

**CITY OF SOUTH JORDAN
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
July 28, 2026**

Present: Commissioner Steven Catmull, Commissioner Lori Harding, Chair Nathan Gedge, Commissioner Michelle Hollist, City Attorney Ryan Loose, City Planner Greg Schindler, Assistant City Engineer Shane Greenwood, Deputy Recorder Cindy Valdez, Director Brian Preece, IT Director Matt Davis, GIS Matt Jarman.

Others: Selvam Rajavelu, Ryan Naylor, Cindy Wagstaff, Jodi Thompson, Dan Peck, Tim Fries, Venkaresh Subramanyan, Sreckantaia Marjuunath

Absent: Commissioner Bryan Farnsworth

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

A. WELCOME AND ROLL CALL – (Chair Nathan Gedge)

Chair Catmull welcomed everyone to the Planning Commission Meeting and noted he will be the Chair Person tonight and that all (4) of the Planning Commissioners are present at tonight's meeting. Commissioner Bryan Farnsworth is excused from tonight's meeting.

B. MOTION TO APPROVE AGENDA

B.1. Approval of the July 28, 2026 Planning Commission Agenda.

Commissioner Hollist motioned to approve the July 28, 2026 Planning Commission Agenda. Commissioner Gedge seconded the motion. Vote was 4-0 unanimous in favor. Commissioner Farnsworth was absent from the vote.

C. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

C.1. Approval of the July 14, 2026 - Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.

Commissioner Harding motioned to approve the July 14, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes as published. Commissioner Gedge seconded the motion. Vote was 3-0 Commissioner Hollist did not vote due to not attending the meeting. Commissioner Farnsworth was absent from the vote.

D. STAFF BUSINESS

Director Brian Preece said Mayor Ramsey is working on getting the replacement for the open seat on the Planning Commission, we will keep you updated.

E. COMMENTS FROM PLANNING COMMISSION

Commissioner Gedge said be prepared to receive an email from me regarding a new business signage going in for property off of South Warren Parkway at approximately 900 West. There is a new property attached to a gym karate studio with the name Adam and Eve, and I won't comment on more of what that business might be if it's permitted, a conditional not permitted use. But I have gotten some feedback from neighbors since it's my neighborhood, so Planner Schindler, anything you could add on that?

Planner Schindler said the business license was originally denied by me because I felt it was something that we could be denied because they sold adult items and so forth. However, now we can go to City Attorney Ryan Loose because that was overturned and it was deemed it was okay to have it there.

City Attorney Ryan Loose said it wasn't overturned, it wasn't denied by you, it was denied by a business license officer. It's not a planning zoning permitted conditional use. It is a license. The reason it was originally denied by the license official is because, in their application, they had put a significant portion of their building for sexually oriented devices that cannot be a primary purpose. In the hearing that was held, and in the later reapplication by the applicant, they defined much more specifically what they were doing. There was no way to interpret that as a primary purpose, and therefore the license was granted. It wasn't overruled. The hearing officer never decided on it. They fixed their application and said what they were going to actually do. That kind of business is in a number of places around the valley, and along the Wasatch Front. As far as we can tell, they have never had a problem with anything. They sell some adult materials that are the same as was sold in Target and Walmart already in the city that you can go find if you know they're there. I didn't know they were there, but when you are told they're there, you go check, and they are there on the shelves. So personal massagers and things of that nature, and so it was appropriately granted. I understand that some of the neighbors may not like that, but under our current rules and current ordinance, as far as what we regulate there within regulations.

Commissioner Gedge said do the neighbors or the community have any avenues for the next steps to appeal to city council?

City Attorney Loose said they don't have any avenues to go and say the Walmart on Gateway is selling those things. Why would they? I mean, there's just no inherent difference, other than they may see it there. What they could do is petition council to look more closely at our regulations, and we've already had a council member request that and see if we can narrow that down. I don't know to what extent we can. There are certain levels of selling stuff that are generally permitted. If we were to say Adam and Eve can't sell that stuff, then we have to say Walmart and Target can't sell that stuff. And I'm not sure where the council will go, but we'll take them whatever information they want.

Commissioner Gedge said can you remind me on the public's right to peacefully gather and protest?

City Attorney Loose said they can peacefully gather and protest in any public space, as long as they don't block sidewalks and stuff.

Commissioner Harding said we've had a number of fires up north in Roy, Clinton and Ogden along the railroad tracks. I'm wondering what the city has in place or requirement for any railroad, front runners or UTA for their property around the tracks. As far as cutting down weeds, what does the city do to help protect homeowners when breaks and different things like that actually set fire?

