

1 **MINUTES OF THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY**
2 **PLANNING COMMISSION WORK MEETING**

3
4 **Wednesday, November 2, 2022**

5 **5:00 p.m.**

6 **2277 East Bengal Boulevard**
7 **City Council Work Room**
8

9 ***ATTENDANCE***

10
11 **Members Present:** Chair Jesse Allen, Commissioner Lucy Anderson, Commissioner Sean
12 Steinman, Commissioner Jonathan Ebbeler, Commissioner Jessica
13 Chappell, Commissioner Mike Shelton
14

15 **Staff Present:** Community and Economic Development Director Michael Johnson, Senior
16 City Planner Samantha DeSeelhorst, Deputy City Recorder Heather
17 Sundquist, Systems Administrator Alex Earl
18

19 **WORK SESSION**
20

21 Chair Jesse Allen called the Work Meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.
22

23 **1.0 Introduction of Revised Doverhill Drive Subdivision and City Park Concept Plan.**
24

25 Community and Economic Development Director, Michael Johnson, clarified that this is a Work
26 Session discussion and no public hearing or public comment will be taken and no decision made.
27 The intent was to reintroduce an item there has been a lot of interest in. A formal application was
28 expected to come forward at the next meeting after which the public process will resume. Once a
29 formal application is received, public notice will be provided.
30

31 Mr. Johnson shared the background of the subject property located at 3625 Doverhill Drive and
32 explained that it is a church meetinghouse property with a privately owned recreational field.
33 Around 2019, the Church listed the property for sale and the City immediately expressed interest
34 in purchasing all or part of it for use as a public park. Through the lengthy negotiation process,
35 the City made an offer for half of the parcel and was countered with two acres from the Church to
36 be used as a public park with the remainder to be sold privately. Ivory Homes ultimately entered
37 into a contract to purchase the remaining acreage.
38

39 The matter came to the Planning Commission about one year ago for Planned Unit Development
40 (“PUD”) approval. Subsequent to the Fault Study, Ivory, the City, and Church officials, who are
41 still the owners and sellers of the property, had ongoing discussions regarding an alternate
42 subdivision plan. Ivory prepared an updated, conceptual draft plan for discussion. As part of the
43 original PUD proposal, the City was concerned with the eastern two acres in terms of constrained
44 lot width and tricky access to the site. It is only accessible to the public from those living on the
45 7650 loop. The City was interested in obtaining as much acreage as possible to preserve the
46 pavilion with more frontage and better access to the park from the neighborhood to the west.

1
2 The current proposal is for a PUD. Ivory requested exceptions on lot widths and side setbacks,
3 which was of concern to the public and the Commission. Ultimately, the Planning Commission
4 voted to approve the request without the setback exception. Ivory Homes conducted a Fault Study
5 and found that faults run through the central portion of the site making it largely unbuildable for
6 habitable structures. The acreage the City has under contract is the eastern portion, which is
7 unobstructed by fault lines and hazards but with the same frontage, width, and access issues. This
8 changes the development potential of the site. The proposal was for 17 lots, which meets the
9 density requirements. The zoning is R-1-8. The development potential for the property is no
10 different so Ivory, in coordination with the City and Church officials, has been working on an
11 alternate plan to propose a public park location and layout that achieves the City's priority, which
12 is size, access, and preservation of amenities. Ivory came back with a preliminary concept plan.
13

14 Mr. Johnson reported that the updated proposal shows 13 total lots, four of which are on the
15 western portion of the property. Under this concept, the park is located in the constrained portion
16 of the site. There is access to and from Doverhill Drive with a portion of the northern boundary
17 line being park space. It provides access from the Summerhill Drive/7650 loop. The pavilion was
18 preserved as well. Setback and frontage modifications were proposed; however, they only apply
19 to the lots on the far eastern side. The only modification requested to Lot 9 was to the eastern
20 setback adjacent to Wasatch Boulevard. All other lot sizes and setbacks for Lots 5,6,7,8, and 9
21 were found to comply with the R-1-8 zoning. The variations requested to Lots 10, 11, and 12 are
22 adjacent to Wasatch Boulevard with an undeveloped property to the south. They are requesting
23 slightly less lot frontage on Lots 10 and 11 and reduced setbacks.
24

