

Tavaci CRR Committee
Report to Cottonwood Heights City Council

Report Submitted March 30, 2010

Committee Members: G. Walker (Chair), R. Moffitt, S. Ryser, W. McCarvill, B. Carrigan, K. Mateus, D. Rees, B. Homer, C. Blanda, L. Holt, J. Frost, N. Valentiner, N. Stowe

This report is divided into three sections. The first discusses the status of the City Master Land Use Plan and related ordinances. The second conducts a project analysis in light of these guiding documents. The final section reviews the two alternatives on which the committee decided and how the committee viewed these alternatives.

I. City Master Land Use Plan. The committee used city and county documents as guidelines to evaluate the proposed Tavaci development, in addition to the proposed CRR (Canyons Resort Residential) Zone. The committee felt that existing guidelines were deficient in several respects and should be revised prior to changing the existing zoning. Nevertheless, existing guidelines were used in their current form to conduct the evaluation.

1. Master Land Use Plan – The consensus was that the City’s General Plan Master Land Use Plan and its Zoning Ordinance need to be refined to better describe the appropriate land use and zoning for various locations and land types in the City of Cottonwood Heights. The feeling was that the Master Land Use Plan and the Zoning Ordinance should be revised to give more specific guidelines regarding densities and commercial uses, especially with respect to the mouths of canyons and urban transition areas.
2. Sensitive Lands Ordinance – The committee was in agreement that the Cottonwood Heights Sensitive Lands Ordinance should mirror the Salt Lake County Sensitive Lands Ordinance more closely than it currently does. The committee recommends that the City abide by the Salt Lake County guidelines until such time as the Cottonwood Heights Sensitive Lands Ordinance can be changed to reflect the stricter definitions of the County ordinance.
3. FCOZ (Foothills and Canyons Overlay Zone) – The committee also felt that the vision for Cottonwood Heights requires that guidelines such as those in the Salt Lake County FCOZ be adhered to and recommends that the County FCOZ guidelines be used until such time as Cottonwood Heights develops a similar document and procedures.
4. CRR– The committee felt a CRR is an important component of the City’s General Plan Master Land Use Plan and Zoning Ordinance, but that it must be restricted to appropriate lands. The Tavaci site is not such a location.

II. Proposed Tavaci Project. In reviewing the proposed CRR Zone in connection with the proposed Tavaci project, the following points were deemed relevant by the committee.

1. The Tavaci site is the wrong location for the proposed CRR Zone. While the proposed CRR has many strong and advantageous attributes, this location is not proper for its implementation.
2. This is the wrong project concept for the Tavaci location. A private, gated project, with high rise buildings, commercial development and high density resort residential development should have better access and a less sensitive location than does this project.
3. The proposed Tavaci development creates very significant view degradation. With six story buildings climbing the hillside, this will be a “stand out” project that will not be outstanding. The existing project creates significant ridgeline view degradation, but the proposed project causes much greater view degradation from all points.
4. This is not a location for commercial development. Located within a gated resort community that will be empty at least half of the time, the commercial segment will not be successful on its own. The development will eventually come back to the city to open the gates for public use which will bring other unintended consequences. Contiguous properties should provide sufficient commercial space to meet the needs of this project.
5. If there is an attempt to create a gateway project, this is the wrong type. A private entrance, resort-based project, which is empty and dark at least half the time, does not provide a gateway image.
6. Lighting is an extremely sensitive issue at this location. The proposed development would most likely be done in such a way that would create inappropriate beacons casting across the valley, with artificial lighting showing the project’s artificial presence.
7. Answers have not been received from the developer on these two critical questions:
 - a. Why is a new project that could comprise as many as 400 residential units, with significantly higher buildings, preferable to the current zoning of 43 single family residences (on relatively large lots)?
 - b. What do the residents of Cottonwood Heights receive in exchange for much higher density and much higher buildings along the foothills?

8. Putting a better-reasoned Master Plan in place would greatly enhance the opportunity to make wise decisions about different areas. Without that plan, it is hard to determine how the puzzle pieces will all fit together. For example, the future development of the gravel pit area seems to be a much better place for hotels, retail, restaurants, etc. The proximity would make it easy for Tavaci residents to have access to those amenities, without having them inside their development.
9. It seems that if one were to look long enough, one might be able to find an “expert” who could explain how all problems could be “mitigated.” For that reason, the committee recommends that zoning be applied in a well-defined and firm manner. The committee recommends zoning that does not allow for variations intended to circumvent the intentions of the City Council and the community-at-large.

III. Conclusions. The committee unanimously agreed that a CRR zone is not appropriate for the Tavaci development.

The committee was almost evenly split between two recommendations. The first was to let the development proceed under current zoning and the approved plan (for the above reasons) and limit density to 43 single-family homes. A second option was to allow a rezone to an existing residential zone that allows for higher density of single homes, no higher than R-1-10.

The second option recognizes that there is an approved development and that the developer is asking for a rezoning and a new development plan to increase the density and general use of the property. Approximately half of the committee would recommend the following recommendations based on the outline and recommendations of the Salt Lake County Sensitive Land Ordinance and FCOZ as a guideline:

- a. The current zoning of F-1-21 allows for half acre lots. The surrounding residential developments are generally zoned R-1-8 (8,000 sq. ft. lots minimum) single family residences.
- b. An overlay zone should be considered for this property, together with R-1-10 zoning that would be compatible with foothill development and the existing residential developments nearby.
- c. The FCOZ states, “All developments in the foothills and canyons overlay zone shall comply with the standards for minimum lot size, minimum lot width, and maximum density required in the underlying zone.” A zone change to R-1-10 would allow a density of approximately 100 lots.
- d. The FCOZ also addresses development standards for clustering of lots, houses or units. The City could allow clustering in order to mitigate the ridge line and foothill impact of the current project or a new project with a

R-1-10 zoning. The ridgeline and foothill visual impact of houses built in these areas are probably the most sensitive part of the committee's concern and the concern of the residents in the City and the Valley.

- e. The FCOZ allows for a density bonus for clustering of up to 25% over the base density permitted in the underlying zone. The City could offer to allow this density increase in exchange for a clustering of units, as a way to mitigate the ridgeline and foothill impact, by requiring the developer to pull the development toward the center of the project and away from the ridgeline and foothills. Committee members who supported this option would only offer increased density of 25% and only to mitigate the original impact of the Tavaci project on the ridgeline and foothills.