

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

Present: Commissioner Steven Catmull, Commissioner Michell Hollist, Commissioner Lori Harding, Assistant City Attorney Greg Simonson, City Planner Greg Schindler, Assistant City Engineer Jared Francis, Deputy Recorder Cindy Valdez, Director Brian Preece, IT Director Matt Davis, GIS Matt Jarman

Absent: Chair Nathan Gedge, Commissioner Bryan Farnsworth

Other: D. Scott Hirckley, Elder Steve, Ferris Taylor, Samsung, Johnson, BBlaimer

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

A. WELCOME AND ROLL CALL – *Commissioner Michell Hollist*

Commissioner Hollist welcomed everyone to the Planning Commission Meeting and noted that (3) of the Planning Commissioner's are present at tonight's meeting; Chair Gedge and Commissioner Farnsworth are excused from tonight's meeting.

B. MOTION TO APPROVE AGENDA

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

Commissioner Catmull motioned to approve the April 28, 2026 Planning Commission Agenda. Commissioner Harding seconded the motion. Vote was 3-0 unanimous in favor.; Chair Gedge and Commissioner Farnsworth were absent from the vote.

C. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

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

Commissioner Harding motioned to approve the April 14, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes. Commissioner Hollist seconded the motion. Vote was 3-0 unanimous in favor; Chair Gedge and Commissioner Farnsworth were absent from the vote.

D. STAFF BUSINESS

E. COMMENTS FROM PLANNING COMMISSION

F. SUMMARY ACTION

G. ACTION

H. ADMINISTRATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS

H.1. WELLER DETACHED ACCESSORY BUILDING - CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT

Address: 10672 S Bison Creek Cv.

File No: PLCUP202500164

Applicant: Mark Watson, NorthFace Construction, Inc.

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

Commissioner Hollist said we were told in our packet, it's a two story building, but what we're being shown there is one.

Planner Drozdek said the front of the building is one one story, and then the behind the rear end of the building is two stories.

Commissioner Hollist said the only thing that we're being asked to make a judgment on is the fact that the wall height exceeds the maximum height.

Planner Drozdek said yes, it is exceeding 16 feet. And in this case, it's 19 feet. The designer also said that he would work with staff to make sure that they're 20 feet back.

Commissioner Catmull said I'm still trying to wrap my mind around that, where is the wall height on the drawing??

Planner Drozdek said it should be in your in your report. I don't think you can see it here, but it's on the two story portion of the home.

Commissioner Catmull said the bottom, that's the 19 feet?

Planner Drozdek said yes, that is correct.

Commissioner Catmull said on the drawing on the bottom, is that representing the fence that exists?

Planner Drozdek said yes, that's what it depicts. So there's two mitigating factors when it comes to this conditional use permit. I think they're in the staff report, there's a couple of existing buildings nearby that are two stories, and one of them has a wall height of 19 feet. It's included in your report. And then the other factor is that this property sits lower than the adjacent properties to the north and to the west, so the wall height is not going to be a big detriment to either one of those two properties.

Mark Watson (applicant) said he did not anything to add.

Commissioner Hollist opened the Public Hearing to comments. There were none. She closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Hollist said how far off of the property line is this on the side that will have the 19 feet?

Planner Drozdek said the one to the north, I think, is 11 or 12 feet, and the one to the west is at least 14 feet.

Commissioner Hollist said what is the required offset?

Planner Drozdek said so this building, from what I remember, is 20 or 21 feet to the peak, and a 16 foot setback. So that's four or five feet, and eight feet is the minimum for the height that they're proposing.

Commissioner Harding said are you clear with where those windows will be? Because I was a little confused.

Planner Drozdek said they will be south facing. There's no windows along the west or the north north facade, but the south facade has windows, and they were approximately almost 20 feet away, like 19 feet away. And when I talked to the designer, they didn't want to ask for the exception, so they said they would just work with us to make sure that they're 20 feet away.

Commissioner Hollist said so you feel like this meets all of our code and ordinances.

Plamer Drozdek said yeah, they're going to have to meet the city codes for us to issue a building permit.

Commissioner Hollist said if in the future they decided to change their mind, the staff packet made it very clear that this would not have an ADU, It would just be for family use. Should they want to have an ADU in the future,would they be in compliance with all of the requirements for a detached Guest House.

Planner Drozdek said I believe so, they're gonna have to come back befor the planning commission for the size, which again, they may not, because the maximum size is 1500 and if they go over that, they have to come to you for approval. But, if the ADU portion is less than 1500 they may not even have to come back to you. Then the property is big enough and they can provide off street parking, they could have a detached ADU.

Commissioner Hollist said the conditional use permit will clearly state that the only exception being made is the wall height.

Planner Drozdek said yes.

