AGENDA
HIGHLAND CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Tuesday, June 25, 2019, *6:30 p.m.

Highland City Council Chambers, 5400 West Civic Center Drive, Highland Utah

CALL TO ORDER: Chris Kemp, Chair
- Attendance – Chris Kemp, Chair
- Invocation – Commissioner Tim Ball
- Pledge of Allegiance – Commissioner Claude Jones

*CLOSED SESSION:

The Highland City Planning Commission may temporarily recess the meeting to convene in a closed session to discuss pending or reasonably imminent litigation, as provided by Utah Code Annotated §52-4-205.

APPEARANCES:

Time has been set aside for the public to express their ideas, concerns, and comments on non-agenda items. Speakers will be limited to three (3) minutes.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

1. **SP-19-02 & CU-19-02** Highland Hideaway Storage is requesting approval of a Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit for a flex office use building located approximately at 11251 N. Sunset Drive.

OTHER BUSINESS:

- Electronic Packets

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

- Approval of the May 28, 2019 meeting minutes.

ADJOURNMENT:

NEXT MEETING: **July 9, 2019** at 7:00 pm City Council Chambers

Legislative: An action of a legislative body to adopt laws or polices.
Administrative: An action reviewing an application for compliance with adopted laws and policies.

FOR SPECIAL ACCOMMODATIONS

Any individual with a qualified disability may request a reasonable accommodation by contacting the City Recorder at (801) 772-4506 at least 48 hours prior to the Commission meeting.

CERTIFICATE OF POSTING

The undersigned does hereby certify that the above agenda notice was posted in three public places within Highland City limits on this 20th day of June, 2019. These public places being bulletin boards located inside the City offices and located in the Highland Justice Center, 5400 W. Civic Center Drive, Highland, UT; and the bulletin board located inside Lone Peak Fire Station, Highland, UT. On this 20th day of June, 2019 the above agenda notice was posted on the Highland City website at www.highlandcity.org.

*Amended- Posted and dated this 24th day of June, 2019

Tara Tannahill, Planning Coordinator
DATE: June 25, 2019
TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Tara Tannahill
 Planner & GIS Analyst
SUBJECT: PUBLIC HEARING AND ACTION – A request by Highland Hideaway Storage for a Site Plan approval and Conditional Use permit of flex office buildings located in the Professional Office Zone south of 11251 N. Sunset Drive (SP-19-02 and CU-19-02) Administrative

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
The Planning Commission should hold a public meeting and:

1) Recommend approval of the conditional use permit with appropriate stipulations. Staff has prepared draft stipulations that could be used. Additional stipulations may also be needed. The Commission may include any conditions which are deemed necessary to mitigate potential impacts and insure compatibility of the use with surrounding development, insure compliance with this ordinance, and which are required to preserve the public health, safety, and general welfare; or

2) Recommend denial the conditional use permit. If the Commission recommends denial the conditional use permit, appropriate and specific findings will need to be drafted; or

3) Continue the conditional use permit to allow the applicant to address the issues outlined by the Commission in accordance with Section 3-4902.

PRIOR REVIEW:
On January 26, 2019 and April 30, 2019 Planning Commission voted unanimously to continue the request in order to have the applicant change the architecture elevations of the building to appear more residential. The elevations have been revised and are shown on Attachment 8.

BACKGROUND:
Professional Office District:
The PO District was approved in 2003. The zone was drafted to accommodate the storage facility and a number of professional office buildings along Highland Boulevard. A Development Agreement was also approved in 2003. A specific site plan was included as part of the approval. There have been a few amendments to the PO District since the
original approval. These amendments related to assisted living facilities and changes to the site plan.

Section 3-4902.7 Conditional Uses states:
7) Any other conditional or other types of professional services which the Planning Commission and City Council determine to be compatible with the intent of the zone.

Section 3-4903.1 Prohibited Uses States:
1) Determination of Use – Whenever a use has not specifically been identified in the foregoing classification, it shall be the duty of the City Planning Commission to determine if said use:
   (a) Is consistent with the intended use of the PO Zone; and
   (b) Is compatible with the other listed uses; and
   (c) Is compatible with the uses of adjacent properties.

In the Professional Office (P.O Zone) District the City Council is the approval body for a site plan and conditional use permit, after receiving a recommendation from the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission is the approval body for the architectural review.

Conditional Uses:
Conditional uses are uses that are meant to give limited flexibility in the review of an application. In Highland, the Planning Commission makes a recommendation to the City Council. A conditional use is regulated by the following standards:

(1) A land use ordinance may include conditional uses and provisions for conditional uses that require compliance with standards set forth in an applicable ordinance.
(2)
(a) A conditional use shall be approved if reasonable conditions are proposed, or can be imposed, to mitigate the reasonably anticipated detrimental effects of the proposed use in accordance with applicable standards.
(b) If the reasonably anticipated detrimental effects of a proposed conditional use cannot be substantially mitigated by the proposal or the imposition of reasonable conditions to achieve compliance with applicable standards, the conditional use may be denied.

If a use is allowed as a conditional use it is assumed that the use is desirable but that it may require an extra level of review. Denial must be based on some factor unique to the proposed location that renders the potential negative effects of the proposed use beyond mitigation. Mitigation means to temper or reduce the negative aspects, not eliminate them.

The action taken in response to an application must be supported by substantial evidence
in the record. Substantial evidence is evidence that is relevant and credible. To be
relevant, it must relate to the standards in the ordinance. To be credible it must be
objective and independent.

SUMMARY OF THE REQUEST:
1. The applicant is requesting site plan, architectural plan, and conditional use permit
   approval for a 20,064 square foot office warehouse building. The property is located
   approximately at 11251 North Sunset Drive and is 2.13 acres. The petitioner does not
   have any tenants at this time.

2. Vehicular access will be provided from sunset drive and a shared road with church of
   Jesus Christ of LDS and an undeveloped lot by Meadowbrook Land, LLC on the east.
   The site will also provide cross access to the storage facility to the north. Access to the
   storage facility is also available through Highland Hideaway Storage’s main entrance.

3. The loading will be in the back of the facility are ground level, intended to allow
   FedEx or other deliver trucks.

4. Access to the property is from sunset drive and a shared driveway with the property
   owners to the east.

5. There are 46 parking stalls provided with two designated handicap parking stalls.

6. Hours of operation will be 8:00 am to 6:00 pm Monday through Saturday. Number of
   employees is unknown at this time.

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION:
The meeting notification sign was posted on the property December 28, 2019 and the
neighborhood meeting was held on January 8, 2019. One resident attended the meeting
and seventeen written correspondences have been received not in favor of the project.

Notice of the Planning Commission meeting was published in the Daily Herald on January
13, 2019 and posted on the state website January 10, 2019. Notification of the public
hearing associated with this meeting was mailed to all property owners within 500 feet of
the proposed site on January 15, 2019. Staff has received 29 emails in opposition of the
project (Attachment 3).

REQUIRED FINDINGS:
The Planning Commission must determine that the proposed use meets three
findings prior to granting a Conditional Use Permit. The burden of proof rests
with the applicant. Each finding is presented below along with staff’s analysis.
1. The use will not be detrimental to the health, safety, or general welfare of persons residing or working in the vicinity or injurious to property or improvements in the vicinity.

The property to the north and west is zoned PO and is the existing storage facility. The property to the south is also zoned PO and is vacant. The property has been approved for non-residential uses. The property on the east side of Highland Boulevard is zoned R-1-40 and has been developed as single family homes. The proposed use will be a minimum of 125 feet from an existing residential homes. The proposed use is compatible with the surrounding land uses.

2. The use complies with all applicable regulations in the Development Code.

The Development Code allows uses in the PO District that are not specifically listed if it is determined that the proposed use is compatible with the intent of the zone.

The site plan provides adequate access and onsite circulation for the proposed use. There are 46 parking stalls provided. The Development Code requires 20.

A landscape plan has been submitted showing a minimum of 35% landscaping. No landscaping was demonstrated on the median on Highland Blvd. A stipulation has been included to address this issue.

The proposed architecture includes the elements required in Section 3-4922 of the Development Code. Materials include stone veneer, CMU block, wood shutters, and wood pitched accents. The original submissions materials included split face block, smooth face block, and metal accents. The second submissions materials included split face block, stone veneer, and wood pitched accents.

All lighting meets the requirements of Section 3-4915 of the Development Code.

All utility and mechanical is required to be screened from view. A stipulation has been included to address this issue.

The building height is a maximum of 30 feet. Due to the topography of the site the height will be lower if measured from Highland Boulevard.

There is an existing 40-foot water line easement that runs through the property from north to south. This limits the types of improvements that can be constructed.

The site plan is being reviewed by the Fire Marshall. The Fire Marshall is requesting that the northern driveway be extended to allow full turning movements for emergency vehicles.
A stipulation has been included to address compliance with any issues.

3. **Conditions are imposed to mitigate any detrimental effects.**

Draft stipulations have been included to ensure compliance with the Development Code.

**RECOMMENDATION:**
The Planning Commission should hold a public meeting and:

1) Recommend approval of the conditional use permit with appropriate stipulations. Staff has prepared draft stipulations that could be used. Additional stipulations may also be needed. The Commission may include any conditions which are deemed necessary to mitigate potential impacts and insure compatibility of the use with surrounding development, insure compliance with this ordinance, and which are required to preserve the public health, safety, and general welfare; or

2) Recommend denial the conditional use permit. If the Commission recommends denial the conditional use permit, appropriate and specific findings will need to be drafted; or

3) Continue the conditional use permit to allow the applicant to address the issues outlined by the Commission in accordance with Section 3-4902.

**DRAFT STIPULATIONS:**
The following are draft stipulations.

1. Development of the site shall comply with the site plan January 23, 2019 and building elevations dated May 23, 2019 except as modified by these stipulations.
2. All signage shall require a separate permit and comply with the Development Code requirements.
3. Final civil engineering plans shall be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer. The site shall meet all requirements of the City Engineer.
4. Final civil engineering plans shall be reviewed and approved by the Fire Marshall.
5. Prior to council consideration an updated landscape plan will be provided demonstrating the improvements to Highland Blvd median.

