

SOUTH JORDAN CITY
CITY COUNCIL STUDY MEETING

JANUARY 20, 2026

Present: Mayor Dawn R. Ramsey, Council Member Patrick Harris, 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, Battalion Chief Clay Miller, Associate Director of Recreation Brad Vaske, Associate Director of Finance Katie Olson, Director of Planning & Economic Development Brian Preece, Planner Miguel Aguilera, Long-Range Planner Joe Moss, Director of Engineering/City Engineer Brad Klavano, Director of Public Works Raymond Garrison, Associate Director of Public Works Colby Hill, Public Works Operations Manager Ashlee Radcliff, PIO/Communication Manager Rachael Van Cleave, CTO Matthew Davis, Senior System Administrator Phill Brown, GIS Coordinator Matt Jarman, City Recorder Anna Crookston

Absent: Council Member Kathie Johnson

Other (Electronic) Attendance: BLZGB, Kim Burgon, Joe Maughan,

Other (In-Person) Attendance: Steven Aiello, Kip Lambert, Christopher Thompson, Garrett Timmerman, Breck Laing, Cam Preston, Ted Fraughton, Anne Fraughton, Andrea Blakey, Robyn Peirce

4:35 P.M.
STUDY MEETING

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

Mayor Ramsey welcomed everyone present and introduced the meeting.

B. Invocation – By Assistant City Manager, Don Tingey

Assistant City Manager Tingey offered the invocation.

C. Mayor and Council Coordination

Mayor Ramsey invited anyone interested in providing an invocation for either a work meeting or a regular meeting to contact the City Recorder, noting that participants may offer a thought, prayer, or other opening message. She noted that the legislative session had begun that day.

Council Member Shelton reported that representatives from Rio Tinto had requested a meeting and that he and Council Member McGuire were scheduled to meet with them the following Thursday. He noted the importance of being prepared and the discussion, particularly regarding

the city's memorandum of understanding (MOU), and requested a concise list of the key bullet points along with brief explanations outlining why each item is important to the city.

Council Member Harris stated that representatives had also contacted him and asked for clarification on the purpose of meeting with them outside of the council meetings. He expressed interest in understanding the reason for holding individual or separate discussions rather than addressing the matter collectively during a public meeting.

Mayor Ramsey responded that the council had previously discussed the matter as a body and collectively determined that the approach being referenced was not the direction, they intended to take moving forward.

City Attorney Ryan Loose referenced a prior annexation petition discussion and explained that, at that time, a previous council, with one different member, made the decision not to engage in separate discussions with petitioners. He noted that when the issue arose and some members asked how to proceed, staff sought direction from the Council. The Council at that time decided that communication would occur collectively as a body rather than through individual outreach.

Council Member McGuire stated that he did not recall the Council making a collective decision on that matter.

Mayor Ramsey stated that she was surprised to learn that individuals had been contacted to meet separately regarding the matter. She noted that she had not personally been asked to meet one-on-one and was unaware that anyone had accepted such invitations. She indicated that her understanding was that the Council had previously decided not to proceed with individual meetings and instead address such discussions collectively. She suggested that, consistent with past practice, it may be appropriate for both groups to meet as a body rather than individually.

Council Member Shelton stated that meeting collectively as a Council would provide a more unified approach in discussions, allowing members to communicate consistently and collaboratively.

Mayor Ramsey added that meeting together ensures a shared understanding among council members. She noted that when discussions occur as a body, all members hear the same information, understand each other's perspectives, and can respond collectively based on what is said during the conversation.

City Manager Dustin Lewis stated that he is scheduled to meet with them on Thursday and asked whether the Council would like him to communicate the preference for meeting collectively rather than individually.

Council members agreed to have City Manager Lewis relay that they would like to meet collectively rather than individually.

City Attorney Loose clarified that the Council's discussion reflects a general consensus rather than formal action, since no motion has been made or voted on during a regular meeting. He noted that this expressed intent is not legally binding but communicates the Council's preferred approach.

He added that, out of respect for Council Member Johnson, who was not present, this understanding should be viewed as an informal agreement. He also assumed that if other members had been contacted for individual meetings, Council Member Johnson likely had as well, though he was not aware of the extent of her communication. He added that someone should reach out to Council Member Johnson to inform her of the discussion and the Council's general preference to meet with the group collectively. He suggested communicating that members have been approached individually but are planning to respond in a unified manner. He emphasized that the goal is to ensure she is aware of the approach and not placed in an awkward position, particularly if she has already had conversations with them.

Council Member McGuire stated that he supports meeting as a group and not individually. He explained that when he was contacted, he intentionally avoided a one-on-one meeting, noting that he does not meet with developers alone and prefers to have at least one other person present during such discussions.

Mayor Ramsey added that she does not believe there are any issues within the MOU. She stated that her understanding is that they are wanting to ask for more.

City Attorney Loose stated that he is pulling up the MOU, which he recently sent to the Council. He noted he can condense and summarize it, highlighting the main points of each paragraph and outlining the obligations for both parties. He emphasized that it is a public document and is available for anyone who wants to review it in full.

Mayor Ramsey reminded Council members of 2026 Local Officials Day at the Legislature, scheduled for January 21, 2026, and noted that the South Jordan Youth City Council will also be attending. Council members and staff discussed the various activities planned for the day, including overlapping events and start times, to coordinate attendance and participation.

City Attorney Loose provided information regarding legislative coordination during the session. He reminded council members that daily legislative update meetings are available to monitor committee activity and ongoing legislation. He stated that invitations are typically sent to members of the City's Legislative Policy Committee but offered to share the link with additional council members or staff who wish to participate remotely and stay informed on legislative developments.

