

SOUTH JORDAN CITY
CITY COUNCIL MEETING

MARCH 3, 2026

Present: Mayor Dawn R. Ramsey, Council Member Patrick Harris, Council Member Kathie Johnson, Council Member Don Shelton, Council Member Tamara Zander, Council Member Jason McGuire, City Manager Dustin Lewis, Assistance City Manager Jason Rasmussen, Assistant City Manager Don Tingey, City Attorney Ryan Loose, Police Chief Jeff Carr, Director of Administrative Services Melinda Seager, Director of Human Resources Teresa Robinson, CFO Sunil Naidu, Fire Chief Chris Dawson, Director of Recreation Janell Payne, Director of Planning & Economic Development Brian Preece, Director of Engineering/City Engineer Brad Klavano, Director of Public Works Raymond Garrison, PIO/Communication Manager Rachael Van Cleave, GIS Coordinator Matt Jarman, City Recorder Anna Crookston

Absent:

Other (Electronic) Attendance: Beth, Brent Burgon, Carol Brown, Jared Olsen, K Burgon, Kristi Chapman, Michale, Ruth's Iphone, Steven Alello, Tristy Lambert, Cortnee McCleary Gloria Tyler Newman

Other (In-Person) Attendance: Breck Laing, Ted Fraughton, Anne Fraughton, Christopher Thompson, Kip Lambert, Jodie Senior, Mark Cameron, Troy Teeples, Rhiannon Mandale, Norah Larson, Elise Jensen, Umu Tafisi, Tyler Corneling, Sydney Sanford, Asher Morrow, Grace Wong, Craig Johnson, Lenora Johnson, Mark Seethaler, Lilly Wong, Tomas Landholtz, Jake Hunsaker, Debra Greenwell, Bob Paxton, Wayne King, Mike Bellows, Charles Kimberly, Derek Rindlisbacher

6:33 P.M.
REGULAR MEETING

A. Welcome, Roll Call, and Introduction - By Mayor Dawn R. Ramsey

Mayor Ramsey welcomed everyone present and introduced the meeting.

B. Invocation - By Council Member, Tamara Zander

Council Member Zander offered the invocation.

C. Pledge of Allegiance – By Fire Chief, Chris Dawson

Fire Chief Dawson led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

D. Minute Approval:

- D.1. January 20, 2026 City Council Study Meeting
- D.2. February 3, 2026 City Council Meeting

Council Member Harris motioned to approve the January 20, 2026 City Council Study Meeting, and February 3, 2026 City Council Meeting Minutes as published. Council Member seconded the motion. Vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor.

E. Mayor and Council Reports:

Mayor Ramsey noted that due to the large number of attendees and the amount of business remaining on the agenda, she recommended either postponing or skipping the Mayor and Council reports for that meeting. The Council agreed to move past the reports to continue with the agenda. She then briefly provided an update regarding the ongoing legislative session, stating that Council and city staff were actively engaged with state representatives and closely monitoring legislation that could impact local government operations and the city. She noted that Utah League of Cities and Towns (ULCT) was tracking hundreds of bills affecting municipalities and that City officials were dedicating significant effort toward advocating for South Jordan and its residents during the final days of the legislative session.

F. Public Comment:

Mayor Ramsey explained that speakers would have three minutes to address the council and would need to provide their name and address for the public record. Before beginning public comment, Mayor Ramsey referenced the extensive discussion at the previous meeting regarding leased secondary water shares and invited Assistant City Manager Jason Rasmussen to provide a brief update on work completed since that discussion.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen thanked residents who participated in the prior meeting's discussion regarding leased secondary water shares. He reported that staff reviewed the issue and developed a solution allowing water share leasing to continue. He stated that emails had been sent to previous leaseholders with instructions for moving forward and noted that residents must notify the city by Thursday if they intend to lease shares due to an upcoming deadline with the Utah Lake Distributing Canal Company. He explained that leasing would be limited to South Jordan residents, and requests for additional shares beyond standard allocations would be reviewed individually. He added that one share is generally considered sufficient for properties of one acre or less and emphasized the city's goal of promoting responsible water use. He concluded by offering to meet with residents after the public comment period to answer additional questions regarding water share leasing.

Mayor Ramsey opened the public comment portion of the meeting.

Troy Teeples (Resident) - Okay, so it appears that the staff has made this decision again. This is a tremendous decision that cannot just be made by staff, because I have a half-acre on these two shares. Now, those of us that use the water, we've done this over decades, and so we figured out the slope of our land, how much our pump pumps up, and how to flood irrigate. We know how to do it, and we do it very, very efficiently, and we don't waste the water, and we don't want to waste

our time either, because secondary water takes time. So the fact that everything's being limited, the fact that if someone owns shares that they can't lease more, this is just a real problem. People need to be able to do what they need to do with their land. There's some in South Jordan City that have secondary water. Take the Charter Point neighborhood. The secondary water comes to each property. There's a box there, and it's not pressurized, but they can turn that water on, and they can run it on their grass 24 hours a day, and they pay their little monthly fee. I used to live in the neighborhood. It worked out beautifully. However, I moved. I don't have that. Our street was never hooked up to secondary, though we had to be plumbed for it. But now I have to pump the water out. And so this whole lease issue, it's worked out beautifully for me for over 20 years, and then the city's made a mess of it. Everything was just beautiful. We were just waiting for our letter. We were going to lease our shares like we always do and move merrily along our way. And now the city has made this mess. It's got us all angry. We've been to now two council meetings. I just propose, can we decide to go back to the way it was and decide it quickly, because obviously there's a deadline, and let those of us that know how to secondary water just let us be. Now, Mr. Rasmussen said when I talked to him on the phone that there's some sort of dollar amount that's being paid for these shares from the Great Salt Lake. And I said, what's going to happen with that dollar amount? It's going to be put in some sort of a fund to offset future water expenses. Is that kind of like the Social Security Trust Fund? How much is going to be paid for by the Great Salt Lake for this water? It just seems to me like it's a big money thing. It's just so important. We feel like those of us old-time South Jordan people are being kind of treated poorly because we're not Daybreak. That's just kind of how we feel. So I would hope that we could come to a decision tonight about just let's return to the way it was. I'd like to know how many shares the city owns and how many of those shares are leased. Thank you.

Wayne King (Resident) - I received this memo the same way everybody else got it. The problem I have is the three bullets. And now what has been said tonight is I'm in the shares where I own shares too. Now I'm understanding that you're going to come out and talk to us, and there may be an accommodation for certain people. Is that what you said? But is that the implication? There may be an accommodation. If there's extenuating circumstances, there's still room to negotiate. Yes, that's fine, but I just want to know if I understood what you said was correct, and I understand that correctly. I have one other comment. I have been getting water since 2009. It occurred after South Jordan dug a deep culvert across my property. It was put in cement. It's six feet high and 16 feet wide. It's buried down about a foot under the ground. So once that was covered, I had to restore the property. The city helped me do it, augmented the cost a little bit, but since that day, I've never been able to water my 1.8 shares of water adequately. Part of the reason is over time, as that culvert is sitting there, the water is gone. It's sunk down around the edges. And now the water does not flow clear across the top of the culvert, but it goes down the sides. So my final comment, assuming I can talk to Mr. Rasmussen, it seems to me that the issue I went through, and I have the water schedules for the last 17 years since I've been using the water, I'll just tell you what my summation was for 2025. There were 37 property owners that used secondary water. Sixty-nine total hours. That was the average of each week. The lease shares were 36 and the owned shares were 33 hours. That's the total 69 hours. So I'm not nearly as aggravated about the situation after seeing the three bullets, based on the fact that I'm going to be able to talk to him, but the fact is that we shouldn't be seeing properties in South Jordan brown out for the mere little volume that's going to get to the Salt Lake. Now, I don't know what you have in other weirs, but I can just tell you this, there's not

enough water going to be pushed to the lake off of Weir 27 to make a dang bit of difference. Thank you.

