

**CITY OF SOUTH JORDAN
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
May 26, 2026**

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

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

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

Chair Gedge welcomed everyone to the Planning Commission Meeting and noted that all (5) of the Planning Commissioner's are present at tonight's meeting.

B. MOTION TO APPROVE AGENDA

B.1. Approval of the May 26, 2026 Planning Commission Agenda.

Commissioner Hollist motioned to approve the May 26, 2026 Planning Commission Agenda. Chair Gedge seconded the motion. Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor.

C. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

C.1. Approval of the April 28, 2026 - Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.

Commissioner Hollist motioned to approve the April 28, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes with corrections. Commissioner Harding seconded the motion. Vote was 3-0 Commissioner Gedge and Commissioner Farnsworth abstained from the vote.

D. STAFF BUSINESS

Director Brian Preece said HR still needs your knowbe4 training completed. Please get that done as soon as possible. Thank you.

E. COMMENTS FROM PLANNING COMMISSION

Commissioner Catmull said a few meetings back I mentioned the software we use for our website and the municipal code, and I asked if we were using the latest version, and we had a back and forth. I since found out that there are two different editions, one that's a cloud hosted and one that's self hosted. The one that's self hosted you can have your own people write the code is what we're on, and so it's just a different offering.

Chair Gedge said thanks for looking at that and giving us that update.

F. SUMMARY ACTION

G. ACTION

H. ADMINISTRATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS

H.1. VEENDENDAAL DETACHED SHOP CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT

Address: 11739 S 1220 W

File No: PLCUP202600078

Applicant: Chip Galloway

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

Commissioner Catmull said on this lot there is, I assume, a private road? I can't remember, I think it is on 1220 West.

Planner Aguilera said technically, yes. The home does sit behind, or to the west, or the east side of that private road.

Chip Galloway, (Applicant) said I think Miguel did a great job on what we're trying to do there for Veendendaal and he would have been here tonight, but he just had a baby today, so I'm filling in for him. The biggest issue is just the fact that the shop is over the height of the residence. We're at that 25 foot marker, and he's on a single story home, so it makes it almost impossible to build the shop that's adequate size to get his RV and other things in. So that's why we're asking for the conditional use permit.

Commissioner Catmull said are there two households involved?

Mr. Galloway said I was the designer, I designed the property. I should have said that. I'm a pool and landscape designer, and as a part of this design, we had the design in the shop, which is on one side. There's a outdoor living kind of structure that comes off the side of the shop as well.

Chair Gedge opened the Public Hearing to comments.

Curtis Evans, South Jordan – said I live on the end of that private street you were talking about, so part of my property is in the front yard. He has approached us and as a neighbor, I'm fine with it. We've talked to other neighbors, and they don't have any problems with it. I'm a little bit removed from it, but you know it is what it is. He wants to build on it, and as a resident of that street and the little subdivision that it is, I'm in for that.

Chair Gedge closed the Public Hearing.

Chair Gedge said I don't think it's an exceptional variance between the single story home and a 25 foot max, and they have the setbacks, and looks like there's no windows looking over the adjoining property. The use seems appropriate for the for the building as well. So those are my thoughts.

Commissioner Harding said I don't have any concerns.

Commissioner Hollist said I had one question for clarification. Is it the interior ADU that has the 1500 square foot or 30% of the main dwelling limit?

Planner Aguilera said that's right, that's where the limit would apply. They didn't provide any indication that any part of this structure would be used as an ADU, but if they wanted to in the future, their property size don't allow them to have a detached ADU.

Commissioner Hollist said but this would be larger than an ADU would allow.

Planner Greg Schindler said actually, the ADU for an external ADU maximum is 1500 square feet period, but with the internal ADU, there's no limit. The state states, you cannot base it on the size of the home, or anything like that. But they can have the entire basement done, or have two floors done to have another floor, they can only have 180 on the property period.

Chair Gedge said but, if it's not part of the application this evening, and if they were to apply for an ADU and wanting to get more than the 1500 feet, that's what would come back to us for an exception. Anything else will be done administratively by the city staff, correct?

