



EMIGRATION CANYON

Planning and Development Services
2001 S. State Street N3-600 • Salt Lake City, UT 84190-4050
Phone: (385) 468-6700 • Fax: (385) 468-6674

MEETING MINUTE SUMMARY
EMIGRATION CANYON PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Thursday, November 13, 2025, 8:30 a.m.

Approximate meeting length: 2 hours 19 minutes

Number of public in attendance: 16

Summary Prepared by: Wendy Gurr

Meeting Conducted by: Commissioner Harpst

***NOTE:** Staff Reports referenced in this document can be found on the State website, or from Planning & Development Services.

ATTENDANCE

Commissioners and Staff:

Commissioners	Public Mtg	Business Mtg	Absent
Andrew Wallace	x	x	
Jim Karkut	x	x	
Dale Berreth	x	x	
Tim Harpst (Chair)	x	x	
Jodi Geroux (Vice Chair)	x	x	

Planning Staff / DA	Public Mtg	Business Mtg
Wendy Gurr	x	x
Jim Nakamura	x	
Brian Tucker	x	
Justin Smith	x	x
Claire Gillmor	x	x

BUSINESS MEETING

Meeting began at – 8:32 a.m.

- 1) Approval of September 24, 2025, Planning Commission Meeting Minutes. (Motion/Voting)

Motion: To approve September 24, 2025, Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.

Motion by: Commissioner Wallace

2nd by: Commissioner Berreth

Vote: Commissioners voted unanimously in favor

LAND USE APPLICATION(S)

Meeting began at – 8:39 a.m.

SUB2025-001345 - Evan Glassman is applying for a three-lot subdivision. **Acres:** 1.68. **Location:** 1128-1162 North Pinecrest Canyon Road. **Zone:** FR-1. **Planner:** Justin Smith (Motion/Voting)

Greater Salt Lake Municipal Services District Planner Justin Smith provided an analysis of the application.

Commissioners, counsel, staff, and Mr. Glassman had a brief discussion regarding fire code modifications, easement in lieu of a dedicated road, conceptual okays, subdivision timeframes, road support and retaining wall, main cut out remains as approved, initial grading cut, agency process, conformance to FCOZ and ordinances, small bedroom community with a few smaller homes. Mr. Glassman produced a map to show the commission of a previous vision. Reviewing agencies have all provided conceptual okay. Waterflow test for sprinklers.

Discussed the Geotech drawing for boundaries and overlay on the lots, number of lots, homes, and addresses. Karryn Greenleaf with Salt Lake City Public Works advised they did send a letter signed by their director. Discussed soil and structural fill and burden on the existing infrastructure, improvements installed, complete or bonding, and snow removal and retaining and retention ponds, and geotechnical recommendations.

PUBLIC PORTION OF MEETING OPENED

Speaker # 1: Applicant

Name: Evan Glassman

Address: 2030 South 900 East

Comments: Mr. Glassman spoke about projects and original grading modification.

Commissioner Karkut asked Mr. Glassman about transferring to a builder. Mr. Glassman advised Mr. Jeffries will be the new owner and builder.

Commissioner Harpst opened the public meeting.

Speaker # 2: Citizen

Name: Camille Erickson

Address: 5557 East Emigration Canyon Road

Comments: Ms. Erickson said because this is a private road how does school bus and fire work with this since it crosses all the roads.

Speaker # 3: Citizen on behalf of neighborhood.

Name: Amy Cutting

Address: 1121 North Burnt Fork Road

Comments: Ms. Cutting read her submitted comments. (attached)

Speaker # 4: Applicant

Name: Evan Glassman

Address: 2030 South 900 East

Comments: Mr. Glassman said he did try to bring equipment up and he apologized. He denies most of the accusations. He doesn't want to inconvenience anyone, there is a learning curve and burnt fork subdivision is part of what will be developed responsibly by a responsible builder and be considerate to the neighbors, especially Margo and knows Jason has that knowledge.

