

**CITY OF SOUTH JORDAN
ELECTRONIC
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
July 28, 2020**

Present: Commissioner Michele Hollist, Commissioner Nathan Gedge, Commissioner Trevor Darby, Commissioner Sean Morrissey, Commissioner Stephen Catmull, Staff Attorney Greg Simonson, Deputy City Engineer Jeremy Nielson, City Planner Greg Schindler, Planner David Mann, Planner, Damir Drozdek, Planner Brad Sanderson, Deputy Recorder Cindy Valdez

Others: Patrick Wong, Kalmar Robbins, Sadie Poulsen, Greg Weaver, Fred Cox, Benjamin Poulson, Glen Boynton, Boyd Brown, Carol

6:30 P.M.
REGULAR MEETING

I. Welcome and Roll Call – *Commission Chair Michele Hollist*

Chair Hollist welcomed everyone to the Electronic Meeting and noted that all Commissioners have joined the electronic meeting.. We have been holding our meeting in an electronic format since the Governor gave an Executive Order and declared a State of Emergency, which has allowed us to do so.

II. Motion to Approve Agenda

Commissioner Gedge made a motion to approve the July 28, 2020 Planning Commission Agenda. Commissioner Hollist seconded the motion. Vote was unanimous in favor.

III. Approval of the Minutes

Commissioner Gedge made a motion to approve the July 14, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes as printed. Commissioner Hollist seconded the motion. Vote was unanimous in favor.

IV. **STAFF BUSINESS** - *None*

V. **COMMENTS FROM PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS** - *None*

I. **SUMMARY ACTION** – *None*

II. **ACTION** – *None*

III. **ADMINISTRATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS** –

A. **ICHIBAN RESTAURANT, SITE PLAN**

Location: 10662 S. Redwood Road
File No: PLSPR202000069
Applicant: Patrick Wong

Planner Brad Sanderson reviewed background information on this item from the staff report. He also noted that he received (3) emails from residents and they are included as (**Attachment A**).

Chair Hollist said I see that there is a house on the south-west corner, is it just a vacant lot next to Redwood Road?

Planner Sanderson said there is a vacant lot by redwood road and then there are houses along the entire line to the west property.

Chair Hollist said do you know which residents are concerned about the dumpster.

Planner Sanderson said they are the residents on the west side.

Chair Hollist said I also noticed in the list of restrictions that they cannot have a drive-thru, so how does our City Code describe a drive-thru.

Planner Sanderson said our City Code doesn't really go into that distinction, but common sense would say that they would have a drive by with a window that you would have to pick up food, so it would allow for pick up.

Commissioner Gedge said the closing hours would be till 10:00 p.m., but they could have their employees in there later than that, correct?

Planner Sanderson said the restaurant would be closed at 10:00 p.m for customers, but we were more concerned about waste management companies and delivery trucks being there after 10:00 pm.

Commissioner Gedge said could you point out where the dumpster is for the Natural Grocers.

Planner Sanderson said I am not sure exactly where it is, but it is on the south side.

Commissioner Catmull said is he dumpster required to have a covering.

Planner Sanderson said I am not sure if it has a covering, it needs to have an enclosure, but it is not required to have a covering.

City Planner Schindler said I am pretty sure that they all come with a lid, but whether they close the lid is the question.

Commissioner Catmull said I don't think the height would block the views, and I know that is not something we look at, but the run and slope wouldn't block the east views would it.

Planner Sanderson said the site is about 2ft. lower than the residential sites to the west, so what they neighbors are used to looking at out their back yard to the east will be different, there will be something there more than there is now. This has been designated for commercial use for some time, long before these homes were even bought, so common sense would say that a commercial use is going to go next to a collector street, so there will be some obstruction.

Fred Cox, (Architect) – said the development agreement said the building should be higher than 35ft, and I have another building in a different town where the building is 35ft, in this case we tried to lower it as much as we could and still have reasonable ceiling heights on both the main floor and upstairs.