Planner Schindler said for the size of the external one to go larger than the 1500, that could come to you.

Commissioner Hollist said so to clarify, this is smaller than the primary, the footprint is smaller than the primary residence. It's just the height, but what was the primary residence maximum height?

Planner Aguilera said he maximum height, I don't believe it was given in the application. So, looking at the street view of it, assuming that the garage height was seven feet tall, then the estimated height of the home was between 16 and 18 feet, perhaps the applicant has a more definite answer. But, in any case, it's still far shorter in height than the proposed garage.

Commissioner Farnsworth said I didn't have a chance to look, but the application summary says that that house is smaller than compared to some of the neighboring residential buildings. Am I interpreting that correctly?

Planner Aguilera said, yes that is true.

Commissioner Catmull said and the primary residence could be a 35 feet max height, so someone could add at least one more floor to that, and it would be roughly the same height as the garage or the accessory building, so I'm totally fine with it.

Commissioner Harding motioned to approve File No. PLCUP202600078, the Veendendaal Detached Shop Conditional Use Permit. Commissioer Farnsworth seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor.

Commissioner Hollist said I wanted to just note that I'm willing, in this case, to make the exception on the height. I know that that part of our code exists because we want secondary structures to appear secondary, and so the fact that the actual footprint is smaller than the main dwelling is what persuaded me in this particular case.

I. LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS

I.1. TEXT AMENDMENT TO SECTION 16.04.320 WATER SHARES REQUIRED

Address: 1600 W Towne Center Dr, South Jordan, UT 84095

File No: Ordinance 2026-15

Applicant: City of South Jordan

City Engineer Jeremy Neilson reviewed background information on this item from the staff report.

Commssioner Harding said give us just in layman's terms the changes, like how it was before, how it will be now, and how that will affect the general public.

Commissioner Hollist said to add to that, will you tell us which was more conservative in ensuring sufficient water rights?

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said that's a great question. Those are both great questions. Okay, so to try and explain it in layman terms, the way it was calculated previously. When a residential development comes in and say it was a 10 acre lot, for example, a 10 acre subdivision, we would take the 10 acres and we would just multiply that by 2.2 acre feet per acre, and so that would be 22 acre feet, and that's the number of water shares that we would require from the development. So then they would go to a canal company and buy the equivalent number of shares and give those water shares over to the city. So that's how it was done, but now they require it to be calculated based upon the equivalent residential connection, which is per meter. so if it's town homes, it's the number of meters that goes to each town home. If it's a single family home, then it's one meter, and so, it does kind of change that calculation a bit. As far as which is more accurate, it's probably more accurate to use the ERCs, because that's more true to what the actual demand would be. There's like some really fine cases where you could make arguments either way, but generally we're more comfortable using the ERC calculation anyway, which is in compliance with state law.

Commissioner Hollist said Does it in any way allow you to take into consideration an industrial business commercial use that would be a high water user, or is that under a business application?

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said on water share collection, we have not been collecting water shares for any non-residential use. We've only been collecting water shares for residential use, and that's been a practice the city has been doing for 20 years. To be completely honest with you, I don't know where that practice came from, other than that's the way it's been done for a long time, I'm assuming it's to try and promote commercial development in the city.

Commissioner Hollist said do we have any concerns about that practice moving forward.

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said you know it's a practice that the city can choose what direction they want to go, but we're just bringing it in line with what we've been directed to do, I guess is the best way to put it.

Commissioner Catmull said it was probably my English teacher who was talking about active voice, versus passive voice. The staff report said city was informed that our water exaction code is out of compliance. My question is, could you clarify who exactly notified the city? Was this like a state agency, or did this come about because someone is seeking an application or has an application, and that's why it came up.

Assistant City Attorney Simonson said we periodically have citizens, not just from South Jordan, but from anywhere, that go to the property rights ombudsman. We had a citizen go to the property rights ombudsman who said he felt like he shouldn't be having an exaction against him at all. So, through a six to eight month process, the property rights ombudsman came back and said, now you're assessing it correctly in proportion with the burden that's being placed on the city. However, under this recent statute, as Jeremy has said, we should be using ERCs rather than acre feet.

