

**CITY OF SOUTH JORDAN
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
January 27, 2026**

Present: Chair Nathan Gedge, Commissioner Steven Catmull, Commissioner Michelle Hollist, Commissioner Bryan Farnsworth, Commissioner Lori Harding, Assistant City Attorney Greg Simonson, City Planner Greg Schindler, Planner Damir Drozdek, Planner Miguel Aguilera, Assistant City Engineer Jeremy Nielson, Deputy Recorder Cindy Valdez, Director Brian Preece, IT Director Matt Davis, GIS

Others: John Mabey, Jamilah Decker, John Thomas, Jim Byer, Cindy Byer, Blake Hamilton, Jarald Bracken, Ruth Cornley, Steve Tingey, Brian Allred, Tom Draper, Kierstin Draper, Annette Barney, John Thomas Lloyd, Bryan Sonntacy, Bob Paxton, Jesse Jacobson, Mark Mabey, Jen Mabey, Janet Mabey, Steve Mabey, Corrina Wolf, Jennifer Smith, Kent, Mark, Walker Kessler, Bob, Matt Stagner, Jessica Clark, Sotna O'Brien, Laura Ware, Brent Burgon, Angela, Cam Johnson, Sunshine Filings, Angela Law, Adam Luper, Liz Burgow, Devery Irving

**6:30 P.M.
REGULAR MEETING**

A. WELCOME AND ROLL CALL –*Chair Nathan Gedge*

Chair Gedge welcomed everyone to the Planning Commission Meeting and noted that all (5) of the Planning Commissioner's are present.

B. MOTION TO APPROVE AGENDA

B.1. Approval of the January 13, 2026

Commissioner Hollist motioned to approve the January 26, 2026 Planning Commission Agenda. Chair Gedge seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor.

C. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

C.1. Approval of the January 13, 2026 - Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.

Commissioner Hollist motioned to approve the January 13, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes. Commissioner Gedge seconded the motion. Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor.

D. STAFF BUSINESS

Planner Schindler said Commissioner Bishop has resigned his position as a Commissioner and the mayor will be looking for someone to replace him.

E. COMMENTS FROM PLANNING COMMISSION

Chair Gedge said I do want to say just one thing to Jeremy. At Jordan gateway, the Union Pacific, did get the job done. I know I've been a squeaky wheel for a few times here, but I wanted to thank you for getting that taken care of.

F. SUMMARY ACTION

G. ACTION

H.

H.1. SOUTH STATION PLAT 3 MULTI FAMILY # 8 PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION

Address: West side of Lake Run Road (5400 W) between Big Sur Dr. (10820 S) and Rain Lily Dr (10890 S)
File No: PLPP20C2500201
Applicant: LHM Real Estate

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

Commissioner Hollist said what are the private lanes in between or in the center of each of the blocks?

Planner Schindler said they call them a private lane, but I believe that's going to be an area for for extra parking on those, so it's not really a necessary lane, but I can verify that with Mr. Suarez when he comes up.

Mr. Suarez, LHM Real Estate (Applicant) – said I don't have anything to add to Mr. Schindler's report this evening, but I just wanted to note that is parking for those lanes.

Chair Gedge opened the Public Hearing to comments. There were none. He closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Hollist said this is an MUT area mixed use, transit oriented development opportunity, because it's within a quarter mile of the transit hub, and our staff report indicates that these areas should provide accommodation for active transportation, such as bike racks. And so I was curious if that's already been incorporated, or if that's something that would occur at site plan.

Planner Schindler said I do not know that.

Mr. Suarez said since we built the ballpark, and for everyone that has been applying we have that bike rack in the back of our mind. So, yeah, we have plans to have that type of bike racks in the locations.

Commissioner Hollist said so being in this zone also allows them to have a lower requirement on their parking but, they're still providing two parking spots per unit, so they're probably exceeding what's actually required.

Planner Schindler said yes, it would only be required to have one.

Commissioner Hollist said I appreciate a three story townhome, and you providing two parking spots. I feel like that's probably realistic.

Chair Gedge said I believe these are under the overall HOA, and so is there any rules or regulations of the HOA that they use those two garage spaces for actual car parking, or can they use it for storage, which I believe a lot of people do.

Planner Aguilera said I don't think there's any reinforcement from the HOA on that side.

Commissioner Harding motioned to approve File No. PLPP202500201 South Station Plat 3 Multi Family #8 Preliminary subdivision. Commissioner Farnsworth seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor.

H.2. GATEWAY RETAIL PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAT

Address: 10376 S. Jordan
Gateway
File No: PLPP202500138
Applicant: Bryan V Sonntag

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

Chair Gedge said just to be simple for the people present, this is basically to legalize the two properties into two separate properties so they each have ownership of their own property.

Commissioner Hollist said can you give us some ideas of what's allowed in an IF zone.

Planner Drozdek said commercial and light industrial type uses.

Bryan V. Sonntag, Applicant said I don't really have anything to add. This is a pretty straightforward application. The property has been one piece since I've owned the property, and my plan as I get closer to retirement is to sell the property, but there are two tenants in the respective parts. I'm also one of the tenants in the in the back section, in the strip mall part, but both

tenants want to have maintained ownership because of the money that they put into their build out. They don't want to take the risk of a new owner canceling their lease at the end of their current term. And so this is an in anticipation of all of that. The only additional thing that I would add is, that actually nothing will change. There'll be an easement for overflow parking for both parties, and there will also be the requirement for current parking on the east end is leased from Pacific Core, and they will be obligated for their portion of the Pacific Core parking spaces. But basically, otherwise, everything will remain as it is now and function as it is now.

Chair Gedge opened the Public Hearing to comments. There were none. He closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Hollist motioned to approve File NO PLPP22500138 Gateway Retail Preliminary Subdivion Plat. Commissioner Harding seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor.

H.3. DAY BREAK VILLAGE 7A PLAT 3 SUBDIVISION LOT C-107 2ND AMENDMENT, SUBDIVISION AMENDMENT

Address: 5567 W Shady Stone Dr, South Jordan, UT

84009 File No: PLPLA202500176

Applicant: Logan Johnson

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

Logan Johnson, (Wright Development) – said we are just looking to split the lot so the buildings each stand on their own parcel for future sales or acquisitions or whatever may come. And the reason we didn't do it earlier was we planned the daycare, but weren't quite sure what we're going to do with the upper half. And then once that settled, we figured we were ready to record the plat, so I am here to answer any other questions you have.

Chair Gedge opened the Public Hearing to comments. There were none. He closed the Public Hearing.

Comissioner Hollist said so if I understand correctly, the easement will grant that landlocked property access to their property forever, right? They'd have to give up that access?

Planner Aguilera said well, it's on the plat, I could ask Greg, but if they have to change it, they don't have to amend the plat.

Commissioner Hollist said so you don't see any concern that this property owner might somehow lose access to their property.

Planner Schindler said I wouldn't think so, especially if it's on the plat, they'd have to do a plat amendment, and it wouldn't have to be approved either.

Commissioner Farnsworth motioned to approve File No. PLPLA202500176 Daybreak Village 7A Plat 3 Subdivision Amendment. Commissioner Harding seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor

I. LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS

I.1. MABEY COUNTRY ESTATES LAND USE AMENDMENT & REZONE

Address: 10049 S Temple Dr, South Jordan, UT
84095 File No: PLZBA202500224
Applicant: Kyle Denos

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

Chair Gedge said if we can go back to the concept map, there seems to be a potential stub road in about the middle that would access to the north. Is that correct?

Planner Aguilera said so they show two stub roads, taxes to the north and one taxes to the south, those are the only two.

Chair Gedge said and they're offset, I'm assuming, to prevent cross traffic?

Planner Aguilera said I wouldn't know that.

Chair Gedge said can we go to the overview of the joint property? So obviously, on the west side of the property, there is a pretty recognizable October pumpkin patch that is on that property right there that's going to be divided by two thirds almost. Of course, this might be for the applicant. I guess you know, will that use continue on the remaining parcel? And my concern would be the majority of visitors that use street parking, which is going to be eliminated here by some homes. So I just want to raise that on the record as well, besides a second at access from 13th to 10th West for people who get backed up on Shields Lane looking to cut through 10th west to fast away. So any concerns you have there with the current use that's on the pumpkin patch, if that was to continue and parking.

Planner Aguilera said we don't know what the plans are for the current use of that property over its neighbor. So I think that would be best for the applicant to speak on.

Chair Gedge said so on 10th West, what is the road rating for this level, and how many vehicular traffics per day, and how many would be potentially increased with 46 additional homes.