25 The current proposal was presented to the City Council who was supportive of the concept.
26 Because it is a PUD, it would be necessary to go through the conditional use process. The other
27 variation was the private road with the hammerhead turnaround. Staff presented the concept to
28 the Fire Department who had no issues and found it to comply with the Code.
29

30 The standard subdivision concept was presented and has slightly less park space. This concept
31 still provides good access to Doverhill Drive and the park. This 10-lot subdivision concept option,
32 however, will likely not preserve the pavilion. All of the lots fully comply with the City Ordinance
33 for R-1-8 zoning. Mr. Johnson explained that because it is a standard subdivision that complies
34 with the Code, it is entitled to approval.
35

36 Negotiations continued with regard to park development costs, which were of concern to the City.
37 In the proposed location, the development of a park is much different than on the eastern two acres.
38 There were ongoing discussions. Assuming the issues are resolved, what will come forward is one
39 of two concepts. Staff's preference was for the option with more optimal park space and a similar
40 impact on adjacent properties. Each of the five lots is mostly compliant with the zoning standards.
41

42 A question was raised regarding the City purchasing the park property. Mr. Johnson stated that
43 the neighborhood has historically used the existing baseball field and there was concern with that
44 going away. The takeaway was that it is difficult to find new park space in the City. This property
45 is for sale and three acres of it is already being used as open space. This was considered to be an
46 opportunity for the City to preserve some of it as public park space moving forward. Mr. Johnson

1 reported that it is a neighborhood-scale park space and noted that there is no walkable park location
2 in the area currently.

3
4 The expectation was that Ivory will submit a Subdivision Application for the concept and move
5 forward with that version. It was noted that part of the ongoing discussions was to come up with
6 a preliminary park design concept. The feedback received from the residents was that they do not
7 want a lot of on-street parking in the neighborhood.

8
9 The issue in the past was with setbacks. Not revising the setbacks on Doverhill Drive or the north
10 seemed like a reasonable compromise. Another comment was received during the public hearing
11 about the project they are proposing. It was recommended that the developer offer as much as
12 possible in that regard. There could be additional dialog about the design compared to a standard
13 subdivision. Stormwater management solutions were discussed such as a Stormwater Agreement
14 to ensure that runoff is maintained.

15
16 Mr. Johnson reported that the Commission's role is entitlement of either a PUD or a standard
17 subdivision regardless of the final layout.

18
19 A question was raised regarding the condition of the existing pavilion. Mr. Johnson stated that it
20 is in good enough shape to remain where it is. Senior City Planner, Samantha DeSeelhorst, stated
21 that there has been a lot of interest expressed by members of the community about seeing it
22 preserved. The involvement of the Architectural Review Commission was discussed. They will
23 be charged with reviewing the landscaping, site layout, tree planting, and fencing issues. A bill
24 was passed recently at the State level limiting local control over architecture.

25
26 A question was raised as to whether Ivory has proposed different types of density. Mr. Johnson
27 indicated that their intention from the beginning was to comply with the zoning requirements,
28 which they have done. A more detailed version of the concept was expected to come forward,
29 likely at the next meeting.

30
31 **2.0 Additional Discussion Items.**

32
33 **3.0 Adjournment.**

34
35 ***Commissioner Anderson moved to adjourn. Commissioner Shelton seconded the motion. The***
36 ***motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.***

37
38 The Work Meeting adjourned at 5:41 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate, and complete record of the*
2 *Cottonwood Heights City Planning Commission Meeting held Wednesday, November 2, 2022.*
3

4 Teri Forbes

5 Teri Forbes

6 T Forbes Group

7 Minutes Secretary

8

9 Minutes Approved: December 7, 2022