Ms. Gurr read an emailed citizen comment. (attached)

Speaker # 4: Applicant

Name: Evan Glassman

Address: 2030 South 900 East

Comments: Mr. Glassman said as far as erosion and mitigation, he learned how to improve the land. Invested money, time, and labor to put in mitigation controls in that area, so no potential runoff from the property and has receipts for contaminating the creek two years ago. He isn't a professional developer and builder, Jason is.

Speaker # 6: Citizen

Name: David Grunwald

Address: 1146 North Burnt Fork Road

Comments: Mr. Grunwald said in his experience, development becomes difficult at a later stage becomes non-compliant. Once it moves along it is hard to come up with waivers. It has been vague presented. Received assurances but not written. Maps inadequate of homes. Cutting back from five to three homes. Will be an easement across the subdivision to connect the two properties. Vague promises on the retaining wall for the driveway and urges commission not to approve until every aspect is clear in the commission's mind.

Commissioner Harpst closed the public meeting.

PUBLIC PORTION OF MEETING CLOSED

Commissioner, counsel, and staff had a brief discussion regarding 30% slope, burden of three homes replat, burden of soil, burden to homeowners, burden on municipality and false representation. Steps and review of title 18, along with information coming to us and conditions. Miscommunication regarding representation of the last six months and ordinances reflecting state law requirements, prematurely enough and all information to make an informed decision. Request access road and retaining walls complete before approval and demonstrate ability to conform with FCOZ. Harmful development citations researched for reference and opportunity for the MSD to provide all information received within the last six months. Request proof that if replat granted, five parcels are developable within FCOZ of septic and a home, grading in the blue. Bond is required but never collected. No funds to complete the work and how do we ensure the bond is collected before the work proceeds. Request Notice of violation initiation. Plan is incomplete, building envelope, criteria of ordinances for slope and square footage of the lot. Road engineering layout. Boundary lines and rezones.

Motion: To continue application #SUB2025-001345 Evan Glassman is applying for a three-lot subdivision to the December 11th planning commission meeting to provide research and information requested throughout the application. Discussion to allow staff and counsel an opportunity to provide steps taken, review processed and documentation over the last six months and provide researched citations overlay.

Motion by: Commissioner Karkut

2nd by: Commissioner Geroux

Vote: Commissioners voted unanimously in favor

Commissioner Berreth motioned to adjourn, Commissioner Wallace seconded that motion.

MEETING ADJOURNED

Time Adjourned – 10:51 a.m.

My name is Amy Cutting.

My husband and I live at [REDACTED], more commonly known as the Burr Fork PUD in Pinecrest Canyon. We are located just down-canyon from the subdivision being proposed by Mr. Glassman. I am speaking for our entire PUD of 5 homes as well as some of the neighbors on both sides of the street, above and below this subdivision.

We are here today to ask the Planning Commission to deny Mr. Glassman's application for the following reasons:

1. As you know, Mr. Glassman was given an FCOZ waiver in August of 2022 to be able to create driveway access to build what he said prior to that time was a single a home on the flatter land above the slope. Permission was granted with the understanding that he would also put in a terraced retaining wall along the driveway to prevent erosion and improve the aesthetics of such a steep and dramatic cut. That was over 2 years ago and the wall has never been started, let alone completed.

We neighbors have looked at this horrendous scar in the hillside for these 2+ years and not seen any attempts made to terrace the hillside or construct the retaining wall. We have watched the open hillside slough and slide during rainstorms and snow melts, during which time it has contaminated downstream wells, muddied driveways and the roadway, and fouled the creek. At this point, there is no reason to think the same thing won't happen during the upcoming rain and snow season.

We feel strongly that **no further permission** for additional development should be granted to Mr. Glassman until this terraced retaining wall has been completed. Requiring compliance with the terms he is already obligated to, before granting further permissions, would give him the chance to demonstrate genuine commitment, and it just makes sense in terms of finishing what has already been agreed to before moving on to further steps.