Mayor Ramsey provided additional information on infrastructure updates coordinated by the Wasatch Front Regional Council (WFRC) during the legislative session. She noted that these meetings occur every Thursday morning at 8:00 a.m. and include a Zoom option for those who cannot attend in person. The first meeting will feature the speaker and president discussing plans to secure funding for infrastructure, particularly to enable development on already-entitled land that currently cannot be developed due to a lack of infrastructure.

City Manager Dustin Lewis informed council members of an upcoming ribbon-cutting event hosted by the South Valley Chamber for Modern & Chic Boutique, scheduled for Friday from 9:00 to 9:30 a.m.

City Attorney Loose asked council members if they would like him to share the notes he takes from Legislative Policy Committee (LPC) meetings. He explained that he routinely takes detailed

notes during LPC sessions and sends them to the committee members but wanted to confirm whether the entire council would like to receive these notes, noting that they are generally routine and detailed. Council members indicated that they would like to receive updates and relevant information.

D. Discussion Items:

- D.1. South Jordan Chapel Rezone (Community-Commercial with Planned Development Overlay), Property Location: 10353 S Temple Drive. PLZBA202500214 – Christopher Thompson (Applicant). (By Director of Planning & Economic Development, Brian Preece)

Director of Planning & Economic Development Brian Preece noted that the current proposal for the building represents a unique opportunity and is, in his experience, the best he has seen for this site. He acknowledged that there are aspects to discuss, including building heights and setbacks for an additional structure on the site.

Steven Aiello, Director of Design for Cobalt, introduced himself and explained that Cobalt is serving as the owner's representative and design and feasibility guide for the project, working on behalf of Kip Lambert and his company, Destinations, LLC.

Kip Lambert, a lifelong South Jordan resident and Bingham High School graduate, introduced himself and his family's business, Destinations, LLC, which has been operating locally since 1990. He explained that the business currently leases space near the newest fire station. He emphasized that this project has been a personal goal of his for years and highlighted the building's significance as one of the oldest public structures in South Jordan. The proposed event center aims to provide a hospitality-driven venue for community events, creating lasting memories while complementing their existing business.

Planner Miguel Aguilera reviewed prepared presentation (Attachment A) and handout (Attachment B). He provided an overview of the proposed project site, located along Temple Drive near South Jordan Parkway. The property is currently zoned A-1 (agricultural) and contains a historic chapel, with the land use designation also listed as historic. The proposal seeks to rezone the site to Community Commercial with a Planned Development overlay. He presented photos of the existing site and the proposed site plan, which includes renovating the chapel, adding an extension to its rear, and constructing an office building on the north side of the property. The plan also incorporates a plaza and gathering space with landscaping and fountains, with parking integrated between buildings and public areas. The site currently provides 102 on-site parking spaces but is short by approximately 55 spaces; the proposal includes a shared parking agreement with the neighboring dental office to supply 53 additional spaces.

Director Preece explained that the shared parking arrangement between the office building and the event center would function at opposite times, with the dental office using the spaces during the day and the event center using them in the evenings and on weekends.

Planner Aguilera continued reviewing prepared presentation (Attachment A) and handout (Attachment B), showing the renovated chapel and rear plaza, as well as the proposed office

building, which is planned to be 24,035 square feet, three stories, and 50 feet tall. The office building is proposed with essentially a zero-lot-line setback on the north side, with a small buffer from city-owned property, and there are no residential properties directly north, only a park parking area. He then reviewed the draft development agreement, outlining nine key obligations for the developer. The agreement specifies that construction will follow the approved concept plan and that the historic land use designation will be maintained, with the chapel preserved and the office building designed to match the historic character. The proposed reception and event center is a conditional use, and including it in the agreement removes the need for a separate conditional use permit. All buildings comply with zoning height limits except the office building, which is requested at 50 feet. The chapel meets all setbacks, while the office building's front setback is proposed at 10–15 feet, less than the required 20 feet, and the north side is proposed at a zero-lot-line setback. Parking for the site includes 102 on-site stalls and 53 spaces through a shared parking agreement, meeting the required 157 total spaces. Landscaping will be provided according to the concept plan, and the developer is requesting the option to subdivide the property in the future if desired.

Mayor Ramsey expressed appreciation for the presentation and emphasized her interest in hearing from the applicants about the broader vision for the project. She noted that what stood out initially was the applicants' passion for the potential impact of the development on South Jordan.

Kip Lambert expressed enthusiasm for the project, emphasizing a personal desire to preserve the historic building. He highlighted the building's significance, noting that the late Ed Fraughton, a renowned American sculptor, created art there and that the bronze horse in front of the building has become an iconic symbol for South Jordan. He shared that he and the Fraughton family value the building's history and cultural importance, reflecting the deep personal and community connection to the site. He elaborated on his passion for the project, highlighting his extensive experience in creating memorable experiences through incentive travel and event planning on a global scale. He expressed a personal commitment to preserving the historic church as a space for public gatherings and life events, noting the site's exceptional views of the Wasatch Mountains. He described plans for a reflecting pond and thoughtful landscaping to enhance the chapel's setting and explained that the proposed office building to the north would help make the property financially viable through potential ownership opportunities, while complementing the chapel rather than becoming a high-occupancy commercial space. He emphasized the historical significance of the church, noting the dedication and financial sacrifice of its original builders. He highlighted that preserving the church aligns with South Jordan's community values, history, and art heritage, and expressed enthusiasm for the project's potential to enrich the city while maintaining its historical and artistic significance.

Steven Aiello reviewed prepared presentation (Attachment C). He clarified several technical aspects of the proposed development. He explained that the shared parking agreement with the adjacent dental properties includes not only the immediately adjacent lot but also two additional lots below it. He noted that while the 102 on-site parking stalls could independently accommodate either the office building or the event center, the shared parking is necessary to support overlapping hours of operation. The timing works well, as the dental offices are generally vacant after 5:00 p.m. and on weekends, coinciding with the peak use of the event center. He also corrected the building size, noting that the office building is approximately 30,000 gross square feet, with

roughly 24,000 net rentable square feet after accounting for elevators, restrooms, egress, and stairs. He further explained the technical justification for the zero lot line setback on the north side of the office building. Because the narrow strip of land between the property line and the curb is city-owned and contains utilities, it is effectively unbuildable. Measuring the fire separation distance from the center of the street, as allowed under the building code, would permit the use of larger window walls rather than smaller openings or fire-rated walls, enhancing the design while complying with safety requirements.