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said currently on 10th West it has an ADT of 1500 vehicle trips per day. That's for a collector road, for a two lane collector Road, that's like a level of service, and we try to keep our roads above level of service D, for 46 lots an average single family home is 10 trips per day. So it would be about 460 trips additional per day, but that would be spread out throughout a few different access points, that wouldn't be 100% on 10th West.

Chair Gedge said I live right off 10th West and it is 25 miles per hour. And obviously, this would have to go through us this evening. Then to City Council for a preliminary subdivision, then actually built. If there were going to be speed issues, which are currently potentially issues along southwest, what are the mechanisms to help mitigate any potential safety concerns of increased traffic. But obviously, people who are new to this area, who may not follow the posted speed limit status, what remedies would we have in the future? Just as we evaluate this proposal.

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said the city has a pretty good form online. They can search up South Jordan City traffic enforcement request, and that request goes directly to the police department for traffic enforcement for speed violations, those kind of things. If there's concerns about the design of the road, design considerations or concerns. They're always welcome to contact the engineering department, and we can do a speed study and other things to look and see if there's any recommended changes.

Commissioner Hollist said who owns the surrounding land to the north and the south? Is it the same owner?

Planner Aguilera said I would not know about all the ownerships around this property. I can look that up.

Commissioner Hollist said I'm just curious why this strip, if it's the same landowner, why this piece?

Planner Schindler said it looks like three lots at the top and the same at the bottom. That section is owned by the current owner the Sherman Maybe family LLC.

Commissioner Hollist said so they own both, and the land to the south.

Planner Schindler said yes, and then to the north is Maureen Anderson investments LLC.

Commissioner Hollist said so just so that I don't lose it, I will have a question for the applicant. Why not develop all of it at the same time? Because piggybacking on what Commissioner Gedge said, I lived on a residential street growing up in Sandy that was long and straight, and it did make it for speeding. You're presenting here a long straight road with with a bend, and actually, mine had a bend too, and that's where the accidents happen, because people would be going too fast. So, I actually do have some concerns about how this is set up. And if you were to develop at the same time, potentially all of that, I think there might be some better solutions. So that's just a concern. My next is, was there any discussion with the applicant about the zoning request? So why an R.3 instead of maybe an R2.5 or a R1.8 that might be a more natural transition for this area and match better what's there.

Planner Aguilera said so an R.3 was chosen because, based on its size and the number of lots they wanted to have on these properties the density that would best accommodate their skinny road. The

R.3 with an R2.5, or an R1.8 they would have less lots based on this property's size. As far as concepts, we did have a discussion with them, a consultation when they came in with this proposal, they did explain, and they can probably speak more to this. They wanted to kind of try to match the esthetic of the surrounding area with these country style homes. This is what they think would best fit their project and that area.

Commissioner Hollist said if all the surrounding open land, agricultural around this were to develop at an R.3, how many units are we talking? so this strip is 46 but is it about 90 more if you did what's north and south.

Planner Aguilera said I would have to take a look at the size of each property to accurately determine how many lots based on the proposed density of R.3.

Commissioner Hollist said you put stubs on this obviously, to leave open the possibility of developing the properties to the north. But, do you anticipate that this will be the arterial connection point that everything will funnel into from the north and south?

Planner Aguilera said that's hard to say, because right now, their concept plan shows a stub road, but it doesn't necessarily align with what's on the south side, for example. So I'm not sure maybe Jeremy could speak to this better.

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said I've not seen any plans for that. I think it's just trying to accommodate future development.

Commissioner Gedge said can I just ask a question about noticing. What distance were people notified? 300 feet, 500 feet off Temple Drive?

Planner Aguilera said the noticing was based on a buffer of all seven properties. So 300 foot buffer of all seven properties. The sign for the required notice was placed on 13th West at the address of 10049, South temple drive. That's where the sign originally was placed.

Commissioner Gedge said I'm assuming this afternoon I saw it on 10th West, was that moved today?

Planner Aguilera said no, it wasn't moved. An additional sign was added on that side.

Chair Gedge said and does that satisfy the noticing requirements on a property this size.

Planner Schindler said the one satisfies the requirement of the code, but we added the other one to make sure everybody was able to see it on both sides. We did hear from people that said they didn't see the sign because it was on 13th west.

Commissioner Catmull said so in the general plan under Agricultural Preservation, I believe there are some characteristics that come into play and I don't know if I saw those analysis in the staff

report. So I'm just looking at some of my notes here on the Agricultural Preservation and in there was character clustering and a few things like that. Did the staff have do analysis of it, specifically, what the general plan said, in addition to the grow live goals and everything else that's in there.

Planner Aguiler said not on Agricultural Preservation, the reason is because the applicant intends to amend the current land use as well to go from preservation to stable neighborhoods. So because of that, the analysis on Agricultural Preservation wasn't done.

Commissioner Catmull said it does say that growth is anticipated, that it should be primarily residential, and so I see that piece of the compatibility.

John Thomas, Consultant – said the Mabey family approached us to help them to develop this piece of property that has been in their family for 140 to 150 years. This is kind of an honor for me. It's been kind of fun. It's been really fun working with John and his his sibling, and the reason that we're not developing all the property around it, is just because John's family only owns that strip. So, as property passes down from generation to generation, different kids get different land. He is surrounded by cousins, so he has leased this property to his cousin for decades now to farm. But the use of that is not something they've needed to develop and find the best use for that property. And so they hired us to help. This isn't this big bad developer, this is us trying to help some people in their retirement years. But, to answer some of the questions, like the biggest question is always traffic, right? We've talked to the to the planners, which were fantastic, by the way, your city planners. They are some of the best I've worked with, and I've worked with almost every city in Utah. They're, great to work with, very smart. But we talked about what some of the things we've done for other communities which are moving towards pinch points. People don't really like the speed bumps. People don't slow down for them very much, but the pinch points tend to be a better type scenario, and in speaking with Jeremy about the traffic in the area, it is lighter than I've seen in any other other projects we've worked on. But, we're happy to do traffic studies, which will come back showing a very low usage, I believe. But we also want to talk about the future development. We are happy to put those stub roads in wherever the city planners tell us to do. Most of the time, we just take their instructions while we're doing preliminary plat and roll with what they need. So we'll do all of the testing, all the all the geotech's, and everything that's necessary to make certain that this is as good or better than any other subdivision in our beautiful city.

Commissioner Hollist said back to the density. I know it feels like there's not much difference between a 2.5 and a R.3. But back to my original question, why R.3 when everything else around it is bigger than that. And let me then piggyback and say, because the next developer is going to come and say, Well, this is an R.3 so why not an R.5 with everything around it. It only gets denser and denser.

Mr. Thomas said so a lot of times it's not really the size of the lot that matters, it's a shape for a building pad. If you're developing something for a future builder or homeowner, something that we found that's a lot better than a rectangle, is a square. And so that size, just based on the the width of the property and the length of the property, really works here, and especially for marketability. People nowadays just don't want large yards, so it's harder to take care of. People aren't interested

in that anymore, they spend more time inside. But we do want to preserve the look and feel of this community, because it does have such a beautiful agricultural history, and so we wanted to really produce this for builders or homeowners, to have more of a farmhouse type look. We even talked about having community gardens, community orchards, and some of the spaces around you. The stub areas as a possibility. So we're pitching those ideas back and forth with the city planners, because we'd rather not have ugly stub roads, so things like that until future development happens. And so we're the most cooperative development team there is in making something that is a beautiful product that makes sense for the community, that fits the surrounding communities, because there are similar zones surrounding this. We toured the neighborhoods, and it just looks nice. So that's the the reasoning for that lot size.

Commissioner Hollist said which lot has the building that will be preserved?

Mr. Thomas said this is the oldest house in South Jordan, so I'm going to depend on that. I don't know if it's accurate, but it's right there, and it's actually part of our plat. It's not showing a line there, it's a very small farmhouse, but it does have historic value that I think tells quite a story. The family was even thinking about putting a memorial plaque there. I don't know if that would be interesting to the city, but it's a thought. This next season on the pumpkin patch, the land's still going to be leased to Steve for the pumpkin patch, but I do believe that all along that road there will still be like plenty of parking for that.

Chair Gedge opened the Public Hearing to comments.