Commissioner Catmull said and Jeremy, the ERC, is that calculated by the State Engineer or Department of Water?

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said it's defined in that memo that is referenced in the new code. I forget the exact name, and the level of service, but the average annual demand per ERC, and the current water use level of service memorandum, it's defined in there. In this case for residential use, it's per meter, so you just add up the number of meters that any subdivision would have, and that's the number of ERCs that would be.

Commissioner Catmull said I was just thinking, as we've seen more and more ADU's and everything else we're putting more households on the same meter, and so I just want to make sure that that calculation gets updated, otherwise we might be packing more density than historically on a single meter. How do non-residential applicants ensure that they've acquired enough water for their use today? How is that done?

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said they all hook up, and they're all already covered under Jordan Valley Assessment district, and so the use is already assigned to that block of land. Now, if it's new land that isn't inside of their assessment district, then that is something that would need

to be negotiated with Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District as part of the development, and that's what Rio Tinto is going through now and is getting added into their assessment district.

Commissioner Catmull said does Jordan Water Conservancy District gets a chance to look at site plans for new development?

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said they usually don't go to that level. The city usually just verifies that they're included in the assessment district, and then, at that point the city does the reviews. Jordan Valley isn't really involved at that point once they're included in the assessment district.

Commissioner Catmull said does Jordan Valley control basically all water inside South Jordan, for example, the contaminated plume, I think they involved with that clean-up. Are they exclusive, or are they only worried about the containment partner, and if someone wanted to use water that had phosphorus, sulfate or whatever was in there, but don't need to clean it, can they use water in that plume to cool something.

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said there's a whole process for a new well. If they're not just tying into the culinary system, that's different, that's a different application that would involve the state engineer to get a new well, whether they can use it or not. I don't completely know, it depend on what water rights they have, but that would be a different application.

Commissioner Catmull said so how do we know from a capacity planning perspective, how do we know that we have enough water? How do we monitor for the non-commercial that we have enough water capacity to support the non-commercial or non-residential that comes in, is that all through Jordan Conservancy District and their basin.

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said we depend upon Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District, I don't know exactly the percentage, but more than 90% of the water comes from Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District. There are a few like pocket secondary water systems in the City, but the majority of all the water that's in the city is all Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District, and so that capacity and that demand is all included in our water master plan, that gets updated about every five years to make sure that we have capacity, and the demand is going down with our conservation efforts and those kind of things.

Commissioner Catmull said what would trigger these new water requirements? So, for residential uses, we have people that when they developed on the feet per acre. Is there any type of development on redevelopment that would trigger them having to reassess their water rights on this new formula.

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said if they submit a new application to the city, for like a residential development like a SRD single residential development, or a subdivision, or something like that, that would trigger this water share.

Commissioner Catmull said would that include like a lot line adjustment subdivision or a new subdivision?

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said as I recall, it's only new subdivisions and SRDs. I'm not aware of any lot line adjustment that's required for water shares.

Commissioner Harding said you've referred to it a couple of times, but this has nothing to do with secondary water with a new development, is that correct?

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said it's all water that we're talking about. So, this is the water shares that come from a canal company. Those water shares may be applied to a secondary water system inside the development, so, it may go directly towards that development, or it may go towards other water uses in the future, possibly even reuse in the future for the city.

Commissioner Harding said in my area, we have city water and secondary, would that require two shares for those lots, or how does that work when there is secondary?

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said it would be the same calculation in your area as it would everywhere else in the city, which would be based on ERCs, the number of ERCs that the new development is proposing, depending upon the number of ERCs. That's how many water shares they would contribute, which is currently, based upon that memo, it's half an acre foot per water connection, is the way you'd calculate it. So, however many number of meters there are, you'd multiply that by 0.5 and that would give you the number of the acre feet that they would need to contribute to the system,

Commissioner Harding said I'm just trying to picture this, because the case before there was an out building, and so is that going to be under the original water meter, or because it's a second building and as a possibility of being an ADU, would that be a second meter, would that then require that homeowner to go buy a water share in order to build on their property.

