



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, December 11, 2025, 8:30 a.m.

**Approximate meeting length:** 2 hours 4 minutes

**Number of public in attendance:** 12

**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          | x            |
| Brian Tucker        | x          | x            |
| Curtis Woodward     | x          | x            |
| Justin Smith        | x          | x            |
| Polly McLean        |            |              |
| Claire Gillmor      | x          | x            |
| Adam Long           |            |              |

### LAND USE APPLICATION(S)

Meeting began at – 8:33 a.m.

**SUB2025-001345 – (Continued from November 13, 2025)** - 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)

**Speaker # 1:** Applicant

**Name:** Evan Glassman

**Address:** 2030 South 900 East

**Comments:** Mr. Glassman said his background is in fine art and design, not a land or housing developer. Solutions have been found. Brought artwork that represents what he is plan for the property is. Thought about objective criticism, not subjective. Objective is informed and decent. Meets all codes and ordinances, not modifications or allowances.

**Speaker # 2:** Citizen

**Name:** Amy Cutting

**Address:** 1121 North Burnt Fork Road

**Comments:** Ms. Cutting read from her statement and is speaking on behalf of herself and the neighbor's. (attached)

**Speaker # 3: Citizen**

**Name:** Laura Gray

**Address:** 1195 Pinecrest Canyon

**Comments:** Ms. Gray said also own the lot above and across the road. Join in what Amy said. Believe the lots were never developed, because they are not sustainable due to the slope range. Not sure, the roads don't count because of the grading and problems demonstrate the problems of the site. Has code been violated by not providing a bond. And why was work not able to complete the work in 2 1/2 years and has been working with the MSD with regards to excavation permit. Have concerns with Mr. Glassman's behavior. Trespassed and parked on their property. Wall has gone unfinished, and sediment has fallen into the creek and acted in bad faith. Trucks parked on their property.

**Speaker # 4: Civil Engineer - CMT Technical Services**

**Name:** Mathieu Perron

**Address:** South Jordan

**Comments:** Mr. Perron said he is the applicants civil engineer and here to answer questions. They have made an effort to follow the codes when planning and working with Evan for a year.

**Speaker # 5: Citizen**

**Name:** David Grunwald

**Address:** 1146 North Burnt Fork Road

**Comments:** Mr. Grunwald said what was the relationship with a pledge to build the road and retaining walls versus applying to the permit.

*Greater Salt Lake Municipal Services District Senior Planner Curtis Woodward provided clarification from reviewing agencies.*

*Commissioners and staff had a brief discussion regarding parcel zones FR-0.5 and FR-20 at least half an acre, replat requirements in FR-0.5, right-of-way constructed buildings affecting homes to the west, easement requirement access to paved road prior to final plat, staff recommendations, site plan, slope, and conditions adding one additional: F – septic drainage fields and slope protection waivers are not approved as part of this plat!! and the two items must receive the approval of proper authorities. Parcel 1146 needs access to 1128, condition number 4 should have referenced 18.10.040 not 18.16.010, buildable area, failure to record, findings as to applicable standards, and judgement.*

**Motion:** To approve application #SUB2025-001345 Evan Glassman is applying for a three-lot subdivision with staff recommendations and additional conditions 12-F, 13 and 14.

**Motion by:** Commissioner Geroux

**2<sup>nd</sup> by:** Commissioner Wallace

**Vote:** Commissioners voted unanimously in favor

## BUSINESS MEETING

**Meeting began at – 9:55 a.m.**

- 1) Approval of October 9, 2025, Planning Commission Meeting Minutes. (Motion/Voting)

**Motion:** To approve October 9, 2025, Planning Commission Meeting Minutes with amendments.

**Motion by:** Commissioner Berreth

**2<sup>nd</sup> by:** Commissioner Karkut

**Vote:** Commissioners voted unanimously in favor

Approval of November 13, 2025, Planning Commission Meeting Minutes. (Motion/Voting)

**Motion:** To approve November 13, 2025, Planning Commission Meeting Minutes with amendments.

**Motion by:** Commissioner Wallace

**2<sup>nd</sup> by:** Commissioner Karkut

**Vote:** Commissioners voted unanimously in favor

2) 2026 Planning Commission Schedule. (Discussion)