The following stipulations are suggested for the Commission to discuss to address the architectural issues the Commission has raised in previous meetings:

1) The building shall be broken into a maximum of 64 foot linear segments. Each segments shall be designed to appear as separate buildings. Each segments shall include the following within appropriate proportions: A main architectural entrance towers similar to the main proposed towers and two smaller towers or the entrance shall be flanked by towers.
2) A minimum 2-4-foot separation shall be included in the front façade every sixty feet.
3) Different materials shall be used on the first and second stories excluding the tower elements.
4) Decorative canopies consistent with the front elevation shall be installed over all doors on the rear elevation.
5) Windows, matching what is proposed, shall be installed on the second story of the left hand side of the south, east and west elevations.
6) The east and west elevations shall include horizontal elements to provide visual relief.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**
This action will not have a financial impact on this fiscal year’s budget expenditures.

**ATTACHMENTS:**
1. Vicinity Map
2. Project narrative
3. Letters from citizens
4. 2003 Development Agreement Site Plan
5. Proposed site plan and updated elevations dated February 14, 2019
6. January 9, 2019 Architecture Elevation
7. April 24, 2019 Architecture Elevation
8. May 23, 2019 Architecture Elevation
Project Narrative

To: Highland City

From: Ken Berg, P.E., Berg Civil Engineering

Subject: Highland Office and Warehouse Park

Proposed Use
Highland Office and Warehouse Park is a project comprised of several adjacent office warehouses. These office warehouses can be used for a variety of companies. Some uses include but are not limited to the following: Dance studio, Daycare Center, Mom and Pop shop and other small businesses. The exact use of each office warehouse may vary slightly from the next but will be consistent with the General Plan and compliant with the Development Code and other city codes and regulations.

Consistency with the General Plan
The general plan currently shows this area to be Professional Office. The proposed use meets this requirement.

Development Code Compliance
Based upon Article 4.9 Professional Office (“P.O.”) Zone, allows for the following:

1. Professional offices and services including but not limited to: architects, engineers, contractors, real estate offices, property managers, and mortgage and title offices.
2. Financial or legal offices consisting of but not limited to: banks, insurance offices, and law or accounting offices.
3. Medically related offices/services consisting of but not limited to: doctor’s office, dentist’s office, pharmacy, physical therapy, optometrists, chiropractors, counselors, and psychiatrists.
4. Other types of Professional Services including but not limited to: information technology services, marketing, travel and employment agencies, journalists, collection agencies, educational services, music studios, photography studios, churches, colleges & schools (academic, pre-schools, special education, indoor instruction only).
5. Art and craft galleries, and studios for the teaching of arts and crafts.
6. Any other conditional uses or other types of professional services which the Planning Commission and City Council determine to be compatible with the intent of the Zone.

Based upon Article 3-4905 allows for the following:

Coverage of a site by a building shall not exceed thirty (30) percent.

| Total project size | 23 ac | 100% |
| Storage & Office Buildings | 6.90 ac | 30% |

All site plan configurations, landscaping and/or natural open space shall occupy no less than thirty-five percent (35%) of the total

As per the Open Space Table in the attached Overall Master Plan for the overall project the total project as able to maintain the required 35% open space required by the zone.
**General Compatibility of proposed use with adjacent property**

The proposed addition is located centrally in the existing Professional Office (PO) Zone. This addition will be surrounded on the West and North by existing storage sheds, and by the East and South by future professional office buildings. The proposed use is compatible with its surroundings.

**Site the building design with exterior lighting**

The proposed buildings will be similar to the existing buildings as shown in the attached colored elevations. The exterior lighting will be minimized with downward directed lighting.

**Ingress and Egress**

The proposed addition will be accessed from Sunset Drive and a new driveway to the East. No additional roadway access points along Highland Blvd are proposed. The site has been designed to allow for emergency vehicles to turn within the site as shown on the site plan.

**Pedestrian and alternative vehicles**

No pedestrian or alternative vehicle improvements are proposed for this storage shed site.

**Volume and character of traffic**

Using the Institute of Transportation Engineers, Trip Generation, 10th Edition, the land use code of 130 – Industrial Park was used to identify the Peak PM trips associated with this land use (20,000 sf of Flex Warehouse) = 8 PM Peak Hour Trips.

**Impact of public services**

Water & sewer connections for each unit are proposed for the site. A common landscape connection is proposed for the common landscaping. There will be no impacts to surrounding schools or recreation facilities.

**Screening and buffering**

A 21 foot landscaping buffer along Highland Blvd is required and is shown on the site plan.

**Proposed outdoor activities or storage**

No outdoor storage activities allowed.

**Hours of operation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office Hours</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday - Saturday</td>
<td>8:00 AM - 6:00 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of employees**

Number of employees is unknown at this time. The number of parking spaces is based upon typical office requirements.

**Noise, smoke, odor, dust, vibration, or illumination created by the proposed use.**

After construction, there will be low to no impacts of noise, smoke, odor, dust, vibration or illumination created by the storage sheds.

Regards,

Ken R. Berg, PE
Email from Melinda Ashton dated January 23, 2019:

My name is Melinda Ashton and I live in the Country French Development. I agree with the following letter written by Jamie Frischknecht.

To whom it may concern,

I am a resident of Highland city, and I live in the Ivory Homes development on the west side of Highland Boulevard. I want to add my voice to that of many other residents in opposition to the development of the Patterson warehouse building. I have looked up the Zoning Requirements for Professional Offices built in Highland City stated in Chapter 3, Article 4.9, Section 3-4901. We expect all development in the Professional Office Zone where the Patterson warehouse is proposed to be built to adhere to the primary intent and purpose of the Zone. I have copied this information from the code:

(2) The overall intent of these regulations is to establish a standard for professional office and storage facility development and maintenance which:

(a) Promotes the overall functionality, safety and visual attractiveness of professional office buildings, storage facilities, accompanying substructures, and surrounding landscape;

(b) Promotes architecture with a residential flavor;

(c) Promotes development which works in harmony with the open, rural atmosphere of Highland City;

(d) Prevents the erection of buildings or substructures with an industrial or a pre-fabricated appearance;

HIGHLAND CITY DEVELOPMENT CODE 9-Jan-14 - 143 – and; . . . .

The current proposal for the warehouse does not fit these requirements. To comply with the required “visual attractiveness” and work with “the harmony” of the “open rural atmosphere of Highland City” and prevent an “industrial appearance”, the proposal will need some major adjustments. If the building is approved, Patterson will need to take on the additional cost to give the building a residential façade that matches our neighborhood, similar to that of the current Patterson building and the Highland Hideaway Storage. While we appreciate proposals of a sidewalk, tree-lined park strip, and retaining wall, we expect the building to follow the zoning guidelines of Highland City. The building cannot have an industrial appearance. We live in a nice neighborhood that does not include warehouses and industrial buildings. These type of buildings need to be built in industrial areas.

We have an additional concern for the number of transportation trucks that will presumable accompany the presence of a warehouse. This will surely increase traffic problems and pedestrian safety in the area.

We ask that you not approve the construction of a warehouse building in our neighborhood. If the building is approved, we expect that it will be built in compliance with Highland city code.
Please consider our concerns as you consider the approval of this building.

Thank you,

Jamie Frischknecht

801-427-3084

---

Email from Amber Gueck dated January 15, 2019:

To whom it may concern,

I live in Highland in an Ivory homes neighborhood off of Highland Blvd. and I’m concerned about the news that Patterson Construction is considering building an office warehouse near the storage units off of Highland Blvd. We chose to move to Highland (from CA) about 4 years ago because we liked the scenery, open space, and the neighborhoods with large lots. We drive past the storage units on Highland Blvd very often and they’re not very noticeable, the new church getting built in that area is noticeable, but attractive, and when I picture an office warehouse being built in that same area, I can’t imagine that to be attractive, or add to the “welcoming” neighborhood feel. I don’t know anything about Patterson Const., but I keep hearing about them in Highland neighborhood/community conversations or emails and I always come away from the dialogue with the impression that Patterson Construction doesn’t care what the people LIVING IN the community desire. I hope that the planning commission will take into consideration how an office warehouse being built on land that is the main entrance to our neighborhood will affect the ambiance of our neighborhood in an unattractive way. This would’ve had an affect on our decision to move here if we had known about it. Thank you for taking the time to read this.

Best regards,

Amber Gueck

---

Email from Anne Hansen dated January 14, 2019:

Planning Commission:

**RE: 11251 N. Sunset Dr / Highland / Highland Hideaway Storage**

I do not support the proposal for a Conditional Use Permit for 2.13 acres by Andrew Patterson. This property is at the entrances of Bull River HOA and Country French Estates as well as the entrance to our city. Highland City is predominantly a bedroom community. Placing warehouses adjacent to high end properties will only bring property values down; bring in more truck traffic; excessive congestion to an already congested intersection (entrance to the commuters lane) and potential work activities at night. Please deny this permit.

Thank you for your consideration.

Anne Sward Hansen

11349 N. Tamarack Dr.
Email from Cynthia Shaw dated January 16, 2019:

To who it may concern,

My husband and I moved to Highland 2 1/2 years ago after 31 years in Las Vegas. While in Las Vegas, we enjoyed living in Summerlin, a beautifully master-planned community. When we moved to Highland, we were attracted to the city because it had a feeling of being a master-planned community. It appeared family friendly, classy, harmonious and spacious, with lovely architecture. I have just learned that Patterson, the company who developed my subdivision, wants to build an industrial warehouse on the corner of Highland Blvd and Timpanogus Highway. I am vehemently opposed to an industrial-looking building at the entrance of our pleasant little community. To build something like that would be akin to destroying the curb appeal of a house. And I know for a fact that my neighbors object to the project as I do. Please review this plan in light of all of us who would be negatively affect by this unattractive warehouse in our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Shaw

11272 N. Calais Circle,

Highland, UT 84003

Email from Danielle Bailey dated January 16, 2019:

Hi, my name is Danielle Bailey and I am resident of the country French neighborhood in Highland across from the storage unit facility. We have lived there for 10 years.

I have heard about the proposed plan from Patterson to build warehouses north of the storage units and want to share my opinion as a homeowner.

I am highly against this development. When we moved here, we were assured by several people including realtors, that Highland was a bedroom community and was very particular and protective of that title. To me, that means there would be no industrial or office buildings near our neighborhood.

I am frankly disappointed in the unfinished islands and sidewalks on highland Blvd west of our neighborhood. I thought the Developer was responsible for beautifying that and they have done nothing. To me that is something simple that can be done and makes a big difference.

I am from Southern California with a mother that has served on city council and as mayor of Whittier for several years. She said she is shocked at what some of our streets look like in comparison to the type of neighborhoods they border.