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said I'm not aware of us collecting water shares for accessory dwelling units. It's only been the SRD's and any new development subdivisions. I'd have to double check the code, but I'm not aware of any requirements for an ADU.

Planner Schindler said in a ADU they're not allowed to have a separate meter, so they have to run on the same meter as the houses.

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said code change just applies to the water shares. The certificate that we get from the Water Canal Company that gives the water rights to the city, but as far as like the system improvements, who pays for the meter, the pumps, those kind of things, that that's pretty specific per development, and so, I'm not certain in that specific case.

Commissioner Harding said where before it was just based on acreage, not by how many meters.

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said right. This will change the calculation. Before, it was based on the number of acres, and now it will just be based on the number of meters.

Commissioner Harding said is daybreak also under the same mandate, so if they have seven units up, are they getting charged water for all the units

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said I would need to double check the development agreement per the code. Yes, they would be required to, but there may be something in the development. I want to say there's something in the development agreement they've done something different, but I would have to double check that. But yes, per the code, the way the code's written, they would be required, and I'm guessing there's something in the development agreement that addresses that.

Commissioner Catmull said I think those development agreements are basically locked, and we put copies of the code as it was when it was signed, and it references as it was signed, or overridden.

Chair Gedge said and with any new state law they're basically grandfathered. Mr. Simonson can correct me on that, but the development agreement is locked into the day when it's executed, unless there's an amendment at that point.

Commissioner Catmull said so it's like we have residential and non-residential and now we have nothing, no underwater rights or water property rights in non-residential. Do we have enough? Are they superseded by state law, and that's what gets applied, or do we have anywhere else in the code that says, these are the requirements, and how you meet them going forward. Is this going to leave a hole, or is it clear to people who are looking at our code and develop potential developers, and so forth, that there are still requirements, and here's how they're met.

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said with this revision, there's no water share requirements for any non-residential development.

Commissioner Catmull said haven't seen Daybreak 2.0 or whatever it's called, but if that doesn't end up being houses and it became a data center with natural gas generators and all that, how would that water be procured in the eyes of the city?

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said It may need to be procured through Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District, because we're a distributor, we don't have a water source that they could tap into, so if it's not included in the Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District Assessment District. It would need to be negotiated with Jordan Valley to get that water. So, with these water shares, what they do is they give the city a chunk of water that they own, and it gives us negotiation power. It gives us flexibility in the future to use water reuse, other things that can be our actual own source of water, whereas right now we're 100% dependent upon Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District. That's that's kind of the way these water shares can be used.

Commissioner Catmull said and when it's cleaned up, when the contaminated plumes are cleaned up, will the city kind of become more like Riverton and others, where we just have our own wells, and we're not restricted from using the plume water, and we can just use the subsurface or whatever it is water, not the groundwater, but the non-ground water.

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said we would have to go through the state, and we'd have to make sure that we have water rights to do that right now, because Jordan Valley has those water rights. I know we have some water rights to the groundwater underneath, but I don't know for sure if we can do that, because we don't have any wells at this point. There would be a whole process to be able to accomplish that.

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

Chair Gedge said I think we're tied by the new State law to update our city code for new developments, so from what I understand, anything existing is good to go. It's just anything new as described by Jeremy, so I'm fine forwarding a recommendation.

Commissioner Harding said I think it would behoove us to not just go with the code, but also review things, but that's not our place. I would recommend it to city council to get us in the alignment.

Commissioner Hollist said I would ditto that. I mean, there have been previous years where the city of Lehi has said no more building allowed, we're out of water, and then we still have to water on the cycle. I know we're all facing that this year, but I think good stewardship makes use of opportunities like this, where we want to review and make sure that we're allocating water appropriately as we bring in new uses into our City.

Chair Gedge said with both commercial and residential, I think we need to really address the non-residential.

Commissioner Harding said and to the point that if every time we do it, we get something we own, and we're not relying on Jordan Valley, right? In my mind, it just makes sense.