Jim Buyer, South Jordan – said we are just to the east of the property, so we have a senior water, rights. It's number 59-166, and it is fed by the groundwater, we also have a hillside stream. Utah's groundwater policy emphasizes that groundwater in the western Salt Lake Valley is limited and that new developments must not impair existing rights before approving this rezone, I request a formal hydrogeological study assessing an impact from the excavation, the soil compaction, grading and changes in storm water infiltration on shallow or perched groundwater that may feed my stream. The UGS has shown that shallow groundwater systems are highly susceptible to disturbances from development. I also request that low impact storm water designs be required to maintain natural recharge. Finally, I request ongoing groundwater monitoring before, and during construction, so that's verified that it doesn't decrease. I have three asks and three questions. First one is to have a baseline groundwater level measurement to be performed near our property before construction begins, and then on going monitoring during the grading and foundation digging. There has been problems in the area with deeper basements than are typical, a requirement that develops and developers mitigate if the water levels of the stream flow declines. So, as long as they cause a problem, we need them to fix their problem. And my three questions are, will the city require a geological study for the development area? And second, will all studies be made available that are impacting high water right holders for approval? And will there be a public comment period after technical studies are published?

Cindy Buyer, South Jordan – said just down on River Pass Cove, there was a house that was built there, and that's what brought this all to our attention. That house has a pump that goes

constantly because of the groundwater in the area, and they are now pumping that water which used to flow down our water right. They're now pumping it away into a different storm drain, and it's diverting it off of our actual water right. If that happened along this whole back area, we would no longer have our water rights, so we just want to just preserve that.

Glen Herberger, South Jordan – said I just wanted to raise concerns about the adequate notice. I mean, the sign just showed up today on 10th W, and if it was sitting out on 13th W we would never have seen it. So I think that you would see a lot more people here tonight if adequate notice was actually provided to the residents. It's nice that they took 300 feet, but that is such a small sampling of what is really going to be impacted by this new development. I also have concerns about the density, once you have those small lots, and you have the appropriate setbacks around those lots, those are going to be small homes. The present images that were provided are much larger homes. I'm not adverse to the development, what I am adverse to is the density. I think that the lots should match what's the surrounding area. The new development that has happened have similar lots, similar character homes. I would think that typically, when you get this far into a development they probably have plans for homes. Is that the case or not? Are we just relying upon the present images that were provided? That was one of the questions I had, how far into the development process are they? Are there homes that are currently planned for these sites. Because that will be really telling as to how large these homes really are.

Tom Draper, South Jordan– said we're actually the lot that has that pump. It's nice to finally meet you in person, went through a lot of headache working with the city and everything to make sure that was all kosher and not affecting your stuff. I appreciate you guys, and I appreciate you guys being thankful as well. Anyway, water was not going to be one of my things I was going to bring up, but it probably should be mentioned to the developers that there is a very high water table. We don't have a giant deep basement, but it's a basement below the garage, so it's a little two tier, and it's had a lot of water. If someone can pull up the land use map. This development seems to be basically just dissecting the Agricultural Preservation zone in half. You're segmenting this whole land use in between these two, this strip of residential that doesn't really feel like following the intent of that land use. I don't know if staff has reviewed that or not, but that was one of my thoughts. Also, several have mentioned the lot size. I'm a civil structural engineer by trade, and I've been with other cities doing this job and I understand the logistics of getting stuff to fit. There are three in the area, but directly adjacent to this, it's all larger. Our three in the area are separated away from it, but within the area, so having houses that were shown in the concept seem to be much, much bigger than what could fit on a quarter acre lot. That's my main point. My main question was just with the land use, and if staff had reviewed slicing the preservation zone in half and then dividing it.

Kirsten Draper, South Jordan – said I also just wanted to voice concerns about the size of the lots. But before that, we're new to South Jordan from Bluffdale, and part of the reason why we valued coming to South Jordan, so we both met and married in Portland, Oregon, where there is a lot of our Agricultural Preservation. And we fell in love with this area because of the Agricultural Preservation, but also recognize the need to grow. And so it's not necessarily that we want to say no, but I do want to voice my concern with the lot sizes and also Commissioner Hollist, thank you

for mentioning about the traffic. My father has been an HOA president, not because he wanted to, but because he's the nice guy down in Saratoga Springs. He's done it for over 15 years, and we are always down there with them. They went through a similar concern where they're near the golf course, and he is part of the community where a very similar addition to their community was built. It was a straight road, very similar to this same lot sizes, and I got to witness what difficulties and challenges came to that neighborhood. They did have to put in speed bumps. They did have to do a lot of alterations because of the speed and traffic flow did increase in massive amounts due to families and school schedules and afternoon schedules. I did witness as I navigated that with the community, trying to solve some pretty significant problems with safety. So I would also recommend that lot sizes be reviewed, and I also voice what my husband said about the fact that it doesn't seem very congruent to just take half of this Agricultural Preservation land. It seems dubious, and so I also just respect the thought that you're putting into this, when you look at the safety, and also just the logic of what the reality is. It sounds pretty. I do believe there will be concerns, I just appreciate you recognizing that and trying to identify those and value this beautiful neighborhood that we're so privileged to be a part of.

Breanna Allred, South Jordan – said so to reiterate a little bit of what we've heard. I am concerned about the lot sizes as well. We are just to the north of this development, and we're the 2.5 there and I would love to see that continue if we're going to make new lots, and also know what the house sizes are going to be on these new lots. I would disagree with the fact that people want less yard overall, especially in these types of neighborhoods. They also mentioned community areas and things, but it doesn't really show where there's any space for any of that in that community. And 10th West, even though part of it was redone, it is still a very small road to handle this amount of extra traffic. So I am very concerned, and want to voice that I would like to have 10th West looked at for this. I actually probably fall within that 300 foot and I did not receive a notice in the mail, and alot people that I've talked to, haven't received notices. There were some in our neighborhood, and then I noticed the sign this afternoon and started reaching out to my neighbors, and a lot of people didn't know what was going on. So I think that maybe there should be a redo for people to actually know that this is happening, because this is the first I've heard of it.

Paul Paxton, South Jordan – said I would like to thank you commissioners for allowing me to speak and allowing us to voice our opinion. I voice the same opinion, or a similar opinion that the other speakers have said, and that's concerning the density. I would like to see this remain as a 2.5 and then have a master plan so that when lands are developed years or decades down the road, it's the same thing. I've lived in South Jordan for over 35 years and there have been a lot of changes, many of which I'm not really in favor of. But if we go from a 2.5 or 1.8 to an R.3 then that's a significant change. When the next developer comes along, it's going to be an R.4 and then R.5 and then, I might as well live out in Daybreak or someplace that's that I don't really care to live in. I don't like the congestion. So that's my 10 cents on that. I also wondered if there were going to be any open areas, any little farmland areas, so that people could remember what has been in this area. The other things that I worry about is water. We in Salt Lake County, don't put a lot of science behind our water. And my degree is in science, and I have a daughter that works on a couple of different commissions with the Great Salt Lake on trying to save that, this year in particular. Alta ski resort for example, is sitting below 50% of normal. We've had some good years, but we also

have some occasional bad years. So, I think that as a commission and as a city, we need to watch what we develop because of water and so I have a couple of questions that I know won't be answered. Will there be canal water available for these lots? And then what will be the guidelines that are given to these lots to try to control the amount of water a little bit, and then, will the city receive water rights? When the city went to to annex 2200 acres for daybreak, I asked that question, and they said we did not receive water rights from Kennecott or any place, and we all know they have a lot of water rights, so we need to have water. We just can't rely on strawberry.

Ryan Dunford, South Jordan – said just to echo what's already been said and add one comment. First off, the lots are too small. 12,000 square feet, people will buy bigger lots. Mabey Lane has kind of shown that there's lots of areas around the city where lots are getting too small, density is getting too packed, and this is an area that can have and sustain bigger lots that will also help with the traffic. Second is the notice. I'm within that 300 foot boundary and I got nothing. I saw the sign on 13th West two days ago, and it is was Tuesday. I don't even know what time you have to give people, I would think a minimum 7 days notice. I work for an airline, and I'm out of town four and five days a week, and if I hadn't been home off chance today, I wouldn't have been here. So, thenoticing was a bad, was a bad ball drop by somebody. Third thing, retention pond. You guys have these things all over South Jordan. Where's the retention pond for this area? Is there going to be a plan for one, either in this particular subdivision or the one just north of my house, but I guess south of the street anyway, those are my comments.