I feel like Patterson seems to do what they feel like doing, and these warehouses would be an extension of that. I’ve also been told that none of the main guys from Patterson even live in Highland. I feel with multi million dollar homes just a few feet away, the worst thing for property values and beautification,
which would also affect the city would be to build these warehouses. My suggestion would be another
development of homes.

I would never move to a neighborhood with existing buildings and I think building the warehouses would
discourage people from moving to the surrounding area, which hurts Highland in the long run.

There is plenty of opportunity to build these warehouses elsewhere. Building homes instead I know
would not bring in the same revenue, but it would keep the property values higher in the surrounding
areas, which would be beneficial for long term tax revenue.

Please do not let this happen. Keep our community beautiful and accurate to what Highland advertises.

Thank you for your consideration, Danielle Bailey

Email from Emily Norton dated January 14, 2019:

To whom it may concern:

We are from the View Pointe neighborhood and we started the process about a year ago to purchase
the open space land behind our homes. There are about 30 homes we have been coordinating with that
wish to purchase land. Another street in our neighborhood was able to purchase their land after a few
years of working towards it. We had already gotten all of our signatures and application filed and were
well on our way to completing the process when we found out about the price change per square foot.
This completely blindsided us and we were not properly informed in advance of this change coming
down the pike. If we had known, we most assuredly would have sped up our process to make sure we
could secure the land at the lower price. The fact is, if we cannot purchase the land at the original $1.40
per square foot we were originally told, all of our homes will withdraw, which could potentially be tens
of thousands of dollars. We wanted to inform you that we would like to come speak to you on Monday
about the potential of letting us be grandfathered into the previous rate of $1.40, since we were already
very close to completing the process. Thank you for your time and we look forward to meeting with you.

Amy Peachey, Emily Norton and

View Pointe Neighbors

Email from Ken & Gloria Williams dated January 16, 2019:

Hello,

In regards to the proposed Patterson Warehouse planned to go in adjacent to the storage units on
Highland Blvd, my husband and I are very much opposed to the idea as it will detract significantly from
the residents view across Highland Blvd, in addition to detracting from and lessening the value of
surrounding homes and neighborhoods. Unless there's the possibility of making it look like the Patterson
offices that look like homes on the corner of Highland Blvd and SR92.

Thank you.
Sincerely,

Ken and Gloria Williams

Email from Ivy Tornow dated January 15, 2019:

My family lives in the Country French Estates off of Highland Boulevard. We have been informed that Andrew Patterson has requested a Conditional Use Permit so that he can build a warehouse on Highland Boulevard. We moved to Highland a year and half ago to be in a beautiful residential neighborhood surrounded by an aesthetically pleasing community. When we purchased there were two commercial buildings on Highland Boulevard; Hideaway Storage Units and the office building on the corner of SR 92 and Highland Blvd. We do not need any warehouses in the area. It will decrease the value of our beautiful residential area if people have to drive through a warehouse district on their way to our homes. I ask that Patterson be denied a Conditional Use Permit for this project because it means that it is an exception to the current zone. Please force them to keep Highland aesthetically pleasing as it currently is. If we allow one warehouse to be built then it sets a standard for others to be built and devalue our neighborhood.

Highland is a fabulous community and we want to keep it a special place to live and raise our families. Thank you for holding fast on the current zoning to keep it that way.

Sincerely,

Ivy Tornow

505-947-5252

Email from Janet Eyring dated January 10, 2019:

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a concerned resident at 6727 W. Spring Hollow Lane, Highland who is opposed to the Pattersons' building an office warehouse on Highland Blvd. next to the Hideaway Storage Units. There are several concerns I have about this project. First the height of the buildings and the commercial look of the buildings do not fit into the “look and feel” of the surrounding neighborhoods. If the plans could be altered to sink the building and surround it with trees, this would greatly improve the appearance of the structure and help reduce noise and tone down lighting. Highland Blvd. is the entrance to 3 communities: Bull River, Country French, and Dry Creek, all of which are trying to maintain a residential versus commercial feel. I hope new plans can be drawn up which address some of these issues I have mentioned. I plan to attend the meeting on January 29 to further voice my opinion on this issue.

Sincerely,

Dr. Janet Eyring
Email from Jenelle Cox dated January 9, 2019:

To whom it may concern,

We as residents of Highland are concerned about the proposed building on Highland Blvd. next to the storage units. We moved here and built high-end homes in a bedroom community for peace and beauty. Everywhere we turn building is going on. It is unfortunate that the developers cannot see the value of having beautiful neighborhoods kept away from industry and commercial buildings. Isn't there enough office warehouses being built all along the freeway? It is overdone and becoming an eyesore. Please do not bring that this far into our city and ruin our neighborhoods. It isn't all about money. It is also about lifestyle and raising families in areas untainted by commercialism.

Please care.

Jenelle Cox

Email from Jill Tew dated January 9, 2019:

We've been told Patterson is wanting to build some warehouses on the southwest corner of Highland Blvd near SR-92. PLEASE do not let them do this! We moved to Highland to get away from the ugly industrial buildings. PLEASE keep our community looking nice. IF commercial buildings have to be built, PLEASE keep them to one level so they don't block the view of the mountains. We do not want to look at ugly buildings every time we leave our homes.

Thank you for preserving our community!

Jill Tew

Email from Johanna Warr dated January 9, 2019:

Hi,

I’m writing to express my concern about the commercial building development that is proposed to happen across the street from my Country French neighborhood. What can I do to voice my opinion and help put a stop to having a 2 story commercial office building go up right there?

Sincerely,

Johanna Warr

801-995-0925

Email from Laura Mustard dated January 11, 2019:

Thank you for your quick response, Mr. Mayor.
And thank you, Manuel, for your efforts and willingness to speak on behalf of our community in the interest of keeping it beautiful.

Mr. Mayor, while you may not have the regular opportunity to hear directly from members of the community, please know that all of our neighbors at Country French care very deeply about Highland and preserving its beauty. Matters like these are discussed frequently and there are strong feelings about some of the administrative decisions made on our behalf.

Particularly in the case of Patterson development, and please forgive me putting this in easy terms, there is a general feeling that the company is permitted to do whatever it wants. Sometimes to the benefit, other times to the detriment of the larger community aesthetic.

As it relates to this case, Mr. Bueno has raised our collective concerns over use of the land directly outside the entrance to the Country French neighborhood. However, it’s more important than that.

We feel this particular space serves as a beautiful welcome to Highland itself, as many people travel up Highland Blvd to the many other well maintained communities up the road. While there has already been development of offices and storage space at the very start of Highland Blvd, it’s our hope that a great deal more consideration will be given to preserving some of the beauty that exists. We should all be invested in presenting Highland as the unique and beautiful community it is, placing more importance on Highland Blvd to showcase that beauty.

I’ve attached Mr. Bueno’s previous note that reinforces these points and also offers several ideas on how to address.

Now that the issue has been made visible and appropriately brought to the attention of homeowners, I’d expect you’ll hear from more of them - within Country French and beyond.

Perhaps it’s worth a larger discussion?

Thanks for your time.

Email from Manuel Bueno dated January 10, 2019:

Hello Mayor, Council and Planning Committee. I recently received a letter from Patterson Homes about the proposed Highland Business Park because I live within 500 feet of the property. I attended the Neighborhood Notification Meeting on Tuesday at 6:15 pm. I was the only resident who attended. Wayne and Andrew Patterson presented the information. I am not aware why I was the only resident there. Perhaps this letter was not mailed out to very many people? Perhaps it was the time of day, being just after 6:15 pm?

I appreciate the opportunity to first hear about this project. I did feel like Patterson was wanting to hear concerns. My two initial concerns was the height of the project and the look of it. However, after having time to think about the information I do have more concerns than this.

1) I do not support warehouse space anywhere in Highland and let alone across the street from my home. This gives rise to all types of industrial businesses and large truck traffic which I don’t think is conducive to Highland City. My preference would be to add more residential lots and homes there. It
seemed like when I first moved into my home, this subject piece of land was part of a larger piece that was zoned residential. Perhaps when Patterson donated some of the land to the Church they were able to get the remaining parcels zone commercial office? I am not sure but you would likely know the history. If residential cannot be done then something similar such as assisted living or a funeral home would be better. And if that is not possible just place office would be the last possible resort. No warehouses.

2) For this particular lot I would only do a one story on the street frontage side because that part of the parcel is built up with a large natural dirt berm. If they want something taller such as 20 to 22 feet or two story, you can do that on the back side and have it be walk out, similar to a walk out basement where the front only shows one story but the back shows two. What I am saying here is if you want two stories, you can do that with a basement as story one that has a walkout on the west or back side. This way only the top story sits on top of an already elevated lot for this area.

3) If office or any commercial is done, it should look like residential. If you look at the buildings that Patterson owns such as the office building of the adjacent storage units and the office building(s) on the corner of SR 92 and Highland Blvd, these buildings look more residential. Any additional office building should also have a residential and not a commercial, linear look.

As a side note, Andrew said they would finish the medians in the area while working on this project. I would hope the medians look nice and match the other up the street that have landscaping and not just concrete. You can have good landscaping that uses low water.

To recap: I would propose this property be developed as residential but if not then having it be assisted living or something of that nature be better. Of last resort would be a one story office building on the frontage which has a residential looking facade. And actually, whatever structure appears, having it look residential is best. No warehouses please. No warehouses.

Sincerely, Manuel Bueno, resident.

Email from Michael Tornow dated January 15, 2019:

To whom it may concern:

I know that it’s not always easy to deny someone the ability to use their property for commercial use. However, when someone purchases a property in a residential area, they consider the neighborhood before purchasing.

The zoning is done for a certain reason. We have many homes in Highland that are what I would consider “high end.” These homes bring in a very nice tax revenue to the city. A warehouse area compared to a residential area is not what should be in this area. Patterson should build their warehouses in an industrial part of town, away from residential. Please consider this when evaluating land use and the esthetic nature of the area. All local residents should have a voice in their his matter.

Thank you,

Dr. Michael Tornow
Email from Monica Wonnacott dated January 14, 2019:

Dear city planning committee and Mayor,

It has come to my attention that Patterson construction has applied for a conditional permit. The permit would allow them to build a warehouse like building just off of Highland Blvd. As a resident of the adjacent neighborhood, country French estates, I have serious concerns about this.

1. Decreasing property values. I have invested a lot of money in building a home where I have in Highland. A large warehouse devalues that property. I bought the land and built where I did only after I had investigated who owned the surrounding land and what the zoning regulations were already in place. Allowing an exception at this point, changes the rules. I would not have built where I did, if I had known warehouse buildings were going in there.

