

# SOUTH JORDAN CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

## STAFF REPORT

MEETING DATE: FEBRUARY 11, 2025

### FILE OVERVIEW

Item Name	Flag Lot Text Amendment
Address	1600 W Towne Center Dr.
File Number	PLZTA202400242
Applicant Name	South Jordan City
Staff Author	Joe Moss, Long Range Planner

### ITEM SUMMARY

The proposed amendment modifies four sections of the South Jordan Municipal Code as follows:

- 1- The Flag Lot Overlay Zone, [§17.130.030](#), is eliminated.
- 2- Subdivision and Development Code, [§16.04.160](#), is modified to introduce enhanced development standards including those related to access, building setbacks and height, owner occupancy, and minimum lot sizes. It also creates a single administrative process for all flag lots that is staff approval if a proposed flag lot meets all development standards.
- 3- The Definitions in [§17.08.010](#) to update the definition of a flag lot and add definitions for access strips and parent lots.
- 4- The Accessory Dwelling Unit Floating Zone, [§17.130.130](#), is modified to prohibit guesthouses on flag lots.

**Staff is recommending approval** of the proposed amendments.

## TIMELINE

- **December 4, 2024**, Staff submitted a text amendment application to modify flag lot regulations.
- **January 21, 2025, at the** City Council Study Session, staff brought possible changes to the council for additional direction from the Council.

## REPORT ANALYSIS

### Process:

*The Current Code* has two paths for a flag lot to be approved:

- 1- Administrative Approval. These can be utilized when the parent lot is at least twice the average size of the original subdivision. This process is the same as other subdivision amendments. Approval is given by the Planning Commission if the application meets the requirements of the subdivision ordinance. Administrative processes can be evenly implemented as they are based on if an application meets City ordinances.
- 2- Flag Lot Overlay Zone. If a lot is smaller than the average size of the original subdivision the Flag Lot Overlay Zone may be utilized. This is a legislative process that follows a rezoning procedures including public hearings at both the Planning Commission and the City Council. The City Council gives final decision on any proposed Flag Lot Overlay Zones. The Flag Lot Overlay Zone does not provide approval criteria or similar guidance to aid the City Council in consistent decisions. A legislative process like the Flag Lot Overlay Zone elongates the subdivision process beyond what is typically required by State statutes, and is not utilized in surrounding municipalities.

*The Proposed Amendment* eliminates the Flag Lot Overlay Zone, [§17.130.030](#) and requires all flag lot applications follow an administrative approval process. An application that meets all requirements of the Subdivision and Development Code [§16](#) would be approved by the Director of Planning.

### Development Standards:

The proposed text amendment provides more flexibility on lot size while introducing new development standards for flag lots in the Subdivision Code, [§16.04.160](#). These standards are intended to provide clear criteria to determine what properties are eligible for a flag lot and provide compatible development patterns that minimizes impacts on surrounding properties. The proposed amendment addresses the following:

- Lot Size
  - *Current Code* requires a lot be twice the average size of the original recorded subdivision plat for a lot to be eligible for an administrative process. There is not a minimum size for lots to be eligible for the Flag Lot Overlay Zone. All proposed lots must meet the minimum lot size requirements of the governing zoning district.
  - *Proposed Amendment* requires a proposed flag lot(s) must be a minimum of 125% of the governing zoning district's minimum lot size. The access strip portion of the lot is excluded in this calculation. A diagram has been included in this section for enhanced legibility.
- Density
  - *Current Code* requires a flag lot to comply with the minimum density standards of the governing zoning district. This is applicable both to administrative approvals and the overlay zone. Density is measured by the number of lots contained in the area included in the original subdivision plat.
  - *Proposed Amendment* would not change this requirement.
- Frontage
  - *Current Code* has no minimum frontage for administrative flag lots but does require a minimum frontage of 125' for a lot to be eligible for the Flag Lot Overlay Zone.
  - *Proposed Amendment* requires a minimum of 125' of contiguous street frontage.
- Setbacks
  - *Current Code* does not specify any additional setbacks for flag lots and is regulated by the governing zoning district.
  - *Proposed Amendment* requires all setbacks to be a minimum of 15' or as determined by the governing zoning district, whichever is greater. It also clarifies that the front setback is measured from the lot line that is most parallel to the street. It also prohibits structures (including accessory buildings) from being built in the access strip of a lot. The proposed amendment also includes a minimum separation requirement for flag lot driveways to be at least 15' from an existing neighboring residential structure, excluding the parent lot.
- Building Height
  - *Current Code* does not specify any height restrictions for flag lots and is regulated by the governing zoning district.
  - *Proposed Amendment* limits structures on flag lots to 25' in height.
- Access Strip
  - *Current Code* requires access strips to comply with fire code, but does not further specify what is required.