Mike Bellows (Resident) - I spoke in the last session, and I made the point that I've been on my property, which is just shy of an acre, for 45 years. And I wanted to clarify a couple of things that I said before. When the weir came across, my property was in a ditch. It was about from me to your dais wide in places and very deep, but it was dangerous, and I took it upon myself to put in 300 feet of 15-inch corrugated culvert, building a head gate that accommodated the water to come full down all the way on out. I don't know. I know you probably can't answer this, but do any of you have shares? Either leased or owned? Anybody here? I think it's hard to understand, if you don't, how this really works. I have a pump station. I pump through a two-inch pipe water out to irrigate my yard. It's not flood irrigated. It's two inches from a 15-inch corrugated culvert that has most of that full of water. Then it comes down. The rest of the water, while I'm irrigating, goes on down. That water ends up, and by the way, I am not the only one. Most of the people who do this are not flood irrigating. Most people are pumping it out. So if we have this much volume coming down, and we're taking this much volume out for the period of time we're allotted to take care of our yards, and my next-door neighbor has an acre, and his yard is probably a third to a half a big garden, he doesn't flood irrigate either. He takes out, dumps out about this much. The rest of his water is going on down. That water ultimately ends up going to the Jordan River and to the Great Salt Lake. So we're not talking about total utilization of the available water. That's not the issue here. That water is already getting out of here and getting to the Great Salt Lake, which I think is the objective here, or they wouldn't be paying money to get those shares, right? So my point is that if you really understood how it's working right now today, this method and how it's worked historically, these fellows who have been doing it for a long time, you ought to understand that there's a lot of that water that's already getting there. So there's a big delta between what the usage is and what the available water is, and that extra available water is honestly getting to where it's supposed to go. You're not going to make a big dent. You think you are, but you're not. So my recommendation is that you really can't study this from afar. You need to have a hands-on look at how this is going and how it's been going for years and years and understand some of the sunk costs involved with some of these good people who are depending on it, and myself too. So I appreciate your time. I really do, but I really am adamant about this. You need to understand how it's going now without making an arbitrary and capricious decision to sell it and take away that water from your citizens. Thank you.

Umu Tafisi (Resident) - I was here two weeks ago with my fellow residents, and I am returning here because I have some major concerns. Mr. Rasmussen, thank you so much for highlighting the bullet points in the notification that was sent to most, if not all, of us. I have questions. I had emailed one of the administrators of the city asking who I should submit my evidence to requesting more than one share of water. I own an acre of property, and respectfully, one share is not enough for that one acre. I can tell you all the stories of how my kids and I wake up at the crack of dawn or stay up really late to put our tarps out to capture that water. I know a lot of my residents here. One of my neighbors taught me that method, and it's something we've done every year since I've lived here for about eight years now. But that said, there should be a forum in an appropriate time and place. I hope that I can provide my evidence and share my stories of how one share is simply not enough. But I think with the time that I have at this podium, I want to see if anyone here is familiar with City Code 13.08.250. I am a lawyer, but I am not a water rights lawyer. I am here

because I believe in due process and the Constitution of our great nation, as well as our city code and a lot of the rules and the processes that you Council Members should follow. My simple understanding of this City Code 13.08.250 relates to appeals regarding secondary water and the process. And I asked Mr. Rasmussen, who I understand is a city manager, to please organize the Council into a Board of Equalization to resolve issues, because clearly more than three residents have come forward with concerns, and it sounds to me like requests to appeal what is being decided upon with respect to the lease shares. I also want to say that my understanding, too, is that two of our Council Members who are sitting in front of us have disclosed conflicts of interest with respect to Water Conservancy boards, and my hope is that decisions can be made by impartial decision makers who do not have any conflicts of interest with respect to water access and water conservancy. That said, I believe that there are other options out there. I read the news today that the Garff family donated 10,600 acre-feet water shares, and Governor Cox announced that. I request, please go after those who have larger shares, not after the residents who simply want to water our gardens, take care of our farms, and have green space for our children on small one-acre properties or under two acres, half acres, what have you. Thank you for your time. Mr. Rasmussen, I'll meet you outside.

Charles Kimberly (Resident) - Shares that are leased, the way I understand it, are shares from the ULDC, Utah Lake Distributing Company. Correct? So leasing a share from South Jordan is leasing the same share from the ULDC, correct? A share from the ULDC, Utah Lake Distributing Company, when you lease a share from that canal up there, whether it's South Jordan or a private citizen, you get 5.1 acre-feet of water per season. That is a mathematical number, and that's what it is by contract. That's what you lease. That's what you get. That's what is allotted to you. That's a legal binding contract. Your certificate, if these people lease a share from you, it's the same as leasing that share from the canal. And I don't think you can put people on a diet. They deserve that much water. And the canal, over 176 years, has developed this system mathematically. It's not arbitrary. Those 12-inch pipes, the flow, the rate, and the elevation of the canal, is all calculated. I've gone through it with the canal people. It works very well. But you can't tell people that their share of ULDC is something less than 5.1 acre-feet per year. That's divided typically by about 20 weeks, and that's roughly 70,000 to 80,000 gallons per hour. Sounds like a lot, but in the first months, when it's hardpan, you can't water one acre with one share. You have to force the water when it's really, really dry, as it has been. But it's a moot point. When you lease a share, that's how much water you get. The city does not have the right to alter that. Sorry. Thank you.

Mayor Ramsey closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

G. Public Hearing Item:

- G.1. Ordinance 2026-06, Repealing Chapter 5.98, Retail Tobacco Specialty Business Licenses, of the South Jordan Municipal Code. (By City Manager, Dustin Lewis)

City Manager Dustin Lewis reminded the Council of a prior work session discussion regarding specialty business licenses related to alcohol and tobacco sales. He noted that City Attorney Ryan Loose had previously explained that these licenses are regulated through the business licensing process rather than being tied directly to land use. He stated that staff had since researched the

issue further and determined that the city is not required to offer specialty tobacco licenses. Based on that review, staff recommended repealing the section of City Code that allows specialty tobacco shop licenses. He explained that the specialty license permits businesses to devote larger amounts of floor space to tobacco and tobacco-related products, including associated merchandise. He stated that staff believes specialty tobacco shops are not in the best interest of the community and that the proposed ordinance change supports the City's goals related to the health, safety, and welfare of residents. He clarified that the proposed repeal would not prohibit the sale of tobacco products at grocery stores, convenience stores, or similar retailers operating under other existing tobacco sales licenses.

Mayor Ramsey opened the public hearing for Ordinance 2026-06. There were no comments. Mayor Ramsey closed the public hearing.

Council Member Harris motioned to approve Ordinance 2026-06, Repealing Chapter 5.98, Retail Tobacco Specialty Business Licenses, of the South Jordan Municipal Code. Council Member McGuire seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote

- Council Member Harris - Yes**
- Council Member McGuire - Yes**
- Council Member Johnson - Yes**
- Council Member Shelton - Yes**
- Council Member Zander - Yes**

The motion passed with a vote of 5-0 in favor.