2. Safety. The kind of traffic that pulls in and out of a warehouse office building is very different then a neighborhood. I have small children and I’m concerned about the type and increase traffic pattern. More importantly, when they become driving teenagers, I am worried about a constant flow of trucks in and out of there. I moved from our previous home in Lehi due to a similar situation that ended up causing dozens of trucks up and down our neighborhood street on a daily basis.

3. Esthetics. An office warehouse is an eyesore. I chose my neighborhood because the houses are beautiful and different. How tragic to have to look an office warehouse every time I pull in and out of my neighborhood.

4. Changing the rules. When the area was zoned and development started, all the parties involved were made aware. Making exception for one large developer without considering the opinions and how it affects other people is ethically wrong. Patterson’s request is based off the financial best interest of the developer alone. In no way does it benefit the surrounding neighborhoods (ultimately the people who are affected by it).

I urge you to vote NO. Please feel free to contact me if you have further questions.

Thank you,

Monica Wonnacott, MD
Highland resident
(801) 368-9943

Email from Steven Tew dated January 16, 2019:

I am a resident of Highland with my home very near the proposed location of Patterson’s proposed warehouse site. I am in the Dry Creek Highlands area and pass that area multiple times daily. I moved to highland to be away from the congestion and feel of commercial development and to have a warehouse complex put up right next to our neighborhood is totally against the reason we built here. Please do what you can to prevent the unchecked development that will take away from the value of highland. If development needs to happen, please have it be in keeping with the neighboring communities - not warehouses.

Thank you, Steven Tew
Email from Vana Olson dated January 15, 2019:

I am opposed to the rezoning and proposal for the property located near the new church building on Highland Blvd. This property should be in keeping with adjacent residential and in keeping with the vision of the founding fathers which is residential on large lots.

Email from Melanie Westcott dated January 16, 2019:

Mayor, Highland City Council, and Planning Commission,

We live in Country French off of Highland Blvd. We are very concerned about Patterson wanting to build a warehouse across the street from our home development. Considering Highland's current status as a quiet bedroom community, I do not see how a warehouse should be allowed in Highland right at the entrance to several beautiful home developments including Country French and several nice communities along Highland Blvd.

Zoned office space should be similar to the office space Patterson has already built on the East side of the entrance to Highland Blvd. These offices look more like homes and enhance the entrance to Highland and Highland Blvd. Truly, I am sad that this space across the street from our development is zoned for offices and not for single family homes. I wish I had known when that zoning took place.

But worse than offices is warehouses!! Warehouses belong on streets like the industrial Geneva road, not Highland Blvd. It is already very frustrating that a storage unit (also better suited to Geneva Road or roads adjacent to the freeway) is on Highland Blvd. Furthermore, having large trucks coming and going to a warehouse on Highland Blvd. would further burden the roads, make them less safe, and add to the eyesore of a warehouse. Additionally, a large warehouse could draw activity that Highland is not accustomed to. As I look at Utah County crime maps, Highland is virtually free of daily crime. The safety of Highland is a major factor contributing to Highland's excellent property values and people's desire to move here with their families. A large warehouse invites opportunities for people with mal-intent to have a silent, remote place for illicit activity where much is unseen and no one is around to notice or hear. Highland does not need to create spaces where more police work will be required--especially not directly across the street from some of Highland's nicest neighborhoods.

Our new church building will also be adjacent to this property. Several teens and children will walk alone to their church to attend weekly activities. A large warehouse adjacent to the church only heightens the worry parents will face as they send their children in the church for these activities on dark weeknights. A warehouse is a great place to watch and hide out for those who could pose a danger to our children, teens, and women.

I implore the mayor, council, and planning committee to keep Highland an inviting, safe, beautiful bedroom community in all your future decisions as you plan Highland's development. Keeping Highland safe and beautiful will keep our property values up which inevitably will leave you, as officials serving our community, with the greatest legacy. Please consider what is best for the future of Highland's residents (those who voted you into office) and not what is most pressing, convenient, and lucrative for developers who constantly come appealingly and incessantly to your inboxes, phones, and meetings.

Thank you for your time,

Lincoln and Melanie Westcott
Email from Jamie Frischnecht dated January 17, 2019:

Dear Councilmen and Mayor Mann,

I am a resident of Highland city, and I live in the Ivory Homes development on the west side of Highland Boulevard. I want to add my voice to that of many other residents in opposition to the development of the Patterson warehouse building. I have looked up the Zoning Requirements for Professional Offices built in Highland City stated in Chapter 3, Article 4.9, Section 3-4901. We expect all development in the Professional Office Zone where the Patterson warehouse is proposed to be built to adhere to the primary intent and purpose of the Zone. I have copied this information from the code:

(2) The overall intent of these regulations is to establish a standard for professional office and storage facility development and maintenance which:

(a) Promotes the overall functionality, safety and visual attractiveness of professional office buildings, storage facilities, accompanying substructures, and surrounding landscape;

(b) Promotes architecture with a residential flavor;

(c) Promotes development which works in harmony with the open, rural atmosphere of Highland City;

(d) Prevents the erection of buildings or substructures with an industrial or a pre-fabricated appearance;

HIGHLAND CITY DEVELOPMENT CODE 9-Jan-14 - 143 – and; . . . .

The current proposal for the warehouse does not fit these requirements. To comply with the required “visual attractiveness” and work with “the harmony” of the “open rural atmosphere of Highland City” and prevent an “industrial appearance”, the proposal will need some major adjustments. If the building is approved, Patterson will need to take on the additional cost to give the building a residential façade that matches our neighborhood, similar to that of the current Patterson building and the Highland Hideaway Storage. While we appreciate proposals of a sidewalk, tree-lined park strip, and retaining wall, we expect the building to follow the zoning guidelines of Highland City. The building cannot have an industrial appearance. We live in a nice neighborhood that does not include warehouses and industrial buildings. These type of buildings need to be built in industrial areas.

We have an additional concern for the number of transportation trucks that will presumable accompany the presence of a warehouse. This will surely increase traffic problems and pedestrian safety in the area.

We ask that you not approve the construction of a warehouse building in our neighborhood. If the building is approved, we expect that it will be built in compliance with Highland city code.

Please consider our concerns as you consider the approval of this building.

Thank you,

Jamie Frischknecht

801-427-3084
Email from Jen Brown dated January 17, 2019:

Dear Councilmen and Mayor Mann,

I am a resident of Highland city, and I live in the Ivory Homes development on the west side of Highland Boulevard. I want to add my voice to that of many other residents in opposition to the development of the Patterson warehouse building. I have looked up the Zoning Requirements for Professional Offices built in Highland City stated in Chapter 3, Article 4.9, Section 3-4901. We expect all development in the Professional Office Zone where the Patterson warehouse is proposed to be built to adhere to the primary intent and purpose of the Zone. I have copied this information from the code:

(2) The overall intent of these regulations is to establish a standard for professional office and storage facility development and maintenance which:

(a) Promotes the overall functionality, safety and visual attractiveness of professional office buildings, storage facilities, accompanying substructures, and surrounding landscape;

(b) Promotes architecture with a residential flavor;

(c) Promotes development which works in harmony with the open, rural atmosphere of Highland City;

(d) Prevents the erection of buildings or substructures with an industrial or a pre-fabricated appearance;

The current proposal for the warehouse does not fit these requirements. To comply with the required “visual attractiveness” and work with “the harmony” of the “open rural atmosphere of Highland City” and prevent an “industrial appearance”, the proposal will need some major adjustments. If the building is approved, Patterson will need to take on the additional cost to give the building a residential façade that matches our neighborhood, similar to that of the current Patterson building and the Highland Hideaway Storage. While we appreciate proposals of a sidewalk, tree-lined park strip, and retaining wall, we expect the building to follow the zoning guidelines of Highland City. The building cannot have an industrial appearance. We live in a nice neighborhood that does not include warehouses and industrial buildings. These type of buildings need to be built in industrial areas.

We have an additional concern for the number of transportation trucks that will presumable accompany the presence of a warehouse. This will surely increase traffic problems and pedestrian safety in the area.

We ask that you not approve the construction of a warehouse building in our neighborhood. If the building is approved, we expect that it will be built in compliance with Highland city code.

Please consider our concerns as you consider the approval of this building.

Thank you,

Jen Brown

801-949-4641
Email from Kayla Springer dated January 17, 2019:

Dear Councilmen and Mayor Mann,

I am a resident of Highland city, and I live in the Ivory Homes development on the west side of Highland Boulevard. I want to add my voice to that of many other residents in opposition to the development of the Patterson warehouse building. I have looked up the Zoning Requirements for Professional Offices built in Highland City stated in Chapter 3, Article 4.9, Section 3-4901. We expect all development in the Professional Office Zone where the Patterson warehouse is proposed to be built to adhere to the primary intent and purpose of the Zone. I have copied this information from the code:

(2) The overall intent of these regulations is to establish a standard for professional office and storage facility development and maintenance which:

(a) Promotes the overall functionality, safety and visual attractiveness of professional office buildings, storage facilities, accompanying substructures, and surrounding landscape;

(b) Promotes architecture with a residential flavor;

(c) Promotes development which works in harmony with the open, rural atmosphere of Highland City;

(d) Prevents the erection of buildings or substructures with an industrial or a pre-fabricated appearance;

The current proposal for the warehouse does not fit these requirements. To comply with the required “visual attractiveness” and work with “the harmony” of the “open rural atmosphere of Highland City” and prevent an “industrial appearance”, the proposal will need some major adjustments. If the building is approved, Patterson will need to take on the additional cost to give the building a residential façade that matches our neighborhood, similar to that of the current Patterson building and the Highland Hideaway Storage. While we appreciate proposals of a sidewalk, tree-lined park strip, and retaining wall, we expect the building to follow the zoning guidelines of Highland City. The building cannot have an industrial appearance. We live in a nice neighborhood that does not include warehouses and industrial buildings. These type of buildings need to be built in industrial areas.

We have an additional concern for the number of transportation trucks that will presumable accompany the presence of a warehouse. This will surely increase traffic problems and pedestrian safety in the area.

We ask that you not approve the construction of a warehouse building in our neighborhood. If the building is approved, we expect that it will be built in compliance with Highland city code.

Please consider our concerns as you consider the approval of this building.