Working with staff we moved the building as far east as we could, in fact, it is 10ft. further east than I was originally thinking we could. We had originally put the dumpster closer to the building, but closer to the south property line, which would have been allowed by the zoning ordinance, but the development agreement specifically had the 50ft requirement, so that is one of the reasons we reconfigured our parking and a couple of other factors. The engineering department specifically asked for the fire hydrant to be put in that particular location, because they wanted it far enough away from the building so if there was a problem with the building they would be able to access the fire hydrant, but not be too close to the building, so that is why the fire hydrant is located where it is. If we were to move the dumpster further east and swapped with the fire hydrant, it wouldn't be where they wanted it. I think the dumpster is in the best place that we can put it, and we did push it so that it is more than 50ft. away. I have always seen dumpsters with lids, and we don't have a problem making sure that it has one. We have LED lighting and they have the ability of providing light very closely, so if we can't keep the light where we want it then we will add some shields, but there shouldn't be problems with the lighting. Regarding the building blocking the view, we have lowered the building as low as we can, but we do have significantly more trees than we had originally planned. We hired a landscape architect that went through the zoning and development agreement, as well as receiving feedback from staff to add additional trees to create as much blockage as we could. The trees will be a little larger than what we normally use, so they will add some additional blockage. The parking and the lighting we did our best to not impact the neighbors, but I do appreciate the suggestions and comments. The windows upstairs are not all the way to the top, so they are not anywhere near as tall as the building is. We have (4) tenants upstairs, and based on the development agreement we are allowed to have the (4) tenants. The main floor has a restaurant, but we are looking to have a smaller restaurant also in that location. The parking is based on the number of seats, so it would not be able to be as large of a restaurant to the south because we are limited on our seating.

Planner Sanderson said in talking with the neighbors and hearing some of their concerns, if the fire department and engineering would allow it, would it be possible to put the fire hydrant down in the island and put the dumpster where it is. I want it to be clear that this meets the requirements the way that it is, but I am just asking for the residents. I don't need a solid answer right now, but would it be something that you would consider?

Mr. Cox said where we are putting the water line going to the hydrant would be further, but if engineering was ok with the fire flow it is a possibility. We can't move the water line because of the sprinklers for the building, but it is something that we could look at.

Chair Hollist opened the Public Hearing to comments.

Greg Weaver, South Jordan – said my property is directly west to the site in discussion. I would like to thank Mr. Sanderson for being open to the discussions we had last week, as well as Mr. Cox, and Mr. Wong for doing what you can to make the building as least impactful as possible. When I built my home 11 years ago, I knew this would be commercial property, and I had hopes that some of the things I wanted would be fulfilled, and some have not. The main issue that has been brought up is the garbage from the dumpster. If this was a dry goods store with lots of paper that would be less impactful, but this is raw meat, and that would be very impactful. We would be very appreciative if there is something that can be done to move that dumpster to a different location. I have a concern if there is going to be illuminated signs on the west side of the building, are there any plans to have any illuminated lighting other than the lighting for the parking lot? There is also a safety concern because of the elevation difference, and there is a 6ft masonry wall between my property and it ends up being about 4 ½ feet, so my property is quite elevated. My request would be that with the 2 feet elevation change between the wall and the parking lot that they put in a small 2ft. retaining wall, so there is a barrier. It is unfortunate for me that this is a 2 story building, because those windows are going to look right into my daughter's bedroom window, as well as

mine, but I am not sure that there is much we can do about that, other than increase the trees and you have already done that.

Ben Poulson, South Jordan – said I also have a property that is directly west of this building, and that dumpster is directly behind my property, so that is probably the biggest concern I have. The natural grocers dumpster is further away than the 50ft. required, and it is on the west side of their establishment. We can still smell that dumpster often from where we live. I am very concerned about the type of garbage that will be in this dumpster, and I don't think any home owner would want that behind their property, so anything we can do to have it moved further away would be appreciated. I am pleasantly surprised about how much lighting there is, and I don't think there will be a lighting pollution issue, unless there is signage on the back of the building. I am a little bit concerned on the other side now that there isn't enough light in the back portion of the lot, it will be dark and that will be an attraction for people to meet up, and it would be a perfect location for a drug deal to go down.

Kalamar Robbins, South Jordan – said I have a question about the sidewalk in the front. I realize that the ordinance that controls this was done in the year 2000, which has been 20 years ago, but Redwood Rd has now become a major thoroughfare and has enlarged to a (3) lane roadway in both directions. I do have land, and a building there, and it seems like an 8ft. sidewalk does not make sense, but I think putting the additional landscape and trees does makes sense for safety. I have been out on Redwood Rd for hours at a time and there are not a lot of people that walk along there, because of what Redwood Road has become. I just think that this is something that was established many years ago, but now it is not reflecting what is happening at this time. It is just a thought to throw out there for you to consider.