Commissioner Hollist said think I'd like to just comment that, I'm in favor of this because of how staff noted that this is set lower than the properties around it. That helps mitigate the additional height that they're asking for, as well as the additional setback that they've indicated so that there is 11 feet on the one side, and the 14 feet on the other. So, I think that both of those things, along with the slope in that area allows mitigation for what we would normally require as far as a minimum height.

Commissioner Harding motioned to approve File No. PLCUP 202500164, Weller Detached Accessory Building, based on the findings in the staff report with the following condition: The building plans shall be revised to comply with window setback requirements. Commissioner Hollist seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 3-0 unanimous in favor; Chair Gedge and Commissioner Farnsworth were absent from the vote.

H.2. ALLAN BOLDT RECEPTION HALL SITE PLAN

Address: 1188 W 10400 S

File No: PLSPR202500109

Applicant: Nichols Naylor Architects

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

Commissioner Catmull said so you're saying that on this diagram it says on attachment H that the elevation line in the top left is 23 feet, and if that's to scale the top of the roof is at least 30 feet.

Planner Aguiler said that's correct. So I did put it in the attachment, so it looks like it's going to be 23 feet, roughly to that ridge line. So the highest point to that ridge line, they're proposing 23 feet and seven inches. That's not including, the architectural projections of what it looks like to be that brick chimney style looking structure on one side, and also that like middle extension in the middle of the roof there.

Commissioner Catmull said I thought you said in your presentation it was less than 30 feet, right?

Planner Aguilera said I did say it was less than 30. I couldn't quite remember the exact height.

Commissioner Catmull said the overall roof height will be 34 feet at the top.

Planner Aguilera said yeah, it is a 34 feet maximum there. And so with that, this is a rendering of what they're proposing in the south side of the building to look like, as previously stated, there is an existing building on the south side. I am not sure what their plans are for that, but right now, it looks like it's just being used for office purposes. Not sure exactly who occupies those offices. They're not proposing to remove any existing parking spaces for that. There's 20 existing so they're just adding on 40 more to the total. So complete 60, And this building is going to be, you know, situated about 40 or 45 feet away from the existing structure. So it won't be too close either. So the reception hall events will not be right next to the to that existing structure.

Commissioner Hollist said can we talk about parking one more time. So you said there's already 20, they're gonna add 40. How many of the existing 20 are required to service the other building on this lot? What is the parking required?

Planner Aguilera said so the use is just for that one structure per the use, it's one per 300 so that's based on their floor plan, which it's only one level. It's about 22 spaces, but they're proposing adding a 40 additional to the 20 existing, so the total parking spaces on site, they're showing 60.

Commissioner Hollist said so they're adding 40, but 22 are required for the additional use that they're adding to the law.

Planner Aguilera said yes, that is right.

Commissioner Hollist said I assume that there's been a calculation done on the existing building. Have we confirmed that the 20 that are already there are sufficient to meet the parking requirement.

Planner Aguilera said based on what the building footprint estimation was, because it's an older building, so based on the records there may have been some changes internally. So based on the just that footprint, the parking cap is about 19, 20 right now. They are not taking away any spaces from that building, from its parking.

Commissioner Hollist said is this still all one site, one property?

Planner Aguilera said it's still all one property. So it'll be two buildings on the same parcel, essentially.

Commissioner Hollist said and because it's the same parcel, I assume they don't require a parking agreement between one another.

Planner Aguilera said it's all one owner there. The only reason they would need a parking agreement is if they would need to have some sort of shared parking agreement with the neighboring property owner to the west, which looks like it's a pretty big parking lot there. Not sure if they need that in their application, they didn't have any sort of shared parking agreement. So just for this one site, they don't need one.

Commissioner Hollist said is there any requirement that their parking lot will be available to the property to the east.

Planner Aguilera said well, there's actually a fence there, a masonry wall dividing that property. It looks like that may belong to the temple, or maybe a parcel of the temple, and that's all walled off from this property.

Commissioner Harding said I am just curious on this about the dumpster. I didn't see on your mapping where the dumpster would be. I also only see three handicap parking, is that to code for both buildings, and are they only 3ADA parking stalls.

Planner Aguilera said we can ask the applicant about the dumpsters. It's not clear to me where they plan to put it in this in this area, so I'll just have to clarify that with them. As far as the ADA parking, we can double check that with the planning code, it doesn't specify ADA parking. It's a different part of the code than the planning code. So I'll just have to look at the requirements.

Commissioner Harding said and then on the rendering, I'm not seeing where any roof mount air conditioning or things like that would be.

Planner Aguilera said they're not showing it. They may be placing it in the back of the building, we can ask them to clarify that.

Commissioner Catmull said in the staff report, it talked about the retention pond, and there was kind of a "softer" word like "buffer" with a little wiggle room in it. I wonder if you could speak to is there specific reason for that word choice in the site plan staff report.

