

**CITY OF SOUTH JORDAN
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
July 22, 2025**

Present: Chair Nathan Gedge, Commissioner Michele Hollist, Commissioner Lori Harding, Commissioner Sam Bishop, Assistant City Attorney Greg Simonson, City Planner Greg Schindler, Planner Damir Drozdek, Assistant City Engineer Shane Greenwood, Director Brian Preece, Deputy Recorder Cindy Valdez, IT Director Matt Davis, GIS Coordinator Matt Jarman.

Absent: Commissioner Steven Catmull

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

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

Chair Gedge welcomed everyone to the Planning Commission Meeting and noted that (4) of the Planning Commissioner's are present. Commissioner Catmull is excused from tonight's meeting.

B. MOTION TO APPROVE AGENDA

If you are here for the Bess Dental office rezone, that item has been removed from this evening's agenda and will be heard at our next meeting on Tuesday, August 12, 2025 Any emails that city has received today will be part of that public record.

Chair Hollist said do we know why that was pulled?

Planner Schindler said it was pulled because there was an improper notice. The sign that went on the property from public works did not get put up in time to meet the noticing requirement. Planner Aguilera thought that Public Works would put it up on the Friday before, but the streets division is closed on Friday, so nobody was there to do it. It got put up late, and so we decided to not bring it forward.

Commissioner Hollist motioned to approve the July 22, 2025 Amended Planning Commission Agenda. Chair Gedge seconded the motion. Vote was 4-0 unanimous in favor; Commissioner Catmull was absent from the vote.

C. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

C.1. Approval of the June 24, 2025 - Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.

**Commissioner Hollist motioned to approve the June 24, 2025 Planning Minutes.
Commissioner Gedge seconded the motion. Vote was 4-0 unanimous in favor;
Commissioner Catmull was absent from the vote.**

D. STAFF BUSINESS

Planner Schindler said I found out today that Councilman McGuire has chosen someone to fill the replacement for Laurel Bevans as the new Commissioner for his district. The person he's chosen will be presented to the City Council at the August 5th or the August 19th meeting. I also wanted to let you know that there is an opportunity for you to get training hours. If you'd like to attend the Utah Chapter of the APA fall conference we can register, and pay for the registration fee and so forth for you to attend. The conference is October 9 and 10th, and it will be at the Depot down at Gateway. If you're interested in going, I'd like to know hopefully sometime next week, as quickly as possible, so we can get you registered. We can discuss with our director and the attorney how many hours of training you would get by going to that meeting.

E. COMMENTS FROM PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS

Commissioner Harding said we did have a brief conversation about the email we received. I would like to recommend that we come up with a way where it can be documented, so we know what to do when an email comes in and what to do with it, an understanding so we're all consistent. Do we forward it? Do we not forward it? Who responds to it? Things of that nature? It's just my first time getting a direct email from staff.

Planner Schindler said we can probably come up with something in writing by maybe next meeting.

F. SUMMARY ACTION

G. ACTION

H. ADMINISTRATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS

H.1. DAYBREAK COMMERCE PARK PLAT 4 AMENDED

Address: 7040 W Crimson View Drive (10360 South)

File No: PLPLA202300214

Applicant: Dominion Engineering- Logan Terry

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

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

Chair Hollist said I am trying to understand the intent of the circle. Is that going to be the only access to these properties in the middle, and access across one of those parkings?

Planner Schindler said there's Crimson View Drive along the south side, this is a road that's going to continue out.

Commissioner Hollist said what's the purpose of the cul de sac?

Planner Schindler said the cul de sac in the middle will give an extra access to those two lots there because they're larger. And then the biggest lot has access also off of Wire Grass, but the two smaller lots toward the end, we're only going to have access only off of Crimson View Drive.

Commissioner Bishop said I'm just curious. We're amending the plat, right? The subdivision, etc. is also like a road dedication.

Planner Schindler said well this will be dedicating the extension of crimson View Drive, and also that cul de sac is all included in the in the approval, when the subdivision is recorded that dedication will happen.

Commissioner Harding motioned to approve File No. PLPLA202300214 Daybreak Commerce Park Plat 4 Amended. Chair Gedge seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 4 to 0 unanimous in favor; Commissioner Catmull was absent from the vote.

