

**CITY OF SOUTH JORDAN
ELECTRONIC
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
February 25, 2025**

Present: Commissioner Michele Hollist, Chair Nathan Gedge, Commissioner Laurel Bevens, Commissioner Steven Catmull, City Attorney Ryan Loose, City Planner Greg Schindler, Deputy City Recorder Cindy Valdez, Deputy City Engineer Jeremy Nielson, Planner Damir Drozdek, IT Director Matt Davis, GIS Coordinator Matt Jarman

Absent: Commissioner Sam Bishop

Others: Marc Holliday, Cal Hakamura, Tammy Hakamura, Michael Florin, Lily Perkins, Susan Hinds, Barbara Palmer Deyette, Annette Barney

**6:32 P.M.
REGULAR MEETING**

A. WELCOME AND ROLL CALL – *Chair Nathan Gedge,*

Chair Nathan Gedge welcomed everyone to the Planning Commission Meeting and noted that (4) of the (5) Planning Commissioner's were present. Commissioner Bishop absent and excused from tonight's Meeting.

The new Planning Commissioner replacing Commissioner Wimmer will be sworn in and will be attending our next Planning Commission Meeting.

B. MOTION TO APPROVE AGENDA

Commissioner Hollist motioned to approve tonight's agenda as published. Chair Gedge seconded the motion; Commissioner Bishop was absent . Vote was 4-0 unanimous in favor.

C. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

C.1. February 11, 2025 - Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Commissioner Hollist motioned to approve the February 11, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes. Chair Hollist seconded the motion; Commissioner Bishop was absent and Commissioner Bevens did not vote because she did not attend the meeting . Vote was 3-0 unanimous in favor,

D. STAFF BUSINESS

Planner Schindler said the new Commissioner Lori Harding has received her first one hour of training before she could vote. So she will be ready to vote as well at her first meeting. She would have been here tonight, but she had previous commitments with her work that she was be out of town

E. COMMENTS FROM PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBER

Commissioner Bevans said just want to say thank you for allowing me to speak at the last meeting, even though I was virtual. I apologize for my appearance on that virtual meeting, but I'd had a really rough day sitting at the beach.

Commissioner Catmull said speaking of the last meeting, I think I misapplied rigor on the last item, so I just wanted to apologize to the commission and to the staff.

F. SUMMARY ACTION – *None*

G. ACTION – *None*

H. ADMINISTRATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS - *None*

I. LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS - *None*

I.1. ALTITUDE LAND USE AND REZONE WITH DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT

Address: 515 W. Ultradent Dr

File No: PLZBA202400018

Applicant: Krisel Travis, DAI

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

Chair Gedge said I believe this revised revision went to our committee as well.

Planner Drozdek said yes, it did and it was passed and recommended for approval.

Chair Gedge said you said, by 50% is the actual in the flood plain. So from the home that's closest on the west side of this property to the nearest homes that would be on the west side of the river. Do we know how much distance that is afoot? Because there's the property line on the development to the west across the river, then you have the actual River Trail, and you have the river. Do we know how much distance that is in width from property to property?

Planner Drozdek said it is about 300 feet from the river to these new buildings. That's for the river walk community and I think the distance is about the same to the river.

Chair Gedge said I'm glad you said about 300 feet. Is the public noticing typically 300 feet, or 600 feet for this type of property?

Planner Drozdek said typically it's 300 feet, in this case we extended the notice to 600 feet, but the standard is only 300 feet.

Commissioner Gedge said I just want to disclose that I was personally hand delivered a notice by residents of the South, and I think I'm within a third of a mile, so definitely more than 600 feet. But I want everyone to know that people in excess of 600 feet did receive copies of Damir's notice on that. And lastly on the noticing, because I couldn't understand one of the applicants emails. Did we hit all the required deadlines and noticing requirements by the state and city??

Planner Drozdek said yes. The noticing was sent out on February 13, 2025.

Commissioner Bevans said I have a question on the Development Agreement, on section 5.1 it talks about owner occupancy of the for sale units and that non leased units cannot be rented by the owner so they must be owner occupied. What is the enforceability of that? Because I'm struggling to understand how we're going to enforce that.

Planner Drozdek said it can be enforced by their HOA. They're going to be run by an HOA., so that's one way to enforce it. Another way to enforce it is in the case of complaints that they're being rented out. It is in their documents that some of these units are not to be rented out, so if they are being rented out they can make a complaint to the city.

Commissioner Bevans said in section 5.13, it talks about how the developer can build a retaining walls up to 12 feet in height without further review from the engineering department. Will they still be subject to building permits and inspections to ensure that those are properly constructed?

Planner Drozdek said yes, they will.

Commissioner Bevans said in section 5.16 it talks about allowing the developer to construct beyond 35 feet, and I get that's part of the transit zone. Is there a reason the city did not put a limit on that height? Obviously, we're doing a rezone tonight, and what we're seeing is conceptual, but if the development agreement doesn't put a limit on the product...

Planner Drozdek said it refers back to the to the attachments in the agreement, so it does show building heights in those attachments.

Commissioner Bevans said so they would be subject to the elevations that are on the conceptual drawings, even though they say concept only.

Assistant City Attorney Simonson said on that development agreement the exhibits are all incorporated, and even though it says concept, that doesn't mean that we're going to be able to

change the concept. The agreement sets it so that you can do minor changes through staff, and things such as height and so forth, those would have to be a complete amendment to the agreement.

Chair Gedge said just to make sure that we are making recommendations on the development agreement to the city council. Therefore, nothing has been agreed to or signed by the city council as of today, correct?

Planner Drozdek said yes, that is correct.