H. Historical Chapel Development Land Use Public Hearing Items:

- H.1. Presentation on Resolution R2026-03 and Zoning Ordinance 2026-02-Z, all related to the Historical Chapel Land Use development. Destinations, Inc. (Developer). (By Director of Planning & Economic Development, Brian Preece)

Planner Aguilar reviewed prepared presentation (Attachment A). He reviewed the Historic Rezone and "Purple Church Plant Development" proposal, explaining that the project has been under review with the developer for several months. He stated that the proposal preserves the existing historic chapel while allowing additions and redevelopment on the site, including a chapel/event space and a new office building intended for professional uses. He explained that the zoning would change from A-1 to Community Commercial with a Planned Development Overlay governed by a development agreement. The historic land use designation would remain, ensuring the chapel structure is retained, with rear additions designed to match the original architectural style. He noted the office building would be three stories and approximately 45 feet in height, reduced from a previously proposed 50 feet following council feedback. The building would include approximately 24,000 square feet of office space, with design elements intended to complement the historic structure. He also outlined the parking plan, including shared parking arrangements with adjacent properties and a total of approximately 216 parking spaces across the development,

with about 91 spaces on-site and additional flexible/shared stalls contributing to capacity. He concluded by stating that staff supports the proposal and is recommending approval, citing preservation of the historic chapel and compatibility of the development with the surrounding area.

Mayor Ramsey thanked staff and invited the applicant representatives from Destinations, Inc. to present their portion of the proposal. She noted that they were welcome to speak on the project and encouraged them to share information so both the public and council could hear all perspectives prior to any decision-making.

Kip Lambert (Applicant-Destinations, Inc.), presented the proposed redevelopment of the historic “Purple Church” site. He stated he is a lifelong South Jordan resident and emphasized the project’s intent to preserve and restore the historic chapel while repurposing it as an event center. He provided background on the building’s history, noting its community significance and long-standing presence in South Jordan. He also acknowledged the involvement and support of the Fraughton family, who have historically maintained the property, and highlighted plans to preserve and display historic and artistic elements associated with the site. He reviewed prepared presentation (Attachment A). He described the project as a mixed-use redevelopment that would include restoration and expansion of the chapel for event and wedding use, including new patio and garden areas designed to take advantage of mountain views. He explained that additions to the rear of the chapel would be constructed using materials and architectural details intended to closely match the original historic building. He also discussed the proposed office building located north of the chapel, noting that the project team revised the design after receiving council feedback regarding height and scale. He explained that the building height was reduced from the original proposal while maintaining similar usable square footage. He stated that the highest points of the building, specifically the gables, would reach approximately 45 feet, while the lower roofline and eaves would align more closely with the height of the historic chapel at approximately 32 to 33 feet. He emphasized that the office building was designed to reflect architectural elements of the chapel in order to maintain visual continuity across the site. He further outlined site improvements, including shared parking agreements with adjacent businesses, relocation of access points to improve traffic flow and emergency vehicle access, and pedestrian-oriented spaces between the buildings. He explained that parking demand for the office and event uses would complement one another because peak activity times would generally occur at different times of day. He concluded by reiterating the goal of preserving the historic character of the chapel while creating a long-term community asset that blends restoration, adaptive reuse, and compatible new development.

Mayor Ramsey invited the current property owners, Anne and Ted Fraughton to address the Council if they wished, noting that the property has been in their ownership for many years and that the Council would value hearing their thoughts regarding the proposal.

Ted Fraughton (Resident) - Stated that his family moved into the property when he was 11 years old and that the family is supportive of the proposed project. He introduced his mother, Anne Fraughton, and expressed appreciation for the opportunity to share the history of the building. He explained that the structure was built in 1926 and designed by architect Don Carlos Young, a son of Brigham Young. He noted that Don Carlos Young became the Church’s principal architect following the death of Truman O. Angell in 1887 and was responsible for numerous significant projects, including Temple Square grounds, the Eagle Gate, the LDS Business College, the Church

Administration Building, and other notable buildings throughout the region. He stated that, given Don Carlos Young's age at the time, he believes the church building may have been one of the architect's final projects. He emphasized that the building is an important architectural and historical asset within the community and stated that the proposal would provide an opportunity for the public to once again access and enjoy the structure while preserving it for future generations. He noted that restoring and maintaining a building of that nature requires a significant commitment and expressed hope that the project would move forward so the building could continue to be preserved and utilized for the public and community benefit.

Anna Fraughton (Resident) - Expressed strong support for the proposed redevelopment project, stating that having developers who are committed to restoring the historic chapel and doing so with care is valuable and appreciated. She noted that the project team has invested significant effort into planning and preparation. She also stated that the family is supportive and willing to assist the developers as needed to facilitate the project's success, including providing access to the property for planning and preparation. She emphasized their full support for the project and commitment to seeing the restoration move forward.

Mayor Ramsey thanked the Fraughton family. She inquired whether they had received any other proposals to preserve the church, and if so, what types of offers had been made compared to the current project.

Ms. Fraughton responded that they had not received any comparable preservation-focused proposals. She noted that one prior offer would have required demolition of the building, which she rejected because it conflicted with her goal of preserving the structure. She added that while others have expressed interest in restoration, the project requires significant financial and logistical commitment, and she was uncertain whether other proposals would be able to match the scope and quality of the current development plan.

Mayor Ramsey followed up by asking for clarification, noting that while neighbors and others may have expressed interest in restoring the building, she wanted to confirm whether any other parties had approached the owners with a concrete financial offer and full redevelopment plan comparable to the current proposal.

Ms. Fraughton responded that there had not been other formal "money and a plan" offers presented to her. She explained that she has chosen not to engage in discussions about other proposals until an appropriate time and indicated that she would let interested parties know when she is ready to consider them. She acknowledged that many people love the building, including herself, and described the emotional difficulty of preparing to leave the home after many years, noting that she has been in a prolonged transition period and expressed gratitude for the process and the project team's efforts.

H.2. Resolution R2026-03 Public Hearing.

H.3. Zoning Ordinance 2026-02-Z Public Hearing.

Mayor Ramsey opened the public hearing for Resolution R2026-03 and Zoning Ordinance 2026-02-Z.

Mark Seethaler (Resident) - I shared my concerns via email (Attachment B) with your planner here, Mr. Aguilera, and I think, to keep my comments brief, I'll just read a modified version of that and then enter that into the minutes. Just as water is a limited resource, traffic flow is likewise constrained by factors such as lanes of traffic, speed limits, intersection restrictions, stop lights, driveways and so forth. Along with my neighbor, Russ Naylor, who was prior Chair of the South Jordan Planning Commission, we've been in correspondence with the developer, Kip Lambert. I am in favor of the project. I think it will be a wonderful addition to our city. I'm grateful for the Fraughton's. They've been good and quiet neighbors in the 19 years we've been there. I didn't move in on my 11th birthday. It was my 20th birthday 19 years ago, but nonetheless, we're the relative newcomers there in our PUD development across the street west from this new planned development. I think the legacy of the Purple Church will be preserved, and the people involved in the history of it for over 100 years now will be commemorated as it's restored and enhanced. The one issue I believe could still be unmitigated in the plans is the impact on 1300 West, particularly southbound traffic during the congested hours, which are basically from 4:00 to 6:00 p.m. Mondays through Fridays. Excuse me. Is there a way to put on the screens the overhead map? There was one that you had before in the presentation packet that wasn't the best, but it's one that we can refer to here for the next couple of minutes. I don't know who is working on getting control of the screen or turning on the camera for you to put a presentation there, but yeah, this will be a lot better than looking at me. And I see my seconds ticking down. I just have this written statement. I'll try and be brief. The two-lane northbound from 10400 South, or South Jordan Parkway, currently narrows immediately to one lane. I say immediately, it's just after this new property development here. That hasn't been a problem for through traffic, but will be a bigger issue with cars slowing, therefore backing up northbound traffic right at the point where they're naturally accelerating, creating a more dangerous environment for safe travel to turn into the new development and for cars to merge into traffic out of this development. 1300 West southbound currently, when cars travel in the single southbound lane toward 10400 South before the road widens just before the intersection, those turning left to go east frequently enter the middle lane before it widens into the two left-turn lanes at the light. Many times while I've been traveling north, I've moved into the center lane with my left blinker on to turn into our subdivision and met head-on with a southbound driver, always during times of high traffic flow, who jumped into the center lane early to get into one of the left-turn lanes ahead in order to pass up cars waiting at the light. Those exiting this new development, the additional traffic during the busiest times from 4:00 to 6:00 p.m., will face a solid row of cars in a single lane heading southbound, which is often stacked up from the light at 10400 South back to Yworry Lane and beyond. Yworry, I believe, is at 10250 South. It is a long line of cars during those busy hours. Pulling out of the new development into the center lane to go southbound with the intent of merging into the traffic in order to go straight through the light or to turn to the right west at the light at 10400 South will be problematic, as each driver will be relying on the mercy of a southbound driver who has been waiting often through multiple light cycles to let them into the traffic flow. For those pulling out southbound with the intent to turn left or east at the 10400 South traffic light, there will be no incentive for them to first merge into the single lane of southbound traffic just to shortly enter into one of the two opened-up left-turn lanes further south. So those drivers will stack this middle lane. Thus northbound cars wanting to turn left or west into Temple Vista Lane, into our development, may be faced with the