H.2. ATWELL SUITES SITE PLAN

Address: 10526 S. Jordan Gateway

File No: PLSPR202400220

Applicant: Zach Gundry, The Richardson Design Partnership, LLC

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

Chair Gedge said is there any parking requirements for the hotel staff?

Planner Drozdek said not for staff, it's, one per room. I guess the assumption is it's not going to be 100% occupied.

Commissioner Hollist said incorporating the suggestion that the ARC Committee had recommended, but recommendations aren't necessarily ending it is a suggestion or a recommendation?

Planner Drozdek said since it's not required by city code to have an amount of rock, stone or brick, they do not have to do it. So it is something that the ARC Committee recommended. But again, since it's not required by city code they're not obligated to do it. It's a recommending body, basically.

Commissioner Harding said is it an extended stay at all, or is it a standard hotel?

Planner Drozdek said I believe it's a standard hotel, but maybe the applicant can speak to that.

Commissioner Bishop said I am curious about the approach to the building, it seems like a really hard u-turn as you approach and then you come back up to the front. Am I understanding that correctly?

Planner Drozdek said yeah, but it's because of the grade. They're trying to make that grade, and that's the reason for that turn to the south, because it's going up the hill.

Commissioner Bishop said I wondered with a building like this, do you need a bay for big truck deliveries?

Planner Drozdek said I imagine they may need to come in from time to time, but it's something that they've taken into consideration, I'm sure.

Chair Gedge said just one other thing for Assistant City Engineer Greenwood. So this is right off Jordan gateway on the west side of the street, are there any concerns with vehicular traffic crossing the Jordan to get you going north accessing this? Sometimes it backs up as people exit the front runner station, or a the gateway to turn off to where 10400 S stops at the Parkway.

Assistant City Engineer Shane Greenwood said we looked at it but we don't have any concerns with it.

Taggard Harris (Architecture) said Damir did a great job reviewing the staff report. I won't add too much, but yeah, it's not a full service kitchen, so loading and unloading is very minimal in and out loading. There's some strategic loading doors around that we can use as parking lots. The main entry is favorable for that as well and that is on site. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have for me.

Chair Gedge said just on the parking, is there 84 rooms?

Mr. Harris said so we have some additional rooms, and again, it's not fully occupied.

Chair Gedge said is this the first location in Utah?

Mr. Harris said yes, the Atwell brand is very new, which is part of the reason why we didn't have a lot of flexibility on the design. IHG holds their design of this initial product. So when we pushed to get stone and some other products on the exterior, we were shut down hard. So because it fit within the alignment, we were hoping to make that adjustment, but the brand wasn't allowing it.

Chair Gedge said the idea here is that we're capturing a lot of people coming from the airport that are moving south. So based on their pro forma, this area, this location, there's a couple other hotels, and I think just the site itself has been pre graded. There is two access points there, which is another reason why we're not proposing a new access point. There's two shared accesses there. But the hope is to capture a lot of people. Coming from the airport.

Chair Gedge said we have recently approved a new pickleball development that is within almost walking distance. Will you guys have any type of shuttle, hotel shuttle, to the airport and or to that location for people who are at pickleball tournaments.

Mr. Harris said you know the owner Ben, what are you thought on shuttles?

Ben Smith (Zadok Construction) said I don't believe there's any plan for an airport shuttle, the distance is significant enough that it doesn't make sense to have a shuttle and then to address further shuttling to other local events could be a possibility. I don't know that our clients are aware of the plans for the pickleball court. I think they'll be glad to hear that, and I'm sure they would love to incorporate that into the business model. So, I know they're online watching right now, so I'm sure they have heard this conversation. We just appreciate the consideration and all the help that we've had from the planning and engineering departments. If you have any other questions, I am here to answer them.

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

Chair Gedge motioned to approve File No. PLSPR202400220 Atwell Suites Site Plan. Commissioner Harding seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 4-0 unanimous in favor; Commissioner Catmull was absent from the vote.

I. LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS

I.1. HOWLAND ZONE CHANGE

Address: 9450 S. Redwood Rd.

File No: PLZBA202500118

Applicant: Tina Franco, Howland Partnership

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

Commissioner Hollist said will this be a single parcel?

Planner Drozdek said yes, this be a single parcel.

Commissioner Hollist said will the entire three acres conform to the requirements of a one as far as coverage, building usage and etc.