Janilla Decker, South Jordan – said I also want to complain. I guess I'm a little farther than 300 feet, but this sign notice just being dropped off today was quite startling, and all our neighbors are really frustrated and not happy about that, so I'm kind of representing my little happy neighborhood. I wanted to request that the Commission puts a delay on approval of the rezone until the neighborhood surrounding it is well notified. I have huge concerns over the designs of this future neighborhood, connecting 13th to 10th right here in one big long street. Is going to create an undesirable traffic pattern for the surrounding areas and undesirable street design that doesn't blend with the surrounding area. The future development plans are smaller lots on a tree street of this nature will not lead to a long term great community design. And as a my friend that's a county planning commissioner, she lives in Shy Ridge, she wants to encourage more awareness to the surrounding community before pushing this rezone to council. And so, yeah, that's my concern. But of course, you already mentioned traffic and and then the small lots to reiterate.

Jennifer Smith, South Jordan – said I am just north of the proposed area. I would say that maybe some things may be a little bit different spin on the density. I also think the lots need to be bigger. I would disagree that we all want smaller lots. Most of us move to South Jordan because we enjoy the agriculture. We want a garden and a yard. And so, I would propose that's probably not the reason we want neighbors who are also going to appreciate the pumpkin patch next to them, and yes, the occasional dust when it's when it's being plowed, and people that are okay with agriculture being around them, whether it's farm animals or gardens or things like that. I do appreciate the idea of having a community garden or a community green space, but that would also need to be in the plans. As the lots get smaller, people still want their square footage, the homes get taller, so I'd also like that to be considered. My sweet neighbors, the Drapers that live right next door to me, started

digging, and there was a pond in their foundation. We had a couple of ducks for weeks, until we started pumping it. But, their house needed to get taller in order to accommodate their plans. I live in a rambler right next to them.

Corrina Wolf, South Jordan – said so I live on one of the streets that this development would be directly connected to. I actually did not learn about this meeting till six o'clock tonight. One of my sweet neighbors texted me. So, I think I do fall into the area that I should have been getting a notice, and we did not. I do understand that I don't have enough information about this development, but the little information that I have leads to great concern. One of them is that our little street is not able to hold high traffic. We can barely view the parking on one side of the street in the neighborhood and to park on the other side, you can get a car through. So if we have an emergency or a fire truck going through that neighborhood with that high density, that's a great concern for us on Chosen Way. The other one that I'm thinking as I look at those plans, when our neighborhood was built, I don't know if I can call a rule, but it was a three car garage. It doesn't seem like that these homes are big enough that they can accommodate a three car garage, so it would not go along with the planning of our neighborhood. High density is a huge concern. I know others have spoken to, but not just the high density, but the demographic and the looks of South Jordan. Most of us moved here for land. Those that don't want land are in Daybreak and in Salt Lake City. We want land. So I'm not against this development. I'm against poor development. And I think right now, we don't have enough information to pass this, and I hope that we can look further into into this development before we approve.

Annette Barney, South Jordan – said I'd like to thank Commissioner Catmull for bringing up the Agricultural Preservation topic, because the land use amendment that they'd like to make, I think, will dramatically change the feel that is generally planned into this area. I think you've asked questions that are really great about addressing that, and I would hope that you continue to question that as you go through this. I'd also like to thank Commissioner Hollist for bringing up everything about the future development questions and the density and how that opens up the doorway for even more dense developments in the future. Thank you for that. And Commissioner Gedge, I too have a strong concern about that traffic. It looks to me exactly like a through street for shields lane and everybody who wants to skip that really long wait, so please keep focused on that for me and make sure that this concern can be dealt with appropriately, so that when the land is developed, it doesn't become a danger to anyone. I'm not sure that just having a little blip in it is going to slow anybody down on their way when they're tired at the end of the day. So that that's that's really all I want to say is thank you for questioning this and keeping in mind the needs that we have as a city for this development to balance our desire for pleasant agricultural in this area of South Jordan With the needs for development and growth.

Steve Tingey, South Jordan – said my property is back and right adjacent to this property. I own approximately two acres there. I've had animals the whole time I've lived in South Jordan, that's why we came here, because of the openness, and I've seen a lot of changes. The zoning has gone smaller and smaller. So I am concerned about the density, and I want to make sure that I'm still able to irrigate the property that I have. I'll have run off water, and I need to know what, and where that will go to. But my main concern is the density, and I'd like some open air to breathe a little bit.

Thank you for your time. I've known both families involved for 54 years. They're all great people, and appreciate their right to do with the property what they want, but we still want to live here and be comfortable.

Jessie Jameson, South Jordan – said I am within the 300 foot notice. But as few people have already said today, that not enough notice was provided. I found out about this notification at 5:30pm today, and have been fervently taking some notes. Will a geological study be conducted? I think that's important. Will an Agricultural Preservation study be conducted? I think that's also important. And as well, will proper water rights and water impact study be done for this increased population of 46 homes. Again, concerns of density have already been spoken about. It's a concern. Will the city consider the traffic impact to the adjacent neighborhoods, and how will this be addressed. For example, speed bumps introduced. I know there's been pros and cons against that, but I can attest, living on that street, that there's a lot of speeding, as you well know. And I would say there's actually quite high in the traffic that goes the traffic flow that goes through there. So will the traffic flow study be conducted? I also echo the sentiments and benefits of having larger lots. It does serve several things. There's less traffic, obviously, less water usage and lifestyle is a benefit having larger yards, gardens and so forth. And then lastly, is there a historical requirement to meet in order to approve this proposal? I mean, there's 140 150 year old farm that's been here in South Jordan. So that was just a question that I had as well. Thank you. Thank you, sir. Please come forward.

Kevin Tominey, South Jordan – said I live right next door to Steve and Janet Mabey. I've actually been a planning commissioner before. It's been about 10 years on South Jordan City Architectural Review. So I've had a little bit of a taste of that side of it. I know how difficult it can be, just a couple quick points to ponder. So, this whole area was large lots, It was all 2.5 1.8 predominantly 1.8 and then R 2.5 got introduced. And then somewhere, I think it was around 15 years ago, Stone Haven was introduced to that, which is that one island of R.3 that's right kind of in the middle of it. And even then, everyone came out and said, please make it 2.5 so that there's not a future argument to be made for more R.3. And here we are. Here we are again. You know one thing, had South Jordan City got their head out of their hiney years ago and come up with a minimum lot size, and said, this is where we're going to be. Let Daybreak do what they want to do. If you want to live on top of your neighbors, Daybreaks, great place for you. But down here, these were all large lots, but we keep introducing more and more stuff, and Hidden Village that was part of the downturn. They came in, cried their eyes out, and they got double the density. So at any rate, 2.5 is just great down there, they're still going to make money. It's going to knock off about six houses. Not a huge impact. But the lots are going to be bigger. They've got some serious water issues. Those those foundations are going to be way out of the ground and where it looks like they're doing two stories, it's going to be a massive visual impact. Just throw us a bone. Give us 2.5 and don't keep adding to the burden there of R.3 that at some point it just tips and it can't we'll never go back. So thanks for your time.

John Thomas Lloyd, South Jordan – said doesn't Agricultural Preservation mean that you cannot split the land into small parcels for residential housing, as long as we have somebody willing to cultivate the land, the land should maintain its Agricultural Preservation. That is the use planning

for open space contradicts what the city has discussed openly, specifically, what has happened this last year with the best dental office on 9800 south and Temple Drive. On the development of that corner, a point was brought up at one of the city council meetings on September 2 of last year, and I asked this, who will own this open space? Is it the city? If so, it contradicts what the city council has said, as mentioned in that city council meeting on September 2. Council Member McGuire asked for clarification regarding small parks in the city's new master plan. He noted that the city seems to be moving away from creating new small, quote, mini parks, and asked if that was consistent with the plan. He referenced existing small parks, such as the one on 9400 South, noting that those would continue to be maintained. But in general, the city is shifting away from adding new mini parks. The Assistant City Manager clarified that according to the city's sustainability and operational guidelines, new city parks are typically planned with a minimum size of four acres. Smaller remnant parcels like the one at 9400 south were improved only when additional funds were available, as these parcels otherwise had no specific purpose. He further explained that the city generally avoids creating new mini parks unless improvements can be implemented concurrently with development. So a four acre open space that's not adequate replacement of 17 acres, as long as somebody is willing to cultivate the land, let them. Let them cultivate it.

Rowlane Hanson, South Jordan – said I first want to say I agree with everything that's being said that needs to be checked out. My concern is that this notice didn't come very quickly, and the information is inaccurate on it, because here where it mentions, you can see what's being posted. It says it would not be posted until January the 27th today, at noon. Now, I know it was posted on Friday, but you've got all kinds of people who didn't even know anything was even happening, and I think the inaccuracy of this needs to be addressed first and foremost, because everybody has the right to have the information. So that's my opinion. May I just make one more statement about how we don't have a lot of traffic, come to where I live and try and get on Temple drive out of my driveway.