Director Preece said we have a fire code violations that covers weeds and those kinds of things.

City Attorney Loose said along the railroad tracks, We don't regulate the railroads. They won that battle long before any of us were born. Regarding, the weeds the height is 6 inches, and the County Code is 9 inches

SUMMARY ACTION

F. ACTION

G.1. **ALMOND DENTAL BUILDING 2 SITE PLAN**

Address: 10433 S. 2200 W.

File No: PLSR202400093

Applicant: Jeffrey Almond

Planner Damir Drozdek reviewed background information from the staff report. He also passed out B copies of the signed agreement, which he passed out to the Planning Commissioners and the Deputy Recorder. (See Attachment A)

Commissioner Harding said It's going to be a separate building, one level. The entrance is going to be on the south side, or is that also an entrance?

Planner Drozdek said there sowing the entrance on the north east corner.

Commissioner Hollist said So I understand that we're now reviewing an agreement, and so it does change our purview to some degree. But I want to clarify why we're not concerned. Is it both the reduction in total building space as well as having somebody go and observe the current usage?

Jordan DeJarne, Architect – said yeah. We had a parking study done, and the parking study based on the existing use and the existing building on site, and then the proposed use for the new building, the parking study came back and showed that we are adequately parked, and we went to City Council and they motioned to approve that parking reduction that we were asking for,

and then after that, we also the reason it also shrank by a whole floor as well is because it just wasn't working parking wise by having that much additional space, so we didn't really alter the design of the building or anything like that. We just basically chopped off the floor and brought it down. But yeah, after the parking agreement submission and then the parking and shared access agreement as well was drafted. We went through multiple rounds with the city attorney to make sure that we implemented any changes that they wanted to see in that document and the owner after they deemed it basically complete with no further changes, the owner had signed it and had it notarized. So all the requirements that you guys have asked us to complete from the last time we were here, and any other requirements that the planning department had to get the building to be within code to in city standards, we've now met all of those requirements.

Commissioner Gedge said Can I just ask one quick follow-up? So we've heard this a couple times, and one of my personal concerns was just at the time there was leasing of parking stalls during the day to the high school across the street. Is that going to be a continuation once this is built out?

Mr. DeJarne said no, that's actually part of the parking agreement. That's not allowed. that's actually also on our site plan and our plans as well to be noted. But there will be signs for that as well.

Commissioner Hollist said so often uses are locked in. Does this now lock in that one can be a dance studio and the other can be a dentist's office, or in the future can they say "Well, dance studios are allowed." We want all of this to be a dance studio, or is each building locked into the use that they've provided tonight.

Planner Drozdek said the parking study anticipated expansion of the dance studio, so they're increasing their space, and then the leftover space, they anticipated for either retail or office, and with either one of those two uses the parking still worked on site.

Commissioner Hollist said are they then limited from expanding the dance studio any further? And what happens if the parking is not sufficient? Does this agreement allow for the city to reevaluate?

Planner Drozdek said that's just an agreement between the properties. That's not an agreement with the City. That is what you instructed them to come back with was a shared access and parking agreement on site. It's not an agreement between the city and the applicant. They reviewed the parking study and they agreed with the results of the parking study with the proposed agreement.

Mr. DeJarne said and something to note as well is we have 64 parking stalls on site, and the parking study came back and showed that for the proposed uses. The proposed new expansion of the dance studio, on top of the existing building and keeping the dance studio where it's currently located as well, that was only requiring a parking amount of 54, and so we actually, according to the parking study, is basically saying that we have an excess of 10 extra stalls. So per really just

code in general, the dance studio could grow, but it could not grow to a point where it would end up exceeding the parking requirement of that remaining 10 stalls.

Commissioner Hollist said I would like staff clarification: he's referring to a parking study that does not actually refer to our current ordinances, because I believe the staff report said that based on usage, we would require 100 and 104. Is that correct?

Director Preece said the way the code is written, it is something like that. I want to make a general comment. This happens all the time when uses change, so what happens is when they come in for a new business license. If they were to expand, they would have to upgrade their business license. The planning department looks at parking as to whether it's adequate for the new use or expansion. So there, it's there's still a mechanism to watch and review.

Commissioner Gedge said this has been a long process with this location. I appreciate the applicants and city staff working together, also involving city council to come to remedy for this. I really want this area to proceed or be successful. I think we all have interest in this intersection with some of our fellow family members who are much younger. So we hope it succeeds.