Planner Drozdek said we can only cover a certain percentage and that's with buildings, not pavement.

Commissioner Hollist said I'm curious about what the residential accessories will become, essentially, and then there's additional building, so just what the use will be for all of these various things. I assume this is not also coming with a guest house or 80 request, right?

Planner Drozdek said not for now, but it's not to say that it's not going to be back in front of you in the future. But right now there's no request for a guest house or an accessory ADU. for the current existing business.

Commissioner Hollist said so for the current existing business that would have to come in front of us to convert it into an ADU, correct? Because I'm guessing the square footage makes it a requirement for the Commission to review it.

Planner Drozdek said I haven't looked at the square footages, but if it exceeds, it'll come back to you. If it doesn't exceed, then it's going to be approved by staff, and then you don't get to see it, but it just depends on the size.

Chair Gedge said so being three acres, they would be afforded animal rights again on this property.

Planner Drozdek said yes.

Chair Gedge said if they were to subdivide in the future, they could go to one acre lot size, because it's a one, so if you wanted to go anything smaller, It would have go through another rezone to accomplish that.

Planner Drozdek said yes, that is correct.

Commissioner Harding said so help me understand, with all the parking and everything that is there, are they required then to remove it?

Planner Drozdek said no, they're not, because in A-1 or A-5 zone, you can still have a single family residence. You don't need to be growing crops or having farm animals, you can have just a home on an A-1 zone property. They are not required to make changes to it. I mean, you could still have a parking area even in front of your home if you wanted to.

Commissioner Harding said what does that change as far as taxes for the two?

Planner Drozdek I think it's the count. Maybe they can answer that, but the county assesses them at a higher rate if it's commercial.

Gary Allen (Property Owner) said I'm the owner of the property. I've lived there for about 26 or 27 years. The office has been my office, I've walked to work for 20 years, and so we're now in Murray. We actually have already moved the office, and so our offices are in Murray. We moved in April, and so my daughter would like to see a horse put in the office, but I don't want the horse to go in the office. At this point, we're not sure what we're going to do,

Commissioner Harding said so what is the purpose of changing, if you don't really have to do anything, what's the benefit of changing right now?

Mr. Allen said because only a portion of my property is residential per the county records, and part of it is commercial. I'm only able to deduct, if you will, the property taxes relative to and get the exemption on the residential portion of the property. By putting all the property in as residential, I'm able to claim the entire property as a residential property on primary residence.

Commissioner Hollist said what are you planning to do with your business building?

Mr. Allen said most likely between my wife and I have we 9 children and 18 grandchildren, so I imagine that with the bathrooms and the offices that convert pretty easily into bedrooms for the kids will want to move in with the price of housing. So right now, we haven't really decided.

Chair Gedge said you are aware of the process if you chose to do that, right?

Mr. Allen said yeah, we would go through an accessory dwelling permit. That's the other thing that we wanted to make sure, is if we did the rezone, then it wouldn't be available. The accessory dwelling wouldn't be available under the commercial zone, it's 5,000 square feet. My current residence 10,000 sq ft, the office is 5,000 sq.ft and the vacant office is 5,000 sq ft.

Commissioner Bishop said yeah, I was just gonna say, I didn't expect the whole time I'd be on the planning commission for someone to see property go from commercial to A-1.

Mr. Allen said especially for my commercial developer, right?

Commissioner Hollist said what is this building at the edge of the parking lot where it jogs over to where the pool is, not by the pool, but on the eastern edge of that.

Mr. Allen said it was my wife's salon. When we got married about 23 years ago she cut hair, and so she had a business license and was cutting hair at the time. She no longer cuts hair, but now it's just for the grandkids and her friends. So it's not a business. Likely it'll be a pool house. We have a swimming pool, lap pool, hot tub and a pavilion, so it'll be probably become part of that with a pool house change room. We have a single bathroom with the pool house and it has all the equipment in it. It doesn't have a change room.

Chair Gedge opened the Public Hearing to comments.

Giovani Perez said I couldn't hear you back there. I waved to you that I couldn't hear you and you ignored me, but that's okay.

Chair Gedge said I need you to speak in the microphone, sir.

Mr. Perez said how come you didn't speak in the microphone when I asked you? I will put the microphone back, but I still have the right to voice my opinion. Or are you going to kick me out for voicing my opinion? I waved to you and you ignored me. That's the issues that I have with you people. What are the future consequences or bearing on adjacent properties with this change.