Sadie Poulson, South Jordan – said I live directly west of Mr. Weaver, and I have the same concerns. I would also like to mention that I am concerned about the parking for all of these establishments and their patrons, and the workers. We do have concerns with the Vortex shop, those people that work at Cut-Throat do not park in the parking lot they park on the residential street, so I want to make sure that there would be enough parking for all of the businesses. I am also concerned that you will even be able to fill this building, because we have several buildings that have been sitting empty for over 2 years, so I am concerned that they won't be able to fill those spaces.

Chair Hollist closed the Public Hearing.

Chair Hollist said I like what Planner Sanderson said about moving the dumpster, so if Planner Sanderson and Mr. Cox could work with staff to see if they can move the fire hydrant to a different location, I know that the resident would really appreciate it.

Planner Sanderson we will plan on doing that.

Chair Hollist said there was a question about the signage, so Mr. Cox could you address whether you will have any signage on the west side of the building that would generate light specifically.

Mr. Cox said I talked with Patrick earlier and we are not aware of any proposals for illuminated signs on the west side of the building. The doors on the west side will provide access to the upstairs offices, so I don't see any reason to put any illuminated signs on the west side, because of the design of the building.

Chair Hollist said there was a question about how long the wall will be along the west side of the property.

Mr. Cox said it is 6ft. on our side, but it is less than 6ft. on their side. I don't think there should be a concern.

Chair Hollist said will there be a retaining wall put in that area.

Mr. Cox said there will be quite a bit of landscape with all of the trees, and looking at the grading plan I don't see any easy way of changing the grades a lot, because if we were to move our side up it would make it worse. I don't think there is much else we can do, except add the trees that staff has recommended.

Chair Hollist said do we know how often the dumpster is emptied.

Mr. Cox said restaurants typically hire someone to empty the dumpsters, and I am not sure how often they do that.

City Planner Schindler said if they smells became an issue it would be Salt Lake County that would enforce their ordinances.

Chair Hollist said there was a concern about the lighting at the end of the property, so could you address that Mr. Cox.

Mr. Cox said we were asked to set the lights so that by the time they hit the boundary it would be pretty well gone so there wouldn't be a problems with the neighbors. We have a controlled light that is lighting the parking lot, but I am sure that by the time we get the trees in there, it will be possible that the light doesn't get through all of the trees. I really don't know that adding more light to the light pole would even help. The intent was to have very little lighting for the neighbors, so that if at 10:00 pm they want to go to bed there wouldn't be an issue.

Chair Hollist said there was an issue about the off-set on Redwood Road and the sidewalk, could you remind us how much of a park-strip there is, and discuss the safety now that Redwood Road is (3) lanes each way.

Planner Sanderson said it is already existing and it has already been designed and installed this way. I do come in early on that road and I do see some joggers, but there is not a lot of people. The idea is to have a complete network for both pedestrians and the cars. There was an issue brought up about the safety, the sidewalks on both sides are 4ft. wide, some are 5 or 6ft wide. and the park-strips are 3, or 4ft. along Redwood Rd. The ideas is to have them wide and added trees for a buffer.

Chair Hollist said could you address the Parking requirements.

Planner Sanderson said they do meet the requirements, but if there is an issue they could go to the Natural Grocers and talked to them about a shared parking agreement.

Chair Hollist said the last concern was that your office space being empty, do you have any tenants lined up at this point.

Mr. Cox said I know that the majority of the main floor is for the Ichiban Restaurant, and the upstairs is (4) small offices. The bulk of the building would be the main floor and it is my understanding that they have someone lined up for the other restaurant, but I do not know who that is.

Commissioner Gedge said there was a question asked about adding a 2ft. wall, but I think with the elevation it would be a moot point. I would also like to make sure that when staff and Mr. Cox discuss moving the fire hydrant, I want to make sure we are not adversely affecting the Natural Grocers for emergency response by moving it to the south. In this zone, would residential be an allowed use on the second floor? I know it is not today, so what would happen if this was to change, would it have to come back to the Planning Commission, or City Council? I am concerned that it might be sprinkled, but is it plumbed for (3) showers on the second floor. Is the residential use a permitted occupancy of this building. I also wanted to bring up the it has been brought up several times that there is going to be a second restaurant on the first floor as well, so are we considering one restaurant with the parking stalls, and what happens when they add the second location. We have had similar instances where there isn't enough parking with other strip malls that subdivide for several restaurants.