Commissioner Gedge motioned to approve File No. PSPR202400093 Almond Dental Building 2 Site Plan. Commissioner Harding seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 4-0 unanimous in favor. Commissioner Farnsworth was absent from the vote.

H. ADMINISTRATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS

H.1. 7 BREW DRIVE-THRU COFFEE SITE PLAN

Address: 3634 W 11400 S

File No: PLSPR202600076 Applicant: Janis Wren

Planner Aguilera reviewed background information from the staff report.

Commissioner Hollist said what's a remote cooler? And do these exist in more places? I'm just not aware.

Planner Aguilera said that's a good question. I also asked them that question. I think they said something along the lines of storage purposes or storage for cooling items that need to be cooled. But perhaps the applicant can answer specifically.

Commissioner Gedge said before we get into public comment or the applicant, so this area is infamous for one of the questions I always ask when we have these type of drive-thru's. It's very near to a traffic issue that we had several years ago with a very successful business. So if the 10 parking stalls and the drive-through traffic weren't able to push the the flow fast enough, and traffic was to back up onto 11400th South. Can you confirm that the individual vehicle driver operators could be ticketed for impeding a public action? And so, it would behoove the applicant to make sure that there is steady traffic flow and people not stacking on the streets.

Planner Aguilera said I probably can't speak to the ticketing on that, but what I can say is in their site plan, the entry and exit is on the north side. So the north side connects to an internal shared driveway between all of these properties, so it would take quite a bit of length to get from that internal driveway onto one of the public roads. They don't have direct access from 11400 South onto this property.

Chair Catmull said because it's budding on what we have on the display right now, is 3626 West is going to become a road?

Planner Scindler said that will never become a road. It is privately owned . It was put there for a detention basin way back when they were doing the condominiums and so forth that are in there.

Tim Fries, Encore Enterprises – said we are the franchise group for Seven Brew Coffee in the state of Utah. Currently, we have six locations open. We have one under construction, another permit in process. Of course, this one in process as well. It's our goal to have approximately 28 to 30 of these locations in the state of Utah by the end of 2027. In addressing traffic and queuing, I don't have the exact number. Maybe Miguel can help me with that. I think in this location we have 18 to 20 stacking for queuing. It is a double drive-through. We do not utilize a speaker for our menu board. We have our customer service representatives with iPads, so we walk to your car. So you know if there is an overflow of traffic, then we assign additional CSRs with iPads to walk to the cars to continue the flow through. Our national dwelling times are less than five minutes from pull in to pull out. We're improving that daily. I would love to have the city officials write tickets for us because I would love to have a line that goes that far out to the main road. We'll gladly pay tickets and and probably complimentary coffee along the way if we have a if we have something like that. We would certainly be the envy of Chick Fil A, I would imagine. But from that aspect, we feel like that we do address all of our traffic and queuing issues. Our peak times are from 6 a.m. to 10 p.m. Again, that doesn't necessarily affect other businesses or from the bank next door and things like that. They open up much later. You know, I will say it has been our history that opening week is rather cumbersome, so we do cooperate with local law enforcement to help us with traffic flow for that first week, but our average queuing is between six and eight cars at even at our peak times. As far as additional traffic being added to your main thoroughfares or anything like that, we're basically considered a pass-by destination. We don't necessarily add vehicles, you know, to the traffic flow. It's you know taking the kids to school and practice, and the dad going to the hardware store or the convenience store and things like that, and then they swing by and and stop and get a seven brew drink or something like that. So our studies show that we don't necessarily add to the traffic flow, but we're more of a pass by destination, our building is approximately 510 square feet. The cooler storage, cooler slash storage, it is a fixed building, and it supplies some product, anything that can be maintained above 32 degrees. But most of our product is in our building. Our building is not for public; it is employee only. In fact, our parking spaces are typically for employees only. I would say 99% of our business is drive-through. It's not that we would turn away, walk up, but we don't have a walk-up window. You know, we don't necessarily have that now. The two side entrances. where people walk up. We we typically put picnic tables out there for our employees to take a break or

something like that. But it's not to stop someone from coming up, walking to the window and ordering a drink, and sitting there on the on the picnic tables that we have there, so that they would utilize that. But that's very rare that we have something like that, and it's something that we don't even promote walk up or pedestrian traffic. We are looking forward to coming to the South Jordan area.