Commissioner Catmull said I had a similar question on 5.16, on the height. It would be nice to see in the future some sort of cap there and a reference instead of like "they may exceed". I would like to thank the developer for providing those trail or river view slides, that was helpful. I went there today to go walk that trail and kind of see what it looked like as well, but obviously, I couldn't see the buildings there.

Nate Shipp (Applicant) – said sometimes we go through these processes and we're asked to reconsider. That takes a little bit of swallowing of the pride, because we don't usually come forward with a project that we're not proud of and think would be a good addition to the communities where we're building. In this case, we had an experience where we were made aware of some additional concerns, and we were able to go back and we looked at what we had proposed. It started with sitting down with the Jordan River Commission representative of that entity that came and was willing to spend time with us and explain to us the purpose of the of the River Commission and the concerns that he had brought up in this meeting, were brief but poignant, he expanded on them and brought it to our attention. I know why he was really concerned about those things? It caused us to step back and re-evaluated a lot of what we had proposed. So we're super excited now to bring a new plan that's been modified that removes the buildings out of the floodplain. We did have the argument at one point. Well, you know, the projects up and down the river across from us have been gone through and they've raised the elevation of the properties, and they have built similar type town home products right next to us. We're here tonight to say this is a better way of doing it. We're excited to do it this way. I think the staff has done a great job of explaining what we're proposing. I'd be happy to go back to some of those pictures, we went through those fairly quickly. We're willing to live by those. We spent several months now revamping what we are doing, and not only are we moving buildings completely out of the flood plain, but we have been able to work with your South Jordan engineering department, and we've been able to now redesign the lower portion of that property, the proposal that we brought to you back in November. We didn't really get into the details of what we were doing down in the bottom there, but in our plans we were planning to raise that property by over 20 feet, as we raise the entire area up so that we could kind of level, and we've not done away with any of that. In fact, we still have to raise it a little bit, but we're talking a couple of feet. We've been able to avoid the walls, we've been able to re evaluate and establish nature viewing areas that we've worked on and we believe it will become an amenity as the property to the south of us is designated and owned by the federal government. I believe in Nature Preserve, we have enhanced it, not just added to, but enhanced the acreage that we're now preserving. So rather than just leave it as it is, we're now working with arborists and I always get

the botanists, the guys that come up with the right plants and floral to re establish in the bottom of the river to the original vegetation that existed, so that it will become what it once was. So our hope is that by doing this project, not only are we doing it better than it's been done in the past, but that we are improving what has been done to the river bottom. I believe that's why the Jordan River Commission, along with our application submitted a letter of support, because we were willing to go above and beyond what I think even Soren had hoped for. The other concern that we heard was affordability, and trying to find that balance of introducing residential community that's going to have some disturbance to what is there now, and balancing that with finding a place where people can live, own, and afford it. So we've gone back to the drawing board, and we have come up with the proposed product today. We believe that we have not had to sacrifice on the exterior look and feel the units. Instead of raising it up 20 feet, we're only raising it up a foot and a half to two feet. They're slightly taller, but the roof lines will actually be lower than what we had proposed previously, and we're able to bring that forward with the expectation that we'll start selling those in the 300's and that's an affordable price.

Commissioner Hollist said are they condominiums? And how many bedrooms?

Mr. Shipp said we have two, three ,and four bedroom options, starting in the 300's going up as high as 450,000.

Commissioner Hollist said how many parking units have you provided for each of these condominiums?

Chrisselle Travis (Co-Applicant) said the parking ratio is 3.4 to every unit, the Condominiums are such that they have 10 garages per building. Two of the units will be assigned a covered parking stall that will be provided in that parking, and assigned at the time of the plat so that those that don't have garages will have two specific stalls. There will be 48 parking stalls total.

Commissioner Catmull said if I am remembering correctly, the visitor parking stalls will be distributed throughout?

Ms. Travis said yes, that is correct.

Chair Gedge said at our previous meeting there were some concerns from a neighbor to the North, regarding road access, shared access of the road, has that all been resolved, or is that still pending?

Mr. Shipp said So there's still two roads that are designated to be expanded in the future, should they decide to develop. It will stub to the property to the north, but not connect until the property owner to the north, if and when they ever chose to connect, and we have two access points going to the east. That does satisfy the requirements of two ways in and out, and they don't go to the property on the north.

Commissioner Bevans said I think he was asking about that second access that's coming through the private property that we received an email that said that easement was not going to be granted.

Ms. Travis said you're talking about the stuff that comes north of Ultradent on the East. We have been working with the engineering department, and we will be obtaining a wide enough width to comply with a fire access of 20 to 22 feet, in addition to whatever is existing there. I think there's another 12 that's granted on the plats that are previously recorded, and so we won't be seeking or needing anything from the property that's to the north of us to meet and satisfy the engineering requirements for that access. It will be widened enough to comply.

Commissioner Hollist said can you pull up the map on the screen so we can look at it.

Mr. Shipp said we are talking about this access, and we're purchasing property from the south owner through here to widen our access to meet the requirements of the city. We can comply with the property owner to the north's desire to not sell us any property, and this will always be accessible. This is not closed off just for emergency access, no access, full access, public, and publicly dedicated to you as the city.

Ms. Trevor said development agreement has some language in it that talks how it works through it. Along with that, there's the portion that will be purchased as an easement from Rocky Mountain Power to get under the power lines that will be dedicated and the city is party to that agreement.

Commissioner Bevans said does staff have any concern with purchasing that Southern property and creating a future conflict between the North business owner that did not want to sell or grant an easement. Are there any concerns that there's going to be conflict between them and people coming in and out of this property?