Mayor Ramsey asked for additional renderings of the project, specifically requesting images of the back deck and patio areas. She noted that earlier in the presentation, the council may not have fully understood that the proposal involves a wedding and event venue, and she wanted to ensure that the intended use as an event space was clear.

Mr. Lambert reviewed prepared presentation (Attachment C). He explained that the project team has secured letters of intent with Dr. Miller and the neighboring office property to reconfigure parking, which would result in additional stalls. He noted that the current ingress and egress for Dr. Miller's property is narrow and difficult, particularly for larger vehicles like fire trucks, and that the plan is to shift access entirely onto the property adjacent to the chapel, eliminating the existing entrance and improving traffic flow. He emphasized that parking is a critical component of the project and that the proposed plan has received preliminary support from the property owners involved. He also provided details on the chapel's condition and renovation plans, noting that while the building is structurally sound, key improvements are needed, including seismic upgrades, roof replacement, and repair of the facade and mortar joints. A major change involves creating a breezeway between the chapel and the former rectory, with a second-story addition that includes an elevator connecting the upper levels and the basement storage area. These modifications are intended to preserve the historic structure while accommodating modern functionality for its use as an event and reception venue.

Mr. Aiello added that a detailed structural analysis of the chapel was conducted early in the planning process to determine the feasibility of preserving the building. The analysis concluded that the structure could be saved with targeted improvements, including concrete buttressing in the basement, tying masonry walls into existing floor diaphragms, installing a steel framework within the chapel space, and adding new roof diaphragms. He noted that these measures are budget-feasible and align with both the Fraughton family's vision and the project goals of Destinations. He continued, explaining that the rear of the historic chapel would be expanded with a large glass window wall on the right side of the building and a smaller one-story addition with a trellis and upper-level dining patio on the left. These additions would provide roughly 9,000 square feet of usable space across the first and second floors for event purposes. He then described the proposed office building as a three-story cross-laminated timber structure with approximately 10,000 square feet per floor. The design mirrors the chapel's gable form and incorporates elements from the rear chapel addition into the office facade. He noted that the site's 35-foot height limit effectively restricts buildings to two stories, but the project would require a ridge height of 50 feet to accommodate Class A office floor-to-floor heights of roughly 13 feet, allowing for cross-laminated timber depth and ductwork while maintaining ceiling heights around 11 to 12 feet. He emphasized that this height adjustment represents the primary variance request in the proposal.

Council Member Harris inquired about the height of nearby dental buildings, noting that some of them appear relatively tall. He asked for clarification on how their height compares to the proposed office building.

Mr. Aiello acknowledged the question, noting he had not previously considered the comparison. He identified members of the design team present, including Garrett Timmerman and Chris Thompson from Core Architects, and Cam Preston from Ensign Engineering. He referenced that nearby dental buildings are tall, with at least two stories. Regarding the proposed Purple Church office building, the highest point at the ridge is approximately 32 to 33 feet.

Mayor Ramsey asked if council members had any additional questions and clarified the location of the Purple Church, noting it is just south of South Jordan Parkway. She emphasized that directly north of the property is Aunt Mame's farm, with no residential neighbors immediately adjacent.

Mr. Lambert highlighted the scenic vantage points of the property, noting that from the north side, one can see the valley dropping toward the Jordan River Temple, and that the Holt Farm lies below the chapel's balcony. He emphasized that the office building and event spaces will benefit from these impressive views, offering a unique visual experience for visitors and occupants.

Council Member McGuire asked for clarification regarding the zero-foot setback along 1300 West, questioning whether the building could be shifted slightly east to provide additional space. He noted that this concern relates to existing challenges with development along that corridor.

Director Preece clarified that the zero-foot setback in question is actually along the north side of the property, not along 1300 West.

Mr. Aiello explained that since submitting the application, the team has conducted additional studies to refine the office building footprint, particularly in relation to the shared parking with adjacent dental offices. Adjustments were made to optimize the layout, and Ensign Engineering is performing a boundary and topographic survey. He noted that the original property line had been incorrectly shown in the middle of Temple Drive, whereas it is actually near the back of the sidewalk, and the revised plan ensures a minimum of 10 feet from the right-of-way line to the face of the building.

Mayor Ramsey acknowledged the legacy of the property and invited Anne and Ted Fraughton to share their thoughts. She noted that while this approach was slightly nontraditional, it was intended to honor the family's long-standing connection to the property and its significance in the city.

Ted Fraughton shared that he worked alongside his father for 43 years and has a deep personal connection to the property, having lived there since age 11. He described the site as "magical" and emphasized its significance as both a family legacy and a cultural landmark in South Jordan, noting that it was built in 1926 and is now nearly 100 years old. Following his father's passing, the family considered various options for the property but encountered developers who intended to demolish it. They ultimately chose to work with Kip Lambert and Cobalt, who committed to preserving and restoring the building. He highlighted his father's legacy as a sculptor, his contributions to American art, and his original dream of creating a museum at the site. He expressed hope that the

city would support preserving the building, including the iconic horse sculpture, and noted the importance of maintaining the property for future generations.

Anne Fraughton briefly shared her reflections on the property, noting that 2026 marks its 100th year and that a time capsule is located somewhere in the front chapel entrance. She described her personal connection and fond memories. She expressed her excitement and gratitude toward the applicants, acknowledging their enthusiasm for the project, and stated that while she is sad to leave, she is pleased that the property will continue to fulfill meaningful dreams under new stewardship.