middle lane of cars backed up during the busy periods. Moreover, and more acute, those northbound cars wishing to turn into the parking lot, which is further south than Temple Vista Lane for the Goldfish Swim School or the pediatric office, will face the extra challenge of navigating in between an additional column of waiting cars to cross traffic and make their medical appointment or drop off their children for swim lessons. I'm interested in the total actions of the city to reduce these bottlenecks and backups with the introduction of this additional traffic. Again, I like what I've researched and understand about the development. It will be a plus for the preservation of the structure and add some culture and economic activity to the area of our city. I'm simply offering a voice of warning about the increased traffic at this pinch point during peak times and anticipate that city engineering has or will have plans to make this manageable. I ask that a traffic mitigation improvement be thoughtfully considered and amended to this project resolution and implemented together with this development. Thank you.

Mayor Ramsey noted for the record that any residents who submitted prior email comments had their input received and read by the council, and that those emails would be included in the official record of the public hearing.

Russ Naylor (Resident) - I happen to have an office that's just south of the 10400 South intersection. I had a chance several months ago to see this project and offer some comments to the developer. But, you know, I'm fully supportive. We moved into our house in 2006, so we've lived there going on 20 years, and we've watched this property when Mr. Fraughton was out training horses in the north pasture. And obviously, as they've aged, the challenge of keeping up with this old building, as you know, has suffered. I think this is a great opportunity to have somebody take it and restore it to its former beauty. I can echo the fact that they have to be really committed to this to want to spend the money to upgrade this building to meet the current seismic codes and international building codes, but excited to see this happen. I would like to echo some of the comments that Mr. Seethaler made. As I leave my office just south of the Maverik on the east side of Temple Drive, I often go north and turn my signal on to turn into our development, only to have somebody meet me in the center. And I frankly, at this point, hold my ground and make them go around me because it's so irritating. They start into that center turn lane sometimes as far down as the temple, and usually I think that's probably when there's some kind of a problem on the freeway, but it really is a difficult situation. I don't know what can be done by the city to help with the traffic, but it would certainly be appreciated if the traffic engineer could take a look and see if he can come up with some ideas. Again, I really like the project, and I hope you will look at it favorably and grant them their zoning and other approvals that are required. Thank you.

Craig Johnson (Resident) - I live in the Holt Farm subdivision. We call it Hidden Village, known as Hidden Village, which is just adjacent to the property in question. Just a couple of points. I think the points are very valid that Mr. Seethaler or Mr. Naylor have made. I'm not going to address that. I'm just going to address this from a purely personal point of view. Over the 12 years that we have lived in Hidden Village, we have had the great honor of becoming good friends with the Fraughton's. I went to Jackson Hole one day a few years ago and went into one of the art galleries there. I asked the proprietor, the gallery owner, "Have you ever heard of Ed Fraughton?" And he said, "For my money, Ed Fraughton is one of the two best sculptors in the world." I'm not sure that South Jordan understands the treasure that we have in the legacy of Ed Fraughton. My wife and I are ecstatic about this development and the way that it's been presented. We think that keeping the

chapel and restoring the chapel will be a great honor to the legacy of Ed Fraughton, and we're excited for Anne and the benefits that it will give to her as well. I can't speak for our neighbors. I've spoken to a few of them, and the ones that I've spoken to are certainly in favor of the development as well. I happen to think that it matches well with the architectural theme of our neighborhood, which is kind of a farm-focused theme, farmhouse theme. We think it matches well with Aunt Mame's property there that's the centerpiece of our subdivision. We're just excited to have it done, and so we certainly would hope that you would agree that it's something that should go forward, that the zoning should be changed so that they can go forward with this project. One other thing. I know we came to the Planning Commission meeting a few weeks ago, and somebody voiced a concern that with an event center there, will noise be a problem for the neighbors? We live right on the park there in that subdivision, and I mean right on the park. It is literally across the street from our home and right next to the gazebo there. And we have not had any issues with noise there right in the park. I don't foresee that that would be a major issue to anybody concerned. With that, thank you very much for your time, and we would hope that you would look favorably on this development. Thank you.

All Public Hearing Comments received via email (Attachment C).

Mayor Ramsey closed the public hearing.

Council Member Shelton asked staff for clarification on whether the shared parking agreement with adjacent property owners had been formally received as part of the project materials.

Director of Planning & Economic Development Brian Preece responded that the shared parking agreement had been received during the meeting from Kip Lambert and that he had forwarded it to City Attorney Ryan Loose for review.

City Attorney Loose stated that he had not yet seen the shared parking agreement, noting that it did not come through as an attachment. He explained that he had since talked with his land use attorney, Greg Simonson. He reported that Attorney Simonson had reviewed the document and felt it was adequate to meet the necessary requirements, indicating that the agreement should be sufficient as presented.

Council Member Shelton asked whether city engineering staff could provide input on traffic conditions associated with the project, acknowledging that detailed engineering review would occur later and that the council is currently focused on the land use decision. He then requested that Director of Engineering/City Engineer Brad Klavano speak to the traffic situation and any preliminary considerations.

Director of Engineering/City Engineer Brad Klavano responded that he had reviewed Mr. Seethaler's email regarding traffic concerns, particularly issues involving vehicles entering continuous or center turn lanes prematurely and creating conflicts with turning movements. He stated that similar traffic patterns can be observed in other intersections both within South Jordan and in other cities. He indicated that while he was not previously aware of a specific documented issue at this location, the concerns raised are valid enough to warrant further study. He explained that, regardless of the project's approval status, staff can conduct traffic analysis to better

understand conditions at the intersection and evaluate potential mitigation options. He noted that there may be possible improvements available but did not specify them at this time.

Council Member Shelton followed up by asking for clarification on whether the potential traffic solutions mentioned by engineering staff would include engineering design options, and whether the issue could be addressed through engineering measures rather than relying solely on enforcement.

Director Klavano responded that further engineering review would occur during the site plan and subdivision phase, at which time staff would likely require an additional traffic analysis to evaluate circulation and access more precisely. He noted that estimating traffic for the event/reception center is difficult, but generally those uses generate peak activity during evenings and weekends rather than weekday peak commute hours. For the proposed office building, he estimated, based on Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) standards, that the development would generate approximately 260 daily trips and about 32 trips during the PM peak hour, which he characterized as not a significant increase to 1300 West traffic. He also stated that the revised site plan, which consolidates and shifts driveway access points farther north, would likely improve circulation compared to the existing configuration. He explained that combining access points into a single, more controlled entry is generally a safety and efficiency improvement. Addressing broader traffic concerns at nearby intersections, he noted that similar lane drop and merge conditions exist in other areas of the city and region. He suggested that, in some cases, such conditions can function as a natural deceleration effect that helps manage turning movements. He concluded that additional analysis would be conducted when detailed site plans are submitted, and that traffic conditions and mitigation options would be further evaluated at that stage.

