

**CITY OF SOUTH JORDAN
ELECTRONIC
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
January 24, 2023**

Present: Commissioner Michele Hollist, Commissioner Nathan Gedge, Commissioner Trevor Darby, Commissioner Steven Catmull, Commissioner Laurel Bevans, Assistant City Attorney Greg Simonsen, City Planner Greg Schindler, Deputy City Recorder Cindy Valdez, Deputy City Engineer Jeremy Nielson, GIS Coordinator Matt Jarman, Planner Andrew McDonald, Senior IS Tech Phill Brown, Meeting Transcriptionist Diana Baun

Others: Cecil Burk, Ellen Brown Sue Seelye, Ryan Berry, Devan Hatch, Kalmoor Robbins, Kenyan Clark, Travis Hiatt, Melanie Hiatt, Liz Bean, Neal Smith, Jared Osmond

Absent: Commissioner Aaron Starks

6:30 P.M.
REGULAR MEETING

A. WELCOME AND ROLL CALL – *Chair Michele Hollist*

Commissioner Michele Hollist welcomed everyone to the Electronic Planning Commission Meeting, and excused Commissioner Aaron Starks who was absent.

B. MOTION TO APPROVE AGENDA

Commissioner Gedge motioned to approve tonight’s agenda as published. Commissioner Hollist seconded the motion; vote was unanimous in favor. Commissioner Starks was absent from the vote.

C. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

C.1. January 10, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Commissioner Gedge motioned to approve the January 10, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes as published. Chair Hollist seconded the motion; vote was unanimous in favor. Commissioner Starks was absent from the vote.

D. STAFF BUSINESS - *None*

E. COMMENTS FROM PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS

Chair Michele Hollist asked the commission members to forward any discussion suggestions for the joint meeting in March to her by Friday, so she can forward those to staff. She also sent the commissioners a schedule for attending and representing the planning commission at City Council Meetings, and asked the commission members to take a look at it.

Commissioner Laurel Bevans gave a brief review of the last city council meeting.

F. SUMMARY ACTION – *None*

G. ACTION – *None*

H. ADMINISTRATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS

H.1. SILVERSTONE AUTOMATION SITE PLAN

Address: 10096 South Jordan Gateway

File No: PLSPR202200232

Applicant: Joseph Milillo, MHTN Architects

City Planner Greg Schindler reviewed background information from the Staff Report.

Chair Michele Hollist asked for the height of the highest point of the building.

Planner Schindler said he was unable to read it on the plans he had, but there is no height limitation in this zone.

Chair Hollist invited the applicant up to speak.

Ryan Berry (Applicant Representative) He is with MHTN Architects. Silverstone Automation are engineers that develop automated machines for companies like Merit Medical or ED Medical. They are moving their operations from Bluffdale to South Jordan City in this new location. This is an owner-operated building, so they will be the tenant there for many years. There are about 11 employees that will be employed at this site.

Commissioner Gedge asked about the hours of operation and potential noise.

Mr. Berry said typical business hours are 7:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m., and this is not a noisy process. Most of the work is assembling different parts manufactured by subcontractors.

Chair Hollist opened the hearing for public comment. There were no comments and the hearing was closed.

Planner Schindler was able to share that the highest point of the building is 32 feet.

Commissioner Gedge motioned to approve File No. PLSPR202200232, Site Plan Application at the address above. Chair Hollist seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor. Commissioner Starks was absent from the vote.

I. LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS

I.1. D&D RESIDENTIAL/HATCH SUBDIVISION

Address: 10827 S. 1055 W. & 10828 S. 1055 W.

File No: PLZBA202200217

Applicant: Devan Hatch, D&D Residential Development, LLC

Planner Andrew McDonald reviewed background information from the Staff Report.

Chair Michele Hollist asked if the images from the Staff Report are what will be built, or just what will potentially be built.

Planner McDonald said that is what they would see as a layout in the preliminary subdivision application, as the developer has been working with staff to develop this.

Chair Hollist noted that this plan looks unusual, and asked why with it's larger size the roads and access weren't done in a standard fashion.

Deputy City Engineer Jeremy Nielson responded that they have private lanes similar to this in Daybreak, with a hammerhead that could be accessed with a firetruck. He also noted that this is not a site plan application, this is a rezone and the images are the concepts they are proposing.