Planner Drozdek said we don't have any concerns.

Chair Gedge said Commissioner Bishop who could not be here this evening because he's ill sent us some comments. His one concern is more developments like this area and where its proximity to both the river trail and to the front runner station includes some sort of maybe bike parking for for that. Do you have this in the plans anywhere? And if so, could you show that on the map, or if you're not on the plans, there'd be something maybe to consider in the final to make sure that Commissioner Bishop is represented here this evening.

Mr. Shipp said it would make sense in my mind to add that down by the bridge and we have had some ongoing conversations. At one point, we proposed building a small playground for the kids with a park bench and some other things. Some of the feedback we got was that, because that would be public it's not necessarily planned. In your city plan we would be happy to add some bike parking in there. I mean, the intent is that what we're providing is more of a meditation area, some benches and some other things, where people can go and observe and watch the river and other things. But, the recommendations we've gotten from the staff was to not have a playground

area, I don't want to put words in anybody's mouth. I think the intent with this connection and the trail is to be able to provide a kind of a space that is halfway between the other connections that can get people up to the front runner station. It would be more transitory people that are going to be moving their bikes and riding their bikes past the space than stopping here. I have young kids, and I know that often when we go places, it's nice to have a place to park a bike and stop.

Chair Gedge said before I open up the public comment, I'm just going to recognize that we did receive four emails from citizens prior to our meeting today. So I just wanted to say they are part of the public record. The commissioners have all had a chance to review them, so thank you for taking time and sending those into us.

Chair Gedge opened the Public Hearing to comments.

Mark Halliday, South Jordan – said I'm one of the owners that's to the north of this property. This property used to be in the family since 1885. In looking here at the South Jordan general plan that you did in 2020 said that the eastern portion of South Jordan is known for its large lots, quiet neighborhoods and beautiful historic homes. South Jordan continues to experience rapid growth and I realized that that with that rapid growth they had Agricultural Preservation, and it says the future development shall be primary residential and serve to preserve the rural character in forms and character of the development. I believe that large lot homes that they're doing here and increasing kind of goes against that for the Agricultural Preservation within that area. Back in 2020 residents said they would like to take and keep the open space. The majority of housing units in South Jordan are owned occupied, single family homes with large lot sizes. In your 2020 plan, South Jordan has a variety of apartments and rental options already in there, 940 more units were already approved by the city. The future use of housing response of residents was a desire to preserve single family neighborhoods. During the public outreach, many complained about a high number of apartment complexes being built in the city. When we look at where we live and our goals and strategy that the city had in 2020, the number one goal was to ensure that development of well designed housing that qualifies as affordable housing to meet the needs of moderate income households. I believe he's looking at \$500,000 price tag, is what he had in the paperwork here, and rentals of upwards of right around \$4,000. I don't see how that is affordable housing. In the goals there, that was your number one goal. Number five was to reduce water waste. I believe you guys are having a problem with water on the west side. What are the houses going to do for water on the east side. Number Six goal was preserve desirable open space and natural open space areas within the city. You put that down on the list, I think that should be number one, agricultural and where is your food coming from. Number eight was to preserve South Jordan historical and agricultural properties. Seems like we have taken and moved that further down where that's no longer an issue. And on his plans, I see where he has the rail fence going on there, adjacent to my property to the north. I have large animals on that size side. How's a four foot rail fence going to protect children in that development? I believe that it needs to take and remain that six foot wall and, or an adequate chain link and or field fence to sustain large animals, horses, cattle, sheep, sheep will go right through that fence. I've had sheep, and I'm gonna have sheep down there again.

Barbara Palmer Deyette, South Jordan – said I am renting from The Harrisons. I've been there for many years. I own the large animals that are there right now. Mark spoke about protecting the kids from the animals. I think about protecting the animals from the kids. I don't want some kid going in there and getting hurt, and I don't want them to mess in with my animals. Anyways, I've lived there for many years. My husband is one of the original cowboys himself, from South Jordan. I tell people that I live in the country surrounded by the city. The proposal to me is to turn what is now a sweet little encapsulated pasture into a city. I would ride my horse or play with my horse and my dog and my goat. We would go down there. We could circle that place in minutes. I can't help but think, what if they were going to propose to put that on your street? You would hate it. I don't understand why they want to put something so big in such a small agricultural space. I will never understand. Put it where it's appropriate. That is so inappropriate for you to put it down there. And I also agree with Mark on the four foot wooden fence. Where I live, there's no cement. It's not easy to live there. It's rough. It's not a fancy house with a fancy garage, it's horses and goats and chickens and cats and dogs. To me, there's no logic in it. They keep pouring more cement and covering the pastures. We know growth is going to happen. I was reading this book to my five year old grandson over the weekend, and in the back it says the wild desert is a precious place. If it is preserved for future generations of tortoises, Jack rabbits and people, we will all be winners.

Susan Hines, South Jordan – said I am a teacher at South Jordan Elementary. This just came to my attention this weekend, so my comment is, what study has been done for the impact of 222 condominiums, not only on the bussing, but on the amount of students that could possibly go to South Jordan Elementary, which is already considered highly overcrowded. The bus that the kids would take is the bus my kids take right now. My kids sit three to four kids to a seat on the bus because the bus is overcrowded. The way they do that is my daughter sits on my son's lap. So what is the study that has been done to show the impact of adding 222 condominiums, plus the 120 units you approved at 1055 West, and what is the study of how many students could possibly be coming from that? So now you have over 300 units. I haven't seen a study about the impact not only on the elementary school but the district, as well as bussing, the number of teachers, and the classrooms that would be impacted. That is what I needed to say tonight.