Planner Aguilera said so what I think you're referring to is the landscape area there. The retention pond will be that buffer space between the building and the property line to the north where past those property lines are residential homes, essentially, and also the temple. They haven't indicated any intention to use that space for anything other than the retention pond. They've said that for any recreational activities, active space, it's going to be the front of the building where that lawn is. That's why they're putting the lawn in the front. Per code, technically, landscaping code doesn't allow lawn anymore in commercial or these types of developments, except in active recreation areas, which they told us that they are willing or they want to do active recreation activities there during their events.

Commissioner Catmull said in the recreation pond area?

Planner Aguilera said not in the front, they're using the front, as opposed to the rear of the building, for outdoor activities. And the rear of the building is going to be maintained as that landscaped area to serve as a buffer with the landscape trees there. And also, because the property inclines, or just slopes downward towards the east, it's going to hopefully drown out any noises. But even then, there's not any doors to the outside on that side, so people wouldn't have direct access via them, providing it via walkways or doors to get to that area based on what they're showing.

Russ Naylor (Applicant) said we've been working on this, I think, for now almost two years, working our way through the list of complications of the site. This piece of property is owned by Alan Bolt, so both buildings are on property, he owns the use in the building he owns, it's a title company. It's Pioneer Title, and so they don't have a lot of public, they do loan closings and those kinds of things normal to title companies. He's had in mind to do this little reception center for quite some time. He has actually ordered the log of the timber building, and it does have a high roof line, but it's it's open to timber structure and so forth on the inside of the building. And then we have the bride's room, restrooms, a little warming kitchen, mechanical space is the lower slope roof that's on the north side of the building. The Hindu Temple is probably 50% of our property to the north, and there is a wall around and just recently they they did some major

construction and created a big entry feature that goes across that road that's to the east of our property. And they did construct like a six foot masonry wall that runs all along the east side of the property. That's the reason there really isn't any possibility for us to expand to the east, or for anybody to the east to spread out on. Let's see you mentioned the height of the building, and it is pretty tall. It has some clerestory windows and some gables with windows that face to the south, and you can see those in the rendering of the parking lot to the west of our building. It has a like an eight foot grade difference between the elevation that this little reception center is going to be on, and that pretty much screens our building from the two or three houses that exist in hidden village to the north. So we're thinking that we're not going to have any impact. And as was mentioned, you know, all of our activities would be primary in the building. And then to the south, the building is surrounded by kind of a covered walkway area with with a shed roof that drains off to the south, and it's had it hips, around the corners. We did go to the architectural committee, it's probably been almost a year ago, I think. We had to show that the materials that we would finish the building with are durable and relatively maintenance free. So we're proposing to use hardy board siding as the primary finished material to try to maintain that architectural image like a cabin and pretty rustic.

Commissioner Harding said there was a dumpster question.

Mr. Naylor said there is an existing dumpster, and it exists upon the parking, behind the existing building. It's a masonry enclosure and so forth. So we anticipate that's what we're going to use. The title company generates very little in the way of waste that has to be picked up by a commercial operation, and hauled to the landfill or the dump.

Commissioner Catmull said I was asking about the retention pond?

Mr. Naylor said basically there is an existing retention pond that exists on the north side of the building. With the increase of the commercial use, we ended up having to do a below grade storm tech solution to retain a little bit more surface runoff. But, we're going to clean up the retention pond and so forth. But it can't be reduced, or really used, because it does get three or four feet deep, running away from the building and then back up to grade as we reach the North property line. So it will remain. You talked about trees, so Alan would really like to maintain the trees that are kind of on the south where we enter into this new facility, and some on the east side, and we feel like we have a really nice landscape plan to enhance the building and on the property around the building.

Commissioner Hollist said we did receive an email and they were just concerned, again, with the trees and how it's been a beautiful barrier between the property and their homes. But you answered that one.

Mr. Naylor said on some of the trees that are in the retention basin really aren't what I would consider to be really nice looking trees, but there are some really attractive pine trees that are around other spaces around our parking and between this facility and the existing building. And it is our goal to try to maintain those and protect them during construction.

Commissioner Harding said we did receive his email, he was concerned with the dumpster and keeping it clean. And so, I guess, if it's in a locked and not used for public use, that should not be an issue.

Mr. Naylor said you asked about mechanical equipment on the roof too Commissioner Harding, and basically, we can't put equipment on that steep pitched roof. So basically, what we're proposing is, heaters, furnaces inside the building, and then some condensing units that will sit in the landscaping on the outside of the building, so there will not be anything that will go on the roof.

Commissioner Hollist said can you tell me a little bit about 104th, will the parking that you're proposing putting in right along that impact access easements, whatever's in place there.

Mr. Naylor said he has easements across the property to the west, and they have access easement across Allen's property to the south. That goes down and then you can go south to South Jordan Parkway. And like I said, they came in and created a little driveway. They made a little driveway into a big driveway with a big arch and so forth over the top of it for the entry into the Hindu Temple. So we don't require any additional easements, I guess is the point I'm trying to make.