Chair Hollist asked if six lots is the maximum they can have with the zoning requested.

Planner McDonald said they could possibly add one or two more lots if they reduced the sizes of the lots. Any lots on the east side would be separate from this subdivision. The property size owned would allow the applicant to go smaller on the lots, but the applicant is also aware of the character of the area and after discussion with staff, felt that six lots would be more appropriate.

City Planner Greg Schindler added that any property zoned in the R-1.8 could apply for a subdivision that included any existing lots, and density is based on all the land. They are not considering changing the two lots on the east side, and the city has been told there is a buyer

for those lots that is going to keep them the same to build new homes on. If the property to the north of this wanted to rezone to R-1.8 they could do a subdivision including all the R-1.8 properties in one subdivision and still have smaller lots, with the smallest lot size allowed being one-third of an acre. A concept plan is something required with any rezoning, and is subject to change.

Commissioner Laurel Bevans asked for the total acreage of all lots.

Planner McDonald said that it's just under 5 acres if you include the current properties in the zone.

Commissioner Steve Catmull noted that a property owner could subdivide their property in a multitude of ways. He asked if they made it all the R-1.8, could someone come in and reconfigure the subdivision within the zone.

Planner Schindler said that if the current property owners decided not to develop and sold the land, another developer could come in with a different plan within the constraints of the zone.

Commissioner Nathan Gedge noted that because 1055 West has been removed from the historic designation, that means any developers who rezone will have to do full improvements of curb, gutter and sidewalk, and asked if that was correct.

Planner Schindler said he believes that is correct, they will have to make improvements as they develop.

Commissioner Gedge noted that the Rise Development is just slightly north of this, and asked if this area was to be rezoned, would the developer would have to put in appropriate fencing to protect the current agricultural rights of the adjacent property owners, as did the Rise Development.

Planner Schindler said if the lots in the new subdivision are zoned for, and large enough to have large animals, there are no fencing requirements between them.

Commissioner Gedge asked if the existing water rights would be preserved, and if the developer would have to either pipe or ensure the water flow is not interrupted.

Engineer Nielson responded that is correct.

Chair Hollist asked for a confirmation that 1055 W will be done to the standard requirements in terms of width, sidewalks, etc., along this section.

Engineer Nielson said those details haven't been confirmed yet with the change in historic designation. They are going to start doing surveys and other research to find the least impactful footprint for that road. It is possible it will be curb adjacent sidewalk to reduce the footprint of the road.

Chair Hollist invited the applicant up to speak.

Devan Hatch (Applicant) is the owner of D&D. Regarding the road and questions regarding the private lane, that is a giant hill and they have to retain that hill while getting access up the hill. The cul-de-sac stops short because of that steep hill. They kept half acre lots because they want to hang on to the animal rights in the area, they don't plan on making them any smaller because they want it to be a nice, beautiful community with larger homes. They plan on working with the city on improving 1055 W, and that will really improve the flow and feel of that road. The lot to the north in the corner with the private lane will be his personal residence, so he is excited for this project and to be a part of this community.

Chair Hollist opened the hearing for public comment.

Commissioner Gedge noted there was public comment received prior to the meeting that the commission has reviewed (Attachment A).

Kalmoor Robbins (Millcreek Resident) – I am that larger piece to the north that is 5 acres. The one thing that I wanted to mention was that I have been in the two City Council Meetings about 1055 W because we are being impacted by it. It is going to be a residential road that meets the normal standards of South Jordan and I know that our piece is actually going to be impacted the most because we do have an elevation change when it hits our piece, where we are about 5 feet lower than the roadway will be. That was done because of safety, and I am all in favor of that. I want to support the guy, but that is a very steep hill that he is dealing with there. People can say different things, but that was steep. I happened to be in a meeting a week ago where somebody said that the property to the north, which was under site plan approval and zoning change, drops off. However, on our piece where that is, that is just a nice gentle grow. It always disturbed me a little bit that somebody didn't understand what was being explained to the city council and the public hearing had ended at that point so I couldn't really give any input to it. I am grateful that they are improving 1055 W, I do think that is crucial to what is going to happen in the future, and I appreciate your willingness to be patient with this process that is going on.