Annette Barney, South Jordan – said my questions come from some items in the development agreement. I understand that there will be a donation for that future bridge. What information do we have on the actual cost of building that bridge in the future? Because, I don't think it should be my cost to build it in the future. So I would love to know if we have good data on that cost and the projection and a time frame, because \$350,000 right now might not build us anything in seven to 10 years. I hope that there's some good information about that. And also, along with that bridge, I have the question of, do we have information about what police presence that might have to be increased based on increased use of the River Parkway area. There are sections of the Jordan River that have been shown to be somewhat unsafe, and I do not want that to be what happens in our community. So that is a concern to me as well. So I would like to make sure that the council or commission pays attention to that concern for our residents. We want it safe for the people who would move into this new community, as well as those who already live there. Also, my next question has to do with the traffic that will be coming in and out of this new community. We're talking about as many as 222 units. So how many cars is that that's going to

be coming out? It's great. We have two accesses right now. I believe there's only a pedestrian crosswalk there. And if this is meant to be people who will use that front runner, we need an extremely safe method for them getting across that street. Will a traffic light be required? What kind of traffic studies are going to be necessary to justify this increase in people coming out trying to turn left because they're going to go to the freeway, and that's the direction to the freeway. Do we have information on the effect that that will have, and then also connected with that? Do we have information that says this will be people who will use the front runner. I think there's a lot of transit oriented communities in Salt Lake along the front runner. Do we find they actually use the front runner? And if they do, what kind of concerns do we have with increasing traffic to the transit hub itself? And do we need increased transit officer presence with that? And who's going to pay for that. Lastly, I saw something in one of the engineers comments, and I wish I could say exactly where that there are sewer lifts in this community. That makes sense. You have to move that stuff somewhere. But there was also a mention that it might possibly build a sewer line across the freeway. That's just ugly. I'm just gonna say that, which I know we're building a bridge and there might be ways to hide it, but would that affect the recreational quality of the river? What are those kinds of problems? So thank you for your time.

Michael Florin, South Jordan – said Ive been here for 28 years. I've seen quite a bit of development going on. I'm assuring you that the pictures they've showed us, it will never look anything like that. Believe me, I've seen development. I've seen what happens. First of all, this is the entrance to South Jordan City. I think it's appropriate that we do something with it that makes the city a jewel that it is. If you approve a development like that, I'd make a proposal to change that tree, it will no longer be South Jordan with the trees. Put a big high complex apartment and They're gonna have to get a new logo. Okay? In Denver and in Boulder along the city lines. they have a parkway that covers both sides of that, the whole city. It's beautiful. That River is a beautiful That River is a beautiful diamond, and it's not something that high density houses should be put around. Can you imagine New York City without Central Park? I'm starting to imagine South Jordan without parks and without open fields. You were talking about a place to meditate. I'll be meditating on your building every day of my life at my kitchen table. When I see that building, I'll be able to see it from my kitchen table, masonry wall, that's what they were going to put on the end of my property there. When they built that road to build all those houses down there, they took 10 feet of my property. They were going to put 10 feet back and a bunch of grass and trees. It was nothing, nothing like what they proposed. I just want to let people know that there's a 12 year old girl that just won a science project. Her project was trying to figure out which plants absorb the most carbon dioxide. I wonder what she'd had to say about something like this. It was a beautiful place to live, and I hope it still is. You want to know what high density looks like. Take a ride on the front runner. Get on on 100 South, and then go north and look on either side where all that development is, isn't that a lovely site? Wouldn't you like South Jordan to look just like that? And my question for the nd my question for the developer is, where do you live? The wildlife, birds, squirrels, foxes, deer, raccoons, geese, eagles. I've even seen pelicans in and around Mulligan's golf course. And it's, it's amazing, just amazing. So for me, it's, it's, it's my dream to live here. It's a beautiful place, and I just don't think this is appropriate.

Tammy Kikuchi Nakamura, South Jordan - said I live in River Walk Executives, so we'll be looking at this every day. We moved here in April, and it's lovely, and it's been lovely. I would

like for it to stay lovely without that development. Also, what I'd like to see is he talked about not putting fill in to a certain level, so that the taller buildings won't be as tall, but they'll still be tall. I'd like to see a rendering of how that matches up, so we could have an idea, we would like to see a rendering of how that matches up, so if we could have an idea, you know, and see really what it would look like. Also, where would the bridge go? Because that makes a difference too, we are in the river walk executive, and how really high is that? Are those four stories? And is it necessary to have the four stories? When they came the first time, it was three stories, so why the sudden change? And I agree with the former gentleman speaking about the wildlife, it is one of the things we love. We're out on that river walk every day because we have a dog, and so we're out there all the time. And we love seeing all the wildlife there, and we don't want to see it destroyed by a development.

Carly White, South Jordan – said I'm a new resident. We've been to South Jordan for a year and one of the most charming things about South Jordan, particularly where we live, is the land with the open area and the wildlife. So I know it's been mentioned, but I just want to reiterate again that this is something that's paramount to how we see the value of our home. Secondly, is obviously the increase that would be anticipated in property tax with this type of change in the infrastructure of our community. Thirdly it just doesn't sit well that the property was zoned appropriately back in 2020 and now it's asked to be rezoned again and again. It just doesn't sit well. It seems out of integrity, and that's something to be considered as well.