Chair Gedge said we will not directly answer any questions. We will write them down until public comment is over, and then we will discuss them.

Mr. Perez said okay, that's my main concern. What is the future consequence to adjacent properties in the future? Because, I wouldn't like to find out, after your approval, I would like to know before any decision is made. I wasn't going to voice my opinion, but it seems like you forced me to. It seems like the system is always designed to favor the well to do in South Jordan City. We always seem to comply make changes to those who we want to favor, for example, I heard a few questions here, what's going to happen to that building? Oh, well, we don't know, we will see if it's moved. There's no need, because then it would be out of compliance with city ordinances on the roof if it's going to be used for residents dwelling and why are we going to agricultural? Like he said, I have never seen anybody go from residential to commercial and then back to agriculture. And obviously the reasons, I'm not stating them, I'm repeating them is for tax purposes. Why am I being forced to pay residential to accommodate somebody, we're going to allow them to turn it into agriculture for a tax deduction. I don't see the equality there. I don't, and that's one of the issues that I have. We always favor those whom we want to favor, and we even ignore those who we don't. I don't think it's right. I don't think it's fair. The good thing about it is we only have 100 years or less, and I hope for a better world where things are much different. I would like an answer to my question.

Chair Gedge said okay, thank you for coming this evening.

Chair Gedge closed the Public Hearing.

Chair Gedge asked Mr. Allen to come back to the microphone to address Mr. Perez questions.

Mr. Allen said I don't have any rebuttal. I know Mr. Perez and his wife, and they're very nice, friendly people. I think a lot of the problem that has occurred is just a lack of understanding of when he said, "what's going to happen to his property." when I zoned this property commercial many, many years ago, at the same time his property and the adjoining property, and Demir could probably answer this question, if it still is that way. I think it's from redwood road back to the rear of the office. It is commercial, and it was zoned commercial for that many feet. So the Perez's home is not zoned commercial, but it is probably taxed as a residential and as far as the taxes are concerned, where Mr. Perez says the tax is an agricultural or less. That is incorrect, because it is taxed based upon the market value of the home as a residential home, and so it's still taxed as residential. It's just that when we were meeting with staff in the city, they felt that it was most appropriate to take it and put it back to the original zone of agricultural, because we had the three acres, but it wasn't for us for any particular financial reason at all. Mr. Perez would be where my driveway is. There's a home right next to it. That's a rental home, and Mr. Perez would be the next home that would be north of that. But again, I apologize to Mr. Perez, if in any way, we've offended him, or hurt him in any way. But I believe, the question that he was seeking is wanting to make sure that his property wasn't going to be down zoned from the commercial zone that it currently to residential, but I can't speak for Mr. Perez.

Chair Gedge said this is a legislative public hearing item which we make a recommendation to the council. We had a couple questions raised during the general public comment. The applicant addressed some but obviously any kind of a rezone of any property in the city, there could be future implications of surrounding properties. It looks like we have single family residence on redwood road, which is government owned. So I'm seeing a 5-A, A-1 and R-2.5, RN-6, again, this isn't a spot zone. I guess there could potentially be a impact to a neighbor.

Commissioner Hollist said actually I can think of an impact that we do need to address. So with bringing animal rights onto this property which apparently weren't available previously, this is new.

Chair Gedge said not as long as it's a half acre and if it's an agricultural zone,.

Chair Hollist said so I'm not sure why animal rights came out with very high rights on the residential portion.

Chair Gedge said if you can just confirm the current zone, the PO Zone does not have animal rights, and so then what is fencing? If the properties that are residential, next to the agricultural properties neighboring, do those require the standard fencing requirements to divide?

Chair Hollist said the map that shows it surrounding with the same zoning, so if they put animals on the PO zone, I would argue the RM-6 zone to the South would require barrier fencing.

Planner Drozdek said I believe there is a six foot or an eight foot masonry along the south, but I'm not sure about the west or the north boundary.

Commissioner Hollist said should an animal be brought on this property? Would they require that, now that the zone is different?

Planner Schindler said the answer to that would be, the applicant that has the animal, because it's usually the properties that have put up the fence to protect their property. If they want to put up a wall, they can, but in any case, it's never required to put up a wall or fence for animals. That might be if you're the developer and you're causing the issue with being the developer of it.