We know that Mr. Glassman has stated that he is anxious to get this plat application approved because he has found a developer to whom he plans to transfer ownership once it is permitted. If being required to complete the terraces feels too onerous or time-consuming to occur before the transfer, it might make sense for the next owner to be the one responsible to submit the preliminary plat application for approval once the retaining wall is complete. You, as a Commission, should be evaluating the request on the most appropriate timeline, not because he has a time pressure.

2. According to the Emigration Canyon Municipal Code (18.08.080B), the approval process for subdivisions is extensive and includes documentation that the Preliminary Plat meets a list of established standards, along with a review by each of the relevant agencies that insure he is compliant with their codes; e.g., Planning, Geology, Urban Hydrology, Traffic, Surveyor, Unified Fire, and others. As I have looked through the pages of the required reviews of these entities, there are many blank pages, with many of the reviews indicating they are pending, incomplete or blank. Where there are comments, most of them are identifying problems or lack of compliance with the various codes rather than confirming evidence of fulfillment.

I can see from this report that the MSD Planning Staff is recommending approval of the application. However, there is over a full page of conditions that must be met before approval actually occurs. I am wondering what the rush is in approving this application with so much important details lacking. You, as a board, have the chance to make sure that everything is right for a proposed subdivision before it leaves your oversight permanently. As someone who will be living in close proximity to it, I urge you to take that oversight responsibility seriously and deny the application.

3. Finally, I think it is important to let you know about some concerns those of us in the neighborhood have about Mr. Glassman's approach to us regarding this project since he began to envision building on this land he purchased several years ago. While I honor the Commission Meeting's Code of Conduct that prohibits "personal attacks", and will avoid doing so, I believe you need to know that many of us have had some problematic encounters with the applicant that concern us about his future trustworthiness.

I will only share the experience of our own PUD, but there have been other concerning incidents others have shared with me. I believe it was prior to the FCOZ waiver application that Mr. Glassman first approached our PUD and asked whether he could use our roads for access to his land, stating that his hillside approach was too steep. We said no. Months later he then appealed to a different homeowner in the PUD, with the false claim that he had been given permission to do so by the PUD's HOA. He was once again denied access.

~~tracked excavator~~ Sometime thereafter, he tried a 3rd time to gain access but this time actually brought a ~~bulldozer~~ up onto our PUD, and up our road, and it was clear he was planning to cross our land regardless of the denials. Had the homeowners at the end of our road not been home to question and stop him, it appears that he was going to traverse our PUD's land, and a 3rd party's land as well, with heavy equipment. When he was confronted and advised he was trespassing, he became aggressive and threatened the homeowner. The sheriff was called to document the incident at which point Mr. Glassman again falsely claimed to have had the permission of the "HOA Board", 2 of whom were present and corrected the falsehood.

In closing, I want to make it clear that this is not a “not in my back yard” situation. As a neighborhood group, we recognize people’s right to build on property they own and we know development is going to happen. We are, however, committed to development done correctly and in compliance with the rules and regulations that you, as a Commission, have established. For those reasons, all of us in the neighborhood hope that you will take our comments into consideration and deny the application at this time.

Thank you for your time and the opportunity to speak to you this morning.

From: [Laura Gray](#)
To: [Wendy Gurr](#)
Subject: Glassman development in Pinecrest Canyon
Date: Wednesday, November 12, 2025 5:46:59 PM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [. Learn why this is important](#)

Hi Wendy,

My wife and I are unable to get to the firehouse tomorrow am for the planning commission meeting, but we want to go on record as opposing the plan Mr. Glassman wants. We live at [REDACTED] and own [REDACTED] lot just north of his planned development as well.

We've watched him as he has failed to protect his property against sediment runoff and hasn't taken any steps in two years to build retaining walls for his God awful scar he made for his road. He has trespassed on neighbors lots.

We do not think can be trusted to be a good steward or follow the rules set for him. We agree that he needs to get carefully watched and would like a big bond in place to secure his compliance with existing rules if his plans are approved.

Thank you

Laura Gray

Meg Sandy

[REDACTED]