Best,

Kayla G Springer

801.889.5269
Email from Charisse Chambers dated January 17, 2019:

Dear Councilmen and Mayor Mann,

I am a resident of Highland city, and I live in the Ivory Homes development on the west side of Highland Boulevard. I want to add my voice to that of many other residents in opposition to the development of the Patterson warehouse building. I have looked up the Zoning Requirements for Professional Offices built in Highland City stated in Chapter 3, Article 4.9, Section 3-4901. We expect all development in the Professional Office Zone where the Patterson warehouse is proposed to be built to adhere to the primary intent and purpose of the Zone. I have copied this information from the code:

(2) The overall intent of these regulations is to establish a standard for professional office and storage facility development and maintenance which:

(a) Promotes the overall functionality, safety and visual attractiveness of professional office buildings, storage facilities, accompanying substructures, and surrounding landscape;
(b) Promotes architecture with a residential flavor;
(c) Promotes development which works in harmony with the open, rural atmosphere of Highland City;
(d) Prevents the erection of buildings or substructures with an industrial or a pre-fabricated appearance;

The current proposal for the warehouse does not fit these requirements. To comply with the required “visual attractiveness” and work with “the harmony” of the “open rural atmosphere of Highland City” and prevent an “industrial appearance”, the proposal will need some major adjustments. If the building is approved, Patterson will need to take on the additional cost to give the building a residential façade that matches our neighborhood, similar to that of the current Patterson building and the Highland Hideaway Storage. While we appreciate proposals of a sidewalk, tree-lined park strip, and retaining wall, we expect the building to follow the zoning guidelines of Highland City. The building cannot have an industrial appearance. We live in a nice neighborhood that does not include warehouses and industrial buildings. These type of buildings need to be built in industrial areas.

We have an additional concern for the number of transportation trucks that will presumable accompany the presence of a warehouse. This will surely increase traffic problems and pedestrian safety in the area.

We ask that you not approve the construction of a warehouse building in our neighborhood. If the building is approved, we expect that it will be built in compliance with Highland city code.

Please consider our concerns as you consider the approval of this building.

Thank You,

Charisse Chambers
Email from Jan Story dated January 17, 2019:

Dear Councilmen and Mayor Mann,

I am a resident of Highland city, and I live in the Ivory Homes development on the west side of Highland Boulevard. I want to add my voice to that of many other residents in opposition to the development of the Patterson warehouse building. I have looked up the Zoning Requirements for Professional Offices built in Highland City stated in Chapter 3, Article 4.9, Section 3-4901. We expect all development in the Professional Office Zone where the Patterson warehouse is proposed to be built to adhere to the primary intent and purpose of the Zone. I have copied this information from the code:

(2) The overall intent of these regulations is to establish a standard for professional office and storage facility development and maintenance which:

(a) Promotes the overall functionality, safety and visual attractiveness of professional office buildings, storage facilities, accompanying substructures, and surrounding landscape;

(b) Promotes architecture with a residential flavor;

(c) Promotes development which works in harmony with the open, rural atmosphere of Highland City;

(d) Prevents the erection of buildings or substructures with an industrial or a pre-fabricated appearance;

HIGHLAND CITY DEVELOPMENT CODE 9-Jan-14 - 143 – and; . . . .

The current proposal for the warehouse does not fit these requirements. To comply with the required “visual attractiveness” and work with “the harmony” of the “open rural atmosphere of Highland City” and prevent an “industrial appearance”, the proposal will need some major adjustments. If the building is approved, Patterson will need to take on the additional cost to give the building a residential façade that matches our neighborhood, similar to that of the current Patterson building and the Highland Hideaway Storage. While we appreciate proposals of a sidewalk, tree-lined park strip, and retaining wall, we expect the building to follow the zoning guidelines of Highland City. The building cannot have an industrial appearance. We live in a nice neighborhood that does not include warehouses and industrial buildings. These type of buildings need to be built in industrial areas.

We have an additional concern for the number of transportation trucks that will presumable accompany the presence of a warehouse. This will surely increase traffic problems and pedestrian safety in the area.

We ask that you not approve the construction of a warehouse building in our neighborhood. If the building is approved, we expect that it will be built in compliance with Highland city code.

Please consider our concerns as you consider the approval of this building.

Thank You,

Jan Story

801-376-9803
Email from Myrna Dewitt dated January 17, 2019:

Dear Councilmen and Planning Commission Directives,

My husband Scott DeWitt and I, Myrna DeWitt residents of Highland City, fully support Jaime Frischknech’s letter below and too oppose to de build out of warehouses on the west side of Highland Boulevard. We would greatly appreciate it if you could please consider our concerns and hear our voices as residents of this beautiful city we all live on before approving anything.

Best Regards,

Myrna DeWitt

Email from Lexi Fenton dated January 17, 2019:

Dear Councilmen,

I am a resident of Highland city, and I live in the Ivory Homes development on the west side of Highland Boulevard. I want to add my voice to that of many other residents in opposition to the development of the Patterson warehouse building. I have looked up the Zoning Requirements for Professional Offices built in Highland City stated in Chapter 3, Article 4.9, Section 3-4901. We expect all development in the Professional Office Zone where the Patterson warehouse is proposed to be built to adhere to the primary intent and purpose of the Zone. I have copied this information from the code:

(2) The overall intent of these regulations is to establish a standard for professional office and storage facility development and maintenance which:

(a) Promotes the overall functionality, safety and visual attractiveness of professional office buildings, storage facilities, accompanying substructures, and surrounding landscape;
(b) Promotes architecture with a residential flavor;
(c) Promotes development which works in harmony with the open, rural atmosphere of Highland City;
(d) Prevents the erection of buildings or substructures with an industrial or a pre-fabricated appearance;

HIGHLAND CITY DEVELOPMENT CODE 9-Jan-14 - 143 – and; . . .

The current proposal for the warehouse does not fit these requirements. To comply with the required “visual attractiveness” and work with “the harmony” of the “open rural atmosphere of Highland City” and prevent an “industrial appearance”, the proposal will need some major adjustments. If the building is approved, Patterson will need to take on the additional cost to give the building a residential façade that matches our neighborhood, similar to that of the current Patterson building and the Highland Hideaway Storage. While we appreciate proposals of a sidewalk, tree-lined park strip, and retaining wall, we expect the building to follow the zoning guidelines of Highland City. The building cannot have an industrial appearance. We live in a nice neighborhood that does not include warehouses and industrial buildings. These type of buildings need to be built in industrial areas.

We have an additional concern for the number of transportation trucks that will presumable accompany the presence of a warehouse. This will surely increase traffic problems and pedestrian safety in the area.
We ask that you not approve the construction of a warehouse building in our neighborhood. If the building is approved, we expect that it will be built in compliance with Highland city code.

Please consider our concerns as you consider the approval of this building.

Thanks,

Lexi Fenton
801-694-9655
(Maple Hollow Ct. Resident)

Email from Olwen Jewson dated January 17, 2019:

Dear Councilmen,

I am a resident of Highland city, and I live in the Ivory Homes development on the west side of Highland Boulevard. I want to add my voice to that of many other residents in opposition to the development of the Patterson warehouse building. I have looked up the Zoning Requirements for Professional Offices built in Highland City stated in Chapter 3, Article 4.9, Section 3-4901. We expect all development in the Professional Office Zone where the Patterson warehouse is proposed to be built to adhere to the primary intent and purpose of the Zone. I have copied this information from the code:

(2) The overall intent of these regulations is to establish a standard for professional office and storage facility development and maintenance which:

(a) Promotes the overall functionality, safety and visual attractiveness of professional office buildings, storage facilities, accompanying substructures, and surrounding landscape;

(b) Promotes architecture with a residential flavor;

(c) Promotes development which works in harmony with the open, rural atmosphere of Highland City;

(d) Prevents the erection of buildings or substructures with an industrial or a pre-fabricated appearance;

The current proposal for the warehouse does not fit these requirements. To comply with the required “visual attractiveness” and work with “the harmony” of the “open rural atmosphere of Highland City” and prevent an “industrial appearance”, the proposal will need some major adjustments. If the building is approved, Patterson will need to take on the additional cost to give the building a residential façade that matches our neighborhood, similar to that of the current Patterson building and the Highland Hideaway Storage. While we appreciate proposals of a sidewalk, tree-lined park strip, and retaining wall, we expect the building to follow the zoning guidelines of Highland City. The building cannot have an industrial appearance. We live in a nice neighborhood that does not include warehouses and industrial buildings. These type of buildings need to be built in industrial areas.

We have an additional concern for the number of transportation trucks that will presumable accompany the presence of a warehouse. This will surely increase traffic problems and pedestrian safety in the area.
We ask that you not approve the construction of a warehouse building in our neighborhood. If the building is approved, we expect that it will be built in compliance with Highland city code.

Please consider our concerns as you consider the approval of this building.

Thanks,

Olwen & Keith Jewson

Email from Anita Fowler dated January 18, 2019:

Dear Councilmen/women,

I am a resident of Highland city, and I live in the Ivory Homes development on the west side of Highland Boulevard. I want to add my voice to that of many other residents in opposition to the development of the Patterson warehouse building. I have looked up the Zoning Requirements for Professional Offices built in Highland City stated in Chapter 3, Article 4.9, Section 3-4901. We expect all development in the Professional Office Zone where the Patterson warehouse is proposed to be built to adhere to the primary intent and purpose of the Zone. I have copied this information from the code:

(2) The overall intent of these regulations is to establish a standard for professional office and storage facility development and maintenance which:

(a) Promotes the overall functionality, safety and visual attractiveness of professional office buildings, storage facilities, accompanying substructures, and surrounding landscape;

(b) Promotes architecture with a residential flavor;

(c) Promotes development which works in harmony with the open, rural atmosphere of Highland City;

(d) Prevents the erection of buildings or substructures with an industrial or a pre-fabricated appearance;

HIGHLAND CITY DEVELOPMENT CODE 9-Jan-14 - 143 – and; . . . .

The current proposal for the warehouse does not fit these requirements. To comply with the required “visual attractiveness” and work with “the harmony” of the “open rural atmosphere of Highland City” and prevent an “industrial appearance”, the proposal will need some major adjustments. If the building is approved, Patterson will need to take on the additional cost to give the building a residential façade that matches our neighborhood, similar to that of the current Patterson building and the Highland Hideaway Storage. While we appreciate proposals of a sidewalk, tree-lined park strip, and retaining wall, we expect the building to follow the zoning guidelines of Highland City. The building cannot have an industrial appearance. We live in a nice neighborhood that does not include warehouses and industrial buildings. These type of buildings need to be built in industrial areas.