Commissioner Hollist said the large parking lot to the west of you, who's using that?

Mr. Naylor said it's there for the the professional offices, the dental offices and so forth. And, you know, you recall when you saw the proposal for the purple church, they apparently have worked out, some kind of a shared parking arrangement with with that proposed project that's coming along here soon.

Commissioner Catmull said can you speak a little bit to if there's a relationship between the parking, let me put it this way, so there seems to be ample parking, more than enough parking, and yet we're also kind of scooting the building closer to the east edge than what the code allows without coming to the planning commission.

Mr. Naylor said I guess we felt comfortable in requesting the reduction that has been discussed because of what's happening to the east and the fact that there's a tall masonry wall that exists on our property line. So, it's not like we're having any impact or effect on what's going on to the east, we're not going to adversely affect that at all.

Commissioner Catmull said how tall is that masonry wall?

Mr. Naylor said I think it's exactly eight feet.

Commissioner Hollist opened the Public Hearing to comments. There were none. She closed the Public Comment.

Commissioner Hollist said do you have any concerns about the access to this property? It does seem like it's kind of through parking lots, different directions to access this. Do you have record

that emergencies reviewed it, the engineers reviewed it, and they're okay with the approaches and the widths of the access to this property.

City Engineer Jared Francis said the access has been reviewed, and we don't have any concerns. It is tucked back in there, but going on those private drives out to the public roads, we don't have any concerns about that.

Commissioner Hollist said there are no concerns with the new parking that will be put in right along that 10400 S?

City Engineer Jared Francis said no, it might serve as a bit of a traffic calming. If you look a little bit to the west and the existing parking that's there, you kind of have that perpendicular parking off those drive aisles.

Commissioner Harding motioned to approve File No. PLSP2025109, the Allan Boldt Event Center site plan with a reduced east side yard setback as permitted by Chapter 17.62.020, Section E2 of the City's Municipal Code. Commissioner Hollist seconded the motion and Roll Call Vote was 3-0 unanimous in favor; Chair Gedge and Commissioner Farnsworth were absent from the vote.

H.3. ALLAN BOLDT RECEPTION HALL CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT

Address: 1188 W 10400 S

File No: PLCUP202600015

Applicant: Nichols Naylor Architects

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

Commissioner Hollist said as stated in your staff report, a conditional use goes with the property. So if we were to approve this property as an event center, it would remain with the property. The future owners could come in and use it that way as well. One of the things that you've cited is helping mitigate the buffer at that outdoor area, but the retaining pond on the north side, is not planned to be used for an active space. But in the conditional use permit, you haven't specifically called that out that it has to remain that way.

Planner Aguilera said they have not indicated any willingness to turn that into any sort of active space. In the conditional use permit, it wasn't noted in the landscaping plan, but the information. It mentioned that they don't have any intentions to change it. If they do have those intentions to use it for some sort of recreational space in the future, there really isn't anything that we can tell them, per their site plan, per the city code. If there is some sort of nuisance section of the code that we would have to go look at to make sure that whatever activity is going on doesn't have to be a specific distance from from the residential area, like the residential protection area says a 50 foot buffer. If that landscape area is going to be used for the use, let's say it spills outside to the north. Then at that point, it probably wouldn't be allowed there because it's within 50 feet, but if it's something else, I am not sure.

Commissioner Hollist said I guess all I'm saying is, you've told us that the current applicant does not intend to use that as an active outdoor area. But, maybe what I'm recommending to the commission is that we make that part of the conditional use that this current owner doesn't intend to use it. We all agree that probably mitigates any impact to the neighbors. But do we need to make sure that that continues in perpetuity with whoever may come in and potentially run something similar in the future? I don't know, just something to think about.

Planner Aguilera said That is something I think might be okay, because when we measured it, that area would be within probably 50 to 60 feet of the nearest house.

Commissioner Catmull said is this all one lot?

Planner Aguilera said yes, it's all one property with two buildings. Well, one proposed new building, so a total of two.

Commissioner Catmull said so we're allowing that. That means, if we approve this, that means the existing building is to remain as identified on Attachment G, could also become a reception center or extension.

Planner Aguilera said that is correct.

Planner Schindler said if they decide to do that, have two reception centers up there, the second one would have to get approval for a business license, we'd have to make sure that they have enough parking. If they don't have enough parking, they're not going to be able to change it.

Planner Aguilera said their current parking plan wouldn't accommodate both buildings being there for the same use for a reception hall, unless they were to form some sort of agreement with the neighboring property owner with the larger parking lot.

Commissioner Catmull said so city code wise, as the residential protection zones, usually just to keep distance, and noise lights, I am trying to think of other public safety sorts of things like distance from a gas station or things like that. In this case, as we were talking about the buffer on the north side, and the most of that north side is currently used as residential.