Council Member Shelton asked what type of traffic study would be required at the site plan stage and whether it would be a formal study or something else.

Director Klavano responded that the review would likely be more of a targeted traffic assessment rather than a full-scale traffic study. He explained that staff would focus on turning movements and site access design, evaluating how vehicles enter and exit the property and how those movements interact with nearby roadways. He added that, given the project's location near a collector and arterial roadway, a full traffic study is likely unnecessary at this stage, and the emphasis will instead be on access configuration and operational traffic flow.

Council Member Shelton asked who would be responsible for conducting the traffic assessment, whether it would be performed by city staff or an outside engineering consultant.

Director Klavano explained that the city typically uses a traffic engineering firm on retainer to conduct the assessment. The firm provides a scoped proposal and cost estimate, which the city then passes to the developer for payment before the work is completed. He noted that this approach helps ensure the analysis is independent.

Council Member Zander requested that the floor plan slide (Attachment A) of the chapel be brought back up for public viewing to refresh the council's memory and assist those attending or watching online. She asked the applicant to provide a brief overview again of the project layout, specifically confirming the intended uses within the historic chapel and the proposed adjacent

office building, including whether the office space would be used for owner-occupied tenants. She also indicated she had a couple of follow-up questions based on that overview.

Kip Lambert explained the floor plan of the proposed development, orienting the council to the layout of the site. He noted that the historic chapel sits on the left side of the plan (west side near 1300 West) and originally served as the chapel's meeting space, and includes interior areas previously used by the Fraughton family as living and working space. He described a new addition extending from the existing structure, designed to match the architectural style of the chapel. This addition includes extended functional space and a glassed-in area intended to complement the historic building design. He also clarified the site orientation; 1300 West is on the west side of the property, Holt Farm Lane is to the north, and the plan is oriented north-south-east-west accordingly.

Council Member Zander asked for clarification, confirming her understanding of the floor plan by asking whether the vertical line shown on the drawing indicated that everything to the right of it represented the proposed addition to the existing chapel structure.

Kip Lambert presented additional details regarding the proposed renovation and expansion of the historic church property into an event venue. He explained that the proposed addition would include a large gathering space with tall ceilings and glass windows designed to preserve views of the mountains while complementing the existing chapel structure. Outdoor amenities would include pedestrian-oriented patio areas, gardens, and rooftop terrace spaces intended to support event functions and guest circulation. He stated that the project would include both a catering kitchen and a demonstration-style kitchen intended to accommodate a variety of event types beyond weddings, including corporate gatherings and instructional or culinary events. Additional restroom facilities would also be constructed to meet accessibility and operational requirements for event use, replacing existing restroom arrangements that are not functional for the proposed venue. He further described plans for expanded bridal and groom suites, salon and preparation areas, flexible office and support spaces for event staff, and storage facilities. Lambert noted that weddings would likely be the primary use of the venue, though other private and corporate events could also occur at the site. He also explained that the existing building currently lacks elevator access and that the proposed renovation would include installation of an elevator to provide accessibility to basement storage areas and second-floor event-related spaces. He described the second-floor plans as including additional gathering and support areas, rooftop patio access, and flexible spaces intended to enhance the functionality and guest experience of the venue. He stated that the design emphasizes multiple event "activation" areas intended to support circulation, gathering, and various event activities while maintaining safe access and accommodating traffic flow concerns discussed earlier in the meeting.

Council Member Zander asked clarifying questions regarding the proposed use of the property, specifically confirming that the chapel portion of the project would primarily function as a reception and event space while the rear building would contain owner-occupied tenant space. She noted that future tenant selection for the rear portion of the project remained undetermined and observed that the nature of those future tenants could significantly affect traffic patterns and the concerns previously raised regarding traffic impacts in the area.

Mr. Lambert responded that the anticipated tenant uses for the rear building would primarily consist of professional office space with traffic patterns similar to nearby medical and professional offices already operating in the area. He stated that Jordan River Dental had expressed interest in potentially occupying all or part of a floor and noted that discussions had also occurred with attorneys, dentists, oral surgeons, and other professional office users. He also referenced conversations with flexible office providers that operate subscription-based coworking or remote workspaces, where users reserve meeting or office space as needed. He emphasized that those concepts were only preliminary ideas intended to illustrate the type of professional office users being considered. He stated that retail uses were not anticipated for the project and noted that the existing zoning would likely not accommodate retail operations in that portion of the development. He concluded that the intended uses would remain focused on professional, medical, and office-oriented tenants.

Council Member Zander thanked Mr. Lambert for the presentation and acknowledged the project as “fantastic.” She referenced the traffic concerns raised by the public and asked whether the applicant is willing to participate in a traffic assessment as part of the continued review process.

Mr. Lambert responded that the development team is open to participating in a traffic assessment if city engineering determines it is necessary. He noted that, as a resident who regularly travels 1300 West, he personally understands the traffic concerns raised, particularly during peak PM hours near the corridor. He stated that he believes southbound traffic impacts may be less significant, while acknowledging northbound congestion during the 4–6 p.m. peak period as a more valid concern. He added that vehicles exiting the site would benefit from existing lane configurations that provide some buffering for turning movements. Lambert also suggested that traffic issues are common and difficult to fully eliminate, but said the project team is willing to work with the city on potential solutions such as enforcement considerations, lane striping, and other traffic control or engineering measures. He then began transitioning to a question about how the event space would be scheduled, asking whether the chapel would typically be rented for full-day use for weddings and similar events.

Council Member Zander added that she had not previously considered that a portion of traffic could involve trips to and from the Jordan River Temple, potentially affecting traffic patterns near the site. She then asked for clarification on how the chapel event space would be scheduled, specifically whether rentals would typically provide full-day access for weddings and receptions, or whether there would be tighter time windows (such as afternoon-only access). She noted that the timing structure of events could significantly affect traffic intensity and turnover during peak periods.

Mr. Lambert responded that the venue is intended to operate in the higher-end wedding market, where full-day rentals are typical rather than short, segmented bookings. He explained that event use would generally begin in the morning for setup and preparation, with receptions typically running in the evening (often around 6:00 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.). He acknowledged there could be some traffic concentration as guests arrive at the start of events, but suggested that arrivals are staggered over time rather than occurring all at once. He added that most guests typically attend for limited portions of the reception, while immediate family tends to stay through the end of the

event. Because of this, he suggested traffic would be more dispersed over the course of the evening rather than highly concentrated for a long duration.

Council Member Zander agreed and added that allowing all-day access to the venue would help spread out activity and reduce peak congestion. She explained that this approach would help “decompress” traffic flow by avoiding a concentrated rush of caterers, decorators, and guests arriving at the same time, thereby improving circulation during otherwise tight bottleneck periods.

Mr. Lambert responded that their current business plan already follows the “all-day access” model. He explained that while most events would be full-day wedding-style rentals, there could also be midweek corporate events with shorter timeframes (such as lunchtime through mid-afternoon), and that those would typically have lower traffic impacts. He stated that the site is designed with sufficient parking and operational capacity to accommodate both full-day and shorter daytime events, and he expressed confidence that the current plan can effectively manage those varying use patterns.

Council Member McGuire asked what the applicant’s plans are for fencing around the property.