We have an additional concern for the number of transportation trucks that will presumable accompany the presence of a warehouse. This will surely increase traffic problems and pedestrian safety in the area.

We ask that you not approve the construction of a warehouse building in our neighborhood. If the building is approved, we expect that it will be built in compliance with Highland city code.
Please consider our concerns as you consider the approval of this building.

Thanks,

Anita Fowler
801-903-8264

Email from Brooke Sweeney dated January 18, 2019:

Dear Councilmen,

I am a resident of Highland city, and I live in the Ivory Homes development on the west side of Highland Boulevard. I want to add my voice to that of many other residents in opposition to the development of the Patterson warehouse building. I have looked up the Zoning Requirements for Professional Offices built in Highland City stated in Chapter 3, Article 4.9, Section 3-4901. We expect all development in the Professional Office Zone where the Patterson warehouse is proposed to be built to adhere to the primary intent and purpose of the Zone. I have copied this information from the code:

(2) The overall intent of these regulations is to establish a standard for professional office and storage facility development and maintenance which:

(a) Promotes the overall functionality, safety and visual attractiveness of professional office buildings, storage facilities, accompanying substructures, and surrounding landscape;

(b) Promotes architecture with a residential flavor;

(c) Promotes development which works in harmony with the open, rural atmosphere of Highland City;

(d) Prevents the erection of buildings or substructures with an industrial or a pre-fabricated appearance;

The current proposal for the warehouse does not fit these requirements. To comply with the required “visual attractiveness” and work with “the harmony” of the “open rural atmosphere of Highland City” and prevent an “industrial appearance”, the proposal will need some major adjustments. If the building is approved, Patterson will need to take on the additional cost to give the building a residential façade that matches our neighborhood, similar to that of the current Patterson building and the Highland Hideaway Storage. While we appreciate proposals of a sidewalk, tree-lined park strip, and retaining wall, we expect the building to follow the zoning guidelines of Highland City. The building cannot have an industrial appearance. We live in a nice neighborhood that does not include warehouses and industrial buildings. These type of buildings need to be built in industrial areas.

We have an additional concern for the number of transportation trucks that will presumably accompany the presence of a warehouse. This will surely increase traffic problems and pedestrian safety in the area.

We ask that you not approve the construction of a warehouse building in our neighborhood. If the building is approved, we expect that it will be built in compliance with Highland city code.

Please consider our concerns as you consider the approval of this building.
In speaking with other concerned neighbors they have all shared the concern that the council is to focused on the list of requirements for “conditional use”. This seems to be a common theme in your responses to our concerns.

We realize that this area is zoned for professional offices and the development code ultimately gives the city council and planning commissions flexibility on what they decide is “conditional use.”

While I think it is good for our community to discourage the approval of a warehouse in this area, if the council chooses to allow Patterson’s proposal to fit under the “conditional use” category, you still need to have Patterson comply with the primary use guidelines that are built in Highland’s city code.

This means whatever Patterson’s builds will need to have “architecture with residential flavor” and not an “industrial or pre-fabricated appearance.” The city council and planning commission must enforce that they follow a residential look for these buildings similar to the appearance that was used for the current Patterson building and Highland Hideaway Storage. You can also regulate other factors like height restrictions and curb appeal.

In Chapter 3, Article 4.9, Section 3-4901 it states,

) The overall intent of these regulations is to establish a standard for professional office and storage facility development and maintenance which:

(a) Promotes the overall functionality, safety and visual attractiveness of professional office buildings, storage facilities, accompanying substructures, and surrounding landscape;

(b) Promotes architecture with a residential flavor;

(c) Promotes development which works in harmony with the open, rural atmosphere of Highland City;

(d) Prevents the erection of buildings or substructures with an industrial or a pre-fabricated appearance;

HIGHLAND CITY DEVELOPMENT CODE 9-Jan-14 - 143 – and; . . . .

Thanks,
Brooke Sweeney
425-408-2925
11322 north normandy way Highland❤
This is very upsetting to me, this is a warehouse building and looks like the side of I15. I was born in Highland and it has always been a city that retains a quality standard above. They built the storage units in a way that is below sight lines with the entrance more like a home. The offices Patterson built down the road are what is expected.

We put more than 1.5 million into a home that will be destroyed by warehouse space across the street. Country French, developed by Patterson, is one of the highest quality neighborhoods in Highland and was sold to buyers as such. Deeply disappointed that anything short of quality residential looking professional buildings would be even considered let alone built. Expectations are easy as they built professional buildings of high quality right down Highland Blvd.

Really nice city’s such as Park City Utah do not ever lower standards for very wealthy developers attempting to minimize costs and achieve high rent. I assure you Patterson can afford to build quality residential professional buildings as they did before and already set expectations for all of us.

We already have people flying up and down Highland Blvd at over 60mph in 25mph putting children at risk, warehouse space will make this feel industrial not like a neighborhood.

Thanks for keeping me informed Tara. I will attend meetings if I am in town. I will do whatever I can legally, politically, through media and anything else I can think of to prevent this abomination to our very beautiful neighborhood.

Regards,

Jeff and Kay Taylor
1. CONCRETE MASONRY UNIT GARBAGE ENCLOSURE.
2. SITE LIGHT POLE. SEE ELECTRICAL.
3. WALL MOUNTED LIGHT FIXTURE. MOUNT ON BACK OF STORAGE UNIT WALL WITH SURFACE MOUNTED CONDUIT BE HIDDEN. SEE ELECTRICAL.
4. NEW ADA COMPLIANT SIDEWALK CURB RAMP. SEE CIVIL DRAWINGS.
5. ADA VAN PARKING SIGN.
6. PAINTED ADA PARKING SYMBOL.
## Exterior Lighting Fixture Schedule
### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Qty</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Lamp</th>
<th>Lumens</th>
<th>LLF</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>[MANUFAC]</th>
<th>Tag</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BEGA</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.30</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eaton-McGraw-Edison</td>
<td>F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Calculation Summary

- **Type**: Luminaire
- **Cut**: Type 1
- **Unit**: ea
- **Qty**: 1
- **Total**: 1

### Luminaire Schedule

- **Type**: D1
- **Label**: BEGA
- **Total Lamp Lumens**: 17.30
- **LLF**: 56.00
- **Description**: Eaton-McGraw-Edison (Former Cooper Lighting)

### NOTES

1. Verify the proper mounting kit or accessories to facilitate installation at each location on the drawings.
2. Comply with the "Exterior Lighting" section of the specifications.
3. Refer to specifications for important technical requirements for lighting fixtures, ballasts, and lamps.
4. All fixtures shall be approved by UL or another acceptable testing lab for the scale.

---
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Page: 8/24

Not for Construction
NOTE TO ENGINEER:
FOR SQUARE POLES LESS THAN 31' OR ROUND POLES LESS THAN 26', USE TAPERED. FOR ARM MOUNT FIXTURES, USE STRAIGHT POLES, OR WATCH SIZE AT TOP OF POLE (MUST BE COMPATIBLE WITH ARM SIZE). TRY TO MATCH FIXTURE SHAPE. DON'T USE ALUMINUM POLES GREATER THAN 14'. FOR POLES TALLER THAN 30', OR FOR MORE THAN A DOUBLE-HEAD, HAVE A STRUCTURAL ENGINEER PROVIDE CALCULATIONS AND MODIFICATIONS TO THIS STANDARD DETAIL FOR THE PARTICULAR PROJECT CONDITIONS.

3'-0" CLR

6'-0"

2" CLR

12'-0"

+/-.75" GROUT BED UNDER LIGHT POLE BASE ANCHOR BOLTS AND FULL BASE COVER PER LIGHT POLE MANUFACTURER. SEE LIGHT POLE MANUFACTURER TEMPLATE TO SET ANCHOR BOLTS INTERIOR PAINTED WITH RUST INHIBITIVE PRIMER PROVIDE IN-LINE FUSE WITH INSULATED FUSE HOLDER HERE HAND HOLE COVER

SQUARE ALUMINUM POLE?

ROUND ALUMINUM POLE?

SQUARE STEEL POLE?

ROUND STEEL POLE?

PAINTED TO MATCH FIXTURE SEE FIXTURE SCHEDULE FOR FIXTURE HEAD REQUIREMENTS

.75" CHAMFER ALL EXPOSED EDGES

2 SETS #4 TIES IN TOP 5" OF BASE

4 SETS #4 TIES AT 12" OC

#6 .75" CONDUIT

CONDUIT WITH J-BOX (TYPICAL)

8 #6 BARS VERTICAL WITH 3 SETS #4 TIES AT 18" OC

EXCEPT AS NOTED ABOVE

24"Ø CONCRETE BASE

8' X .75" COPPER WELD GROUND ROD

233 SOUTH PLEASANT GROVE BLVD. SUITE #105 PLEASANT GROVE, UTAH 84062
1. CORRUGATED METAL SIDING.
2. LIGHT FIXTURE.
3. CONCRETE BLOCK.
4. POTENTIAL SIGNAGE LOCATIONS TYPICAL (BY SEPARATE PERMIT).
5. ALUMINUM STOREFRONT WINDOWS AND DOORS.
6. FINISHED CONCRETE.
7. STEEL CANOPY.
8. OVERHEAD SECTIONAL GARAGE DOORS.
9. RAIN GUTTER DOWNSPOUT.

SHEET NOTES
1. STONE VENEER.
2. EXTERIOR WALL LIGHT. COLOR - DARK BRONZE.
3. ROOF MOUNTED MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT AS APPLICABLE.
4. POTENTIAL STORAGE LOCATIONS TYPICAL BY SEPARATE PERMIT.
5. ALUMINUM STANDOFF WINDOWS AND DOORS - DARK BRONZE.
6. FINISHED CONCRETE.
7. CANOPY: STANDING SEAM METAL ROOFING - DARK BRONZE.
8. WOOD DECKS: STANDING SEAM METAL ROOFING - DARK BRONZE.
9. CMU WALL COLOR - ?, TEXTURE SMOOTH FACE.
10. HEAVY TIMBER CANOPY WITH STANDING SEAM METAL ROOFING - DARK BRONZE.

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
1. Stone veneer.
3. Roof mounted mechanical equipment as applicable.
4. Potential window locations typical by separate permit.
5. Aluminum storefront windows and door - dark bronze.
6. Finishes concrete.
11. Heavy timber canopy with standing seam metal roofing - dark bronze.
12. Board and batten.
13. Window shutter.