Ian Chandler, South Jordan - said thanks for your time. I just have a couple questions in the general plan. I guess my question is simply, what is its purpose? If the purpose for future land use is really just the one mixed use, because it could be anything at any given time. If the right developer, the right person comes along with the right plan, then my question is, what is the point of having that outline and having designated zonings specifically? If we're saying in the 21st century we don't need agricultural preserve, right? That's 150 years ago and we don't need that. If that's the attitude, then then what is the purpose as a citizen to have a plan? And if the goal is the general plan goes out the window whenever the right developer comes along, then what do we as the public have as assurances for the future of what our city looks like? And that's the simple question. It's the logic of if we have a plan can we agree to stick to it if we choose to vary from that? Because you do have the legislative power to amend those plans, that's fine, but what what happens is that line gets pushed further and further and further, and at some point all of the other justifications for this type of a project as it's currently positioned kind of go out the window. We will run out of green space. So the next high density housing plan that's going to solve low income housing, or it's going to solve housing problems that won't be able to be solved. There's no more land to be developed, and at that point, we'll look back and say, what did we do with our city? What do we have left? We have a lot of buildings. Awesome. Midvale has a lot of buildings. I grew up in West Valley, and they have a lot of buildings. There's a lot of cities that have a lot of that development. And guess what, we still have a housing problem. So my comment would be, if we can't solve the housing problem, then can we solve the problem of sticking to the plan as we originally saw it? We elected leaders to see a plan through.. I'm not here to project an objection to the plan. I think they've made many changes from November that, as a developer I would say are more than rational, more than reasonable. I'm not talking about reason, I am talking about the purpose of a plan, the utility of the plan. And then my last question

is, how much of the current proposed project, as it currently stands, is still infringing on the natural area? It's one thing if you're saying we used to be agricultural, now we're urban, I get that. But if you're saying we're throwing out the baby with the bath water on natural areas. I struggle understanding that it was designated as a natural area. I'm curious how much of the current plan is now encroached upon that and a designated area.

Lily Perkins, South Jordan - said I wanted to start by apologizing for last time I was here, I said, I hate this. I meant public speaking. I respect your work, you're doing your job. Thank you. Talking about disturbancy, I heard that from the developer they are wanting to build 222 units. I know this is already been said, but It's so upsetting. I have lived in big cities. It's fun when you're young, but when you're this old, you don't want things to change anymore. You don't have the time to be creative, and you saved all your money to plant a tree, and you hope to see that tree grow. And I don't have that kind of timing to see a tree grow anymore. I thought I found this space, and I'm and I'm just gonna sit there until I'm here no more. But the disturbance is upsetting. I'm never going to be able to see the view of the mountains, now I'm going to see rooftop and people crossing to a private community. I'm not going to be feel safe anymore, and drugs flowing around the Jordan River. We know it's a little bit up north, but it's going to flow with the water eventually, and the house market value for our existing homes are going to drop significantly. As far as I'm concerned, my home right now, it's going to drop a big time with the new proposal. They say the prices are starting at 300,00 to 450,000, I'm sorry with everything so pricey right now, I doubt that you're going to keep that price, good luck with that. I am just very disappointed.

Chair Gedge closed the Public Hearing.

Chair Gedge said I want to start with Jordan School District, because I asked that when we had a similar property a few weeks ago, about the school with a similar proposal. The kids might be going to the same elementary school 11400 S in that same area. I am assuming that the school district has to legally provide a will serve letter. But was that done with 222 additional units,. Do we know if that was done?

Planner Schindler said I don't know of any rule that the school district has to supply that, but it would be up to the school district. They have been notified of this project, so it's up to them and what they are going to do, the city doesn't have any anything to do with how the schools are planned. They are planned by the Jordan District and the Jordan District State Agency, that's not, part of the city. We do give them notice that this is going to happen or could happen, and it's up to them to figure out how they're going to get the get students back and forth. The City doesn't have much to say about where they build it, or how they build it, or anything.

Chair Gedge said thank you. Hopefully, the last pathway is to share a concern about the bussing. The Current bussing situation with it being tripled and quadrupled up on a seat. Hopefully, we have someone from staff that can share that with our district representatives.

Planner Drozdek said so like Greg was saying, They're one of the affected entities so I did send out a letter to them stating the number of units and what type of housing units. They received the

same notice as everybody else did, so they can see what kind of housing they're proposing to do and the number of units. If they need more information, they can reach out to us and request it, but they haven't reached back out to us, so they have the information they need.

Chair Gedge said any concerns or prospects for having a sewer line? I think they said by the freeway, but I think they meant under the river. What would happen in the event that an expansion was needed with the utility services regarding either water or sewer, how would that be accommodated with the natural preserve of the area?

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said it's been done in other places. We have multiple utility crossings, crossing the river and there's some engineering challenges we need to work around, but it can easily be done and the space can be restored. We don't have detailed design. We don't know if it's going to be a lift station or if they're going to try to bore something under the river. Most likely they would bore the sewer, it wouldn't be like an open cut or something like that, but we have multiple utility crossings. It can be done in this space and it can be restored.

Chair Gedge said I know there is a proposal there, I think it's called a hot crossing. What is the current pedestrian crossing. I know there is a traffic light, which I don't think aligns with the current light with the front runner station. But there is a hot crossing with 222 units. What is the anticipated traffic volume at peak times, and what would be any potential traffic mitigation or concerns? Obviously, engineering had a chance to review this proposal, was there any concerns with the traffic?

Assistant City Engineer Nielsen said we did have a chance to review this and the applicant actually prepared a traffic impact study as part of their concept drawing. It will require the applicant to update that study as part of the subdivision, but looking at that study and all the intersections, were still at an acceptable level of service, and so traffic signals were not required. As part of this project, there's an expected pm peak with this development, there's expected about 130 vehicles being generated from this development, so to spread out over two accesses. That's about one vehicle a minute, traveling, you know, up and down those accesses during the pm peak. That's kind of the worst time of the day.