Ruth Carling, South Jordan – said we didn't get a notice at all, we just got a text this evening at six. So I have a few concerns. I think the density is too high, and we need to think about agricultural conservation. I'm sure there's probably somebody who would want to buy that land that would want to farm. But on chosen way, there was a time when you were working on 10400 south that you made shields Lane a collector route. I don't know if that still is, but chosen way couldn't handle that kind of traffic. And when you think about schools, busses, you really need to consider all the infrastructure that's involved in that much density. And I'm also concerned about water.

Britton Smith, South Jordan – said I would put my name also as someone who did not receive notification, so something happened there. I feel compelled to observe from my position in the rear of the room certain people's reactions to several comments that have been made by residents directly affected by their development. It's insulting, and it compels me to make a comment. As I look at the initial concept, I think my daughter could make a better concept of a better way to use this land. So it's insulting when our comments are laughed upon.

Eric Smith, South Jordan – said if your going to do a traffic study, make sure you do it in October, when there is the most traffic. I know the Maybe's are going to keep doing the pumpkins and the pumpkin patch, and that would be very important to put on the books. Thank you very much.

Chair Gedge closed the Public Hearing.

Chair Gedge said probably the most pressing issue was raised was the noticing with the sign. I don't know the legalities but I believe it is 10 days, or is it two weeks prior to the meeting.

Planner Schindler said the noticing is it has to be mailed within 10 days, whether it arrives within 10 days, it's up to the post office, not the city.

Commissioner Gedge said just also confirm that it was was put on the Utah Public Notice website.

Planner Schindler said it was noticed before the 10 day window. It is on the UPN website if it needs to be verified.

Chair Gedge said was it all seven parcels within 300 feet, or is it over a certain address?

Planner Schindler said it's every parcel that we measure 300 feet all the way around. We have a county map when it comes to the who the owners are. We just click on the the parcels, and then it'll generate the the notice. It will generate the 300 feet with everybody's name included in there, anybody on Chosen Way is 600 feet away, so they did not get any notice, it's only in the 300 feet.

Commissioner Hollist said I tried to follow where people lived, and so you've answered one of them, but I am aware that one of the people who spoke is adjacent to one of these seven properties. However, it is the biggest piece. So is it a possibility that whatever you used for the address of that biggest piece, it could still be 300 feet away to an adjacent property.

Planner Schindler said it's at the border, we make the boundary around from the border.

Planner Aguilera said I didn't receive any return mail for the list that was produced and generated from the 300 foot buffer. I will say this 300 foot buffer does not include the two properties on River Pass Cove. So those two properties, the generator did not include them in that mailing list.

Chair Gedge said obviously, staff has confirmed what they've used to generate the list and our requirements, just as our legal advisor, do you have any concerns that the noticing was followed per state statute or city code.

Assistant City Attorney Greg Simonson said it's so good to hear from all of these people, and it is of concern when they stand up and say, you know, I didn't get notice, but we knew this was going to be an issue tonight, and so we went over the requirements. I am completely convinced that all the legal requirements were met for noticing. I was concerned that another sign went up later, but

that was not legally required. That was an effort by staff to get the word out further to people, so anybody that is concerned about noticing can come into the city. They can see the exact list of who was on there. So if somebody didn't get noticed and they're within the 300 feet, they can come in and look and see if they are on the list. The city cannot guarantee delivery of course, but we can guarantee compliance with the statute, and that was sent out within that 10 days.

Chair Gedge said I guess one thing I should have maybe stated earlier is that I am a resident of this area, definitely outside of 300 feet, but I have some relationships with individuals here. I don't have a direct ownership or interest in this property, so I did not recuse myself. I do have interest, but I know that when I noticed this item on the Utah Public Notice website on the date several weeks ago. I know I put it on my social media to share with some of my neighbors who are definitely outside of 300 feet, but I don't think any of them are present here in the chambers this evening, so it's unfortunate.

Commissioner Hollist said would this require improvements along 10th West, where it is adjacent curb, sidewalk, expanding the road, dedicating the piece to make it up to city standards.

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said in this area was recently improved with sidewalks, curb and gutter on 10th West, so I don't at this point. I mean, we're not looking at the site plan, so I'm not 100% sure, but at this point in time, nothing comes to mind, as far as improvements that would be required.

Chair Gedge said I was going to bring this up this evening, but this evening you just mentioned, this part of the road was just recently done with curb and gutter and widening and putting park strips in. Was the city aware of the potential of this application before we went through the expense of putting that in, because now we're going to have to cut the curb and gutter to potentially put in a road, and that just seems a little wasteful. You don't need to answer that, but it's on the record. The next theme obviously traffic, which we can mitigate that if it was to move forward with a site plan.

Commissioner Hollist said can we talk about speed bumps. I don't think the city does speed bumps anymore. Jeremy, would not even be a traffic calming option.

Assistant City Engineer Nelson said the city stopped doing speed bumps in the 90s. But there's a lot of other traffic calming things that they do. When you drive through daybreak, you can see the the bump outs. And you know, there's other things that can be done that aren't speed bumps.

Chair Gedge said one resident raised the idea that it was a dead end from 10th and one from Technical Drive. That probably would not be with fire access. A fire access and other cities like garbage collection and snow removal, have two dead ends.

Assistant City Engineer said yeah, that's not in line with what the general plan is to try and connect the communities.

Chair Gedge said just after traffic, the next item would be water. A lot of stuff on water rights. Obviously, there's a canal that down flows, there's some groundwater issues and studies. So before, we move forward and get approval by city council and get to the next steps, would any type of water or ground study be required.

Assistant City Engineer Neilson said basically, as part of the site plan process and the building permit process, we require a geotechnical study, they would also do soil borings to measure the the groundwater elevation to determine if basements are feasible.

Commissioner Hollist said is it standard to require it. Mr. And Mrs. Buyer requested that happened, both as a baseline ongoing, and post, would that be standard procedure?

Assistant City Engineer Neilson said we don't monitor that actively, but it would be publicly available and part of our future planning commission staff reports. I don't know if the general public has access to those results, or only the developer, the applicant, and the city staff.

Chair Gedge said would it be publicly available and or part of our future planning commission staff reports? Or what would the general public have access to those results, or only the developer, the applicant, and the city staff.

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said I am certain that the geotechnical report would be available through a GRAMA request. It probably wouldn't be something we typically would include in a packet though.

Chair Gedge said it was mentioned about a retention pond. Any concerns with 25, 50 or 100 year, storm drain and water collection? What I can't recall on 10th West, did we put in the road improvements. I mean, can you address any concerns or need for a retention pond in this area that's currently a farm that's never absorbing the water for all these years, any concerns for water retention.

Assistant City Engineer Neilson said as they proceed through the design they will need to do an on site retention for at least the 80 percentile storm, and that's for per our low impact development requirements. Beyond that, if there's capacity available in the existing storm drainage system, then they can release into that storm drain system. If there's no system that has capacity, then they may need to retain 100% but we don't know for sure at this point what would be required there, but a minimum of the 80 percentile.

Chair Gedge said I'm assuming, because it's currently a working farm over 17 acres, there is irrigation rights that also flow down eastward towards properties down the line as well. I mean, what's the ramifications or responsibility as we consider this type of request. Or is that a civil matter? In the past, I thought we had allowed the water to continue to flow to people who are already using it and have rights to that. What are the ramifications with the developer if this were to go through, would we have to make sure that that water flows uninterrupted, either by piping, or

are there any concerns with the people who have existing water rights down downstream from this property.

Assistant City Attorney Simonson said typically, as part of the engineering with this, that's something that the developer is required to do to ensure that whoever has water rights that they continue to have access to those water rights. And if there's well water those kind of things they may need to put in pipes to manage that tail water. As far as regulating those water rights, the city doesn't have that responsibility.

Commissioner Hollist said this seems a little more nuanced than what we normally get. We often have somebody show up with their ditch master agreement or their irrigation agreement. This seems a little more murky to me. I'm not even sure what I'm asking.