Planner Aguilera said correct.

Commissioner Catmull said so any lighting for this building, would not be allowed to intrude on to neighboring properties. If that were the case, there are steps the city can take to fix that. So for example, if there's another project that we have where they installed a shield on the lights to make sure that those light poles closest to the residences don't have light coming to those backyards. The impacts that I'm thinking of would be noise and light, and I believe city code and county code have protections for just adjacent property owners, certainly for noise, because I'm familiar with that light, we usually get some sort of light, lighting plan or transmission. I don't see any lights on the back end of this of this particular building, or when we have the site plan. Are there city codes that controls the light transmission across property lines?

Planner Aguilera said yes, there is. Any lighting for this building, would not be allowed to intrude on to neighboring properties. If that were the case, there are steps the city can take to fix that. So for example, there's another project that we have where they installed shield on the lights to make sure that those light poles closest to the residences don't have light coming to those backyards. So if that ever happens to be the case, that light intruding onto neighboring properties, the city would require that from them. But the plan didn't show any light intrusion onto neighboring properties for this building.

Russ Naylor (Architect) said just a couple of comments as a part of the building permit review, we'll have to provide a photometric plan showing the light level calculations to demonstrate that we won't have any light trespass to neighboring properties. I don't foresee any circumstance that we would ever try to do anything on the north side of the building, given the fact that that's where the major portion of our storm water retention is, and that would be a real major effort to have to move all that around and put that all underground in a storm tech, you know, chamber situation. I understand you asking the questions. They're great questions, but I don't think that they would have any concerns about what you're asking.

Commissioner Hollist opened the Public Hearing to comments. There were none. She closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Hollist said we were presented a report that very specifically brought up some mitigating factors. Are we ensuring that those stay in place?

Planner Schindler said just to let you know that in a PO zone, there's only there are certain uses that are allowed in the PO zone, and some of them are actually conditional uses. So, if they decide it's not working out with the reception center there. Then they sell somebody or they want to lease it out to a different use, that use will have to either be a permitted use or another conditional use permit, another conditional use. So if it's a different conditional use, they'll have to go through the same process to get a conditional use permit for that. So this conditional use permit runs with the land, but it's for a reception center. It's not for another use. I think the only other use allowed in the PO zone are restaurants. I don't think anyone's going to want a restaurant where it can't be seen from a road.

Commissioner Harding motioned to approve File No. PLCUP202600015, the Allan Boldt Reception Hall Conditional Use Permit for a reception/meeting hall use. Commissioner Hollist seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 3-0 unanimous in favor; Chair Gedge and Commissioner Farnsworth were absent from the vote.

I. LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS

I.1. THE RESERVE RESIDENTIAL REZONE

Address: 9633 South Temple Drive
File No: PLZBA202600048
Applicant: Derek Rindlisbacher

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

Commissioner Hollist said My question might be more for a site plan, which I know this is not. So this is just a potential concept, right? What we see tonight isn't what it necessarily will be. It's just a reason that would allow them to go up to this density.

Planner Aguilera said correct. If this was part of a development agreement where this concept would be entered into an exhibit and they would be held to this concept, but because it's not, this concept is subject to change. When it comes to preliminary subdivision, there's going to have to go through an engineering, pretty rigorous engineering review, where definitely a lot of other things will come into play, such as the streets, with sidewalks, curb, gutter requirements and all of that, in addition to making sure that each lot is at least the minimum, has a minimum frontage, and then the lots have the minimum size for the zone and The density is not exceeded.

Commissioner Hollist said so my question isn't appropriate then to what we're hearing tonight, but I'm going to ask it anyway, so that it can be on staff's mind for when that site plan could eventually come. So that emergency ally you just talked about, what would the city do to ensure that access was always there. We've seen too many where even when there is an easement recorded, it gets ignored, and then we have lawsuits, and then it doesn't get enforced, and then it's not there when it needed to serve a purpose.

Planner Aguilera said I am not sure right now. What the engineering team department does with those sorts of access, I think they make sure they're not obstructed. They make sure there's signage there. Apart from that, probably Jeremy could speak more to what they do to keep those unobstructed. They have indicated that in the future, for now, it doesn't look like it's going to be like full street width. So it wouldn't be like one car and then another car going, it's going to be wide enough for emergency vehicles to access, but not an actual street, according to what they've told us. In the future, though, if the property turn in the north does develop and there's space, and that would potentially become a full Street, not just an emergency alleyway.

Commissioner Catmull said could it also be removed if it's not necessary, if there's enough emergency access, depending on how it develops to the north.

Planner Aguilera said potentially.

Planner Greg Schindler said it could properly be removed. And also, if it gets approved this way, and they do a subdivision that matches this subdivision in the future, and they have it there, it will probably be private. I don't think the city was going to want to maintain it. And then the other thing would be, it probably wouldn't be used unless there was some emergency that blocked one of the two roads, so people, some emergency vehicles, could only get up one way or the other. And so, it's not a shortcut for anybody because they're both really long roads. So if you're at the end of one, you're not going to circle around and go down another one. So you're just going to go down your street.