Commissioner Bevans said is that number reduced at all based on the proximity to the front runner station?

Assistant City Engineer Nielsen said no, it was not with the numbers we looked at. But there's a good argument why it could be, but they were not reduced as part of that.

Chair Gedge said with the neighboring properties being agricultural. And testimony was given that there are large animals present there, is there a four foot iron fence being proposed?

Planner Drozdek said it is in the city code that they need to do masonry, but obviously, if it's in the agreement that can be changed, so that's what's getting adopted. That is something that they proposed, and I think what I heard from them is that after meeting with the Jordan River Commission, it was one of the proposals that they made, because one of the concerns was

disruption to the wildlife. It will kind of to open that up and then allow for more to flow between the properties. I think that's kind of what they proposed to do. But, I mean, we can check with the applicant.

Chair Gedge said the height of the buildings got raised by several of the residents. I know that there's a neighboring residential development to the south of this proposal. Do you know the maximum height of those residential buildings, that are currently in this line? Is the proposal in line with the maximum height at the peak?

Planner Drozdek said are you referring to those apartment buildings on Durham gateway? They are four or five stories? So they would be just about the same height, just not as tall.

Chair Gedge said it was brought up about the proposed bridge that the developer has offered, I believe they would provide some funds for that. I think the amount has been presented because the city has a federal matching grant for that amount, is that correct?

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said that that is accurate. We have a grant, a federal grant, to build that bridge across the river. It would provide better access between the trail and the front runner station and the money that the developer would be contributing would be the city's match.

Chair Gedge said there was a concern of potential tax impacts. I believe in our staff report, there was a slide about the potential revenue to the city, but by actually turning the single 18 Acres into 18.5 acres, and into 222, units, there's probably actually an increase in revenue to the city, in tax revenue because of going from one property to 222, is that correct?

Planner Drozdek said that is correct.

Commissioner Hollist said there was one other concern that was brought up and I'm curious about it as well. It deals with our land use plan. Can you comment Damir about how the portion that they're keeping open and how it overlays with what we've already designated as natural area versus agricultural? To my eye and looking at these charts, it looks like it's probably lined up fairly reasonably.

Planner Drozdek said I did it in our GIS, and when I sketch it out the current natural area is about five acres, and with this new proposal it's been increased to six acres.

Commissioner Hollist said and does it match up with our current land plan?

Planner Drozdek said approximately It does.

Commissioner Hollist said is this statement generally correct that where we're developing and putting residential units and parking is the area that is currently zoned agricultural, land use is designated agricultural.

Planner Schindler said none of them that are in the preservation area. I would like to address the general plan and so forth. The question was why do we have one and so forth? We have one, but

it is dated from 2020 and things have changed. One of the things that has changed is that we are now by state mandate, required because we have a perimeter station there so we have to have area station plans. They do not expect the area station plans for a transit station to have low density or no density in their plan. We haven't been told that necessarily, but it's obvious to us that the state wants those plans to have density, because they see the only way they're going to get more housing is to require it in certain areas. And so this plan is for part of the property because it is within the stationary plan boundaries, which is a one and a half mile radius around the station, so it's right there at the end. This will help the city meet the requirement of the state is hasn't officially mandated, but we would anticipate that if we don't have some density in thist plan, they would probably do what they've done in a lot of things and try to take over our zoning, because were not doing it right.

Commissioner Hollist said is this included in the area that we saw or heard last time and looked at changing ordinances to allow density greater than eight units per acre.

Planner Drozdek said yes.

Commissioner Bevans said about density. In the development agreement, it says that they're allowed up to 12 units an acre. Their density is technically 12.03 is that minute enough that we're just going to ignore that, or does that need to be addressed so that it's correct in the development agreement?

Commissioner Hollist said what number did you use? Because I noticed that in our packet it said 18.5 but somebody, or somewhere, it said 18.56.

Commissioner Bevans said I am using the concept plan they have on their concept plan that their density is 12.03 units.

Planner Schindler said I think its minute enough that we don't need to correct that.

Commissioner Catmull said someone asked about the bridge location.

Chair Gedge said bring up the map so that the people who are attendance can just see where the map of the bridge is on the the aerial, so if that's the right that they can see it on concept. At the previous meeting I did raise that there are currently crossings 10400 S and on Shields Lane. However, this would allow basically a straight shot onto the front runner line, but also for this development to access the Jordan River Trail. So right there, you can see where the bridge would cross about south of the wetland, you could see it right there over the river. That's where it be located.

Commissioner Catmull said regarding water, is there a standard process? I am not well informed of it.

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said as far as water for this development, this area is already included in the Jordan Valley Water Conservancy area and it's already been annexed inside of their plan. And so there's adequate water to service this development.

Assistant City Attorney Greg Simonson said it's my understanding of the statute that the developer will be required to dedicate some water. It set forth in the code for the city to offset the burden that is posed on the city for for water use.