Kenyan Clark (Resident) – I own the property just to the south of this property. I am very concerned about the road change. I need to know where the road is going to be improved, and when it stops. If it is improved on my property, I will lose all my garden area and all I'll have left is a steep hill which will destroy some of the things I moved here for. I need to know exactly where the road will end, is it going to go all the way to the dead end. I don't know if you people are aware, but it is a dead end with one way in and one way out, and that's it. If this property goes through there is going to be a dangerous area because of one way in and one way out, whether we improve the road or not. If we actually put a sidewalk and create more space needed on both sides, east and west, we are going to go over the top of the Beckstead Ditch. I am also appalled that we have taken the historical representation of the Pony Express Road off with just a stroke of the pen. There was not any public voice on this, nobody was asked, it was just done and I am upset about it and I think it's just terrible. I have been a South Jordan resident for 28 years, and I have never seen anything like this in my life.

Travis Hiatt (Resident) – The east end of my property backs up to this proposed development. I have a couple of things I wanted to mention, first of all the multiple forms of pollution. Light pollution was the one that we noticed initially when they took down a bunch of trees on the east side, as it faces the mountains, and now we can clearly see from the back of the house the office building that's down the hill, all the way to I-15. We used to have a nice tree line that met the mountains. We moved in not quite 2 years ago, and that view was one of the most important reasons we bought that property, and that view has been obliterated. The other one is noise pollution, and I'm not even talking about proposed construction noise pollution, I am talking about what I can now hear when I step out the back door is I-15. We used to live in Draper, we specifically moved from Draper to South Jordan to avoid the hustle and bustle of 12300 South, 700 East and I-15. When they eliminated those trees that were at the bottom of that property, we increased light and noise pollution dramatically. I can now hear the constant lull of I-15, where I couldn't before. We spoke a little bit about the irrigation. Currently, there are 14 properties that have rights to that irrigation so I'm glad that was brought up because we are concerned about that. Along with the irrigation, there is also that natural spring that existed where the trees had been taken out. It is hard for me to imagine that by removing all those trees we haven't disrupted that spring somehow, and now we are creating potential erosion and all the things that come along with that. Another issue is property value, there is no way that anybody can convince me that by ruining the perfect view that we had and putting this project up, it didn't affect my property value. I am sure it diminished my property value and everybody else's that looks east onto that proposed property. The last thing, but certainly not least, we are worried about the safety. The safety of all pedestrians, but really the school kids. What kind of plans are going to be put in place to have crossing guards, crosswalks, as has already been stated that is a dead end road. We are almost already doubling the amount of traffic that is going to take place in that area, so we would like to know what kinds of safety precautions are going to be put in place, specifically for pedestrians but more importantly for the kids.

Melanie Hiatt (Resident) – I had no intention of speaking tonight, but I want to express how appalled I am with Mr. Clark, as well on the removal of the historical road at cemetery road. I also want to comment on a few things being said. The concept is unusual, because in putting this in it is going to completely change the landscape of this area, it is going to completely change how it looks. When we bought our house we had cows and horses in our backyard with this row of trees, now they are completely gone and we are not only getting numerous homes, but again you are doubling the traffic and eliminating people's water rights and changing the entire scope of the street that has been that way since the pioneers did it. That is why it looks like the pioneers did it, because I'm pretty sure they were the people that settled the area, which is what we are supposed to be honoring and respecting. I am totally appalled. The driveway that you see on the picture that is unusual is going to become my backyard, this weird wrap thing is weird and is not appealing or really feasible. Again, the grade is incredibly steep, it is just not something any of us want to look at. I would also like to comment that I am sure we can get other neighbors in the area that are out of town, as several travel for work that are not here, but I can tell you the overwhelming response of the neighborhood is that they do not want this. Speaking to the one way in and one way out dead end road, again you are adding enormous amounts of traffic and homes and people to a very

small road that should have remained historic, that is now going to be infringed upon, as well as the owners that live down there.

Mr. Clark asked to bring up one more thing.

Chair Hollist noted that they will finish the public hearing and then see if there is a motion to allow him to speak again.

Cecil Burk (Resident) – What was referenced with the Rise Development, and has just been brought up again is that this is going to increase traffic down cemetery road. I appreciate the fact that in the small part the development has suggested they are going to be fairly large lots, not a duplex or townhouse development, but at the same time it is going to change the road as the town council has already decided is going to be done in reference to the Rise Development. I can't imagine that will stop short of this development that is being talked about tonight.