Assistant City Attorney Simonson said let me make a couple of comments that went through my mind on this issue. I'm sorry, I don't remember the first people that came up. Their water rights are very important to them. I don't know exactly how those look on paper to them, and it's up to them to protect those rights and it's going to be on the developer to make sure that those rights are not interfered with. In the end, the city can require the geotechnical report and analysis, and I would encourage these people with water rights to follow that. I don't know what to say beyond that, there was a question asked whether the city, or anybody has any rights to develop water anymore. And this project, like virtually every other project that is going on in the city, will hook up to the city water system. The city does have enough water. If the situation ever comes to the point where we don't have enough water, development will stop. Somebody also asked if the city requires a developer to contribute to the water, as we have studied in our training meetings it is called an exaction, and the city has the right to impose on the developer an exaction in the amount, or approximate amount of the water that their development is going to be using. They have to purchase that water and then donate it to the city. And that that's done on virtually every development that I'm aware of, and I assume it will be done here as well.

Chair Gedge said on the water retention pond, though Jeremy answered, but for the 80 percentile storm, that would be the developer to maintain open space of some sort to accommodate that if there's not adequate drainage through the city's pipe system, correct?

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said it's really connected to open space, though it's more they could do underground chambers if they chose to, but those are quite expensive, so typically, it's in open space.

Chair Gedge said so the current property obviously has irrigation, I'm assuming from one of the canal companies. I'm looking at the proposed zone R.1-8, if that turns to a R-3 zone would they be able to choose irrigation or secondary water irrigation.

Assistant City Attorney Simonson said that's going to be more of a question for the developer on how they're going to work on that. I live in South Jordan and I have city water, and I also have

irrigation water, so there's places that have them both, and I don't know if this is going to be one of them.

Chair Gedge said it was raised because of the stub home. I'll call it the original home, is very historical, the oldest home in South Jordan. The farm I drive by very frequently, like multiple times daily, it has historical farm signage. Are there any concerns with any historical designation? I know we've had that over by the seminary before, people claiming that there's a historic road. Are there any concerns with any historical requirements of moving this from a farm agricultural to residential. Are there any concerns that we would be violating any historical designation that may be out there.

Planner Aguilera said so the historic land use would not apply in this case, it's the Agricultural Preservation of the one house on 13th West because the property owner wanted to do that, but they're not required to do that.

Chair Gedge said on the street size, maybe you can explain this. So if this were to be approved and be a street connecting to Temple Drive and 10th West with homes on both sides, what type of street size width would it be. Would curb and gutter be required, sidewalks on both sides. What are the minimum requirements for a street that might be in this area.

Assistant City Engineer Neilson said it would need to meet our street standard for residential street, which is 55 feet of width from the back of the sidewalk to the back of the sidewalk, which is about 28 feet of asphalt is what it is on a typical residential street, is how it would be designed.

Chair Gedge said this is also a land use amendment to change it from the Agricultural Preservation zone. It looks like we're making that change kind of down the middle, leaving remnants to both the north and the south of those zones. Usually, when we've done this, and I believe in our training that we considered late last year of a property just to the north of this as an example. You know, it wouldn't basically cut it down the middle and put the residential in the middle, and leave that remnants on the outside as agricultural. Are there any concerns of parting out the agricultural on both sides. And obviously that's an ultimate decision for city council to make. It's almost like a spot zoning with the land use amendment. Has the city ever done something similar. I've only been here for 50 years, so I can't recall if any.

Planner Schindler said there is evidence where we can go out further west, where it's called, they all have a stone name on their streets. They jumped way out there, and there was agricultural. Sunstone Village that was developed with an R.3 zone and with agricultural on all three sides that are in South Jordan, across the street from Herriman and nothing was developed there either, until they put the high school up. But this is long before the high school came up. So that's one place with an entire subdivision surrounded by an agricultural look. I can bet if I looked at old zoning maps when everything was agriculturally zoned, they divided that up to put it in our R-1.8 zone, because that was the first residential zone the city ever had. As the city develops, these things are going to happen, This family wants to develop this property, whether it's R.3 or something else. They have every right to apply for this and to develop their property. I imagine that the property

south of it, other members of their family own that property, and eventually they will probably want to do develop as well. I don't think this is going to always remain, and as we run out of land in South Jordan, that land becomes more valuable, and developers and people that may want to develop it will probably pay that price. And that's obviously what's driving up prices, part of what's driving up prices for everyone, you have to remember that the state legislature keeps an eye on what we do. If this is R.3, I don't particularly think that it's a high density zone. And there's only one other R.3 in the in the area, and as to the south, the rest of it is R-2.5. If it's developed as a subdivision, they are proposing 12,000 square foot lots, which is the minimum lot size of the of the R-2.5. And the only thing that they're getting out of this by getting R.3 is they get more lots. They're all going to be the minimum size in this that they're proposing is 12,000. So they get more of them, but if they're an R-2.5, they'll get six. I guess one of the residents figured out they're probably like six less units, but then we would still run under the scrutiny of the state. We have to provide as much housing as we can. I keep hearing they were one vote away from taking away the City's rights to zone.

Chair Gedge said I think the next one I held for last, which was lot size, which was probably the most common theme that came up and you answered that with R.3, R-1.8 and R-2.5. The differences on that, of course, we need to have a discussion on how we want to recommend that the city council. So that's all the questions I have. I mean, something came up about open areas, but we've kind of talked about that with the last one of the last individuals talked about the mini parks and open space on that.

Commissioner Hollist said there were several questions about the renderings that were shown of homes, and if those would be possible to fit on a quarter acre lot. Can you comment on that?

Planner Schindler said you can see what the houses look like, but we don't know what the footprint is going to be. The applicant can fill you in on that. When it comes to height, state law says it's 35 feet. It's been that way for years, so I don't think it's two story homes. We can't prohibit them necessarily, because in our code it allows up to 35 feet tall, and it has been since the 1990's, and the 1980's. So, regarding the number of garages, state law prohibits us from requiring any garage, let alone three.

Chair Gedge said obviously in an R.3, 12,000 acre lot minimum, there would be no animal rights. So the current use with the 17 acres, any animal rights would be forfeited with the zone, just to confirm that, for the record.

Planner Schindler said animal rights don't go away until the developments.

Chair Gedge said but the neighbors who are adjoining and have animal rights with their property that are not part of this application, so they would be able to maintain their animal rights, similar to the water rights we've discussed. Would it be the developer responsible to put in fencing to make sure that the animals don't impede on the new development?

Planner Schindler said yes, absolutely. If the property is zoned R3 or even R2.5, neither one of those zones allows animals, no matter what the size of the lot is, the developer is going to have to install a masonry wall along every property that does have animal rights.

Commissioner Farnsworth said there's some open space proposed. Would the city maintain that? Would the be maintained by the HOA, or maintained by the family.

Planner Schindler said I can't say for sure, but I would imagine that the it would be the HOA to take care of it, because it's just a small piece of property, and it costs a lot of money for the city t to maintain those things.

Commissioner Catmull said I think, as the planner on that open space, and potentially a historical marker or anything like that. Is there anything in this zone or application, if it's approved, that would require that stay in place. Because whenever we do something without a development agreement, a developer of that land can do basically anything in an R.3 so that could involve any of the uses that we have in our zones, not necessarily in this particular application.

Planner Aguilera said the use would have to be residential. I can't really speak to the potential home occupations that could come, there's different types, and those are different requirements that in some of them may or may not require conditional use permits, but it would have to take a look at the home occupation type.

Commisioner Catmull said the uses in chapter 17 of our code, the uses that are listed under R.3 would be full. There's no restrictions on any of those uses. If they are conditional, they can apply to apply for that use, and can be considered if it is a permitted use, they would be allowed automatically.

Planner Aguilera said some of them, for example a daycare. So the daycare requires a specific size. I think it has to be at least one acre, even if the zoning is in place. So none of these properties would qualify to be a daycare.

Planner Schindler said not unless they combined all the properties into one, because any individual property such as a daycare has to sit on a one acre lot. It can't sit on four quarter acres.

Commissioner Catmull said so I'm saying if they bought it and then subdivided, but subdivided and graded one property. Is there a maximum size?

Planner Schindler said I don't think there is a maximum size.

Commissioner Catmull said because I'm thinking also in residential neighborhoods, churches there's conditional uses in schools. And as we think about how the rest of this Agricultural Preservation may develop, those types of uses could come into this area, right?

Planner Schindler said I'm looking at the residential uses, the uses that are you just listed our community residential facilities, dormitories, which are not allowed anywhere in the City, in residential areas. But the allowed uses are, live, work, multi family, neighborhood, residential facilities, single family resident, single family attached and single family detached are the only residential uses that are even allowed throughout the zoning code, and so a daycare is not allowed on any residential lot.