Mr. Shipp said I guess I want to start with saying, I really appreciate this process. We've now been at this with this specific project for almost two years. We've been working through different components of how to proceed, and tonight's just been another great step in, I believe, refining the project that we are proposing to you. The comments that have been made tonight are not lost on deaf ears. We have done our best to listen to what has been said, and we have made some notes, and hopefully we can bring them forward as we proceed with the process. There are some tweaks that will help address some of the things that have been raised we bring change, and we get that. It doesn't change our commitment to the open space. It doesn't change our commitment to doing the project the right way. We have shown pictures tonight, and we don't take that lightly. We will build what we have shown, that is our commitment. There have been a couple of issues raised, and maybe just proactively, I can run down them. The fencing question that came up that was a request from the Jordan River Commission. We would be happy with whatever fence you all feel is the right fence to put there. We just were responding to the Commission saying, it would be better to have more open rail fencing than closed for the purposes of their perspective. We would be happy with whatever you think is best we are planning on lifting the sewer. That was a proposal that we've been working out with the Sewer District. As part of that process, they asked us to look at alternative plans other than a lift station, and so we have evaluated that from an engineering standpoint, and believe it would be possible to bore under the river and connect it that way, but the sensitive environmental issues that are allowing that I would not expect us to end up that way. I would expect that we would be lifting and going out to the east, rather than West, under the river the water that was brought up, just to clarify there's there's two different parts of water. There's the culinary water, and that system, that's what we've known as adequate and conservative stuffs. There's also the secondary system we are bringing as part of this plan, secondary water rights to add to what the city already has, so that if there was ever an opportunity to connect the water system in any way, that the city would have adequate secondary water rights to service this property.

Commissioner Bevans said so are you signing those water rights over to the actual shares over to the city?

Mr. Shipp said yes, it is in the City Code.

Commissioner Bevans said how did you determine which units would be for sale versus which units you would be keeping for rental?

Mr. Shipp said we started with the units that were the most affordable and said, Let's sell all of those to hit the lower price point, and then we did our best to keep a variety of for sale and for rent, and kind of divided them up.

Commissioner Bevans said I know this has no bearing on our decision tonight, but I know in our arc meeting, we talked about on the site plan, I do see now you have the rental office on the site plan, but I still don't see anywhere for trash receptacles for those particular units that don't have a garage. Have we solved that issue yet?

Ms. Travis said the development agreement has been added to that and it will be private pickup, and our homeowners association will take care of that. More than likely we'll go with it a valet service where you put your trash out each day, and then it goes away. But, we do have some ideas where dumpsters and things could be located.

Commissioner Bevans said are they over enough that they could take out parking to put in a dumpster, or are they right there on parking where they can't alter that? Could we lose parking for a dumpster on half so they do show more parking than what the city requires. But are you planning on putting dumpsters in the parking spots?

Ms. Travis said we have a higher standard for our developments, because we know parking is a problem, especially in this type of housing. So we would hate to lose a parking stall to a dumpster, but we'd also hate to have trash piling up. So we have locations we think that they can work into the ends of roadways and not remove any parking stalls.

Commissioner Hollist said regarding the height you submitted a letter that the extra units were needed to make having more owner possible. But is there any possibility to bring those condo buildings down one story? It's a lot of height.

Mr. Shipp said ultimately the answer is yes. We can build a two story unit. It just impacts what the overall cost is that is amortized over certain number of units. So what's the benefit that we get, versus the cost of doing that? And you know, the impact of a three story building versus a four story building weighed against being able to provide additional affordable units, that's the question. I think our proposal is to go four stories, but we're open to hear your ideas.

Commissioner Hollist said we have a land use plan. I'm glad, glad that Greg spoke up about the pressures that we get from the state to consider what's around transit and to consider higher density. I know we've heard another section near transit in a similar area looking at raising our cap from what we typically have is a solid or a hard cap at eight units per acre to more than that, if it makes sense. But part of our land use plan is looking at what makes sense next to one another, and so I appreciate moving everything out of the floodplain, all the structures. I appreciate effectively maintaining that natural area designation, even though we would be rezoning the agricultural portion. The height has me a little concerned. I think that's probably the biggest issue I've got at this point. Even with our day break development, which is another area that's generating a lot of housing in our community, I haven't heard a price point in the three hundreds for several years. So this legitimately would be the most affordable that I'm aware of

new build in South Jordan. And so I go back and forth. I that height has me a little concerned. I would prefer to see the condos limited to three stories, but I don't know what that does to the price point, starting in the three hundreds.

Commissioner Catmull said I wrote down height three level versus four level, I too would prefer a three level, mostly because of the proximity to a natural preservation area. And as I walked that trail area today and just looked around, I know we talked about the apartments that were further to the south, and they are taller, but they're also a lot further away, and they're obscured by lots of things. As I walked further over to where this target location is, and especially seeing the drawings today, you'll see it a lot more. And so I think that that presents a little bit of incompatibility to that natural preservation area. It's certainly not as bad as if you go further north and you're walking along the trail, and then next thing you know, you're standing next to someone's sports court, sort of thing, you know, like that always gives me pause when I'm on the trail. I don't know, it just doesn't feel in place. But the good news is we're talking about, how can we do things now to try to balance developmental rights with general plan and what people expect in the future. Then of course, the fencing is my other thing that I feel like we should take a second. I don't have a strong opinion, but I think that the city council should take as much and solicit as much feedback around that to find the right balance therebecause of what the city code does say generally there. But there's also an interest for the for the preservation of wildlife and everything else that's going around there. If I had unlimited funds, I would buy a lot of property and create a less dense South Jordan, right? But I don't have unlimited funds. And the reality is, this has been talked about. This is following a standard process of a property owner in the context of the city and the state and everything else. So those are some my concerns.