Mr. Fraughton added that he has been caring for the property for 52 years and offered to share any additional historical information if desired. He emphasized that the family's hope is to preserve the building, stating that saving it would fulfill a long-held family dream.

Ms. Fraughton added that she had been approached by developers with plans for office buildings and housing on the property, some of whom wanted her to bear the expense of tearing down the historic building. She emphasized that she found this request unusual, as her goal has been to preserve the structure.

Mayor Ramsey thanked the Fraughton's for attending and asked the council if they had any questions. She noted that the applicants were seeking direction on whether to proceed with the process, acknowledging that moving forward would involve financial investment and that a formal proposal would ultimately be brought back to the council for review and approval.

Council Member Harris expressed personal and community connection to the area, noting that his wife grew up nearby. He thanked the applicants for their efforts to preserve the building and praised the concepts presented, emphasizing that the proposal both protects the historic structure and incorporates elements that could benefit the city. He conveyed support for the project as presented.

Council Member Shelton inquired about the height of the Merit Medical warehouse off Redwood Road. Director Preece responded that the Merit Medical warehouse is 50 feet, the same height as the proposed office building height. He noted, however, that the design differs, with a peaked roof rather than a flat top, which he believes will make it appear less imposing.

Council Member Shelton asked whether the developers might consider moving the office building slightly east to reduce its impact on the neighborhood, noting that the nearby Merit Medical building is very imposing. He suggested exploring ways to make the proposed building appear less dominant. He added that there seems to be some available space on the site and suggested that the office building's setback could potentially align more closely with the setback of the existing church, which might help reduce its visual impact.

Director Preece noted that moving the office building eastward could increase its impact on nearby residents. He acknowledged the challenge in determining the best solution and referenced prior community reactions to the medical building as an example, emphasizing that this is an issue the council should carefully consider.

Mayor Ramsey noted that the office building's 50-foot height is measured at its peak, with much of the structure closer to 35 feet, particularly near the deck, which makes it feel less imposing than the Merit Medical building with a flat top. She added that the building will have setbacks from 1300 West and abut the Holt property, but since there are no immediate neighbors on that side, she believes the impact will be minimal.

Council Member Zander asked for clarification on the chapel's 25-foot setback, specifically inquiring whether that measurement is taken from the road.

Mr. Aiello stated that the chapel's setback is approximately 20 to 25 feet, noting he would need to verify with a scale for precise measurement. Council Member Zander then asked for clarification on the office building's setback, noting it appeared to be about 10 feet. Mr. Aiello confirmed the office building would be 10 foot setback. He added that while there is room to move the office building further east, the site begins to drop off significantly in that direction. He added that reducing the building height from 50 to 45 feet could be feasible by slightly adjusting floor-to-floor heights, but further lowering or shifting the footprint would require substantial site work, including creating a sunken parking lot with retaining walls. He emphasized that such changes would increase construction complexity and costs and could negatively affect the ground floor's appeal for professional tenants.

Council Member Shelton stated that he liked the ideas discussed but expressed concern about how imposing the office building would appear, noting that despite adjustments, it would still be a large structure.

Director Preece added that the building's height would be closer to 35 feet at the eaves before rising to its peak, so it would not sit directly at full height along the street, though it would still be a tall structure.

Council Member Zander asked to see the view of the building from the north and specifically from the west side, noting that previous renderings had focused on the east side and its balconies.

Mr. Aiello showed slide 17 of Attachment C. He explained that the design is deliberately very symmetrical, with the exception of the rear projecting balcony that faces east. Council Member McGuire asked if the agreement requires the glass as shown in the renderings. He added that the agreement should specifically note that the office building would be constructed with glass.

Mayor Ramsey noted that for fire safety considerations, the specific location of the building on the lot affects whether large glass windows can be used, emphasizing that placement plays a critical role in design feasibility.

Council Member Zander noted that the proposed five-foot reduction in height, combined with a slight eastward shift of the office building, aligns with the council's preferences and moves the project closer to their desired outcome.

Council Member McGuire confirmed that, with the proposed adjustments, each of the building's peaks would be at the reduced height of 45 feet. Mr. Aiello responded yes.

Council Member Zander asked whether the agreement would obligate the developers to use the specified materials, noting that as written, they could change the materials without council approval. Director Preece acknowledged that the elevations and design details could be incorporated into the development agreement to ensure consistency with what the council is reviewing. Council Member Zander noted that the glass design was visually appealing, observing that the way light would pass through it would reduce the building's perceived mass and make it feel less imposing.

Mr. Lambert added that the design of the gables is intended to echo the chapel, creating a cohesive aesthetic, and that they hope to match the exterior brick to further tie the office building to the historic structure.

Council Member Zander noted that the chapel itself is only two stories, and while she understands the rationale for adding a third story to achieve a return on investment, it does make the building more imposing. She added that if the office building were only two stories, she would fully support it, but the addition of the third floor is an issue that should be addressed.

Chris Thompson, project architect with Core Architecture, introduced himself and explained that the office building's materials are intended to conceptually mimic the chapel. While the development agreement does not currently specify the materials, he noted the team is open to incorporating language to ensure the building complements the historic chapel. The intent is to create a design that feels open and transparent, is aesthetically pleasing, and harmonizes with the historic property rather than detracting from it.

Mayor Ramsey noted that event attendees would likely be discouraged from holding weddings or other important events in a beautiful historic building if it were immediately adjacent to an unattractive structure.

Mr. Thompson added that the office building will likely appear in the background of many event photos, so the design intent is to mimic the chapel's aesthetic, ensuring the structure complements the historic building and maintains a visually appealing look and feel.

Mr. Aiello added that including language in the agreement specifying a combination of masonry, metal, glass, and wood for the exterior façade, generally in conformance with the presented elevations, would not negatively impact the project's overall performance and aligns with what they are pursuing.