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

Commissioner Gedge said this is a good area for this type of location. We've seen several competitors of yours be successful in this area. I think this is a great location and I'm glad that if this will potentially, depending on our motion here shortly, be the first location in South Jordan.

Commissioner Hollist said I just wanted to comment that this drive-through looks like it has more stacking than we normally see, so I appreciate that.

Commissioner Harding motioned to approve File No. PLPR202600076 7 Brew Drive Thru Coffee Site Plan. Commissioner Gedge seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 4-0 unanimous in favor. Commissioner Farnsworth was absent from the vote.

Commissioner Gedge said can I just ask a quick question to invite the applicant forward? Just your anticipated grant opening opening date. We have you come to the microphone just so it gets in the public record in case people are listening. People might be interested. I am sorry that I failed to ask when he was up here before.

Mr. Fries said the Grand Opening will be 120 days after it gets approved.

H.2. PECK DETACHED GARAGE CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT

Address: 11756 S Gold Dust Dr

File No: PLCUP202600093

Applicant: Sadi Thompson Peck

Planner Aguilera reviewed background information from the staff report.

Commissioner Harding said on this image, it says the garage is being permitted separately. So, they're working on something different on the land?

Planner Aguilera said that's not part of the application. That's a different structure on the other side of the property. It's unclear what their plans are for that.

Chair Catmull said they can have as many accessory buildings as long as they're compliant and they don't exceed the lot coverage requirements.

Planner Aguilera said the lot coverage maximum is 40%. So as long as they don't exceed 40% of the overall lot size and building coverage, then they are okay to do as many buildings.

Commissioner Hollist said the report mentions that it's the maximum allowable height for an ADU is 25 feet. Is that because the primary building is 25 feet tall?

Planner Aguilera said the maximum allowed height for all detached structures in all cases is 25 feet.

Commissioner Hollist said do we require ADUs to be shorter than the primary housing?

Planner Aguilera said no, that's not a current ordinance for ADUs, they have to be less than the height of the existing structure.

Commissioner Hollist said is there a restriction on what square footage within the ADU can be the ADU?

Planner Aguilera said the ADU currently can only be either 35% of the living area of the primary dwelling or 1500 square feet. This one doesn't have this on the ADU floor plans, but this one is within that range.

Commissioner Hollist said, within our ordinances, we restrict second-story windows if they're within 20 feet of the property line. You seem to indicate that if there's a building close by, but is it just written in within 20 feet of the property line, regardless of what's going on?

Planner Aguilera said that's correct. So it's just written that if they're within 20 feet and if they have those windows on the second story, or if their wall heights are exceeding 16 feet, then they require conditional use permit approval. The code doesn't specify any specific conditions that the applicant has to meet for them to be approved by that. It's not specified in the code.

Commissioner Hollist said I just wanted to bring that up because I know that for me it would be privacy within my yard that I think I'd care even more about than it being close to my house, so that's just a personal item I wanted to bring up. I guess specifying that the ordinance isn't written so that you've got privacy within your building or your habitable structure. It's that you've got privacy within your property, regardless of what you've got going on in your side.

Sadi Thompson, Applicant – said so to bring up your point about the windows, the back corner. I actually have a picture on my computer. Sorry, I was actually going to print it, and I had some technical difficulties. But it actually is the neighbor's barn and it has no access to their yard where it's at, their barn is right along the property line, within 10 feet. So they have no access at all to even see into our property from back there. So if that helps a little bit, so it's not like even in their yard. If they're in their yard, it's on the whole other side of their barn. So they don't even see in ours, and ours would see the top, out of those windows you would literally see the side of their barn. And also to answer your question about the 25 feet, we actually were at 28 feet. We

thought with conditional use permit we could do that. We actually re-engineered our plans to make the 25 feet limit, mainly because only part of that also is an ADU. There's just a couple bedrooms, and part of it is an upstairs loft area. If that makes sense, the rest of it is open as a garage, and we plan to use it as a garage and also put a basketball hoop in for the kids. So that was why we wanted to be so high, so the kids could actually shoot hoops inside. as a garage, and we plan to use it as a garage and also put a basketball hoop in for the kids. So that was why we wanted to be so high, so the kids could actually shoot hoops inside.

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

Commissioner Gedge said I actually grew up in this neighborhood, one street over. I know of the proximity of the neighboring to the south, and other properties in in the adjoining streets and across the riverfront border that have a very similar use as well. I have no opposition to this item. It's a good fit, so I just wanted to make that comment.