Commissioner Gedge motioned to allow an additional minute of comments for those who have already spoken, so long as it is relevant to the rezone and things that are under the commission's purview. Chair Hollist seconded the motion; vote was unanimous in favor. Commissioner Starks was absent from the vote.

Mr. Clark – I am very emotional about that issue because the great city of South Jordan has been my home for that long. We moved here from West Valley, and the reason we moved here from West Valley was because of the high density housing and the issues that it caused. What came to my mind after I left the podium last time was that, I don't know if you are aware or not, but there is a lot of water issues coming from Beckstead Estates. You are probably aware there are springs and underground water that is running there constantly, and that the water has been running through this proposed property continually. I am very concerned that if this subdivision is not dealt with correctly it will cause me issues because as soon as they change the elevation in this property that could cause that to run into our neighbors or my property. There has been tons of dirt hauled in already, and I'm assuming that is to cover the high water table, and I don't think that has been appropriate at all.

Liz Bean (Resident) – I live directly behind the property, next door to the Hiatts. I had a question, the road that comes up that hill will be directly into my backyard, so any traffic that comes up that hill is going to have headlights around the corner right into my bedroom and the lower floor of my house. I was wondering how that would be addressed if that house was built there. There is also a little sliver of land right behind the property that's about 25 feet, and I want to know what is it and what is it designated for.

Neal Smith (Resident) – I live just right at the bottom lot, next to Mr. Clark, and past him to the north is the property in question. The question that I have is when we are talking about the three parcels, one being on the west side of 1055 W, are the two parcels to the south of that parcel and the one touching Mr. Clark's lot presently zoned in the same zone that the other parcel is now being proposed for. It seems almost impossible as I have lived there almost 35 years and that has all been one big field, owned by one family, and I just want to

be sure. I didn't get notification for this or this meeting, or the one in two weeks, so I don't know what happened there. It seems impossible that those two parcels to the south are not zoned presently the same as the one that is being proposed for rezoning. Are we absolutely certain that those two parcels to the south don't need to be rezoned. When I looked at my neighbor's map, as I said I didn't get one, I thought immediately that only half of the appropriate property has been identified here for people to look at and potentially make comments.

Jared Osmond (Future resident) – I am planning on building my house on the bigger lot in this subdivision, and I understand change is hard. My life has been filled with change over the past couple of years, going through a divorce and trying to relocate and find something great. We want to be great neighbors. I am a general contractor, I will build my house and we have every intention of doing the right thing. I know it sounds like the neighbors would have preferred we just bought the lot and not torn trees down, and I totally get that and understand, and I am not minimizing that change is hard or how they feel. I just want you to know that we want to be good neighbors, this is where my family is going to live. Even the little driveway looks daunting and big, but we have tried to work with the city to create something that addresses the slope coming up, something that is appropriate with the fire turnaround the way that it is. We want to minimize any light problems, and we are happy to work with the city and neighbors to do that with building the right fences or whatever needs to be done. We proposed, after speaking with Mr. Hatch about his subdivision and my desire to build here, to do bigger lots for that reason so that it is still appropriate, and we think it is still appropriate building bigger homes here and houses that will make sense for this beautiful area; we want to add to it, not take away from it. Our hope is to work with the city on the road layout to figure out what's required, and we are happy to do that, and we have been trying to get this to that point. We are aware of the water table issues, and we are working with engineers to ensure we are not upsetting the water table issues or diverting water where it shouldn't go, as well as retaining any water onsite into the proper storage and handling. I think we will be a great addition to the neighborhood, I am excited to build my house and I hope to mend fences with neighbors that have current issues with me building my house there.

Chair Hollist closed the hearing for public comments. She asked to talk about the road, and to have staff help them understand where the road would have to be upgraded and changed in an application like this, and where it would not be required at this time.

Engineer Nielson said that as part of this application they would require the applicant to make the frontage improvement, adjacent to their property, as shown on the concept. North of that, at this point in time there would be no change to the road. The city does have plans in the near future to replace the waterline along 1055 W and they are hoping in conjunction with doing that waterline they can make some improvements on 1055 W, but that is all in a very early stage of planning and there are no concrete plans at this point as to when that road would be finished with sidewalk.

Chair Hollist asked if this concept plan were adopted, would there be improvements further south.