Planner Drozdek said so usually it's done with development. We'll have somebody come in ask for a zone change, and usually they want higher density, as opposed to what's next to them, which they have farm animals. So, usually it's done with development, but in this case, this is reversed. They're down zone, and there's no development. So in that case, I'm not sure that we can force them to put in a fence, since there's no development happening.

Chair Hollist said for the record, even though the citizen who commented has left, I would like to go over what are the allowed uses with this building that now will no longer contain a business.

Planner Drozdek said storage would be one of them, if they have farm animals. I guess they could turn it into a barn. They could do storage or different things like a garage. It could be a guest house, a detached accessory dwelling unit.

Commissioner Hollist said but does that 5,000 requires an application?

Planner Drozdek said yes, that is correct. But again, it depends if they keep it under 1,500 and the rest is storage. In that case, you know we're speaking hypothetically and they wouldn't have to come back to you.

Commissioner Hollist said for clarification, it could be a single accessory dwelling. So, they can rent up to 1,500 square feet of that building.

Planner Drozdek said they can have just one ADU per property.

Commissioner Hollist said I wanted to make sure that was on the record. We had one more concern. So again, moving agricultural did not run a business out of either of these?

Planner Drozdek said that's what we're being told. There would be no business if it's owned agricultural.

Planner Schindler said home occupations have to be operated out of the home, not anywhere else.

Commissioner Harding said what is the 1500?

Chair Gedge said so for an accessory dwelling in a guest house, it has to be the smaller of 35% or 1500 square feet. And so the largest, it could potentially be is a 10,000 square foot home, as the primary would have to be 1,500 square feet, whatever the larger of that 5,000 square feet.

Commissioner Harding said on that map with the green, blue and yellows on it, does it have three different rings? Up in the right hand corner it says a five, but nothing is listed next to the PO. Is that also an A-5 or is that A-1? because I believe Mr. Alvarez is probably the next one.

Planner Drozdek said his property is the second home to the north, or the second property to the north of this property on redwood road, t's a redwood road mixed use zone.

Planner Schindler said the properties to the North are zoned 2.5.

Chair Hollist said sometimes you give us a financial impact of the city in these staff reports. Have you done any of that kind of analysis on this one? actually, in that negative revenue.

Planner Drozdek said usually we do it with development, and there's no development here, so we didn't do one.

Planner Schindler said I think she means we used to do it with the rezone applications. We would know what the financial impact is, but we don't do that at anymore. Well, we do it with the development, not with a straight rezone.

Commissioner Hollist said I know that we very much want additional places for people to live within our city, because someone actually accomplished that, and it does it at the loss of commercial. So I'm just gonna throw that out there for thought, commercials obviously important to our city. And Julie Holbrook always opposed anything that removed the commercial potential.

Commissioner Bishop said I agree that this, by itself doesn't help with the housing, but I understand the plan. As a grandparent myself, and have kids, I don't know where they're going to live.

Chair Gedge said as a guy who grew up on a farm here in South Jordan, and if someone actually wanted to come in and make an animal horse property. That pulls my heartstrings a little bit as well. South Jordan was known for years as the agricultural community gone the opposite direction, and of course, my family's guilty of that more than probably anyone so I see both sides. This is also on redwood, which on the northern part of that city, which is almost like a gateway to the city as well. So, I suspect the applicant would make it high quality horse property as well, which might entice visitors and potential future residents. I think we have a lot more people here to zone a higher density in this area based on previous experience.

Chair Hollist said so I just want to say for the record one last time that commercial use will not be allowed in these outbuildings, and additional occupancy as a residence isn't allowed without an accessory dwelling unit permit. So I would like that on the record, it should be provenance, or should it be ultimately based on the recruit.

Commissioner Hollist motioned to send a positive recommendation to City Council for File No. PLZBA202500118 Howland Zone Change Ordinance 2025-05. Chair Gedge seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 4-0 unanimous in favor; Commissioner Catmull was absent from the vote.

J. OTHER BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Hollist motioned to adjourn. Chair Gedge seconded the motion.

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 7:37 p.m.