Commissioner Hollist said when we talk about ADUs, I think in our code the building materials recommendation is that it matches the primary structure. What plays into it when we require that versus not?

Planner Schindler said we can't require that any longer, the State of Utah says no.

Commissioner Hollist said one other question is: I'm looking at these elevations, because it appears that there are second-story windows on more than just the side that faces that barn. Am I misunderstanding that the property to the west west?

Planner Aguilera said so the second story windows are on both the property lines that are nearest to their neighbors. So it's on the west side and on the south side.

Commissioner Hollist said I assume the neighbor to the west was noticed.

Commissioner Aguilera said correct. The map shows the notice buffer and everybody within that, and then the subdivision entirely was noticed.

Commissioner Hollist said was there any discussion about offsetting this 20 feet from the property line for 25?

Planner Aguilera said I did reach out to the applicant, and we did discuss this to see if they would be willing to adjust their designs to move the building back 20 feet, or remove some of the windows, or do something to make them non see through. But they wanted to proceed with their designs.

Commissioner Hollist said I am just I'm struggling a little. I don't know the owner to the west and if they care or not, and without them here to testify, but we have an ordinance for a reason.

I've been shown that on the south, there's a reason to potentially allow a clear, openable window on the second floor.

Commissioner Gedge said if I can ingest a little personal knowledge. If you look at the property to the west, it actually is to the south as well on about 11800 South, and that is a very large pasture, and so it's more agricultural. That's more of an agricultural property. If that alleviates any concerns that you might have with the the second story windows to the west.

Commissioner Hollist said it's worth mentioning. We have this ordinance, and so how do we justify making an exception here? Because we've asked a lot of people that request being closer to the property line to go ahead and give us an opaque window that can't open.

Chair Catmull said you know one thing is the city council has delegated the ability for us to do that as we look at it, and so I think one of the key things there is privacy., but when I look at it, the dwelling units are not like right adjacent to each other.

Commissioner Hollist said but that comes back to my point, I I know I live in a smaller lot than this. I want privacy in my backyard, and not necessarily somebody staring down at me.

Commissioner Harding said I don't have a problem with it based on what's been presented.

Commissioner Gedge said this is a conditional use permit. So in the future, if that property to the west south would be developed or concerns arose, then I believe there's a mechanism for the conditional use permit to be reviewed and to to have conditions invoked. The conditional use permit is not a permanent allowance. There are mechanism.

City Attorney Loose said it could only it could only be pulled back if it violates a condition that you impose now. That condition can only be imposed if you identify a detrimental effect, and the condition is the least restrictive mitigation of that detrimental effect, and so if there's no need for a condition now, if someone were to come later and say, "Hey, I moved here and these things change," you wouldn't be able to impose in a future time that condition as at the time it was permitted or at the time approved. It didn't need any conditions, and so anybody subsequent would be taking the property next to it, knowing that it had this environment.

Chair Catmull motioned to re-open the Public Hearing. Commissioner Harding seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous.

Ms. Thompson said you actually talked about everything that I was going to say. I was just going to say that it is far back in that property. It's agriculture. They actually work on cars, like towards the front of it. No one's ever back there. The second part is there are more than half of the properties in this neighborhood that have the exact same building, they're all ADUs. Almost almost everybody has a detached garage ADU attached to their property in the corner within 10 feet. It's pretty standard in that neighborhood. So that's it.

Commissioner Catmull re-closed the Public Hearing

Commissioner Gedge motioned to approve File No. PLCUP202600093 Peck Detached Garage Conditional Use Permit. Commissioner Harding seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 3-1 Commissioner Hollist voted no. Commissioner Farnsworth was absent from the vote.

H.3. SRI GANESHA HINDU TEMPLE SITE PLAN

Address: 1131 W. 10290 S.

File No: PLMPA202600108

Applicant: Aditya Vinadhara

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

Commissioner Gedge said I was walking through this because this is in my current neighborhood, and on 10400 South and Hindu Temple Lane, I believe, and this was two weeks ago, but there were barricades up blocking access, turning eastbound onto 10400 South at that juncture. I'm just wondering if that's appropriate for fire safety access, especially for the residents or businesses along 10400 South. In case there is an incident on 1055 West 10400 South, should those barricades remain, or will they be removed?

Assistant City Engineer Greenwood said the barricades need to remain. It's a private road.

Commissioner Hollist said what happens with the timing when they want to finish that parking? Do they have to come back to us?

Planner Drozdek said yeah, they're going to have to come back as part of a future phase.