Council Member Shelton asked about the developer's request to retain the right to subdivide the property further. He noted that based on the concept plan, any additional subdividing would likely require removal of the reflecting pond and gardens, which appear to be the only remaining area available for such a change.

Mr. Aiello explained that the intended subdividing would follow a line shown on the site plan, primarily for financing purposes. By separating the office building from the event center, banks could more easily evaluate each as distinct entities. The proposed subdividing would create roughly one acre for the office building and about one and a half acres for the event center,

effectively resulting in two parcels while maintaining the shared parking agreement with the adjacent dental properties.

Director Preece clarified that the proposed subdividing is intended solely for the existing chapel on the site and the new office building, emphasizing that it is not meant to enable additional residential development or a larger condo project in the future.

Council Member Zander noted that this clarification regarding the subdividing makes her feel much more comfortable with the proposal.

Council Member Shelton expressed support for the project, noting its great potential and appreciation that the proposal preserves a structure with significant historical value to the city.

Council Member McGuire expressed appreciation for the proposed plan, highlighting that it preserves the historic “purple church,” a topic he first heard about while campaigning in 2017. He noted that while the city lacks the financial resources to purchase and maintain the building as a public arts museum, this private proposal offers a viable way to preserve the church and provide a public amenity. He expressed support for the proposal as presented, noting his only concern remains the height of the office building. He emphasized that if the developers can reasonably reduce it to 45 feet while maintaining financial feasibility, critical to supporting the event center portion, he is fully in favor of moving forward with the project.

Council Member Zander thanked the developers for their flexibility and expressed admiration for their passion in preserving the historic building. She noted that while the city’s role in such projects is limited, the private sector is well-positioned to bring it to fruition, and she believes the event center will meet a strong community demand. She praised the project as an excellent combination of viable business and historic preservation, commended the team for addressing concerns, and expressed appreciation for meeting the Fraughton family. She also invited the family or developers to offer the council an opportunity to tour the building and learn more about its history.

Mr. Fraughton invited the council to visit the historic building and the family’s studio, sharing personal stories about his father’s artwork and the legacy of draft horses that inspired some of the sculptures. He described the challenges of housing large pieces, including a 65-foot wagon, and noted that much of the family’s art and collection remains on site. He highlighted the history of South Jordan as a small town in the 1960s and 1970s, including connections to local families like Leo Palmer and his nationally championed draft horses, which influenced some of the Fraughton’s sculptures. Mr. Fraughton encouraged the council to schedule a visit soon to see the collection before items are moved, emphasizing the unique historical and cultural significance of the property.

Mayor Ramsey expressed strong support for the project, emphasizing her excitement about preserving the church and its historical significance. She shared her personal experience touring the Fraughton property in 2017 and noted the importance of honoring South Jordan’s roots amidst growth and change. She praised the project as both a brilliant business opportunity and a way to protect a century-old piece of the city’s heritage. She requested that if any centennial celebrations are planned this year, the city be included, highlighting the importance of commemorating the

building's 100-year history. She concluded by encouraging the applicants to continue moving forward with the project.

D.2. Curbside Recycling Level of Service. (By Director of Public Works, Raymond Garrison)

Director of Public Works Raymond Garrison introduced Associate Director of Public Works Colby Hill and Public Works Operations Manager Ashlee Radcliff. Director Garrison reviewed prepared presentation (Attachment D) and provided an overview of the city's waste hauling and recycling program, noting that the current contract with ACE Disposal expires on June 30, 2026 and that the company was the successful bidder again. He explained that before finalizing the contract, the council's input was sought regarding recycling frequency, as weekly service would increase costs. He shared 2025 residential tonnage data, reporting just over 32,000 tons of waste sent to the landfill and nearly 5,000 tons of recyclables processed, along with 136 tons of glass and 190 tons of leaves. He noted the increase in leaf collection due to weather patterns and emphasized that the city is charged by the number of cans, with roughly 24,500 recycling cans, 24,200 garbage cans, and 7,300 households with an additional can. He discussed the recycling audit process, explaining that trucks are periodically sorted to determine contamination rates, which affect recycling fees. In September 2025, a truck showed unusually high contamination, prompting further audits. Overall, the city averages about 30% waste in recycling cans. He noted the market value of materials, with aluminum cans, cardboard, and HDPE plastics being the most profitable, while mixed plastics currently have little market demand. The city currently pays \$59 per ton to recycle, with ACE covering half of that cost under the contract, resulting in a net cost of \$30 per ton for the city. For the discussion of weekly versus biweekly recycling, he explained that 4,800 recycling cans were inspected across the city to determine fill rates, with results categorized in ranges from 0–25% and upwards, providing a basis for considering adjustments to service frequency. He added that of the 4,800 recycling cans inspected out of the city's total 24,000, about a quarter were only one-quarter full. He explained that in many cases residents were not breaking down materials, simply placing whole boxes in the cans, which reduced capacity. He noted that during the week of observation, Ace Disposal collected only 15,000 of the total 24,000 cans, which could indicate residents were away, forgot to set out cans, or the cans were not full enough to require pickup. He shared that surveys of surrounding cities showed many are moving to biweekly recycling service. He noted that Herriman is in the process of rebidding their contract and may retain weekly service, while West Jordan will bid again but plans to continue weekly pickup. He also noted that West Jordan uses 65-gallon cans compared to South Jordan's 96-gallon cans.

Council Member Zander asked why a city of 80,000 residents has only 24,000 recycling cans, noting that while multiple people may live in a single household, there are only 24,000 residences with assigned cans. City Manager Lewis explained that the number makes sense because the average household size is about 3.0 people per home. Director Garrison explained that the 24,000 recycling cans align closely with the city's residential meter count, which is roughly 25,000 residential meters.