Chair Hollist said I seem to remember that your parking description showed two restaurants, is that correct?

Planner Sanderson said it does show two restaurants and it does show the parking calculations for both.

Chair Hollist said I thought that residential was allowed in a Mixed Use Zone, could you clarify that issue.

Planner Sanderson said we have had a lengthy discussion on this and the simple answer is, it is allowed in the zone, but the development agreement does prohibits a residential use. When this was going through the zoning the City Council specifically prohibited it as a use, so the only way this could change is to go back to the City Council and have it reinstated into the zone.

Commissioner Gedge motioned to approve File No. PLSPR202000069 for the proposed Ichiban restaurant site plan located at 10662 South Redwood Road, as presented to the Planning Commission, subject to the following:

- **The applicant shall obtain UDOT approval for the proposed storm drain connection.**
- **The applicant shall sign a storm water facility maintenance agreement with the City.**
- **The land owner shall disclose in writing to all future tenants the hours of operation as prescribed within the development agreement.**

Commissioner Hollist seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor.

B. SOJO CENTRAL, PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION

Location: 10719 S. Redwood Rd.
File No: PLPP202000203
Applicant: Boyd Brown, KW Real Estate

Planner Damir Drozdek reviewed background information on this item from the staff report.

Commissioner Catmull said I am looking at the property lines and lot 1 on the west side it has something interesting going on, I am interested to know about what that is.

Planner Drozdek said I don't know at this point, it may have to do with the parking requirements.

Boyd Brown (Applicant) – said we have had a lot of challenges with this property and its shape. There are some easements with the power corridor, so we did the best that we could to get the parking requirements

for the (3) different buildings because of the way the traffic flows through there, so that little jog allows us to have enough parking for the front building, which is retail.

Chair Hollist said will there be some type of a shared parking agreement with these (3) properties.

Mr. Brown said there will be a cross access for the road so there will be a private road that connects and comes out on Beckstead on the south side, and it also connects up to where the library is on the north side, and there will be some agreement of cross access, but part of the reason we have the private property line is that each business will have some of their own parking. This is the way designed it, because there could be some overflow in the middle of all three of the buildings.

Chair Hollist opened the Public Hearing to comments. There was none. She closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Gedge motioned to approved a preliminary plat File No, PLPP202000203 creating (3) commercial buildings lots on property generally located at 10719 S. Redwood Rd. Commissioner Morrissey seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor.

IX. LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS –

A. SKYE DRIVE REZONE, REZONING FROM RESIDENTIAL (R-1.8) TO RESIDENTIAL (R-2.5)

Location: 9811 Dunsinane Drive
File No: PLZBA202000183
Applicant: Dale Hull

Planner Mann reviewed background information on this item from the staff report.

Chairman Hollist said are the only other R-2.5 homes adjacent to this on 9800 S?

Planner Mann said yes, that is correct.

Chair Hollist said what is the zoning on the homes to the west of this property?

Planner Mann said those are R-1.8 and they are all less than a ½ acre.

Chair Hollist said if we were to rezone this to R-2.5, is there the possibility that they could put (3) lots on here?

Planner Mann said they would not have the density and they would not meet the frontage requirement.

Commissioner Gedge said my only concern is the property to the east. I know they have to meet the masonry wall to the LDS church on the south side, but it is zoned R-1.8, so would it flow into a residential next door? And are there any requirements to border that east side of the property.

Planner Mann said here would not be any requirements, and I don't know if there is an existing wall there. I don't know if there is any requirement you can place on it, but the code does allow the Planning Commission to identify certain areas as hazardous, like a canal, but I wouldn't consider a seminary as hazardous.

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said I just looked on google earth and it looks like there is a 5 or 6ft. chain link fence already there on the west side of the seminary building.