Commissioner Bevans said I appreciate the effort to move out of the natural preservation area, the effort to bring edge homes on board and to create a more affordable product. I appreciate the effort working with the city to provide the funding and create that natural preservation area. I don't have an issue with density here. I think this is the right place for density. I don't even have such a huge issue with the height. I am sensitive to what it does removing a full story that takes off 24 units, that has a huge impact on on the bottom line. However, what I'm actually really struggling with is the livability of this. As I look at this as a parent, I let my kids, who are nine and 10, go out front, they can play ball, they can ride scooters, they can ride their bikes and they can play with the neighbor kids. When I look at this, I don't see anywhere I'd be comfortable letting my kids go outside to play alone, let alone anywhere I could take them outside to play. I see their sidewalks, but a lot of the spaces that we're looking at on some of those concept plans and the maps, the slope in those areas is not flat. It's not it's not really a usable space. So I'm struggling with that. The other thing I'm struggling with is, like you said, the compatibility with the surrounding land use and the land to the South will never be developed, as far as we know. The land to the north, as far as we've been told, they have no plans to develop. It may never develop, or it may a long time in the future. And so it kind of feels like we're taking a concrete jungle and plopping it down in the middle of this natural area with without fully considering the livability of it, for not only the people who live surrounding it now, but the people who will live here once it's built, and those who live here and surrounding it in the future. So I don't know how you fix that. It's the right area. I think it's just the execution is still lacking for me.

Chair Gedge said thank you everyone for coming out on this tonight. As you know a lot of you live next door to me, three doors down, seven doors down. I know this area, and I've brought this on other applications in this area in the past and things have changed. When I moved into my home, I had open space all around me, and now homes have been built on all four corners of my property, blocking my access. Change is inevitable, but what's the right mix and the right property? I do appreciate the applicant coming back and addressing our concerns from November with the floodplain. I do have concerns with the fencing. I know they agreed to the Jordan River Commissions recommendations, but the property owners with animal rights, those need to be preserved as well and protected in our city, standard that we have as well, not just the Jordan River commissions, concerns with fencing. I would like to see that default to our city standards, dividing agricultural with residential uses, just because those animal right owners need to be protected for what they have currently. But I do like the improvements of this. I have the same concerns with height. I brought it up earlier. You know, it's already a brick wall from my back porch when I'm looking, I'm missing half the mountain, and so this will just complete that view on my horizon. But, I understand the concern, if you lower from four stories to three stories or two stories, that you're going to increase the price points. And we just reviewed the moderate housing plan at our last meeting with her recommendations to the city council, and we are mandated by the state to provide a moderate housing plan as well. And, of course, this is one of the ideal areas with the front runner station. I could see concerns on both sides, but I think a lot of concessions have been made. Hopefully, the citizens understand that we took their comments last time, and the applicant took them as well from our recommendation to the city council. And it's just how do we present this again tonight, this evening, to city council? Do we move forward with a motion to approve, but with changes we'd like to see? Do we take a motion to deny based on these reasons? This is just a difficult one. I'm fully aware that City Council is listing, and they'll review our minutes and listen to our comments. I know we've spoken to our particular elected official, and we encourage the residents to say, but just where do we go from here on this item?

Commissioner Bevans said think we have to enforce the fencing on the north I mean, it's animal rights. They protect people and the and the animals. I am okay with altering the fencing on the southern boundary, where there it's open space. There's nothing over there. I don't have an issue with that, but obviously that's up to city council I think people have a right to develop their property as they please. However, I feel like we as a commission, and I know the council feels the same there, we hold a stewardship to ensure that we are developing responsibly and sustainably and with everyone in mind, not just the people sitting in the seats tonight.

Commissioner Catmull said splitting where the the condos in the rear are three story instead of four is more approachable to me. I think that's a little more balanced. I could be on board with that. I could also just be on board on just saying to consider lowering the height on the east side, I mean, we could even settle on a compromise.

Commissioner Hollist said you indicated as you walked it, you get dwarfed by it. And so, if you push back from the trail where it gets tall, then maybe that has less of that looming impact. And then you're pushing where it's tallest, over to where it's industrial. Yeah, makes sense that you preserve that natural open to some degree.

Commissioner Bevans said just want to put on the record that we got some photographs this afternoon, and I don't know whoever took those, if you're here or not, but those were beautiful photos. They were beautiful. So the area, the area is gorgeous. I. I don't know that this has anything to do with our decision, but I just want that on the record that was some talent right there. If this goes forward and city council approves it I would like to see all 35 of the additional units for sale and none for rent. So we went from 187, to 222, that's 35 units. I would like all 35 of those additional units to be for sale units, rather than renting.

Commissioner Hollist moved that the planning commission recommend that the city council approve resolution R 2025, 12, authorizing the mayor to sign the development agreement with the recommendation to revisit the following items, either during City Council open discussion or a work session to

- (1) evaluate the overall height restrictions of the development and consider a reduction from four story units to three for some or all of the condo buildings.
- (2) to review the plan for livability aspects, specifically the potential for outdoor gathering and play areas.
- (3) to revisit item 5.6 in the development agreement concerning fencing to ensure that the property to the north is able to safely maintain their animal rights.
- (4) to revisit the percentage of units for rent versus own within the development as well.

I also move to approve resolution R2025-13, approving the land use amendment to approve ordinance 20-2025 Z, approving the zone change.

Chair Gedge seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 3-1 Commissioner Bevans voted no and Commissioner Bishop was absent from the vote.

OTHER BUSINESS

- J.1. Planning Commission Discussion regarding Commission Rules for 2025.

Commissioner Hollist motioned to move Item J.1. to the next Planning Commission Meeting being held on Tuesday March 18, 2025. Chair Gedge seconded the motion. Vote was 4-0 unanimous in favor. Commissioner Bishop was absent from the vote

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Hollist motioned to adjourn the February 25, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting. Chair Gedge seconded the motion. Vote was 4 to 0 unanimous in favor. Commissioner Bishop was absent from the vote.

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

DRAFT