Sheet Notes:

- Stone veneer.
- Roof mounted mechanical equipment as applicable.
- Potential window locations typical by separate permit.
- Aluminum storefront windows and door - dark bronze.
- Finishes concrete.
- Canopy. Standing seam metal roofing - dark bronze.
- Canopy. Standing seam metal roofing - dark bronze.
- Canopy. Standing seam metal roofing - dark bronze.
- Canopy. Standing seam metal roofing - dark bronze.
- Heavy timber canopy with standing seam metal roofing - dark bronze.
- Board and batten.
- Window shutter.
Highland City Planning Commission
May 28, 2019

The regular meeting of the Highland City Planning Commission was called to order by Planning Commission Chair Christopher Kemp at 7:00 PM on May 28, 2019. An invocation was offered by Commissioner Bills and those assembled were led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Commissioner Ball.

PRESENT:
Commissioner: Christopher Kemp
Commissioner: Jerry Abbott
Commissioner: Tim Ball
Commissioner: Brittney Bills
Commissioner: Ron Campbell
Commissioner: Sherry Carruth
Commissioner: Claude Jones

EXCUSED:
Commission Alternate: Audrey Wright

STAFF PRESENT:
Community Development Director: Nathan Crane
Planner: Tara Tannahill
Planning Coordinator: JoAnn Scott
Planning Commission Secretary: Heather White

OTHERS: See attached attendance list

PUBLIC APPEARANCES
Commissioner Kemp asked for public comment. None was offered.

PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS
1. SP-19-02 & CU-19-02
   Highland Hideaway Storage is requesting approval of a Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit for a flex office use building located approximately at 11251 N. Sunset Drive.

Commissioner Kemp explained that the applicant asked to continue Items SP-19-02 and CU-19-02. He opened the public hearing at 7:04 PM.
MOTION: Commissioner Campbell moved to continue Item SP-19-02 and CU-19-02 to the June 25, 2019 Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Carruth seconded the motion. All were in favor. The motion carried unanimously.

2. SP-19-01 & CU-19-01

Eternal Spring is requesting approval of a Site Plan approval and Conditional Use permit for a professional office building located approximately at 10298 N 4800 W.

Commissioner Kemp opened the public hearing at 7:05 PM.

Ms. Tannahill reviewed the details of the application. She said the site plan met the 35% landscaping requirement in the PO district. She reviewed the proposed architect materials and explained that the monument sign would need to be redesigned. She mentioned that no residents attended the neighborhood meeting and that the city had received no written correspondence.

Commissioner Kemp ask for public comment.

Resident Gary Wright was in favor of the project because something needed to be there but thought traffic would potentially be an issue. He talked about how there could be traffic issues with the access to the care center and service trucks. He hoped that the lighting was lower to the ground. Mr. Wright was concerned that the development not create an alleyway with the wall on the south side of the development and suggested that it be wrought iron with stone.

Commissioner Kemp asked the applicant if something could be done about the access and the problems with service trucks. Darin Man with Eternal Spring explained that it was a shared access and was not on their property. He said the trucks were there for a minimal amount of time and that cars could go around them.

Commissioner Kemp wondered what the plan was for the south wall and thought that a wrought iron fence made sense for safety. Mr. Man understood that a masonry wall was required by code, but said they were open to consider other options. Mr. Man said their lighting plan needed to be modified in order to meet code requirements. He said they would be happy to put in lower style lights like the assisted living center. Commissioner Kemp wanted the development to ensure that lights did not shine lights into of adjacent houses.

Commissioner Kemp asked for additional comments. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing at 7:15 PM and called for a motion.

MOTION: Commissioner Campbell moved that the Planning Commission accept findings and recommend approval of the proposal subject to the 10 following stipulations as recommended by staff including modifications to #3 and #7:

1. Development of the site shall comply with the site plan dated January 2, 2018 and building elevations dated May 6, 2019 except as modified by these stipulations.
2. All signage shall require a separate permit and comply with the Development Code requirements.

3. The light levels not exceed one-foot candle at the south and east property lines and have a maximum light height of 4 feet.

4. The refuse container shall be revised to meet the requirements of the development Code.

5. The monument sign shall be revised to meet the requirements of the Development Code.

6. Prior to council consideration, the second floor setback shall be provided to staff to review.

7. A screen wall, including the possibility of using wrought iron, shall be installed against the perimeter that abuts a residential district, except the senior care facility.

8. All utility and mechanical equipment shall be screened.

9. Final civil engineering plans shall be reviewed and approved by the City Engineer. The site shall meet all requirements of the City Engineer.

10. Final civil engineering plans shall be reviewed and approved by the Fire Marshall.

Commissioner Jones seconded the motion.

Commissioner Ball had a question on the motion. He referred to a previous discussion regarding the angle of the top floor and privacy of adjacent homes. He wanted to ensure that the issue was addressed. Commissioner Kemp thought the setback was far enough now that it was no longer an issue.

Commissioner Kemp, Commissioner Abbott, Commissioner Ball, Commissioner Bills, Commissioner Campbell, Commissioner Carruth, and Commissioner Jones were in favor. The motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Kemp thanked the applicant for being flexible with their design.

3. **TA-19-03**

   McKay Christensen is requesting approval to amend Section 3-4704, 3-4713, 3-4716, 3-426, and table 3-47a of the Development Code relating to the Town Center Overlay zone.

Commissioner Kemp opened the public hearing at 7:19 PM.

Ms. Tannahill reviewed the history and details of the TCO (Town Center Overlay) zone and the application. She explained that there were two residential projects in the TCO zone that resulted in 229 total residential units. She explained that residential unit building options were removed from the TCO in February 2016 to ensure that residential projects required legislative approval. In February 2017 the City Council approved an amendment to the TCO to limit the residential units to 229 in order to be consistent with the number of units that had already been approved.
She explained that the applicant was requesting an amendment to the TCO which would allow for a 121-unit development that included 87 apartments with a proposed density of 22.7 units per acre. She reviewed the list of proposed amendments.

Applicant Mckay Christensen said they were hoping that the residential units that were taken away were put back in the TCO. He said there was originally 342 units allocated to the TCO. 229 units were approved with other developments which left 118 units left in the district. He explained that the Town Council voted to deny the developer’s original request to increase the density in 2015 or 2016, then shortly thereafter voted to remove the residential units from the district. Mr. Christensen reviewed the details of their proposed development. He said they were the only property left. He said their proposed development had 10,000 square feet of ground level retail with preliminary commitments from retailers. He talked about the proposed retail units, amenities, construction materials, town home and twin home design and layouts, and parking.

Commissioner Kemp was concerned that the proposed number of parking stalls was not enough. He thought an 18-foot driveway was not large enough. Mr. Christensen explained that there was a limited location where an 18-foot driveway was used. He said all the town homes and twin homes had two car garages. Additionally, there was a visitor parking area as well as 66 stalls for retail.

Commissioner Abbott wondered if residents would be required to park in garages. Mr. Christensen said they would be happy to require it with the HOA. He said the patio could be shortened in order to meet the 22 feet.

Commissioner Ball asked about emergency vehicle access because it looked like the roads were a little narrow. Mr. Christensen reviewed the proposed circulation plan and thought they met emergency vehicle standards.

Commissioner Jones asked about the decision to remove the residential use within the TCO. The Planning Commission discussed reasons for the Council’s decision which included concerns with density and traffic. Mr. Christensen explained that there were originally 118 units. They turned in an application for 240 units and after than the City Council took away the residential. They were asking for the residential back. He said they also listened to what the Council wanted which included a development that had 10,000 square feet of retail, had a lot of amenities, and was a 2-story high-end product.

Commissioner Kemp asked for public comment.

Resident George Ramjoué said he was president of the Coventry HOA (Home Association). Although he was not officially representing the HOA he had received a lot of feedback from residents. He thought it was too bad that the proposed development was not approved before Toscana and Blackstone because it was a decent project. He was in favor of the design and quality of the project, but not in favor of the high-density use. Mr. Ramjoué thought the city needed to be more discerning and patient with land use. He thought commercial use or quality
office space was appropriate and asked the city to consider the impact of high density and traffic
issues. He suggested that the city consult with someone to promote it as a commercial property.

Resident Steve Martinez thought it would be nice if there was a plan to make it not look like a
“hodge podge” development. He thought the proposed bright white buildings were out of place
when everything else was earth tones. He thought that a lower density should be considered.

Resident Laurie Miller was concerned about the high density. She liked the feel of the town
center area but was concerned with increased traffic and parking issues if more density was
added. She talked about living in Riverton and how the feel of the area changed with higher
density. She was concerned with cars filling the streets. She liked to see more office space and
retail.

Commissioner Kemp asked for additional comments. Hearing none, he closed the public hearing
at 8:03 PM and asked for a motion.

Commissioner Ball thought the proposed density was more comparable to Provo or Sandy and
said it was inconsistent with the spirit in Highland. He thought the product looked very nice, but
the list of variances seemed too long. He said it seemed that the compelling reason for
facilitating the project was economic expediency which he did not think was the responsibility of
the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Abbott thought the project looked like exactly what should be in the town center
area. He agreed with parking concerns and 18-foot driveways and thought it needed to be
stipulated with the HOA. He thought the commercial height and density were issues.

Commissioner Campbell liked the proposed product and hoped something could be worked out.
He said he could not support it at this point because there were too many requested changes.

MOTION: Commissioner Campbell moved that the Planning Commission deny Item TA-19-03;
a request for a text amendment in the town overly zone, based on the finding that there were too
many changes that needed to be made to accommodate the proposed development.

Commissioner Carruth seconded the motion. Commissioner Kemp, Commissioner Abbott,
Commissioner Ball, Commissioner Bills, Commissioner Campbell, Commissioner Carruth, and
Commissioner Jones were in favor. The motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Kemp liked the idea and liked that the developer was thinking outside the box. He
appreciated the time and effort that was spent on the concept. He recommended that the
developer meet with city staff before the next Council meeting to discuss what could be done
that was best for Highland residents as well as help the developer be successful. He said the city
loved the commercial element of the development. Commissioner Campbell added that he hoped
it could be worked out.
4. Z-19-01

Mark Hampton is requesting approval of rezoning 64.5 acres of property located at 9968 N 6630 W from an R-1-40 to an R-1-30.