Chair Catmull said what would it come back as? Another site plan?

Planner Schindler said it would be an an amendment to a site plan. It's basically part of one big site, so it would be an amendment to the site plan. But it's also, an addition to the current site plan.

Chair Catmull said there weren't phases in the original one?

Planner Drozdek said no, there was no phases, but they want to phase it out to to a future date.

Chair Catmull said so, can an applicant have two building permits off the same site plan, or when they get a building permit, is it is it completely tied to the execution of the site plan.

Planner Schindler said this this was all one site. They develop part of it, and anything that comes back will be depending on the size of it and how much is being changed when they come back. It'll either be a major site plan amendment or a minor site plan amendment, and so we have different fee structures for those. But there is no reason for them to have a totally new site plan because this is just phases and they'll be able to amend the original one. The building permits

will be allowed, if it's going to be a new building they're going to put in, and then and it's approved through the major site plan amendment. Then the building department can issue building permits through that site plan, they don't have to have a separate site.

Aditya Vinadhara, Applicant – said live in 329 East Old Sandy Court, Sandy, Utah. I've been involved with the temple for the past 30 years. We kind of developed both the parking lot and the access road, and then we had the the parking lot as an ad alternate, and the bids came in higher, so we couldn't do it at that time. So we deferred it to a future. We are planning on a big expansion to the temple and the India Cultural Center. We are designing right now. We'll be submitting the drawings for approval in a few months. So the plan is to start construction like January of next year, and then we probably will be done with the whole expansion by end of 2028. So we will kind of show you what our plans are. You can kind of see what we are doing with the whole site, the development, and all that. And so that's what happened. I would like to thank everybody, they've been very helpful for the past 25 years for all the review and approval process. And it's a great city to have the temple. We are very fortunate to have the temple in South Jordan City.

Commissioner Gedge said I mentioned, I live in this neighborhood, and good neighbors that the applicants are, I just encourage any member of the community who has not visited their temple, especially if you have youth, it's a very good set. The only people who don't like it are the dogs when they do their fireworks.

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

Commissioner Hollist said I have one comment. Thank you staff, for pointing out that the change is acceptable to you because there's been no add-on to the building, There is no new parking requirements, so it's totally appropriate in my mind to phase this.

Commissioner Harding motioned to approve File No. PLMPA202600108 SRI Ganesh Hindu Temple Site Plan. Commissioner Gedge seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 4-0 unanimous in favor. Commissioner Farnsworth was absent from the vote.

H.4. **BEAUTY BARN SALON SUITES SITE PLAN**
Address: 10956 S. Jordan Gateway
File No: PLSPR202600118
Applicant: Russ Naylor

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

Commissioner Gedge said so mine goes to public noticing first. I drove by this site several times this weekend, and I just I couldn't see the outdoor signage that that public hearing would be held. Of course, there's been weather, so I'm not sure if it got toppled. But can we just confirm that all required public noticing was completed for this project this evening?

Planner Drozdek said So there wouldn't be any on-site signage for public noticing. That's just just for zone changes.

Commissioner Hollist said is there is shared parking agreement for everything. I can't remember.

Planner Drozdek said I believe so, it's part of the development agreement.

Commissioner Hollist said so we don't need to specifically review square footage?

Planner Drozdek said that is correct.

Commissioner Gedge said I mentioned I drove by this multiple times this past weekend, and one lane of southbound traffic along Jordan Gateway Drive is closed for improvements, which we had incidents or issues with this area with the rail crossing.. Do we have anticipated timeline of when full traffic flow will be open up? It's been both lanes in both directions the last two months. It seems quite a lot to get infrastructure put into this property. Any idea when we could expect normalcy a little bit in this area?

Assistant City Engineer Shane Greenwood said I believe they're done with most of the utility work in Jordan Gateway. They have to do one more water tie-in to Jordan Gateway, but we're finding a way to not be able to disturb traffic too much. We may have to close the shoulder or whatnot. I'm not sure timeline, but it'll be soon.

Ryan Naylor, Architects – said we're the architects for the applicant, and this is just the second building of this development that we worked out over the past couple years. The first phase, the pickleball building is underway and hopefully will be complete in a year or so. This is just the second piece that the owner wants to build, it's a two-story salon suite-style building, so individual suites for lease for individual people. So, yeah, we're excited to get it going.

