.

Wasatch Advocates for Livable Communities (WALC) submitted a letter to the Planning Commission reviewing the draft ordinance in detail. Their findings point to several places where the current draft goes beyond what state law requires and makes it harder than it needs to be for Sandy homeowners to actually build a DADU — from lot size and setbacks to design requirements, permitting paths, owner-occupancy documentation, and parking.

I'd ask the Commission and City Council to review WALC's recommendations and adopt them as part of the final ordinance. A DADU ordinance that makes it easy for homeowners to build these small homes means more housing options for families like mine — for seniors looking to downsize, young families, and local workers — without changing what makes our

EXHIBIT F.18

neighborhoods work.

Thank you for your consideration.

Leslie Nelson

swede1956@gmail.com, 9901 Evening Moon Way, Sandy, UT, US, 84070