Engineer Nielson said no, as further south is a private lane. This concept has been proposed with the private lane just coming south on 1055 W with a knuckle on the lane where the private lane would continue to the south. The concern about possibly widening to the south of this development has no potential at this time since the city doesn't own any public right of way through there. Also, for the city this would be a benefit to the snow plow drivers as currently the snow plows go down 1055 W and there is no turnaround. There have been incidents where they have damaged private property because there is no way for them to turnaround and they are using driveways and other things. Ending this public road with a cul-de-sac would add benefits for the city.

Commissioner Gedge asked how many car trips per household are average for a development this size.

Engineer Nielson said that on average it's 10 trips a day for a single family home, so 60 trips per day. They really watch the P.M. peak hour, and this would only be adding 6 cars to that peak hour. Currently that road has about 34 trips in the peak hour, so it would go up to 40 trips in the peak hour.

Commissioner Gedge noted that the Rise Development had a traffic study done, and he asked if this subdivision would have a negative effect on the 1055 W load and the traffic signals at South Jordan Parkway.

Engineer Nielson said it would add more traffic, but from a road capacity standard it will still be a safe road.

Commissioner Bevans noted that the traffic study mentioned is available as part of the council packet on the city website, and it is public record.

Chair Hollist brought up the historical designation that was mentioned, but reiterated that is not something the commission has any control over or say in. She recommended residents speak with a member of the staff or potentially their City Council Member if they need more clarification on that particular item. Regarding light pollution, noise and irrigation she asked what is required to protect adjacent neighbors from light and noise, and what recourse do neighbors have if they feel like it's excessive.

Planner Schindler said it has to be something happening on the property that is causing the problem. If a house is built with bright lights that are shining on to a neighbor, that is something the city can address. The city can't do anything when a tree is cut down, or if there is noise and light coming from a mile away.

Chair Hollist asked about private lanes and cars, considering where the lane turns, etc.

Planner Schindler said that if it comes up the way it is, and it will shine in a backyard, the slope should be dealt with at subdivision. If it turns out that for some reason that lane is going to be higher in elevation than the property, the owner would probably want to put in a fence of some sort on that side. If the lane is lower in elevation, and there is a fence, it is unlikely that any lights are going to shine through the fence.

Chair Hollist asked to confirm that irrigation rights remain, water rights remain, and this doesn't take anyone's rights away.

Engineer Nielson said that is correct. Regarding any ditches or similar that traverse the property, the developer will have to work with the ditchmaster to ensure that water continues to flow.

Chair Hollist asked staff if there were any comments on what the city does to ensure safety for pedestrians.

Engineer Nielson noted that as much as it is practical, they try to accommodate pedestrians in the sidewalk, understanding that this will take a little bit of time to rectify.

Chair Hollist asked to confirm that the private road is completely on the applicant's property and not in someone else's backyard.

Engineer Nielson said that based on the concept plan it is contained completely within his property; there are no easements shown or that staff is aware of.

Chair Hollist asked about the level of service grade for the road.

Engineer Nielson said they did counts out there about a month and a half ago, during the P.M. peak there is 34 vehicles during that hour, and that was counted up near the cemetery; down to the south he's sure it's much less. As indicated, they anticipate this will add another 6 trips to the peak hour.

Chair Hollist asked about the reviews and requirements engineering looks at on a subdivision, with respect to water, ground water levels, etc.

Engineer Nielson said all subdivisions have to provide a geotechnical study, where they bore into the ground to determine water table levels. They make recommendations for any additional drainage based on those results, whether the site can have basements, road thickness, etc. The subdivision has to comply with those results.

Chair Hollist asked about the sliver of land that was mentioned.

Planner McDonald showed on the map the areas that will be included in this concept plan, and noted that the areas bolded in red are the ones included in this application tonight. The parcels also included for the concept plan presented tonight are the three currently R-1.8 zoned properties. They are split in two different zones currently, so to make things consistent in the development the rezone needs to be done.

Chair Hollist asked why these have different zones.

Planner McDonald said they did look into the map records available for this area of the city when the application came in, and what is seen tonight is generally how those properties were set up in the past going back a few decades.

Chair Hollist asked about the notifications going out and those details.