Director Garrison continued to review prepared presentation (Attachment D). He provided an overview of the city's residential waste and recycling services in light of the upcoming expiration of the current waste hauling contract on June 30, 2026. The city recently awarded the contract to

Ace Disposal, the current hauler, following a competitive bid process. He explained that maintaining weekly recycling service would result in an estimated 21% increase in garbage costs, or roughly \$1 per cart, and a 27% increase in recycling costs, approximately \$1.40 per cart. Alternatively, moving to a biweekly recycling schedule, with weekly service in December, would maintain the same increase for garbage but reduce recycling costs by approximately \$0.71 per cart. Preliminary analysis indicates that Option 2 would result in an overall sanitation rate increase of 7–8% per cart, while Option 1 would result in an 11% increase.

Council Member Harris expressed concern about shifting to biweekly recycling, noting that household sizes and recycling habits vary widely. He emphasized that some families regularly fill their recycling cans and that the increasing volume of cardboard and packaging from online shopping could create challenges if service were reduced. He acknowledged the higher cost of maintaining weekly recycling but stated that he believes the additional expense is justified to ensure residents have adequate recycling capacity and to maintain the city's cleanliness. He added that the additional cost of weekly recycling would be passed on to residents through their can fees, noting that any increase in service cost would be reflected in what households pay per can.

Council Member Shelton noted that the 27% increase in recycling costs would be applied to the current \$2.00 per can fee, seeking clarification on the financial impact to residents.

Director Garrison explained that the current cost the city pays ACE Disposal for residential garbage service is \$5.19, which would increase to \$6.27 under the new contract. For recycling, the city currently pays \$5.30, and maintaining weekly recycling service would raise that to \$6.74.

Council Member Shelton noted that residents are not charged that amount for recycling. Council Member Zander noted that the city subsidizes the service.

Assistant City Manager Jason Rasmussen explained that the city has been subsidizing recycling since 2021. At that time, council opted to shift some of the cost to garbage service after receiving requests from residents who wanted to opt out of recycling. This approach was intended to protect the recycling program's finances and fund balance, ensuring the program remained sustainable even if some households chose not to participate.

Director Garrison confirmed that the current monthly cost per household is \$5.19 for garbage, which would increase to \$6.27 under the new contract. For recycling, the current cost is \$5.30 per month, which would rise to \$6.74 if weekly service is maintained.

Council Member Harris asked if any money from the general fund is used to pay for the program. Director Garrison responded, no. Council Member Harris confirmed that the costs for the city's waste and recycling program are fully covered through residential can usage fees and do not require funding from the general fund.

Council Member Shelton asked whether staff is proposing to increase the residential garbage and recycling fees. Director Garrison noted that the city planned to bring a rate adjustment to the council previously but postponed it due to the need to go out to bid for hauling services. He highlighted that increases in tipping fees and other associated costs will raise the overall expense, as the hauler's fee covers only pickup and disposal, while tipping fees are paid separately.

Mayor Ramsey clarified that the figures being discussed pertain solely to the contract costs for hauling services. Director Garrison responded yes, and that the contract costs do not include other related expenses such as landfill tipping fees or additional operational costs.

Council Member Shelton asked if the \$5.19 charge for garbage service is a monthly or weekly charge. Director Garrison confirmed it is a monthly charge, not weekly charge. Assistant City Manager Rasmussen explained that the city's charge on top of the hauler's cost covers landfill tipping fees, sanitation employees and trucks, and other related services provided by the city.

Mayor Ramsey noted that Lewis, Robertson, & Burningham (LRB) is doing a full analysis, and confirmed that the council would review the results before discussing any potential changes to rates or services. Director Garrison added that any adjustments to residential rates would be addressed after LRB does their full analysis and that staff would bring back options for council review.

City Manager Dustin Lewis noted that as the current landfill closes and waste is transported to a more distant facility, the city's costs will increase significantly due to both higher transportation expenses and increased tipping fees. Council Member Harris noted that these cost implications could be addressed when the city reaches that point in the future.

Council Member Zander commented on residents in neighboring cities receive recycling collection every other week. Mayor Ramsey shared that she primarily shops online and does not visit physical stores. Despite having fewer people in her household than in previous years, she breaks down boxes but still places her recycling out weekly. Council Member Zander shared that she skips some weeks and suggested that this might be a pattern others could follow.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen noted that while it is not ideal for residents to have two recycling cans, there is always the option to request a second can if needed. He added that he personally fills his can every week but acknowledged that storing two cans might be inconvenient. He also noted that if the city decides to move to biweekly recycling, requesting a second can would remain an available option for residents.

Council Member Zander requested that when staff return with updated numbers, they provide a clear comparison showing the costs for different scenarios; one recycling can weekly, one can every other week, and two cans every other week. She noted this will help the council evaluate options for households with higher recycling needs.

Assistant City Manager Rasmussen emphasized the need for the council to make a decision on the level of recycling service at this meeting so that ACE Disposal can plan appropriately for the number of trucks needed starting in July with the new contract.

Mayor Ramsey commented that while the percentage increases on recycling costs may appear high, the actual dollar impact is modest, around \$1 per month. She emphasized that for many residents, including herself, maintaining weekly recycling service is important for convenience and sustainability, and she is willing to absorb the small cost increase to continue receiving full recycling service.

Council Member Shelton noted that some residents, including himself and friends in nearby cities, manage well with bi-weekly recycling by breaking down boxes, and observed that full recycling cans often contain a lot of air rather than excess material.

Mayor Ramsey asked whether it is worth charging an extra dollar per month to maintain weekly recycling service for residents who need it, versus saving that dollar but reducing service frequency. Council Member Shelton suggested that the city could likely adjust the fees slightly to accommodate the desired level of recycling service. Mayor Ramsey noted that it seems likely the city will need to adjust the fees in the near future, given the current costs associated with the service.