Assistant City Attorney Simonson said the city attorney's office is the last review before the mayor signs the plat, and the review is carefully spelled out in the ordinance. exact angles and the widths and everything that goes into that plat. And then the owner of the land, every owner of the land, if there's more than one, signs off and dedicates easements private roads, everything that is shown onto that map, and then it is recorded with the county recorder's office pretty much sets in stone. I'm not saying it can never be revised, but it can never be revised unilaterally. There are processes to do it. So if this came through and that Alley was there, there's going to be no intruding on that alley or taking something away from that alley without a due process of law.

Commissioner Harding said who maintains that alley?

Planner Schindler said it'll be up to the city when it when it comes forward, whether any engineering department or whoever to determine whether they want it to be private or or public. But, it doesn't meet the public street requirements, so it's highly doubtful, but it probably should be required, because of the long dead end streets, for safety. So, the only other option would be to have a full fledged road there. But then that would just beg to have more traffic on that right adjacent to the farm to the north.

Derek Rindlisbacher (Applicant) said I'm with Block homes and the applicant for the reserve rezone project, so I can clarify a couple of concerns you guys have. We're listening to the kind of the dialog just a few minutes ago was, if we could go back, is there any way to show the site plan? Yeah, so up on the north, just kind of walk you through the site plan that access the alleyway to the north. We have drawn and shown there was initially the main concern was started out with utilities that the properties topography from 1300 West slopes approximately 20 feet, all the way down to the east end of the property. And so in order to make utilities work and to get it out of the northern street, we had to flow it to the east, down to where the storm retention pond is. And that's where the little the purple square is. And then there's a smaller square sections, and we drew that in as a lift station that we were working with Jordan Basin improvement district on. However, we're trying to do gravity sewer at all costs, if possible. That's our preference, and so is Jordan basins. But, we just wanted to illustrate there's room for it if needed. And so with that alleyway, we would have a sewer and water easement and drainage easement running on that north end. And we have the sewer easement with Jordan basin, and we would propose to have the easements with South Jordan for water and storm drainage and for who would maintain and own that we would work with the city on how they would like to go about that as we go through site planning and all that process, and then, alongside that, this project that we are proposing to develop would be a nice single family dwellings that are kind of on the higher end side for this area to kind of conform with what's already around the area, with a nice, stable neighborhood design. And so that's what we would we're proposing. And if you have any questions, I'm happy to answer any of them.

Commissioner Hollist opened the Public Hearing to comments.

Camber Kaizer, South Jordan – said live just right across from this farmland. So this is why this is very important to me. I have been in these proceedings before where things have been allocated as residential, and then someone with deep pockets comes in, and then it gets moved to

commercial. And this is my worry that something that is not set in stone, as we have already said multiple times tonight, that are not set in stone as residential, that there is going to be parcels of this land that are going to be come commercial, because there are, this is total hearsay and rumor. But, if there were family members that have already allocated parts of this land that they want for a tow yard, then they're going to fight to get a tow yard to put there. That is totally rumor, I don't have any evidence by any means. What if this is something that could potentially happen, because we haven't said this is residential, single family only. That's still up to debate, right? So my concern is, how are we going to be sure this is going to be residential and not become commercial, like so many other parts of 1300 that are now becoming what we what we did not move here for, commercial. So that is my question, my very big concern, and I really hope that that is something that is answered sooner than later, because I do not have time to come to these meetings and babysit the city government. I don't I am a very busy mom, and I made time because this is super important to me. But, I cannot come every night and voice my opinion on this. I put a lot of things on hold. My kids are all at home by themselves, so I could at least make this note. So thank you for your time.

Deon Smith, South Jordan – said we live in in a home that is right against the the border of this. And some of the homes have had well two houses down have had a water problem, and they did not have a water problem before they dug for their swimming pool. And so there's water under those streams that run in that area, all through there, and what, how they start getting water in their basement is when they dug for their swimming pool, it changed, I guess, the springs underneath. And we're very concerned about when they start digging, that it's going to change the water streams, and we could start getting water in our basements, and that's a real concern to us, so I just want to propose that. And if that does happen, what is the consequences? Because, it's very costly. Our neighbor just kind of at the bottom of where we live in this same subdivision. Somehow, I don't even know what happened, but the water started changing, or whatever, and they lived there for many years, and then all of a sudden they started getting water in their basement. So something changed with the and it looks like it's pretty fragile, and then that the stream that go under, actually revert and start going different directions, and that's so much of a concern that we are very concerned about that.