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

Commissioner Gedge said I would say it looks like the footings are in for the pickleball infrastructure there, so it is coming along, and going to look really nice there,

Commissioner Gedge motioned to approve File No PLSPR202600118 Beauty Barn Salon Suites Site Plan. Commissioner Hollist seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 4-0 unanimous in favor. Commissioner Farnsworth was absent from the vote.

I. LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS

- I.1. FITZGERALD & WAGSTAFF RESIDENTIAL ZONE AMENDMENT**
Address: 3250 W 11400 S
File No: PLZBA202600119
Applicant: Mark Wagstaff

Planner Aguilera reviewed background information from the staff report.

Commissioner Hollist said maybe I misunderstood the staff report. It made it sound like it would be in compliance for two of these lots for 1.8. So is this yellow lot right here under the minimum size for 1.8?

Planner Aguilera said in the staff report that one would not be compliant, just because it's too small.

Commissioner Hollist said so you're saying the three that result in what you showed us in the more current slide, those would all be compliant with 1.8.

Planner Aguilera said correct. So the applicant would like to at some point do a property line shift, and so the highlighted law is what they're saying, it is roughly what they would like to do with their property and that would be when they do that. They do want to be in compliance with at least 14,520 square feet, which this lot looks like it would be above that. But the only one that wouldn't be in compliance is that small rectangular lot. I did want to make one correction to the report. In the motion for the Planning Commission, it should say Ordinance 2026 06Z. It shouldn't say the file number.

Commissioner Gedge said just to confirm from the map that there are three existing homes on these properties, and it will be the three total lots. Even though it shows four lots with that one little parcel.

Planner Aguilera said yeah, I believe the family or members of the family have ownership of all these ones. So there's four lots total in that box. This one included, but these are the ones that are zoned A-5 that want to be uniform R 1.8.

Commissioner Hollist said so we're just doing a rezone recommendation tonight. We're not changing lot lines.

Planner Aguilera said correct. They they're not changing lot lines now. This application is only to amend the zoning to be uniform across. They haven't indicated any changes away from the current uses as well. So it's unclear if in the future they're going to change a whole lot apart from the adjustment of property lines. It's really up to him.

Commissioner Harding said on your map, right above the home to the right will in the future. It seemed like there's another little sliver between. Will that be taken care of at the same time? I'm just curious. It's just something that stood out to me.

Planner Aguilera said I think that could be a fence. I will double check because I don't see that as being its own separate parcel. But, I will double check because it doesn't show up in this map.

Cindy Wagstaff, Applicant said that part that you were questioning is actually an irrigation pipe that goes along there. But, I want to thank you for serving on this commission. I know it's sometimes a very thankless job. My dad served on this commission in the early 70s, and then

went on to serve for the town council. And I know he did it because he wanted South Jordan to be a better place, and I know that's what you do too. Maybe I should just begin by saying a little bit about the history of this property. This property was once belonged to my grandfather 90 years ago. He owned that and he farmed it. I counted six subdivisions, housing developments that have resulted because of that. He wanted to give part of his land to my mother to build a house, and so they did. They were in their house 60 years. They in turn wanted to give that privilege to my husband and I and my brother, so they gave part of their property to my brother and I. I've been in my home 40 Years, so we shared lawns together, no fences. It's been classified as the Fitzgerald compound. We've held barbecues, scouting events, weddings, the whole thing there. Before my mom passed on March 30th, she said in her notes that she knew that fences would probably have to be required, and we had our lawn equipment in one of two outbuildings, and so she said, "Move the property line so you guys can still have an outbuilding". Keep your lawn equipment, and then build a fence to separate my lawn from the rest. When I called to make that happen, I found out that it was agriculture, which I couldn't do anything, so that's why I'm here.

Char Catmull opened the Public Hearing to comments. There were none. He closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Gedge said I just want to make a comment saying thank you to their father for this past city service. We we know what he went through, and I personally having grown up in this community for the past 50 years, knowing it's definitely changed and grown, and we appreciate the long timers of South Jordan. This seems to me like an administrative cleanup. Obviously, the history-it was a much larger parcel and small little piece. Unfortunately, I think the applicant got stuck in the middle of just trying to put up a fence. But at least we're hopefully getting them out of here quickly this evening. I should ask for Miguel, tentatively, when is this going to be scheduled before City Council?

Planner Aguilera said It's scheduled for next Tuesday August 4, 2026.

Commissioner Hollist motioned to send a favorable recommendation to the City Council to approved File No. PLZBA202600119 Fitzgerald & Flagstaff Residential Zone Amendment. Commissioner Harding seconded the motion.