Commissioner Farnsworth said I was just going to say, I really appreciated discussion on water and the good questions asked by my fellow planning commissioners. I know it's a topic on everyone's mind.

Commissioner Catmull said I would love to see it on non-residential site plans, just to make sure that's kind of a required element in our packet to say where's this water coming from. Because, that's one of our functions as a QA thing. I was thinking about proposing on potential motion, basically voting that we recommend approval and put a condition that we get an education session that we might be able to use for training on this type of matter. How does water impact future planning and development, as we think about it in the general plan. We need to be well versed in the general plan, because we're going to update the general plan and all that, and then just make that a condition.

Chair Gedge said I don't know if we need a condition, but just a recommendation of staff, since they are the ones to develop our training, we tell them what we want to be trained on.

Assistant City Attorney Greg Simonsen said with respect to the possibility of adding on to the reports about where the water for particular development coming from. I personally don't think that's necessary, because there's only one place for residential development that it can come from. It can only come from the Jordan Valley Water District, and so the exaction in virtually every case is to have them bring in an equivalent amount of water to what the burden is being created on the city, but it's creating a reserve of water that is actually owned by the city, but is not being used to supply that particular development.

Commissioner Catmull said were you talking residential or non-residential?

Assistant City Attorney Greg Simonsen said well, non-residential, if this gets enacted, and by practice. What we've done the last 20 years has not been an issue, because there's been no exactions required on non-residential, and the non-residential, it's going to be the same thing, they're going to be hooking up for to Jordan Valley Water District water, and it's the only place you can come from now. If there's something, as Jeremy Nelson referred to, dramatically different from that. Where there's going to need to be wells and so forth, then there's going to be a whole separate process for that, and the planning commission and the city council and the media and everybody else is going to be made aware, well aware of that kind of situation.

Commissioner Catmull said I guess I'm concerned about making sure that we have eyes on there, because I guess a lot of times we will say, that all city code norms are being met, but it's clear that bond, or this particular ordinance, we weren't exacting shares. It was on the books for 20 years, and we weren't doing that. How do we have confidence that we're doing what we're saying we're doing in that area.

Assistant City Attorney Greg Simonsen said it's been a few days since I've read what the ordinance currently says with respect to non residential. My recollection is the language makes it optional for the city to collect or not collect, and so the practice has been for the last 20 years to not collect, and what is being proposed in the ordinance tonight is to take out the reference that they can collect, just because it's basically a misnomer, because we're not doing it.

Commissioner Harding moved that the Planning Commission recommend approval to the City Council of Ordinance 2026-15 text amendment to Section 16.0 4.320 water shares required. Chair Gedge seconded the motion.

Commissioner Catmull motioned to amend the motion. I would like to further move that we schedule a planning commission item within the next 90 days, with the purpose of this study session is to generally understand how water availability and current city and state water rights requirements will constrain, will constrain and shape future city development. encompass both. As part of this broader discussion, we request that staff specifically highlight how our planning and zoning codes would handle the water demands of emerging highly water-intensive uses, such as data centers and advanced energy facilities.

Commissioner Hollist said would you be open to making that 120 days, so that we're pushing in September.

Commissioner Catmull said I am open to any number of days. I just want to put it on the books.

Chair Gedge said you used the word study session, that kind of brings up it's a second, a separate meeting that it would not be is currently calendared, and our calendar has to be approved by the city council.

Commissioner Catmull said if I said study session, I misspoke because I was trying to say just an item.

Chair Gedge said so, first, Commissioner Harding, do you accept the amendment to your original motion?

Commissioner Harding said I accept the amendment with the one slight change of to 120 days, as opposed to 90 days. Chair Gedge seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor.

J. OTHER BUSINESS

Planner Greg Schindler said I don't have any items for the next meeting, so it may possibly be cancelled.

Chair Gedge said if you guys do see suspicious email in your city email account, you can report that as spam they are collecting points for people who are reporting their phishing attacks, so just an FYI.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Gedge motioned to adjourn.

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 7:25 p.m.