Sage Gertzen, South Jordan – said I guess some of my concerns are the trees that we have that were planted the same year that our house, or so we've heard from all the family that lives around us that were planted with our house, as they've been putting up the land markers, it looks like it's going straight through the trees. These are elm trees. They're not just like small little trees. They're very big. I guess I'm just concerned, those trees do bring a lot of privacy to us and a lot of shade to our yard, and everything that we have going on there. And not only that, specifically, we're getting married in our backyard this August, and so I am a little bit nervous, because those trees are kind of the centerpiece.

Commissioner Hollist said you're concerned about the trees because some of them are not on your property?

Ms. Getzen said so, I guess we thought they were, because our land is here, and then there's this big dip, and then there's the current road that goes down the land. So we always thought that was

our land lines. And when the house was built, the original owner planted that as the boundaries. And I don't know if it's just that they're so big and they just grew over, but we always thought that was our land, but then the landmarks kind of go through the trees. So it's like maybe some of the trees would be considered ours and some of the trees would no longer be considered ours.

Angie McIntyre. South Jordan said I came just because I'm curious to know how big the lots could potentially be. They said how many they can put in, but how few would they potentially be putting in? So maybe that can be a question that can be answered, because there is gossip about it. About buying any more property to the north, and is that going to be something that will be answered here today?

Commissioner Hollist said yes, that will be answered after we close the Public Comment.

Commissioner Hollist closed the Public Comment.

Commissioner Hollist said I think the question I'd like to ask staff is, could you please go over what is allowed in an R 2.5 which is the rezone that's being requested?

Planner Aguilera said with the residential rezone, the primary use does have to be residential in almost all cases. The residential zone does allow some other uses, but the other uses allowed are very limited. They can include community services, churches, schools, utility services, daycare and that's about it.

Commissioner Hollist said all right, so you said the primary use has to be residential. A church wouldn't fit that, and a school wouldn't, but would the daycare have to be a home based daycare?

Planner Aguilera said so primarily, what we see in these zones are residential, but those other uses could be permitted with daycares. They could be permitted out of single family home if that property meets other requirements. The business licensing department has for a home occupation, for example, for the any commercial activity that was asked about. So any commercial activity that's not allowed in the current R 2.5 zone would have to go through a rezone again, and so that rezone would have to be approved by the city council. And so it doesn't look like it's something that would happen, because of it's land use designation around this entire area, stable neighborhood, so it's residential land use. So they would have to go through a land use amendment in addition to a rezone. It would be a really large hill to climb. So any subdivision in the future, from this, any lots they want to be rezoned to commercial, it would have to go through that process again, through a public hearing as well.

Planner Schindler said I can also add that a church and a school, those are permitted uses in all zones. But if it's a daycare, it has to have a minimum one acre lot. And I don't think any of these lots are going to be one acre to have a commercial daycare, like Miguel mentioned, they could have a daycare run as a home occupation, which only allows up to eight kids a day for that, and that's all over the city. But as for any other commercial type uses, he was right again about it would have to require another rezone. Most commercial uses are not allowed in residential

zones. And the again, home occupations could, but there's a lot of restrictions on home occupations.

Assistant City Attorney Simonson said that's the point I would make, and I think he's making it too. I'm saying it to you, but I'm counting on our good mother that's here tonight, taking the time. If this vote happens in the affirmative, you are moving this land away from commercial uses to residential uses. I'm not saying that anything couldn't happen someday in the future, but it's extremely unlikely this is a move to build homes, and this is property that is its own. Only real value is for residential, and so I I'm trying to help her sleep better at night, but remain vigilant. I mean, still go online and check what's going going on and keep your eyes open.

Commissioner Hollist said I think our next one is for engineering water. This is not the first time we've had people concerned about something like this. What can you say? What recourse do people have if it does change the water behavior in their area? What would be the responsibility of a developer.

Engineer Jared Francis said I appreciate the comment. It's good to know if there's been groundwater experiences on adjacent properties. What the process is for development, when this will come in for preliminary subdivision, the developer will be required to provide a geotechnical report. So a geotechnical firm will go out and do bore pits and logs different places on the site to try and gage and see what's happening down below, to try and get the best idea that we can as far as where the groundwater is. And then once we have that information, we'll be able to kind of take the next step to plan for that, for the development.

Commissioner Hollist said I assume, however, that there would be a requirement, should something be found, that they have to mitigate that so it doesn't impact adjacent properties.

Engineer Jared Francis said based on what they find in the geotechnical report, there'll be recommendations, usually by the geotechnical firm. As far as like foundations for homes, and that, if it's a shallow groundwater, say they might be required to do foundation drains, that kind of thing, to mitigate it.

Commissioner Hollist said that would apply to the homes that they put in. But what about two adjacent properties that already exist?

Engineer Francis said it's hard to say kind of what the construction activities might do to change underground conditions for adjacent properties. I don't know how you could reasonably determine that.