Chair Gedge motioned to correct the ordinance number to be PLZBA202606-Z. Commissioner Harding seconded the ammened motion. Roll Call Vote was 4-0 unanimous in favor. Commissioner Farnsworth was absent from the vote.

J. OTHER BUSINESS

Director Preece said we still have one person that hasn't finished their training. If you could get that done it would be appreciated. The other item that will affect you is we're working on moving your packets from being emailed to you to being brought to you in Microsoft Teams. You should all have a teams account. From what I understand, the City Council has been receiving theirs this way for about four months, and it's been fairly flawless. We haven't had any complaints, so we'll

let you know when that happens, so you know what to look for. But that will help with size of packets, all kinds of things, and make it more efficient and more secure. So, for people trying to get in, we get instructions on how to access. I'm just going to give you a little heads up on detached ADUs. So the state legislature last session passed an ordinance, or a state law that we have to change our ordinance, and we can no longer require conditional use permits for ADUs. There's very few things that we regulate that we can continue to regulate. We can regulate them through some setbacks and were working on those. Obviously, that will come to you for your review. Most of it will be just to satisfy the state law, so you won't be seeing ADUs anymore after October 1, 2026.

Commissioner Hollist said so are they lifting the ability to restrict size relative to primary residences? Are they removing the ability to limit to one per property?

Director Preece said you can still only have one per property, whether it's indoor, inside or attached. But at this time, you can still have one. There lowering the lot size to 11,000 square feet. Any lot in the city that's residential and 11,000sq feet or more. That's a state law. We've had some board meetings with the council and there is some items that we're we're working on, but you can't do opaque windows anymore. You can't you can't regulate windows, period. Other than that we can regulate setbacks kind of indirectly. But so a lot of the things we have been using as conditions and stuff are no longer going to be allowed.

Commissioner Gedge said so the 1500 square feet or 35% of the primary residence, that goes away as well.

Director Preece said I think there's still some sizes we can deal with.

City Ryan Loose said my recollection is that you can't be taller than the primary building. I don't think we can regulate size and it can't be bigger than the primary structure. So if you have a 1500 square foot Ramblers Lab on grade, the ADU could max be 1500 feet, if I'm remembering correctly. So there are some regulations. There are still setbacks, and things like that. The city council received some good information from Brian and Joe last week.

Director Preece said we'll be going back with some follow-up stuff on the 18th of August.

Commissioner Harding said Is there any requirement if it's a separate building on how far away it needs to be from the primary residence, or there's no limitations?

City Attorney Loose said currently have those, and those are things that are being balanced. The closer you push toward the primary building, the further you are from the neighbors. But you know, five feet between the two buildings is also problematic.

Director Preece said privacy of the neighbors is what we're considering also in the setbacks and whatnot.

Commissioner Gedge said do we know who the legislative sponsors of these bills were?

City Attorney Loose said this was Representative Ward, if I remember right who sponsored the ADU bill, but it had been coming for a while. He'd been pushing it for several years, different forms of it, and he did the internal ADU bill too, and so there are several. Many cities have already gone to something similar to this. Frankly, having them be conditional use and having get the type of the review that you look at has been going out for a while. Conditional uses generally are going out from the standpoint: is how often do you really have enough evidence to find detrimental circumstances, which you can, or detrimental effects, which you can then have to mitigate with evidence of least restrictive. That's hard, and so more and more the city attorneys and the planners are recommending to make them permitted, but then regulate them as much as you can. Just have the rules there, so they're very well known, and people know what they're getting into. Rather than coming to a meeting, have the neighbors state their objections and then have a moving target, that sort of thing. So all of that's kind of happening.

Chair Catmull said I would love to see as you're talking about this with City Council, not considering just the height, but the width of some of these ADUs or the auxiliary buildings. If it is half of a two-acre lot and it's this 3000 square foot accessory building, I would love to see that pushed back, and further based not just on height but width because it's just it encroaches on.

Commissioner Gedge said I watch YouTube and tiny home villages, which is basically trailers. So do these have to be permanent structures, I assume it can't be things that are considered movable.

Director Preece said they could do a tiny home, but it would have to be one that's built in place on a foundation, not wheels. HUD regulates manufactured homes, which are the old mobile homes. They don't make that many mobile homes since 1976 because they call them manufactured homes and they regulate them, but they do what they call as a permanent foundation is much different than what you would call a permanent foundation for what we would think of.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Gedge motioned to Adjourn.

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.