Mr. Lambert responded that there are no finalized fencing plans yet, but the intent is to maintain a farm-style aesthetic consistent with nearby properties. He explained that along Holt Farm Lane and visible public-facing areas, they would likely use a rail-style fence to preserve the rural/farmhouse character of the area, similar to neighboring properties. He noted there is an existing wrought iron fence at the front of the property that would likely be preserved and repaired or replaced as needed to maintain its appearance. For the rear of the property near the canal easement, he expressed a need for a more secure fencing solution to ensure safety, particularly to prevent any accidental access to the canal. He emphasized that this area would require coordination with the city and canal company and said safety would be a primary concern in those design decisions. Overall, he stated the fencing plan would be refined through coordination with the city as part of the landscaping and site design process.

Council Member McGuire asked for clarification on the canal-side boundary of the property, noting that during his review it appeared the front property line may extend all the way down to the canal, including the hillside on the east side.

Mr. Lambert stated that, to his understanding, the property extends to the edge of the canal but is subject to a canal easement that restricts development. He noted he was uncertain of the exact setback distance, estimating it may be approximately 40 to 45 feet. He explained that this easement influenced the placement of the proposed office building, which was shifted further toward the front of the property. He further stated that the northeast portion of the site must remain within the constraints of the easement, which he described as originating near the canal’s centerline, limiting the ability to construct permanent structures in that area.

Council Member McGuire expressed concern about the visual impact of the proposed office building on the adjacent Hidden Village neighborhood, particularly along the east side of the property. He asked whether, if a precast masonry wall is installed along that boundary, landscaping such as trees could be incorporated on the hillside to help soften and screen the development from neighboring homes. He noted that the existing view includes a natural tree line and asked how the

project would minimize visual impacts, especially given the proposed office building height of approximately 45 feet, which he stated would exceed the height of the existing chapel and be visible from nearby residential areas.

Mr. Lambert stated that a detailed landscaping plan would be developed later in the approval process and had not yet been finalized in the development agreement. He explained that the intent is to maximize and preserve views from the rear event lawn area behind the chapel while enhancing the overall aesthetic of the site. He noted that much of the existing vegetation consists of fast-growing, lower-quality trees, and indicated these would likely be replaced or supplemented with more intentional perimeter landscaping. He stated that new trees and plantings would be placed along the edges of the event lawn and near the office building frontage to improve visual quality. He added that there are currently no plans for a terraced masonry wall along the canal side due to easement considerations and the need to avoid permanent encroachments. He indicated that landscaping along the canal edge would still be incorporated, with trees and shrubs selected to improve visual appearance for adjacent neighborhoods while maintaining long-term view corridors from the site.

Council Member McGuire stated that, while he supports the preservation of the historic chapel, he remains concerned about the visual impact of the proposed office building on the adjacent residential neighborhood. He noted that the focus on preserving the chapel could overshadow the long-term impact of introducing a new multi-story structure in that location. He emphasized that the office building would represent a significant change to the existing neighborhood context and that its visual presence is a primary concern. He added that, while the event center portion of the project is expected to include highly intentional and attractive landscaping to support its function as an event venue, similar attention to aesthetics may not be consistently maintained for the office component over time. He concluded that, although he supports the overall project direction, he considers the visual impact of the office building a key issue that warrants continued attention.

Council Member Johnson expressed appreciation for the applicant's work in bringing the project forward. She acknowledged the strong community attachment to the historic building and thanked the applicant for their efforts in advancing a proposal that preserves it. She concluded by recognizing the project's contribution to the city and offering well wishes for its success.

Council Member Harris stated that the project area is personally important to him and his family, noting his spouse's connection to the nearby neighborhood. He said he has generally not heard opposition to preserving the historic chapel, and that most residents he has spoken with are supportive of its preservation, though some have raised concerns about the proposed office building. He also referenced a site visit he conducted with staff, including a walkthrough of the historic chapel and surrounding properties, including nearby office uses. He then indicated he had questions regarding the height of the proposed office building and requested further clarification from staff regarding that aspect of the project. He referenced a photo (Attachment D) that has the dental office building in that area. He stated that his primary question was whether the proposed office building height was appropriate for the surrounding area. He noted his familiarity with the adjacent neighborhood, including regular travel through nearby paths and visibility of existing dental office structures from Hidden Village. He observed that portions of existing office buildings are already visible from the neighborhood and referenced the proposed design, including the three-

story massing and roof pitch, as shown in the rendering. He requested clarification from staff on the actual height of the dental office building in the photo (Attachment D) and whether it is compatible with surrounding structures and neighborhood context.

Director Preece responded that, using an approximate estimate of 10 to 12 feet per story, a three-story building would be roughly 30 to 36 feet in height, with an additional approximately 10 to 12 feet for the pitched roof. He stated that, based on these estimates, the total height of the dental office building would likely be in the range of 45 feet or slightly more.

Council Member Harris stated that evaluating the appropriateness of the office building height was important to him. He noted that the applicant had reduced the proposed height from 50 feet to 45 feet and said he appreciated the applicant's willingness to make that adjustment. Based on his observations of nearby existing office buildings, he stated that while the proposed building would be taller, it did not appear out of character with surrounding development. He explained that he wanted the council, mayor, residents, and others present to have the opportunity to compare the proposal with existing nearby structures when considering compatibility. He added that another concern he had heard related to setbacks. He requested additional discussion from staff regarding the proposed setbacks, how they compare with code requirements, and the rationale for the building placement within the site design.

Director Preece explained that the standard front setback for this type of development would typically be 20 feet from the property line. He stated that the proposal includes a reduced setback of 10 feet due to site constraints, including easement limitations along the rear portion of the property. He noted that the reduced setback would be accommodated through the development agreement and indicated that the applicant could provide additional detail regarding the need for the adjustment.

Council Member Harris asked staff whether the proposed reduced setbacks could create any negative impacts related to traffic circulation, visibility, or turning movements, referencing earlier public comments regarding traffic concerns in the area.

Director Klavano responded that he did not believe the proposed setback reduction would negatively impact traffic circulation or visibility in relation to the building's location and internal drive aisles. He stated that the driveway is positioned a sufficient distance from the building to avoid conflicts. Regarding visibility near Holt Farm Lane, he noted that staff had not yet fully evaluated that specific condition but stated that the project would be required to comply with the city's clear vision triangle requirements as part of the city code.

Council Member Harris asked staff to confirm that, if the council were to approve the proposal, city staff would continue to closely evaluate visibility and traffic safety issues during subsequent review stages to ensure safe ingress and egress for vehicles entering and exiting the site.

Council Member McGuire asked a follow-up question regarding the scope of the proposed traffic evaluation, specifically whether it would include an assessment of Holt Farm Lane in addition to the primary project access points.

Director Klavano responded that the traffic evaluation could include Holt Farm Lane and that staff would review surrounding traffic volumes as part of the broader impact assessment.

Council Member McGuire clarified that his concern was specifically about traffic visibility and safe turning movements, asking whether drivers would be able to adequately see around the proposed building when making left-hand turns out of the site.

Director Klavano stated that visibility concerns are addressed through the city's clear vision triangle requirements, as defined in the municipal code. He indicated that staff would ensure the project complies with those standards during review to maintain adequate sight distance for safe vehicle movements.

Council Member Harris asked whether the applicant wished to respond specifically to the discussion regarding visibility and traffic safety considerations.

Christopher Thompson with Core Architecture, stated that the project's design had been developed with consideration of the city's clear vision triangle requirements and nearby easements. He noted that a city-owned easement to the north provides additional buffering and separation from the roadway, contributing to adequate spacing between the building and surrounding streets. He explained that the property's significant slope toward the canal created design constraints, particularly in balancing building height, footprint, and required square footage. He added that reducing the building height from 50 to 45 feet required adjustments to the building's width to maintain usable space, which further influenced site layout decisions. He concluded that, given the site conditions, easements, slope, and requested design modifications, the current proposal represents the most feasible compromise to meet functional, regulatory, and development goals.