Commissioner Catmull said on Sky Drive it is currently a (3) lane road, and I believe the Master Transportation also calls for it to be a (3) lane road, and it is close to connecting to some areas by Bangerter Highway, so if the road was expanded would those lots have enough dimension to support those (2) lots if more land was taken?

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said in this area of Shields Lane, if you look to the land on the west that is pretty built out, in our Master Transportation plan there wasn't a huge increase in traffic even projecting out to 2040. There was a slight increase, maybe 5%, but it still stays in a reasonable level of service, so there is no plan for additional widening on Shields Lane.

Chair Hollist opened the Public Hearing to comments. There was none. She closed the Public Hearing.

Chair Hollist re-opened the Public Hearing so Planner Mann could read the letter he received from a resident.

Planner Mann read the letter received by a resident – (Attachment B)

Chair Hollist Closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Gedge said can you address how many house hold trips will be so we know how impact with be there.

Mr. Nielson said on an average we estimate 10 trips per household. That is regarding 2 lots and 10 trips, and 3 lots would be 30 trips per household. On Sky Drive it is about 8,000 vehicles per day.

Commissioner Gedge motioned based on the staff report and other information presented to the Planning Commission during the Public Hearing, and the Planning Commission, I move that the Planning Commission during the Public Hearing, and the Planning Commission's discussion, I move that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation to the City Council to approve the proposed rezone from R-1.8 to R-2.5. Commissioner Hollist seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor.

X. OTHER BUSINESS – None

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Darby motioned to adjourn the July 28, 2020 Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Morrissey seconded the motion. Vote was unanimous in favor.

The July 14, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

Meeting minutes were prepared by Deputy Recorder Cindy Valdez

This is a true and correct copy of the July 28, 2020 Planning Commission minutes, which were approved on August 11, 2020.

Cindy Valdez
South Jordan Deputy Recorder

07-28-20 PC Meeting
Attachment A

Cindy Valdez

From: Brad Sanderson
Sent: Tuesday, July 28, 2020 6:24 PM
To: Cindy Valdez
Subject: FW: New Ichiban Sushi site plan

From: Brad Sanderson
Sent: Monday, July 27, 2020 8:38 AM
To: Nathan Gedge <NGedge@sjc.utah.gov>; Michele Hollist <MHollist@sjc.utah.gov>; Trevor Darby <TDarby@sjc.utah.gov>; Steven Catmull <SCatmull@sjc.utah.gov>; Sean Morrissey <SMorrissey@sjc.utah.gov>; Michael Peirce <MPeirce@sjc.utah.gov>
Subject: FW: New Ichiban Sushi site plan

From: Greg Weaver <igweaver@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2020 3:56 PM
To: Brad Sanderson <BSanderson@sjc.utah.gov>
Subject: New Ichiban Sushi site plan

Hi Brad,

I appreciated talking to you yesterday. the areas of concern i have about the site plan for the Ichiban Sushi are as follows:

- location of the garbage. As the restaurant garbage will include raw meat etc, there is a large concern about smells. please discuss with Mr Wong about the moving the garbage further east, for example in the north east section of the center parking
- Signage. Please make sure that there is no lighted signage on the west side of the building
- I will follow up with Mr Wong after i get a quote from a fence supplier, but if you could talk to him about his willingness to move the 6ft wall on the west side of the property to the south side fence line and replace the west side fence line with a 8ft wall. The home owners would appreciate if he would help with the cost, but look mostly to get his approval to move the wall as they are willing fund the price difference if necessary.
- Please explore the possibility of putting up a small retaining wall between the parking lot and the landscaping on the west side to further create a barrier between the commercial and residential lots.
- I am not sure of the inside layout and what is anticipated to go in the second floor of the building, but where there is a second level if there is anyway to eliminate real windows and replace them with cosmetic only windows where there is a second story (vs a high ceiling for the first floor) that would REALLY make the neighbors happy. The really good views are all to the east, and it would mean a lot to eliminate the windows that look down into the back yards of the residential areas.

thanks again for working these issues!

Greg Weaver
801-244-5744

Cindy Valdez

From: Brad Sanderson
Sent: Tuesday, July 28, 2020 6:24 PM
To: Cindy Valdez
Subject: FW: Development at 10662 S. Redwood Rd.