Ms. Tannahill reviewed the details of the proposed rezone. She mentioned that access to the development would be from 9860 North, Madison Avenue, and 10250 North. She said the applicant would dedicate 7.74 acres to preserve Mitchell Hollow. She explained that 70 lots were permitted in R-1-40 and an R-1-30 designation would permit 93 lots, but the applicant was proposing a 79-lot subdivision. She said the city received 21 written correspondence that were not in favor.

Commissioner Kemp opened the public hearing at 8:18 PM.

Applicant Mark Hampton said they tried to listen to neighbors and minimize the number of lots with the trail and dedications. He said they were okay with capping the development at 79 lots.

Mr. Quentin White had no problem with the project but was against the zone change. He said it was in the middle of an R-1-40 area, would have no transition, and thought it would set a precedent. He talked about Madison Ave and thought turning it into an arterial road was a bad idea. He suggested using a road on the north or south as an outlet to the subdivision. He also hated to see the Lehi ditch changed. Commissioner Kemp mentioned that Madison Ave was planned to be an arterial road for a long time.

Resident Kyle Pettit said he was vehemently opposed to Madison Ave becoming an east-west corridor. Mr. Crane explained that changing the property to R-1-30 would have no impact on future plans for Madison Ave. Mr. Pettit wondered why the developer couldn’t give the same concessions with R-1-40 zoning.

Resident Mike Bond was in favor of leaving the zoning at R-1-40. He said he did his due diligence 9-10 years ago when he moved to Highland and there was no major plan for Madison Ave. He said it was frustrating for him because the area was not designed for a major corridor. He wondered if the plan for the corridor would be discussed again.

Resident Douglas Richards owned the farm to the southeast of the proposed development and was concerned about traffic and noise. He agreed that there should be another review of the plan for the corridor and was against the corridor. Mr. Richards mentioned that neighbors were dumping trash on his side of the road which included cement, limbs, and Christmas trees. He said it was atrocious. He mentioned that there were probably drug deals going on at the end of the road that he already talked to the police about it.

Resident Kevin Pace said the development posed challenging traffic control and equitable distribution issues. He talked about the potential number of cars per lot and calculated that there would most likely be 240-300 extra cars. He said he would strongly advocate equitable distribution of traffic flow, noise, particulate matter pollution, and safety issues. He said the suggestion of having 6530 West take the traffic from the subdivision was not a good one and
explained that the road was built in 1973 to accommodate 19 families on an old farm road. It was never intended to be the major thoroughfare. He said a north exit was absolutely needed on 10250 North. He said Madison Ave as a connector road had been the plan for 30 years and thought it would be a traffic mess without it. He thought it was a matter of public safety, fairness, and good community respect for neighbors if Canal Blvd was finished to Madison Ave, require a northern access to 10250 North, and offset the southern exit so that it did not tie directly into 6530 West.

Resident Christian Wright said he was very opposed to a northern access. He said there was an incline with a bend in the road that was a safety concern. He said the road would need to be expanded and the safety concerns considered. He was fine with rezoning with a cap on the number of lots that couldn’t be changed in the future. His property backed Mitchell Hollow Park and he was afraid that the area would not be preserved. He wondered if a fence could be added to the eastern side of the development. Mr. Wright said the residents paid an open space fee but the city was not maintaining the current trails in the area. He asked that the city maintain the trails if the trail system was expanded.

Resident Kevin Clegg talked about how the neighborhood was not made to handle the extra traffic. He stressed the importance of equitable distribution of traffic. He proposed that the entrance just below lot 3 be moved to the left so traffic was not filtered to 6530 West. He explained that 6530 West was narrow with a lot of kids. He talked about cars speeding and the safety issues. He proposed to keep the north entrance open and add a cap for 79 lots.

Resident Derek White asked how the cap would ensure that more lots were not built. Mr. Crane explained that if the cap was approved additional lots would not be permitted and the developer would need to go through the application process to get it changed. Mr. White said that many friends and neighbors were concerned with the connector and that they were feeling a little dismissed regarding the connector discussion. He was opposed to rezoning and thought the city should not set a “foolish” precedent. He thought everyone should be “playing by the same rules”. He thought rezoning to R-1-30 would strengthen and establish a legal precedent and weaken the city’s legal position when future developers wanted to rezone property. He thought future developers would be emboldened to threaten the city with law suits. Mr. White thought the developer did not sufficiently define why the rezone would be in the best interest of the city. Referring to the developer application, Mr. White pointed out that builders were already busy, that the collector road was a moot point because any development required construction of the road, and that Mitchell Hollow was a flood zone and therefore unbuildable. He talked about animals seen in the hollow and said that the hollow did not limit the number of homes that could be built. He asked that current zoning be maintained. He was concerned with mutual backscratching and said it appeared that the city wanted a connector and trail.

Resident Daniel Campbell was against R-1-30 based on the principles mentioned by Mr. White. Mr. Campbell thought the biggest issue was the connector road and wondered how residents could make it an issue. He did not think the city was accurately portraying how much traffic would come from Cedar Hills and northeast of Highland. He thought the intersection at 6630 North and Madison Ave would become the most dangerous in Highland because of kids from...
school. He talked about people speeding and going through intersections too fast. He asked to
address the connector road, and have it potentially stopped. He thought the traffic could naturally
take Alpine Highway.

Resident Scott Thompson was opposed to the rezone. He agreed with Mr. White and Mr.
Campbell and other comments made. He thought it was a bad idea and set a dangerous
precedent.

Resident Devin Dyer said he was in the construction business and liked a lot of lots, but he was
opposed to the rezone. He said no one wanted an asphalt parking lot and trail. He said there were
people at the end of the road all the time doing drug transactions and the city did not need
another parking lot to invite more. He wondered why the city would want more asphalt
maintenance when there was no budget to cover it.

Resident Tammy Sandstrom was adamant that the road to the north needed to be part of the
development. She was against the rezone.

Resident Carrie Madsen said she was all for development but was very opposed to the rezone.
She was concerned that the city was taking on more trails and parking lots to maintain because a
councilmember told her there was no funding to keep it up. She was opposed to making the lots
smaller.

Resident Michael Durham, also representing his wife, did not think allowances should be made.
He thought the property should remain R-1-40. He voiced concern regarding traffic. He thought
the discussion with the connector was not separate from the zoning. He thought the intersection
at 6800 West from the connector was an issue. He thought that a non-negotiable cap should be in
place if the property was rezoned.

Resident Dain Hodson said he and his wife were opposed to the rezone.

Resident Kelly Sobotka thanked the commissioners for their service. He was opposed to the
rezone and did not think the gift of the land and trail was really a gift because nothing could be
built on it. His main concern was the connector road. He recommended that there be a major
traffic study be done to understand the amount of traffic that would flow through the area and to
understand what it would do to the neighborhood.

Resident Ginger Harris said she liked the idea of having a smaller lot while being able to stay in
the same area. She did not think adding 9 more lots was a big deal and was in favor of the
rezone.

Resident David Larsen voiced concern with traffic. He talked about growing up in Highland and
farming the land. He said he loved the hollow and loved the land. He said the traffic was already
an issue and talked about current speeders. He understood that the 57-ft wide east/west corridor
had been in the plan since 1989 and thought the plan needed to be followed. Mr. Larsen thought
the development needed access at 10250 North. He was not opposed to the development. He
talked about being on the city council 35 years ago and focusing on proper planning at that time. He said the east/west corridor needed to be finished for equitable distribution of traffic. He talked about two boys drag racing up his street and said there was already a traffic problem. He suggested moving the south access road a little to the west of 6530 W.

A Highland Resident said he was in favor of R-1-40. He mentioned that the city code read that the R-1-40 zone should expect a minimum of vehicular traffic. He thought that the Planning Commission should not have put Madison Ave through an R-1-40 zone if it was expected to be a corridor. He said that he lived in Cedar Hills and knew what kind of traffic would come through. He said Highland was not what the connector was going to be. He thought it was unfortunate that the area was zoned R-1-40 in the first place.

Resident Alyssa Bond thought one of the reasons most residents loved Highland was because of the green space and thought that the green space in the proposed project was completely unusable. She thought the residents from the 79 houses would use the Wimbledon Park. She suggested keeping the R-1-40 zone and adding green space for the new homes. She talked about all the traffic on the corridor. She liked the feel of Highland and wanted to keep it smaller.

Commissioner Kemp closed the public hearing at 9:14 PM.

Mr. Crane explained that the map in the packet was from the 2008 General Plan. It showed the east-west connector/Madison Ave./Canal Blvd. connecting to 6800 W. He understood that it was in the city plans since late 1989 or early 1990. He said the Utah County parcel map included extra width for the collector road with subdivisions that were approved along the corridor and recorded in 1994. He said the city was responsible to ensure there was east/west connection and was collecting impact fees for the construction of the road. He said the statement that the Planning Commission or Highland City was trading zoning for the construction of the road was inaccurate. He said the developer would be funding part of the road, but not all of it. He explained that the developer would be responsible for the local section. He said the road was needed for several reasons. He acknowledged that there were a lot of concerns about connection and reminded the Planning Commission that they were seeing a concept plan and that a lot of details still needed to be worked out.

Commissioner Ball thought it was a very nice project, but it was not the Planning Commission’s responsibility to maximize profitability. He did not think there was a compelling reason to grant a rezone, but there existed compelling reasons to deny the request. He said that ensuring the quality of life of existing residents was within the Planning Commission’s primary responsibilities.

Commissioner Abbott thought the two houses located at the intersection of the northern access road and 10250 N would get pounded with headlights and thought there needed to be consideration of that when planning the road. He explained that the developer would get a tax benefit for dedicating the Mitchel Hollow property regardless of the zoning. He was not sure Highland wanted the liability of the hollow if there were no funds to maintain trails. He did not see a compelling reason to rezone.
MOTION: Commissioner Abbott moved to deny the request and keep the R-1-40 zoning. Commissioner Campbell seconded the motion. Commissioner Kemp, Commissioner Abbott, Commissioner Ball, Commissioner Bills, Commissioner Campbell, Commissioner Carruth, and Commissioner Jones were in favor. The motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Kemp encouraged the residents to attend the City Council meeting to have their voices heard. Mr. Crane mentioned that the item would be heard by the Council on June 18th. He also mentioned that the Council was considering a public safety fee or property tax. He said the final open house was Thursday at 7:00 PM and encouraged everyone to attend.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: Commissioner Campbell moved to approve the minutes from the April 30, 2019 meeting. Commissioner Abbott seconded the motion. All were in favor. The motion carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Commissioner Abbott moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Campbell seconded the motion. All were in favor. The motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:22 PM.