**Motion:** To approve 2026 Planning Commission Schedule as presented.

**Motion by:** Commissioner Berreth

**2<sup>nd</sup> by:** Commissioner Karkut

**Vote:** Commissioners voted unanimously in favor

3) Other Business Items. (As Needed)

*Commissioners discussed the Forestry zone 19.24 and asked if the setback table be applied to the zoning chapters and that all are identified from a public right-of-way and should be removed from the first three lines in the table. The commission would like legal counsel to discuss with the Emigration Canyon City Council to determine road edge or center line and bring back on the January 8<sup>th</sup> agenda.*

*Two commissioner appointments expire March 1<sup>st</sup>. Commissioner Karkut and Commissioner Geroux both expressed interest in reappointment. Ms. Gurr will advise Diana to add reappointment to the Council agenda.*

*Chair and vice chair election in January. For chair and vice chair, both have expressed their interest in remaining.*

*Commissioner Karkut adjourned.*

**MEETING ADJOURNED**

**Time Adjourned – 10:37 a.m.**

# Amy Cutting & Neighbors

## **Recommendation to Deny the Current Preliminary Plat Application for Juniper Ridge Subdivision**

Based on the submitted documents and regulations, we still believe that the current Preliminary Plat Application for the Juniper Ridge Subdivision should be **denied** in its current form due to concerns related to proposed building density, compliance with site standards, soil/fill usage, and potential negative impacts on adjacent properties.

### **1. Building Density and Insufficient Site Capability**

While the formal application is for a three-lot subdivision, we are all aware that the true intent of the proposed purchaser is to build five homes to make the venture financially profitable.

- My neighbors and I feel that any more than 2 homes in the preliminary plat, and 3 homes in total, exceeds the available space and strains the site's capability.
- As a comparison, the neighboring Burr Fork Subdivision contains five average-sized homes (approximately 3,000 sq. ft. with 3 bedrooms/3 bathrooms). If you overlay the aerial photo from the County Assessors maps onto the Juniper Ridge Subdivision property, you can see that Juniper Ridge is considerably smaller.
- After a detailed review of the plans and my personal experience looking at the site, I believe that Building pad 5 is not a viable location for a home.
- If Building pad 5 is non-viable, only pads 3 and 4 are potentially usable within this application, which should prompt the Commission to reconsider this application for 3 homes. If the builder were to seek future approval for the two additional lots, there appears to be only one more (Building pad 2) that looks large enough, bringing the realistic total to 3 homes, not 5. Building pad 1 is in 2 parts, neither of which has enough land less than a 30% slope to be realistic sites.

### **2. Site Selection and Aesthetic Standards**

The inclusion of Building Pad 5 as a viable site fundamentally conflicts with the Emigration Canyon Municipal Code 19.73.030 on Site Selection And Planning Standards.

- This code requires that buildings "**shall be sited off of highly visible places and designed so they are not obtrusive, do not loom out over the hillside and break prominent skylines**".
- Given the significant drop-off to the south, any structure on Building Pad 5 would be clearly visible from Pinecrest Canyon Road, from homes across the road, and from the adjacent Burnt Fork Subdivision property.
- A structure on this site would most certainly loom over the northernmost home in the Burnt Fork Subdivision and significantly impact sightlines for all adjacent homes.

### **3. Geotechnical and Soil Hazards**

The known characteristics of the soil and the steep slopes present significant challenges that require substantial, disruptive engineering solutions, thereby increasing the risk and potential impact of development.

- The geotechnical report identified the top 12–18 inches of topsoil as Clayey Silt and Silty Sand soils that are moisture-sensitive.
- The problematic soils require removal and replacement with structural fill. Work progress would be significantly limited and difficult during wet and cold periods of the year due to the nature of the silt soils.
- References made by Mr. Glassman and Justin Smith that the Burr Fork Subdivision is precedent for this approval is not valid. The subdivision is 40 years old and was approved prior to many current regulations, including the FCOZ. It is our belief that if that subdivision were to be built today, there is a good chance it would not be approved for the same reasons I am raising about Juniper Ridge. Our history and experience building and maintaining the subdivision highlight the inherent, ongoing issues with the soil and slope angle in this specific area of the canyon.

We urge the Commission to look closely at the realistic density the site can support and the compliance issues related to visual standards before moving forward. The potential negative impacts on adjacent properties and the environment are too great to approve the application in its current form.