- *Proposed Amendment* requires access strips to be a minimum of 20' wide and references fire code.
- Owner Occupancy:
  - *Current Code* does not address owner occupancy for flag lots.
  - *Proposed Amendment* requires owner occupancy of flag lots. This would be recorded as a note on the plat.
- Guesthouses:
  - *Current Code* does not prohibit guesthouses on flag lots.
  - *Proposed Amendment* would modify the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) Floating Zone, [§17.130.130](#) to prohibit flag lots from eligibility for a guesthouse. Internal ADU's would still be permitted in accordance with Utah State Code [§10-9a-529](#) and [§17.130.130](#).
- Definitions:
  - *Current Code* includes a definition for flag lots but does not define access strips or parent lots.
  - *Proposed Amendment* makes minor modifications to the flag lot definition for clarity and includes new definitions for access strips and parent lots along with a diagram to illustrate these three defined terms.

## FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION

### General Plan Conformance:

The request is in conformance with the following goals and strategies from the general plan:

- LIVE GOAL 1: Ensure development of well-designed housing that qualifies as Affordable Housing to meet the needs of moderate income households within the City
- LIVE GOAL 2: Promote the development of diverse housing types which provide life-cycle housing for a full spectrum of users
- GROW GOAL 4: Develop and maintain a pattern of residential land uses that provides for a variety of densities and types and maintains the high standards of existing development

### Strategic Priorities Conformance:

The applicant request is in conformance with the following directives from the Strategic Direction:

- BRE-1. Develops effective, well-balanced, and consistently applied ordinances and policies
- BRE-2. Implements ordinances and policies that encourage quality community growth and development
- ED-2. Promotes the community as a safe, attractive, and quality place to live, work, and play

### Findings:

- The proposed text amendment introduces additional development standards for flag lots to minimize impacts on surrounding properties.
- The proposed text amendment changes eligibility requirements from two times the average lot in the original subdivision to 125% of the minimum lot size of the zoning district, excluding the access strip.
- The proposed text amendment does not change the requirement that flag lots comply with the density requirements of the zoning.

### Conclusions:

- The proposed amendment is in conformance with the General Plan and the City's Strategic Priorities.
- The proposed text amendment consolidates all flag lots into a uniform administrative process, allowing for even implementation of the ordinance.

### Staff Recommendation:

**Staff recommends approval of the text amendment** based on the report analysis, findings, and conclusions listed above.

## PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

### Required Action:

Recommendation for City Council

### Scope of Decision:

This is a legislative item that will be decided by the City Council. The decision should consider prior adopted policies, especially the General Plan.

### Standard of Approval:

Utah Code [§ 10-9a-102](#) grants the City Council a general land use authority to enact regulations that it considers necessary or appropriate for the use and development of land in the City. (See Utah Code [§ 10-9a-501](#) et seq.)

### Motion Ready:

I move that the Planning Commission recommends that the City Council approval for the following item:

1. Ordinance 2025-07, Flag Lot Overlay Zone

### Alternatives:

1. Recommend approval of the application with changes.
2. Recommend denial of the application.
3. Schedule the application for a recommendation at some future date.

## SUPPORTING MATERIALS

1. Ordinance 2025-07, Flag Lot Development Standards
  - a. Exhibit A, Text Amendment