Council Member Zander emphasized that the key decision for the meeting is whether recycling pickup should remain weekly or move to every other week. She clarified that any changes in service frequency would not be absorbed by the city but would be reflected in charges to residents.

Council Member Shelton asked for clarification, noting that the recycling program operates as a separate fund. Assistant City Manager Rasmussen noted it is an enterprise fund that has to pay for itself. Council Member Shelton added that the recycling fund cannot be used to subsidize the general fund.

Council Member Zander noted that if she asked 30 of her neighbors, most would likely pay the small additional amount, around \$1.00, to maintain weekly recycling service.

Council members and staff reviewed the potential cost impacts of maintaining weekly recycling versus moving to every-other-week service. Council members noted that the additional cost to residents for weekly service would be approximately \$1.00 per month, which is relatively minor. It was clarified that residents can opt out of recycling through an established process, though few do. Council members discussed the balance between service frequency and cost, acknowledging that reduced service could prompt complaints, particularly around high-volume periods such as holidays. It was also noted that sanitation rates would increase under either option due to rising hauling and tipping fees, meaning some increase in resident costs is inevitable. Overall, the discussion centered on evaluating service levels, potential resident impacts, and how fees would be allocated without subsidizing the service.

Council Member Zander shared that she does not have a strong personal preference, as she uses her recycling service every other week half the time. She emphasized the need to consider the average South Jordan resident, weighing whether the community would prefer a cost-effective every-other-week schedule or maintaining weekly service to encourage recycling.

Council Member Shelton asked Operations Manager Radcliff, previously employed by Sandy City, whether she had experience with Sandy City's recycling schedule, specifically, if she was there when they shifted to every-other-week service or if that schedule was already in place during her tenure. Operations Manager Radcliff stated that Sandy City was already on an every-other-week recycling schedule during her tenure, and she had served as the purchasing agent when the decision was made to maintain the biweekly service.

Council Member Harris said he thinks residents are going to reach out if the service goes to every other week. He acknowledged there might be some savings, like \$1.00 a month, but expressed concern that people would be upset about not being able to put their cans out weekly. He wasn't sure how residents would respond to that explanation.

Council members and staff discussed the potential cost impacts of changing recycling service frequency. Council Member Zander noted that the difference is more than \$1, citing that weekly recycling costs would be \$6.74 per can, while switching to every other week would reduce it to \$4.58, reflecting the reduced service. Staff clarified that while the per-can cost would decrease, overall garbage rates and tipping fees would still increase, likely resulting in a 7–8% increase for both garbage and recycling. Additional options, such as charging residents a higher rate for a second can, were noted, which could raise the overall increase to roughly 11%. Council members agreed that the net dollar increase per resident would be small, only a few dollars, and staff reminded the council that residents have the option to opt out of recycling if desired, mitigating concerns about the cost impact.

Council Member Shelton recommended keeping the recycling service on a weekly schedule, noting that the additional cost per resident is minimal.

Mayor Ramsey expressed support for maintaining weekly recycling, emphasizing that South Jordan residents value the city's high service levels. She noted that while costs and service options must continually be evaluated, reducing service could erode the quality that attracts residents. She acknowledged the challenge of identifying the "sweet spot" where service remains valued without imposing undue cost, citing past experiences where reductions in recycling service generated significant public dissatisfaction. She stated she would like to maintain weekly recycling as part of the city's service levels and inquired about the duration of the new contract. Director Garrison responded that the new contract will be for seven years, roughly coinciding with the expected closure of the current landfill. Mayor Ramsey noted that changes will likely be necessary when the landfill closes and waste must be transported elsewhere, affecting all communities. She emphasized, however, that she prefers to maintain the current weekly recycling service, particularly given pressures in other areas of city services.

Council Member McGuire stated that he is also in favor of keeping the recycling service weekly.

Director Garrison thanked the council and noted that staff will return in a few months with options regarding sanitation and recycling rates.

D.3. Procedures and Unified Development Code Organization. (By Long-Range Planner, Joe Moss)

Director of Planning and Economic Development Brian Preece explained that the current effort differs from previous initiatives, focusing on making city codes easier for residents to use and simplifying the process for implementing future changes. He noted that much of the current code is scattered, with the last comprehensive rewrite occurring in 2005. The proposal involves consolidating Title 16 and Title 17 to create a more user-friendly framework, with the goal of simplifying the code while allowing for future legislative updates as needed. He added that Long-Range Planner Joe Moss has experience doing this type of work as a private consultant for other

cities in the valley, and having him on staff saves the city money by avoiding outside consultants. He noted that staff have reviewed the proposal with City Manager Dustin Lewis and sought council input.

Long-Range Planner Joe Moss reviewed prepared presentation (Attachment E). He explained that the current development code has become fragmented over the last 20 years, comparing it to the Winchester Mystery House in San Jose, with additions creating awkward connections, “staircases to nowhere,” and scattered information. He noted that definitions in Title 16 sometimes reference Title 17, fencing requirements are spread across at least three sections, and procedural instructions in site plans are incomplete or inconsistent, such as omitting the Architectural Review Committee. The goal of the proposed update is to combine Titles 16 and 17 into a single, unified development code that consolidates procedures, eliminates potential conflicts, and provides a clear organizational structure. He emphasized that this effort focuses on reorganization rather than creating new procedures or making substantial changes to development standards, only clarifying conflicts or ambiguities where necessary.

Director Preece explained that as the reorganization progresses, any items that may need changes will be tracked on a running list. Once the reorganization is complete, those items will be reviewed and addressed. He added that any legislative changes that occur during the process will also be incorporated as necessary.