From: Brad Sanderson
Sent: Monday, July 27, 2020 8:37 AM
To: Nathan Gedge <NGedge@sjc.utah.gov>; Michele Hollist <MHollist@sjc.utah.gov>; Trevor Darby <TDarby@sjc.utah.gov>; Steven Catmull <SCatmull@sjc.utah.gov>; Sean Morrissey <SMorrissey@sjc.utah.gov>; Michael Peirce <MPeirce@sjc.utah.gov>
Subject: FW: Development at 10662 S. Redwood Rd.

I'll reply back to let the individual know I received the below email and have passed it onto the Planning Commission for your consideration. (see below)

From: Ben Poulsen <ben.poulsen@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 27, 2020 8:02 AM
To: Brad Sanderson <BSanderson@sjc.utah.gov>
Subject: Development at 10662 S. Redwood Rd.

Hello Brad,

I've left a couple of voicemails but haven't heard back, so I'd like to make sure that my input is received as part of the planning commission tomorrow at 6:30pm.

My property is one of the 2 lots directly west of the proposed development at 10662 S. Redwood Rd. Because of the proximity, these are my main concerns that I would like addressed at the hearing:

1. Location of Dumpster - the current proposed location of the dumpster is incredibly close to my property. I already often can smell the trash from the Natural Grocer's Dumpster and it is much farther away from our property than this one is proposed. What about changing the location of the dumpster to the NW corner of the proposed building? Or, at least much farther away from the residential areas? Restaurant trash is probably the worst smelling trash there is.
2. Green space from the existing wall bordering my property and the building site - I'm worried about what trees, etc.. are planned for that area to create a blind between our properties. It will be essential that appropriate large trees are planted and/or having the concrete wall extended higher to create that blind and a protection from people easily hopping the wall into our backyards. This is a security/safety issue that needs to be addressed.
3. Parking lot lighting - We are worried about the additional light pollution from lights that are not down-directional.
4. It looks like there will be more businesses than just the Ichiban restaurant located in this building. The entire plan for the property needs to be disclosed at the meeting. If there will be more than one business, Patrick Wong seems to be attempting to pull the wool over our eyes...

5. 2-story building - This is a concern. What will the upper level be used for? Will all the neighbors no longer have any privacy in our backyards??

Please let me know that you received this message and I look forward to attending the hearing.

-Ben Poulsen
801-253-1003

7-28-20 PC Meeting
Attachment B

Cindy Valdez

From: Greg Schindler
Sent: Tuesday, July 28, 2020 5:45 PM
To: Cindy Valdez
Subject: FW: SKYE DRIVE REZONE, REZONING FROM RESIDENTIAL (R-1.8) TO RESIDENTIAL (R-2.5)

Cindy,

The email below is regarding the rezoning item on the agenda tonight.

From: Don Ballash <don.ballash@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 28, 2020 4:56 PM
To: David Mann <DMann@sjc.utah.gov>
Subject: SKYE DRIVE REZONE, REZONING FROM RESIDENTIAL (R-1.8) TO RESIDENTIAL (R-2.5)

RE: SKYE DRIVE REZONE, REZONING FROM RESIDENTIAL (R-1.8) TO RESIDENTIAL (R-2.5)

Respondent's Name & Address:
Don and Marianne Ballash
9777 Dunsinane Drive (Corner of Dunsinane & Skye Dr.)
South Jordan, UT 84009

We are opposed to the rezoning to R-2.5 of the subject property.

When we moved to our current location over 30 years ago the City Master Plan did not identify the density of housing that is currently east of Dunsinane Drive (Elk Meadows subdivision) nor did it include the commercial development on the NE corner of Skye and Bangerter.

The city has acknowledged that the City Master Plan from 30 years ago can no longer be located. We did not expect that master plan to be followed to the letter, but we did expect that Skye Drive and adjoining properties would remain residential at .5 – 1 acre parcels. There was an expectation of some green space to the east of Dunsinane Drive along Skye Drive.

With the changes in zoning that has preceded this request the traffic along Skye Drive has become significant and dangerous. When school is in session, it is very difficult to turn onto Skye Drive from Dunsinane Drive and those resident west of Dunsinane.

As proposed, the 3-house request would not match the neighborhood frontage that currently exists along Skye Drive west of this location. If any rezoning is permitted at a higher density than the current zoning, we would propose no more than 2 single family residences.

Respectfully,
Don and Marianne Ballash