This is a true and correct copy of the July 22, 2025 Planning Commission minutes, which were approved on August 12, 2025

From: [Miguel Aguilera](#)
To: [PLANNING COMMISSION](#)
Subject: FW: PLZBA202400175 Opposition to Proposed Zoning Change at 9816 S Temple Dr, South Jordan
Date: Friday, July 18, 2025 8:14:38 AM

Good morning Commissioners,

Here is public comment on the Bess Dental Rezone on next week's agenda. I anticipate receiving more comments leading up to next Tuesday.

Thank you,
Miguel

From: Winslow Krout <wintone72@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 18, 2025 6:50 AM
To: Miguel Aguilera <MAguilera@sjc.utah.gov>
Subject: PLZBA202400175 Opposition to Proposed Zoning Change at 9816 S Temple Dr, South Jordan

Dear Members of the Planning Commission:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed rezoning of 9816 S Temple Drive to permit business use. This change conflicts with the city's planning goals, creates unnecessary impacts, and risks long-term harm to our neighborhood.

Inconsistent with the General Plan

South Jordan's General Plan clearly states:

"Protect stable residential neighborhoods from encroachment of incompatible uses to preserve property values and community character."

Approving this rezoning directly undermines that policy and opens the door to further incremental changes inconsistent with our city's vision.

No Need for Additional Commercial Space

Within a 3-mile radius, there are over 1.2 million square feet of existing commercial space along major corridors like 9800 South and Redwood Road. Vacancy rates currently exceed 10%, demonstrating there is no shortage of suitable business locations without rezoning stable residential areas.

Disruption of Neighborhood Character

This is a quiet, single-family neighborhood where 88% of housing is detached homes. Introducing a commercial parcel would create an isolated land use incompatible with the surrounding community. In a recent survey, 79% of residents rated preserving neighborhood character as a high priority.

Traffic and Safety Concerns

Temple Drive and Shields Lane are residential streets designed for fewer than 1,500 vehicles per day. Even a small business can generate 50–150 daily vehicle trips, increasing congestion and raising safety risks—especially for children and pedestrians. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration reports that driveway-related crashes are twice as likely when commercial and residential traffic mix.

Precedent for Further Encroachment

This rezoning would set a precedent for additional applications nearby. In Draper, a single zoning change led to three more rezone requests within two years, demonstrating how quickly residential areas can erode once exceptions are allowed.

Impact on Property Values

Studies from the National Association of Realtors and Journal of Urban Economics show that homes next to commercial parcels can suffer 5–20% reductions in value. This is an unacceptable burden for families who purchased their homes with the expectation of a protected residential environment.

Conclusion

This proposed zoning change is unnecessary, inconsistent with city policy, and harmful to the neighborhood's character, safety, and property values. I urge you to deny this application and protect the integrity of our community.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Winslow Krout

South Jordan Resident

9856 South Temple Dr. South Jordan, Utah

(neighbor to the south across Shields)

From: [Miguel Aguilera](#)
To: [PLANNING COMMISSION](#)
Subject: FW: Shield Lane Rezoning
Date: Friday, July 18, 2025 8:14:49 AM

From: Linda Robertson <compoundeffectx8@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 18, 2025 7:07 AM
To: Miguel Aguilera <MAguilera@sjc.utah.gov>
Subject: Shield Lane Rezoning

Glen & Linda Robertson
1361 W Palmer Park Lane, South Jordan, UT 84095

We're opposed to the rezoning on Shield Lane and 1300 W for the dental office.

Nothing has changed for us in our vote against this rezoning. As stated previously in person, we verified with the city's master plan that prior to our purchasing this home, the area around us was all zoned for residential.

PERIOD.

We have already dealt with Bluffdale reneging on their master plan at our family's expense.

If you proceed to ignore the residents and cram the rezoning upon them, the minimum you could do is REQUIRE a "Just Compensation Fund " by BOTH the city and developer to be compensated towards any residents living in direct impact of this rezoning.

MINIMUM.

Having to move away because of higher traffic congestion and safety is expensive and places an unexpected, unfair expense upon those who are established residents.

Especially veterans and retired residents on fixed income.

Bottom line; Greed ...no integrity.

We are disheartened by the lack of integrity in the system and leadership to continually wear down the residents of the area who oppose the rezoning because they lack the ability to vote NO.

Corporations and oligarchs rule.

Freedom exists no more. What's been established as a City Master Plan is not respected.