- H.4. Resolution R2026-03, Authorizing the Mayor of the City of South Jordan to enter into a Development Agreement with Destinations, Inc. pertaining to property located at 10353 S. Temple Drive.

Council Member Johnson motioned to approve Resolution R2026-03, Authorizing the Mayor of the City of South Jordan to enter into a Development Agreement with Destinations, Inc. pertaining to property located at 10353 S. Temple Drive. Council Member Zander seconded the motion.

Council Member Shelton asked whether Council Member Johnson would be willing to amend her motion to include a requirement for a traffic assessment as part of the development agreement, in order to further address traffic-related concerns raised during the public hearing.

Council Member Johnson responded that she was agreeable to the proposed amendment and stated that the motion could be amended to require a traffic assessment as part of the development agreement.

Council Member Johnson motioned to approve Resolution R2026-03, Authorizing the Mayor of the City of South Jordan to enter into a Development Agreement with Destinations, Inc. pertaining to property located at 10353 S. Temple Drive with an amendment to require a traffic assessment as part of the development agreement. Council Member Zander seconded the motion.

Council Member Harris thanked the applicants, residents, and staff for their efforts throughout the process and expressed support for preserving the historic church property as part of the project. He acknowledged that restoring and rehabilitating the structure would require substantial investment and recognized concerns expressed by some residents regarding the proposed office building component of the development. He stated that while preserving only the historic church structure without additional development might be preferable in an ideal scenario, he understood the economic realities associated with restoring and maintaining the property. He emphasized the importance of continuing to work collaboratively with city staff to address issues such as traffic circulation, safe vehicle access, and overall project functionality as the proposal moves forward.

Council Member Shelton expressed appreciation to the applicants and the Fraughton family for their longstanding contributions to the community and stated that preserving and improving the historic “Purple Church” would be beneficial for South Jordan. He noted that while the community would be saddened to see the family leave the property, he was grateful that the building would be preserved through the proposed investment and restoration efforts. He also thanked the applicants for their commitment to the project and expressed appreciation for the additional research and due diligence conducted throughout the review process. He thanked Council Member Harris for his extra due diligence and providing the photo (Attachment D).

Mayor Ramsey stated that the visual presentation and comparison images were helpful in understanding how the slope and elevation changes on the property would affect the appearance of the proposed office building. She noted that the renderings demonstrated how the building height would appear from the roadway and how the natural grade of the site reduces the visual impact of the structure from street level.

Council Member Zander expressed appreciation to the Fraughton family for their long-standing stewardship of the historic chapel and noted her 21-year familiarity with the building and its presence in the community. She stated that she has often wondered about the building’s history and welcomed the opportunity for it to be preserved and made more accessible to the public. She thanked the applicant and project team for taking on the restoration effort and referenced the historical information shared regarding the building’s origins and architect as meaningful and valuable to the community. She expressed hope that the project would include a dedicated space to interpret and share the building’s history with visitors. She concluded by emphasizing the importance of historic preservation, stating that the project represents a significant effort to protect and share an important community landmark for future generations.

Council Member McGuire expressed appreciation for the collaborative effort between the property owner and the developer to create a plan that preserves the historic “Purple Church.” He noted that the issue had prompted thoughtful discussion within his family regarding the trade-offs involved in preservation versus redevelopment. He stated that while there is broad support for preserving the historic structure, the project also reflects the difficult balance between preservation and accommodating new development, including the proposed office building. He thanked the Fraughton family for their long-standing contributions to the community and the arts in South Jordan. He concluded by recognizing the significance of the family’s legacy and stated that the preservation of the chapel through the proposed development represents an important and lasting benefit to the city.

Council Member Johnson echoed comments made by other council members, expressing appreciation for the collaborative effort that brought the project forward. She described the preservation and restoration of the historic building as a meaningful benefit to the city and commended the applicant for contributing to the preservation of local history. She thanked the Fraughton family for their longstanding presence and contributions to the community and acknowledged the broader impact of their legacy. She concluded by wishing the family well and expressing hope that the project would honor and preserve that legacy for years to come.

Roll Call Vote

Council Member Johnson - Yes

Council Member Zander - Yes

Council Member Harris - Yes

Council Member Shelton - Yes

Council Member McGuire - Yes

The motion passed with a vote of 5-0 in favor.

- H.5. Zoning Ordinance 2026-02-Z, Rezoning property located at 10353 S. Temple Drive from A-1 (Agriculture) Zone to C-C (Community Commercial) with a Planned Development Floating (PD) Zone. Destinations, Inc. (Developer).

Council Member Harris motioned to approve Zoning Ordinance 2026-02-Z, Rezoning property located at 10353 S. Temple Drive from A-1 (Agriculture) Zone to C-C (Community Commercial) with a Planned Development Floating (PD) Zone. Destinations, Inc. (Developer). Council Member McGuire seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote

Council Member Harris - Yes

Council Member McGuire - Yes

Council Member Johnson - Yes

Council Member Shelton - Yes

Council Member Zander - Yes

The motion passed with a vote of 5-0 in favor.

Mayor Ramsey stated that the motion passed unanimously and then shared additional personal remarks regarding the project and the preservation of the historic “Purple Church.” She explained that she had strongly supported the proposal since it was first presented because she believed preserving the church was important to the City’s history and identity. She recalled first meeting the Fraughton family in 2017, when they invited her into their home and shared the history of the property, artwork, sculptures, and family legacy. She stated that the experience deepened her appreciation for the significance of the church and the Fraughton family’s contributions to South Jordan and the broader artistic community. She expressed concern following Ed Fraughton’s passing about what might happen to the property and noted that the City did not have the financial resources necessary to preserve the building independently. She stated that she was grateful the applicants stepped forward with a plan to preserve and restore the structure while allowing it to

remain part of the community for future generations. She emphasized the importance of preserving South Jordan's historical identity and legacy as the City continues to grow and develop. She noted that while future generations may not fully understand the building's historical significance, current residents and longtime community members recognize its importance to the City's heritage. She thanked Kip Lambert and the project team for their willingness to invest in preserving the property and thanked Anne and Ted Fraughton for their lifelong contributions to the community. She specifically acknowledged the Fraughton family's artistic and cultural legacy and expressed gratitude on behalf of the residents of South Jordan for their impact on the community. Mayor Ramsey concluded by inviting those present to offer applause in recognition of the family and the project approval.

I. Park Place Phase 5 Development Land Use Public Hearing Items:

- I.1. Presentation on Resolution R2026-04, Resolution R2026-05, and Zoning Ordinance 2026-03-Z, all related to the Park Place Phase 5 Land Use development. Bach Land and Development, LLC. (Applicant). (By Director of Planning & Economic Development, Brian Preece)

Planner II Miguel Aguilar reviewed prepared presentation (Attachment E). He explained rezone application with an associated development agreement for Park Place Phase Five with Bach Land and Development LLC. He identified the project site as located on the south side of 1055 West, near the southern extent of the roadway where it transitions to a dirt road and noted that the proposal includes two parcels. He explained that one smaller parcel, approximately 0.47 acres, is intended to be used for right-of-way and is in the process of being acquired by the city. The larger parcel would contain the proposed subdivision. The concept plan includes a three-lot subdivision, with the existing home remaining on the front/western lot and two new residential lots located to the rear. He stated that the proposal includes extension of a new roadway and the construction of a six-foot-wide trail along the northern portion of the site, connecting 1055 West to the eastern boundary near the Beckstead Canal. He further explained that the development agreement outlines coordination between the developer and the city regarding right-of-way and trail construction. He added that modifications to zoning standards are necessary due to site configuration, particularly to accommodate setbacks for the rear lots. He noted that the development agreement adjusts the front setback for Lot 3 to create a more workable building envelope than would otherwise be permitted under the base zoning. He concluded by stating that staff recommend approval of the application.