Commissioner Catmull said I am just saying anything that isn't allowed in R.3 whatever that is, you can figure that out as there are permitted uses and there are conditional uses in any of the residential zones, and we haven't really talked about those. But back to the historical piece. Is there anything if this developer said, okay, we're going to do this. We're going to preserve this home, and we're going to put this monument here as a nod to the preservation of, you know, the agriculture preservation, and then someone else buys the property or whatever, and just chooses to get rid of it. Is there anything to stop them from doing that?

Planner Aguilera said not on this application. They're not required to maintain preservation of any existing building of that home. Them doing that is based on their own choice. If the land use is amended to stable neighborhood, at that point that Agricultural Preservation land use designation would be removed.

Commissioner Catmull said there's also no architectural restrictions, even though the initial development says we'll do this like a farm characteristic, there's nothing that enforces that to happen if someone chose to change it and build whatever.

Planner Auilera said, the zoning code does not allow us to specify architectural requirements like materials, design style for this zone, the styles of homes are examples from the applicant. That's what they said they intend to do, but they're the city code cannot hold them unless there's some sort of agreement code.

Commissioner Hollist said what studies are required?

Assistant City Engineer Neilson said the city engineer will make a decision on whether a traffic study is required. I can't think of any other studies like that you would require outside of that, like actual study site. Nothing comes to mind.

Commissioner Hollist said one item that just came up because of Commissioner Catmull questioning, the applicant mentioned that those two stubs potentially could be open space, public gardens in the interim, waiting for for future development. But tonight we're just talking about a land use and a zoning change. Is there anything inherently in place that would ensure access to properties to the north and south being able to develop and have access to their land later? How do we ensure that happens at Site Plan, or that that requirement would be met.

Assistant City Engineer Nelson said as I understand it, the city has a strong desire to stub those streets in so that in the future they could be connected and there will be signs posted at the end of

those streets that would indicate that the road would continue In the future beyond that, I don't know what else would be required.

Mr. Thomas (Consultant) said the density on the on this is we actually are at a 2.72 it's not an R.3 actually, if you look at the actual density, we're really close to that 2.5 and so that's why we picked the R.3 because we thought that it really fit. We're not trying to squeeze those lots smaller and fit into that R.3 and get smaller lots. I think this plan just kind of works for this, this little strip of neighborhood. And we don't know what home owners are going to want to build at the end of the day. We can recommend what they want to build on these lots. They're going to follow all the same rules that we all have on our own pieces of property, and one point or other, we're all living on farm property. So, the change and the growth of this and especially this county, has been tremendous. I grew up here and it's not the same, I used to ride my motorcycle all over the south end. So, whether that was legal or not, but I understand that change is really hard, but there are a lot of people that don't have place to live. We have a major housing crisis in this state, especially Utah County. So, like I said, our clients are not builders, so these are going to be professional builders coming in and doing the entire building permit process, creating a lot of revenue for the city, but also creating more taxpayers, more more community. And I never think that's a bad thing at all. I love people. I like to be around people, and I think these lots are plenty big. I know I live on one, I live on a half acre by the river, and it's way too much land for me. So I know that there are people that want larger lots, and there's still plenty of lots to buy and things like that, but at this point in time for our clients, it's just a time that they want to retire, and that farming is not working. So it's it's just a matter of change. The change is going to come. We have interest from all the other neighboring farms of how we did this and what we did. So it's all coming, and I think that we're the first mover, basically. So if there's anything we can do to ease that process, do pinch points, or any type of traffic considerations for for everyone, we we don't want to be a part of the problem. We want to be a part of a better community. And that that's sincere. Because typically, that's not always the case, these people are really great people, and so yeah, as far as the the land, the memorial to the property, that's a plaque for their ancestors. So it's definitely something that they want to do. Now, are their kids going to continue to own that farmhouse? I don't know. And I don't think that there are many historical preservation homes in South Jordan, and if they are, there might be be reception halls or something. But this is just a very small house. There's not much to it, just a little house, how they used to live in cramped quarters back in the day. We did do a geotech so we're waiting for the final report, but the the findings are very similar to other neighborhoods we've done. We did one just just north on the same temple drive on about 9800 S recently, and the water levels look very similar. You know, some of these people are going to want to build ramblers. Some people are going to want to build two story, but there is 100 feet of footage frontage on those homes. You can pretty much build with a 10 foot side side by side, setback and the 20 or 25 front, back. It's going to look like a beautiful community. It's not going to look much different than than an R.3. It's going to be whatever the math is on that our 2.5 sorry, it's going to be 2.2 difference. So it's very it's very minimal. But like I said, we just wanted conformity of the lots and so that's why we went with the R.3. The building pads as looking to the future, and what kinds of builders want to build in there.

Chair Gedge said with the potential for the North and South, on those stub roads, in the future planning, with the site plan, are you open to making sure those are preserved?

Mr. Thomas said yes, just in the future planning with the site plan. The only reason we mentioned the community gardens is because a lot of times those stub roads just sit there so we thought that that might be a good addition, and flair cities don't really like that very much. They like to have that already done, and it's all dedicated actually on the plat. So I think it was Commissioner Hollist that made that comment about how do we ensure that it stays, and it's all detailed on the plat. We are held to it. It's recorded. All these things, even the drainage pond, if we do need a drainage pond, we've talked to the city about that, we're happy to do a draining pond. We've done them in a lot of our neighborhoods, not all, because a lot of times the storm drainage is is able to hold all that capacity water for 100 year storm or an 80 year storm.

Chair Gedge said you heard about the water obviously, you are aware of fencing with animal rights and what preserving any existing water rights.

Mr. Thomas said when infrastructure is put in it will be required to have really nice masonry brick separating the agriculture preservation from our zone, and that's pretty common throughout all cities, so that's where they want that anyway.

Chair Gedge said I was going to just go first, because we're considering moving it from Agricultural Preservation to a stable neighborhood, and I'm probably the bad guy where the advocate just referenced his property on 9800 and temple drive. I believe that's my family's fault, that it was a similar circumstance of that. But, I also personally live in this area, so I would be actually impacted by the change as well. So I am torn. I love seeing the pumpkins and cows across the street, and the preservation of what I grew up in here in this area. And like I've mentioned several times this evening, there won't be many agricultural pieces left in the city. So I am torn on that one. One thing I should mention for the general public, where this is a legislative item, we're not held by any findings or requirements for city code. So these are ones that I know how I feel about how it impact the city. Obviously, the owner has property rights, and obviously, if the legislature is watching us, and they could undo any recommendations the City Council makes, so we need to be probably cognizant of that as well. But, how can we make it the best fit possible? I personally would like to see just slightly bigger lots, just with the neighborhood that's already existing, all the homes that are there, except for a few that are dash three. The rest are 2.5 so this would be my preference, that they would be slightly larger, even the 12,000 lot minimum, and the 100 foot footage or frontage. So that's my thoughts.

Commissioner Hollist said the reason I think I'm really struggling is again, back to that well planned neighborhood phrase. We often are dealing with infill opportunities, and so we kind of make exceptions sometimes for unique properties that are the last of an area. That's not the case here, and this seems like an opportunity to develop something thoughtful. And like Mr. Simonson just said, we can't force everybody to come to the table today, but I'm struggling with the long, straight road, the higher density than what's around it, just knowing that what's going to come next will be even higher density. Part of our land use plan talks about maintaining high standards,

having compatibility between the different zonings. And so I think I'm struggling with what's being asked this evening, because it's not an infill opportunity. It feels like we could do something better. I just don't know what that is.

Commissioner Catmull said I share a lot of those same thoughts. There is also this bit of a tension between goals. We have goals, growth of neighborhoods, of new neighborhoods, goals for the variety of densities, and then we have goals six and eight, which specifically prioritize the protection of specific land types. And I think, that's not written in stone, so then my mind really drifts to if this was the property right next to the other one, then wasn't this a slice of Agricultural Preservation, a proposed new one, and then another Agricultural Preservation. I would feel more comfortable about something like this. But as it is, it feels like to me, this is just my opinion, that if the property owner to the south with a narrow strip would be left as Agricultural Preservation, and wanted to continue Agricultural Preservation, and let's say they develop more. I don't know if they can, if it's technically feasible, but on point eight I think that's allowed in that land use. but this is really odd, it doesn't feel well planned. There's definitely competing interests. I recognize that they need to develop towards housing. And I'm struggling with the strip, let me just be honest, because I don't know what's going to happen on either side and at some level, putting something right next to it, I just struggle with that.

Commissioner Harding said so hearing everything that's been said and appreciate everyone's opinions and copious notes. I'm so grateful that we were able to get answers, or at least some understanding and addressing the concerns of a reduction of six homes by requiring it to R2.5. Is that accurate?