Planner Schindler said the notifications go out to everyone within 300 feet of the proposed rezone, and the gentleman who said he didn't receive the notification is more than 300 feet from the agriculturally zoned property. He will be notified when this potentially comes back with a subdivision because he is with 300 feet of the entire subdivision.

Planner McDonald added that the 300 feet for notification is from the parcel line boundary

Commissioner Catmull brought up the public's questions regarding home values.

Assistant City Attorney Greg Simonsen said that the issue of property values is of course of great concern for all property owners. However, in order to really consider it you need a professional appraisal, someone to say what the property was before and what it will be after, based on their expertise. He hates it when a neighbor cuts down trees, but there is no ordinance against that; they own the property and have the right, there is only so much control that we exercise over a neighboring property and he is always sorry when views change. Regarding the written comment from Mr. Rockwell (Attachment A), talking about the wildlife there, it is hard to see that go but unless the city wants to buy the property and compensate the property owners for it, they have a constitutional right to use their property. There is really nothing the city can do without actually buying the property or compensating them for its value.

Chair Hollist noted that during this, she was reminded of the idea that we only have so many economic infill opportunities and she thanked staff for explaining the history on the area, the ownership, etc., as that helped her resolve that issue at the beginning. Regarding what could potentially come to the area and what is currently there, she has driven through it and feels like this is a relatively friendly change. She appreciates that the zoning isn't more dense than what's around it, and provides an opportunity for additional homes that look like they will match the existing character of what's in the area.

Commissioner Bevans echoed what Chair Hollist said, adding that she definitely appreciates all the comments made by surrounding residents and the property owners as the commission always appreciates when owners and applicants come in and are willing to work with neighbors.

Commissioner Trevor Darby echoed Chair Hollist's comments about gratitude for staff and their efforts, both tonight and every week.

Commissioner Catmull said that during a rezone he likes to go back to the general plan, as that is updated every 10 years, and it indicates that any new development, redevelopment of rezoning within the stable neighborhood designation shall be consistent with the surrounding land uses, in order to maintain existing character and quality of life for adjacent property owners. He realizes that all change is hard when you are right next to it. As he looks at the general plan and sees the large amount of R-1.8 around this property, he feels this application is compatible with that. Many of the issues that were brought up tonight are for the time when the subdivision application is presented, and evidence can be taken at that point in the

decision of what goes there. He encouraged those who have come to continue the process, get evidence and facts from authoritative sources, and engage with your representatives and others; don't wait for the two week notice to come. He is inclined to recommend approval of the rezone, given that he feels it is consistent with the surrounding land uses.

Commissioner Gedge thanked everyone for coming tonight and staff for their hard work. Change is hard and he echoed Commissioner Catmull's comments that if this is passed by the city council he will probably be much stricter during the site plan process to make sure the existing residents are protected. A lot of concerns were raised, and the city council reads these transcripts from these meetings. He is in favor of both proposals for this evening, as they fit what has been previously approved, and what has been there for a couple of decades as well. Also, these larger homes protect a bit of the agricultural and rural feel of South Jordan, which is why many of us wanted to be here.

Chair Hollist noted that she would like staff to be ready to address the concerns presented tonight, as the commission will remember them and want more information when this comes back.

Commissioner Bevans motioned to forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council of Resolution R2023-08, Land Use Amendment, and Rezone Ordinance 2023-02-Z. Chair Hollist seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor. Commissioner Starks was absent from the vote.

J. OTHER BUSINESS

Commissioner Nathan Gedge asked if any part of the large press announcement last Tuesday will be coming to the planning commission.

City Planner Greg Schindler said they might see a subdivision come through if they subdivide a lot off, but the site plan is not reviewed by the planning commission.

Commissioner Gedge asked if there were any updates on the Kennecott annexation, or if that will that be addressed in the joint meeting.

Planner Schindler believes there will be some things coming to the planning commission in relation to the annexation, as there will be a rezoning of the property.

Chair Hollist asked about the next meeting and what it looks like.

Planner Schindler said he believes there will be one item regarding a business on Redwood Road and 11500 South. They are selling property to another business owner, called Shoppe, who designs furnace and ducting for homes and businesses. He is unsure if there will be additional items that night.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Hollist motioned to adjourn the January 24, 2023 Planning Commission Meeting. Commissioner Darby seconded the motion; vote was unanimous in favor.

The January 24, 2023 Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 7:54 p.m.