Long-Range Planner Joe Moss continued to review prepared presentation (Attachment E). He explained that the intent of the code reorganization is to focus on formatting and structure, making it more user-friendly for residents, developers, and staff, while aligning with the city’s strategic priorities. The project emphasizes consolidating fragmented information, eliminating conflicts, using consistent language, and establishing a clear framework for development standards. Examples from other municipalities, including visual tables, flowcharts, and graphics, were highlighted as ways to make complex code easier to understand. The team reviewed the existing code and proposed organizing it into five main sections; general provisions (legal requirements and definitions, with hyperlinks for online usability), procedures (consolidated steps for land use applications and authority processes), subdivision standards (plotting and related development standards), development use standards (landscaping, parking, fencing, and citywide development standards), and zoning districts. A cross-departmental project team, including planning, engineering, public works, building inspections, and code enforcement, was established to ensure the reorganized code meets the needs of all departments and functions effectively for everyone. The goal is to make the code more navigable, visually clear, and easier to maintain over time.

Mayor Ramsey asked if anybody from the city attorney's office was included. Long-Range Planner Moss responded that the attorney's office has been in more of an advisory role and that they have been working with Assistant City Attorney Greg Simonson on how to proceed with the review. Director Preece added that they have met with Assistant City Attorney Greg Simonson and with City Recorder Anna Crookston, noting that the two of them need to be part of the process, perhaps not involved in all the super detailed aspects, but as advisory roles.

Long-Range Planner Moss explained that to accomplish the project, the team is in place and aims to complete the work within six months, an aggressive timeline. The plan is to break the code into

two modules, drafting the first sections and sending them for review while beginning the next sections. This allows reviewers, including the city attorney's office, time to provide feedback while drafting continues. Once complete, all sections will be compiled into a single package for the council's adoption process. To ensure no content is lost, a main tracking document will note where each paragraph from the existing code will appear in the new code.

Director Preece asked if it is something the council would support.

Mayor Ramsey expressed support for the project, stating she thinks it's fantastic. She emphasized the importance of having a clean, user-friendly code for both staff and applicants, noting that since it's been 20 years since the last major update, it's time for an adjustment.

Council Member Harris noted that updating and clarifying the code would help control expenses, reduce confusion, and likely decrease the number of calls from residents. He emphasized that making the code clearer is also an efficiency measure that can reduce frustration for both staff and the public.

Director Preece added that making the code easier to find and navigate allows more people to access information on their own, which improves overall efficiency by reducing the need for staff assistance.

Mayor Ramsey noted that increased clarity in the code also helps the city from a liability standpoint, ensuring there are no unintended loopholes and making it clear to residents what is and isn't allowed. She expressed support for this approach.

City Attorney Ryan Loose added that any significant ambiguity in the code or contracts typically gets interpreted against the city in court. Since the city writes the code, it is essential to be clear and precise to avoid legal challenges and ensure residents can easily understand processes.

City Manager Dustin Lewis stated that this is likely the best opportunity the city has had to update the code, given the skills and experience of the current staff. He emphasized that the expertise of the city engineer, Long-Ranger Planner Moss, and the entire team can be leveraged, and that the resulting code could serve as a model for future efforts.

Mayor Ramsey requested that, once the code update is complete but before it comes to the council, she would like sufficient time to review it thoroughly. Director Preece responded that absolutely, they do not want to hand the document over hastily. He expressed appreciation for the review process, noting that it will be part of the overall process, and reminded the council that he last rewrote the code around 20 some odd years ago, which is why the update is necessary.

City Manager Lewis noted that some portions of the city code are archaic, having been adopted when the code was first written 40 years ago. He explained that this update will help identify and remove those outdated sections.

Director Preece explained that some sections of the code still require paper copies, which no longer reflect current practice. The update aims to align the code with how processes are actually

conducted electronically, ensuring the city remains defensible and consistent with modern operations.

Mayor Ramsey expressed strong support for the project, noting that updates like those made for in-home preschools were important and timely, reflecting current needs for the city, providers, families, and neighborhoods. She acknowledged the scope and complexity of the code, recognizing that it has evolved extensively over the past 20 years and will continue to change, and praised the project as ambitious and valuable.

Director Preece explained that during a recent meeting with Director of Public Works Raymond Garrison, they identified instances where provisions in other titles, such as Title 13 related to water, might be better integrated into the development code, and vice versa. While the project does not encompass the entire municipal code, there are opportunities to clean up cross-references and improve organization between related sections.

Council Member Shelton suggested that this project could also provide an opportunity to simplify and potentially standardize certain zoning and development standards, enhancing consistency across the code.

Long-Range Planner Moss explained that the team has identified parallel design standards that are similar but slightly different, and where feasible, they would like to consolidate these citywide to simplify the code. However, any substantive changes that could significantly impact development will be deferred to a later package, as the current effort is focused on organization and clarity rather than major policy shifts. Director Preece added that the team will keep a list of any identified items for later review and address them once the current reorganization effort is complete.

Council Member Zander motioned to recess the City Council Study Meeting and move to executive closed session for the discussion of the purchase, exchange, or lease of real property. Council Member McGuire seconded the motion. Vote was 4-0, unanimous in favor; Council Member Johnson was absent for the vote.

RECESS CITY COUNCIL STUDY MEETING AND MOVE TO EXECUTIVE CLOSED SESSION

E. Executive Closed Session:

- E.1. Discussion of the purchase, exchange, or lease of real property.

ADJOURN EXECUTIVE CLOSED SESSION AND RETURN TO CITY COUNCIL STUDY MEETING

Council Member McGuire motioned to adjourn the executive closed session and return to the City Council Study Meeting. Council Member Harris seconded the motion. Vote was 4-0, unanimous in favor; Council Member Johnson was absent for the vote.

Council Member Shelton motioned to adjourn the January 20, 2026 City Council Study Meeting. Council Member Zander seconded the motion. Vote was 4-0, unanimous in favor; Council Member Johnson was absent for the vote.

ADJOURNMENT

The January 20, 2026 City Council Study Meeting adjourned at 7:08 p.m.

UNAPPROVED