Derek Rindlisbacher, representing Bach Land and Development LLC, introduced himself and stated that the company is a family-owned business that has been building in South Jordan for approximately 50 years. He explained that the proposal includes a land use amendment, rezone request, and development agreement approval associated with the Park Place Phase Five subdivision. He stated that the existing home on Lot 1 would remain and that Lots 2 and 3 are proposed for new single-family homes similar in character and quality to homes previously developed in Park Place Phases One through Four. He described the homes as higher-end residential properties that would complement the surrounding neighborhood. He noted that they

worked closely with city engineering and planning staff to design a layout that accommodates emergency access, ingress and egress to 1055 West, and connectivity with the adjacent Park Place development. He expressed appreciation for the collaboration and support provided by city staff throughout the process and stated that he would be available to answer questions from the council.

- I.2. Resolution R2026-04 Public Hearing.
- I.3. Resolution R2026-05 Public Hearing.
- I.4. Zoning Ordinance 2026-03-Z Public Hearing.

Mayor Ramsey opened the public hearing for Resolutions R2026-04, R2026-05, and Zoning Ordinance 2026-03-Z, all related to the Park Place Phase Five development application. There were no comments. Mayor Ramsey closed the public hearing.

Council Member Harris commented that there has been significant activity and development occurring within his district. He stated that he recently toured several project areas in the district with Director Preece to better understand the various proposals and conditions on site. He noted that the visit provided helpful perspective regarding the proposed subdivision and surrounding area and stated that, after reviewing the site and discussing the project with staff, he did not have concerns with the proposal as presented.

- I.5. Resolution R2026-04, Authorizing the Mayor of the City of South Jordan to enter into a Development Agreement with Bach Land and Development, LLC. pertaining to property located at 11011 S. 1055 W.

Council Member McGuire motioned to approve Resolution R2026-04, Authorizing the Mayor of the City of South Jordan to enter into a Development Agreement with Bach Land and Development, LLC. pertaining to property located at 11011 S. 1055 W. Council Member Johnson seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote

Council Member McGuire - Yes
Council Member Johnson - Yes
Council Member Harris - Yes
Council Member Shelton - Yes
Council Member Zander - Yes

The motion passed with a vote of 5-0 in favor.

- I.6. **Resolution R2026-05**, Amending the Future Land Use Plan Map of the General Plan of the City of South Jordan from Agricultural Preservation (AP) to Stable Neighborhood (SN) on property located at 11011 S. 1055 W. Derek Rindlisbacher (Applicant).

Council Member Shelton motioned to approve Resolution R2026-05, Amending the Future Land Use Plan Map of the General Plan of the City of South Jordan from Agricultural

Preservation (AP) to Stable Neighborhood (SN) on property located at 11011 S. 1055 W. Derek Rindlisbacher (Applicant). Council Member Harris seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote

**Council Member Shelton - Yes
Council Member Harris - Yes
Council Member Johnson - Yes
Council Member Zander - Yes
Council Member McGuire - Yes**

The motion passed with a vote of 5-0 in favor.

- I.7. **Zoning Ordinance 2026-03-Z**, Rezoning property located at 11011 S. 1055 W. from A-1 (Agricultural) Zone to R-2.5 (Single-Family Residential) Zone. Derek Rindlisbacher (Applicant).

Council Member Johnson motioned to approve Zoning Ordinance 2026-03-Z, Rezoning property located at 11011 S. 1055 W. from A-1 (Agricultural) Zone to R-2.5 (Single-Family Residential) Zone. Derek Rindlisbacher (Applicant). Council Member Shelton seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote

**Council Member Johnson - Yes
Council Member Shelton - Yes
Council Member Harris - Yes
Council Member Zander - Yes
Council Member McGuire - Yes**

The motion passed with a vote of 5-0 in favor.

J. Staff Reports and Calendaring Items:

Council Member Shelton stated that he wanted to take a moment to recognize city staff for their assistance related to a water leak issue at his home. He explained that he had received multiple notifications from the city indicating a possible leak but had been unable to locate the source himself. He thanked Director of Public Works Raymond Garrison and members of the Water Department for responding to the issue who came to further investigate the concern. He stated that within approximately 15 minutes, staff identified the source of the leak and confirmed that it was not located in the service line, which he said was a significant relief. He also commented on a new tool being used by the city that can help detect and locate leaks through sound analysis. He described the technology as impressive and expressed appreciation for the city's leak notification system and the expertise of staff in quickly diagnosing and resolving the issue. He concluded by thanking the staff and asked that his appreciation be shared with the water professionals involved.

City Manager Dustin Lewis stated that he had several updates for the council regarding the upcoming budget process. He informed the council that the next budget meeting would take place

the following evening and would focus on discussion of capital improvement projects. He explained that council members were being provided with a handout summarizing the proposed projects, including details from the Capital Improvements Plan and the associated budget allocations. He stated that the meeting would include discussion of the listed projects as well as any additional projects or priorities council members may wish to consider for future years. He noted that the meeting was scheduled for two hours, beginning at 5:00 p.m. and stated that he did not anticipate needing the full allotted time. He asked council members whether they would like dinner or snacks provided for the meeting and requested that everyone be prepared to begin promptly at 5:00 p.m. He also proposed canceling the budget meeting currently scheduled for March 11 and instead using time during the March 17 work session to address any remaining budget-related items and finalize outstanding discussions.

Council Member McGuire noted that the proposed March 17 budget meeting conflicted with caucus night and stated that he believed the meeting had already been canceled.

City Manager Lewis responded that the caucus night conflict was not known when the calendar was originally set. He asked for council directions on how to proceed with the meeting schedule. He explained that staff were also considering canceling the March 31 meeting and noted that three council meetings had been scheduled in March in anticipation of having only one meeting scheduled in April.

Mayor Ramsey noted that the March 31 meeting would conflict with the opening night of the Bees baseball season and stated that she had already committed to attending the event.

City Manager Lewis requested clarification regarding the caucus meeting time and then proposed final adjustments to the council calendar. He asked whether the council could still hold a work session to complete remaining budget items. He then outlined the revised schedule; the March 11 budget meeting would be canceled, along with both the March 17 work session and council meeting. In their place, he proposed a single budget session on March 17 from 3:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. to finalize budget discussions, with calendar invitations to be updated accordingly. He further stated that the March 31 meeting would be canceled and advised that the April 7 meeting should be expected to be a longer session, as it would be the only council meeting scheduled before the first meeting in May. He noted that several items would need to be re-noticed due to the scheduling changes.

Mayor Ramsey expressed support for canceling the budget meeting scheduled for the following Wednesday, noting that it conflicted with an important Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District Board meeting.

City Manager Lewis apologized for the conflict with caucus night and staff was unaware when the council meeting schedule was established approximately six months prior. He stated that he had no additional calendaring items to address and concluded his update on the meeting schedule. He drew the council's attention to two emails previously sent earlier that day; one requesting final input on a nomination for the Corporate Citizen Award based on prior council feedback, and another providing information on registration for the upcoming SoJo Race Series. He noted that

most council members had already responded and stated that staff would provide the appropriate registration code for participation. He concluded by stating that he had no further staff updates.

Mayor Ramsey reminded council members to watch for action alerts over the next three days, noting that any urgent items would be communicated via text and email and may require prompt attention. She then thanked the council for their time and efforts.

Council Member Johnson motioned to adjourn the March 3, 2026 City Council Meeting. Council Member Shelton seconded the motion. Vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor.

ADJOURNMENT

The March 3, 2026 City Council Meeting adjourned at 8:43 p.m.

UNAPPROVED