Commissioner Hollist said o maybe this is a question for Mr. Simonson, but let's say it's me. My neighbor puts a pool in or a house or whatever, and suddenly my basement has water in it. What recourse do I have? Who do I call, what would that look like?

Assistant City Attorney Simonson said the general legal principle is that every property owner is responsible for the storm water that drains off of their own property, in other words, they're

generally responsible for not having a drain off their property unless there is some kind of storm water. Every neighborhood has a storm water system in it that is designed to drain storm water. This is underground water, but there would be still a drainage system in the neighborhood that's designed through the geotechnical process that Mr. Francis has described. And you know, if they're at the first sign that it's not working, get on the phone with the developer, the people in charge and get us straightened out. But I don't know how you build a subdivision and not deal with these issues. There's a process, there's requirements, you have to deal with it, and again, in life, there's no guarantees that something might not happen but, but there is legal responsibility with the property owner.

Commissioner Hollist said I know that today we saw the smallest lots that we'll see, they have to have a minimum of 12,000 square feet per lot. They can get up to 32 lots in that area and comply with the zoning density for our 2.5. How big could they make the lots on the other end?

Planner Aguilera said there is no maximum lot size, There's only a minimum.

Commissioner Hollist said they could put in 12 one acre lots if they so chose in this zone.

Planner Aguilera said yes,if they wanted they could.

Commissioner Hollist said but they could put in up to 32 lots with this zoning.

Planner Aguilera said they would need to be within the density of 2.5 units.

Commissioner Hollist said so it sounds like some landmarks have gone up. Mr. Rindlibacher, do you care to come and address this one?

Derek Rindlibacher said it's actually kind of funny. I actually mowed that lawn for the elderly lady that lived there prior to them, and so I do understand that it is a beautiful area with beautiful trees. And so as of this moment, we don't know exactly what to do. We just found out about that as of two days ago, when we had our survey done. However, I do know we are planning on working with the landowners to the north. We will work with the McIntyre's on what to do and how we can go about minimizing the impact there.

Commissioner Hollist said realistically, when would you start doing anything? I know you have other applications. You'd have to get City Council to approve this rezone, and then you'd have to come back with a site plan, but what is your timing if potentially, should those things be approved?

Derek Rindlibacher said we're we're kind of just running the rough timeline from what we've done in the past. We're hoping to break ground soon, but they are farming the field right now. So we wanted to get through the farming season, and then after that we will begin if approvals have been granted.

Commissioner Hollist said do you anticipate any movement of dirt or grading or that type of a progress before quarter four? Or is that when you anticipate activity would start to happen?

Derek Rindlisbacher said I would say it would land in the 4th quarter. Especially because with the current landowners we've worked with them on allowing the farmer to continually farm the field for the rest of the year, And then following the farming season, is when we would begin moving earth work and begin utility work, and that's what we would plan on doing there, I would like to mention one thing about the groundwater. I know that was a big topic for a minute. We currently have on the site five piezometers. And if you don't know what piezometers are, they're sleeves in the ground that are vertically placed with perforations in them, and that allows us to measure the groundwater. The reason we are doing that is because it allows for us to gather as much information on a weekly basis of where the groundwater measurements are, and that way, when we get to our site planning process, it allows us to provide our geotechnical engineer with the most accurate information on the site, to give us the best recommendations to minimize any impact for our site, as well as the surrounding area.

Commissioner Catmull said my only question is that I didn't do the research before the meeting, but, I don't believe there has to be a fence between the A-5 and the R-2.5, I'm trying to remember.

Planner Schindler said that is correct, but it probably doesn't need to be addressed tonight, because the subdivision hasn't even been applied for.

Commissioner Hollist said I will just reiterate something that staff commented on, that this rezone would move this area into a residential use. One thing I like about it is that it's a big enough piece of land that it allows the layout to be a little more thoughtful regular streets. We're not seeing some of the funny turnarounds or some of the funny access or flag lots, because it is big enough to allow more standard lots. And that, I think, relieves a lot of some of the concerns that we see with other things that go in, or leaving a piece of land stranded or islanded, in a way where then later the only thing that can come in is maybe something commercial.

Commissioner Catmull said and then in adding that to the north, the way the concept is presented, shows at least there is that path that preserves the property owners ability. It doesn't force that property owner into a specific, inevitable end.

Commissioner Harding motioned that the Planning Commission recommends that the City Council approves of Ordinance 2026-05-Z, Tehe Reserve Residential Rezone, rezoning property from Agriculture Minimum 5 acres (A-5) to Single-Family Residential 2.5 units/acres (R-2.5). Commissioner Hollist seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 3-0 unanimous in favor; Chair Gedge and Commissioner Farnsworth were absent from vote.

J. OTHER BUSINESS

Director Brian Preece said some of you have not been doing your cyber trainings and HR would like you to complete them as soon as possible.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Gedge motioned to adjourn.

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 8:17p.m.

DRAFT