Planner Aguilera said we would have to do another quick analysis of this to make sure that the exact number that we would ask them to reduce would be accurate to make sure it's below a R2.5.

Commissioner Harding said in my mind it allow for a little bit more alignment to the surrounding areas. But I also agree that where it's at now at 2.7 isn't high density housing. And so as far as the resolution, our first resolution, its growth, and that's something that I support for our city, because we are accountable to the overall valley with the need of housing, as far as which zone, that's something I'm still a little up in the air with.

Commissioner Farnsworth said I appreciate everyone coming out tonight. I empathize with a lot of the neighbors. This is a difficult conversation. I certainly agree with Commissioner Hollist that there is an opportunity for better, more comprehensive planning if they were able to bring all of the landowners, but we can't force all of the landowners to want to act now. And so just recognizing some of the legislative pressures that exist, and some of the property rights that exist, I think those are some of the things that are on my mind right now.

Commissioner Hollist said I expressed my concerns with just changing the one strip on the map. And so, as proposed, I would vote against it.

Chair Gedge said regardless of our next action on the rezone, which I may have a different vote, I think stable neighborhood is the most likely for this and future adjoining properties. So I'll be voting in favor of the proposal just because of what the language is. There's really no other designation other than either staying agricultural, moving a stable neighborhood.

Commissioner Catmull said I guess I'm not as confident, and I just don't know, but I'm not as confident that the strip to the south is going to become that, and so for that, I'm opposed.

Commissioner Harding motioned that the planning commission recommend that the city council approve of Resolution R2026-02 amending the future land use plan map of the general plan of the city of South Jordan, from Agricultural Preservation. AP to stable neighborhood. on property located at approximately at 10049 South Temple drive. Chair Gedge seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 3-2 Vote. Commissioner Hollist and Commissioner Catmull Voted No.

Chair Gedge said we now have the second part, the rezone. And just to restate what we're considering this evening, is to rezone it from agricultural A-5 and single family are R1.8, to R.3 single family residential zone.

Commissioner Harding said I am going to pass and see what everyone else has to say.

Commissioner Farnsworth said I don't have anything to add.

Commissioner Catmull said it is tied to the landuse, so I don't have anything to add.

Commissioner Hollist said as presented in our packet tonight, I would again vote against it, even though it's only maybe four or five parcels difference within the what's been proposed tonight. Simply because my history has told me, and I've been on this commission longer than most, that once you let one density in, you're always asking for the next one. And so, for the first piece to develop in this area, I think we should stick to what's in the area.

Chair Gedge said I would most likely vote to recommended a denial, just because of the R-3, even though as the applicant said, R2.7 and it might be six less homes. It's just more commensurate with the surrounding neighborhoods that are already in use. And as Commissioner Hollist just stated, as future development comes in, they're going to push it for more density, and that's what I'm afraid of. And I don't want 10th west to get even more crowded than it will be in the future as well.

Commissioner Hollist said can I add two more comments just so I don't appear petty. I do base my opinion in our our plan, our general plan, in that we do have language that talks about compatible zoning. And so again, to put the highest density in when you know what's going to develop around it will probably request even higher density. I just don't think is in line with our general plan. And then I know that we've mentioned several times the state legislature and the need for housing. I do understand that. I've talked to my representative already, but until this city, the state requires us to change our ordinances. We do have our ordinances in place. We do have our our general plan, and

I think it's okay to continue to proceed with maintaining what our general plan lays out and what our ordinances are.

Chair Gedge said I would also argue that the affordable housing from an R3 to an R 2.5 in this area as well is not going to be significantly opening up to the lower moderate income family. I just know my neighborhood very well, and so it's not really going to make a less dense zone, in my opinion.

Commissioner Harding said I just want to point out that we do have the option to make additional recommendations, as opposed to just deny. Is there a zone that you might feel more comfortable with, as opposed to complete pushback?

Chair Gedge said personally, for me would be to the R 2.5 which is commensurate with the neighboring areas, and I believe the general public has expressed some interest of that too. On that, obviously even larger will be greater. I understand the economics involved, that we want to allow the planned owner to maximize their property as well. I don't know how the rest of you guys feel on that, but I would be open to either.

Assistant City Attorney Simonsen said you need to approve or deny the application as stated. I'm not saying you can't go on the record with what you're position would be as far as what would be more appropriate, but you don't have the ability to approve something different, it's just a recommendation.

Chair Gedge motioned that we, the planning commission, recommend a denial of Ordinance Number 2026-01-07 rezoning property located at approximately 10049, South temple drive from a 5 Agricultural and R1.8 single family residential zones to R.3 single family residential zone. Commissioner Harding seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 5-0 to approve denial.

I.2. LEGISLATIVE TEXT AMENDMENTS TO CITY CODE

Address: 1600 W. Towne Center Drive, South Jordan, UT
84095 File No: PLZTA202600002 Ordinance 2026-03
Applicant: City of South Jordan.

Chair Gedge motioned to take a 5 min break.

Chair Gedge called the meeting back to order.

Director Brian Preece reviewed background information from the staff report (Attachment A).

Commissioner Catmull said I am looking at the one a property prohibited entrance on the right, on this diagram for 17.1.30 and that's not allowed because that's deemed the front.

Director Brian Preece said it's because it's on the corner lot.

Commissioner Catmull said is this connected to how the front yard is derived. In other words, does the front yard and the front surface, always go together.

Director Brian Preece said I think some of this has some very unique situations. I think the majority of the time you don't have any problem with this.

Planner Schindler said especially like on a cul de sac, the road curves around, and you're driving around and you can see a door on the side of the house or so forth. So that's usually where it's at, or if the house is set far enough back and there's a door there. You don't know if it's the front door, but, if they happen to put a step up then it looks like it's a door to to another unit or something.

Chair Gedge said if City Council were to adopt this, would this only apply to future building.

Director Brian Preece said absolutely not.

Commissioner Harding said so this is only a separate ADU. This isn't if someone adds on to a home and adds a separate entrance.

Directorv Brian Preece said it would apply.

Planner Schinder said yes, this applies to mostly the internal ADUs that people are doing. They usually put a basement walkout, and it's usually on the side or rear, but on the side of the house. You can see the where the walkout is, because they would have a railing or something.

Commissioner Harding said so the one that we did recently was a separate garage, and that is what you saw from the street, and then around to the side is where the entered into that ADU.

Director Brian Preece said the way this reads is: the proposal clarifies the ADU entrance is not permitted on the primary elevation as defined. So, if it's visible from the street, it isn't an issue anymore, it's just just the primary.

Chair Gedge said the separate garage would not be the primary dwelling, and so that was would not apply, because that's a separate than the accessory building.

Planner Schindler said this is just for the the internal ADUs, and it's the prominent elevation facing the primary street. So if it's on a corner facing two streets, the primary one would be the one where the front door is.

Chair Gedge opened the Public Hearig to comments. There were none. He closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Harding motioned to send a favorable recommendation to City Council for: Ordinance 2026-03 Text Amendment to City Code (16.36.090 Monument Signs, 17.60.020

Development and Design Standards in the C-N Zone, 17.72.080 P-C Zone Plan, and 17.130.130.030 Prohibitions in the ADU Floating Zone). Commissioner Hollist seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor.

J. OTHER BUSINESS

J.1. Unified Development Code Presentation - Brian Preece, Director of Planning & Economic Development

Director Brian Preece reviewed background information on this item from the staff report (Attachment B).

Commissioner Harding said will we be able to go through those modules too? Is that a part of the plan?

Director Brian Preece said we can, I don't know why not.

Chair Gedge said is City Council having any work sessions with the modules?

Director Brian Preece said no, they're not planning on it. We can report along the way. We can put this on the agenda and just kind of say, this is where we're at. What questions do you have? And keep in mind we're not we're not changing any codes. So that's where I would be the most concerned if you were changing something that we don't even know about? And that's our goal, is to not do that, but we're not trying to do it in a vacuum and keep you out of the process. So we're happy to come back and report and give you copies.

Commissioner Harding said if you're creating an easy way to understand it, even FAQ, or a quick reference guide or something that would be beneficial for us to understand the new format.

Director Brian Preece said yes, so we can report back and then, certainly before we expect you to vote on it, we would want you to have time with it, to be able to get comfortable with it, not just give it the week and a half before the meeting. This way you will have time to digest it. Because it's, going to be a big.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Gedge motioned to adjourn. Commissioner Hollist seconded the motion

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 9:50 p.m.