

**CITY OF SOUTH JORDAN  
ELECTRONIC  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
June 25, 2024**

Present: Chair Michele Hollist, Commissioner Laurel Bevens, Commissioner Steven Catmull, Commissioner Nathan Gedge, Commissioner Sam Bishop, , Assistant City Attorney Greg Simonsen, City Planner Greg Schindler, Deputy City Recorder Cindy Valdez, Supervising Senior Engineer Shane Greenwood, Planner Andrew McDonald, Planner Miguel Aguilera, IT Director Jon Day, GIS Coordinator Matt Jarman, Meeting Transcriptionist Diana Baun

Others: Sonnetmouritsen, Mary Ellen Hardman, Karisa S., Corinne Gustafson, Bennion Gardner, Brett Catmull, Rick & Becky Rodrigues, Rulon Dutson, Gerald Bryan, Chris Sepp,

Absent: Commissioner Ray Wimmer

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

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

Chair Michele Hollist welcomed everyone to the Electronic Planning Commission Meeting, excusing Commissioner Wimmer who was not present.

**B. MOTION TO APPROVE AGENDA**

**Commissioner Catmull motioned to approve tonight’s agenda as published. Chair Hollist seconded the motion; vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor. Commissioner Wimmer was absent from the vote.**

**C. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

**C.1. May 28, 2024 - Planning Commission Meeting Minutes**

**Commissioner Gedge motioned to approve the May 28, 2024 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes as published. Chair Hollist seconded the motion; vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor. Commissioner Wimmer was absent from the vote.**

**D. STAFF BUSINESS - *None***

**E. COMMENTS FROM PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS**

Planning Commissioners discussed potential training items.

**F. SUMMARY ACTION** – *None*

**G. ACTION** - *None*

**H. ADMINISTRATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**H.1. DAYBREAK NORTH STATION MULTI-FAMILY #1 SUBDIVISION 3<sup>RD</sup> AMENDMENT**

Address: Lots 138 through 140

File No.: PLPLA202400083

Applicant: LHM Real Estate

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

Chair Michele Hollist invited the applicant forward to speak.

**John Warnick (Applicant)** – This is the same builder, just with a different product they want to build.

Chair Hollist opened the Public Hearing for comments; there were no comments and the hearing was closed.

**Commissioner Bishop motioned to approve File No. PLPLA202400083, Subdivision 3<sup>rd</sup> Amendment. Chair Hollist seconded the motion.**

**Roll Call Vote**

**Yes – Commissioner Bishop**

**Yes – Chair Hollist**

**Yes – Commissioner Gedge**

**Yes – Commissioner Catmull**

**Yes – Commissioner Bevans**

**Motion passes 5-0, unanimous in favor. Commissioner Wimmer was absent from the vote.**

**H.2. DAYBREAK VILLAGE 4A PLAT 9 AMENDMENT #2**

Address: 11289 S., 11307 S. and 11331 S. Lake Run Road

File No.: PLPP202400036

Applicant: Perigree Consulting on behalf of Condominiums at the Dawn LLC

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

Commissioner Laurel Bevans asked if this entire project of Garden Park is age restricted, including this section.

Planner Schindler responded that there are younger families living in areas of Garden Park so the entire project isn't being held to the age restriction.

Chair Michele Hollist invited the applicant forward to speak.

**Rulon Dutsen (Applicant)** – This project had a change in focus, with an opportunity. There was a community meeting held prior to bringing this proposal to the planning commission initially, and they listened to what was said in regards to fitting in the neighborhood, the height, and traffic. The market changed, and in discussions they decided townhomes would be more appropriate and provide a better blend from the single-family homes to the next product on the other side.

Chair Hollist opened the Public Hearing for comments; there were no comments and the hearing was closed.

**Commissioner Bishop motioned to approved File No. PLPP202400036, Amendment. Chair Hollist seconded the motion.**

#### **Roll Call Vote**

**Yes – Commissioner Bishop**

**Yes – Chair Hollist**

**Yes – Commissioner Gedge**

**Yes – Commissioner Catmull**

**Yes – Commissioner Bevans**

**Motion passes 5-0, unanimous in favor. Commissioner Wimmer was absent from the vote.**

#### **H.3. COUNTRY ROADS SUBDIVISION SECOND AMENDMENT PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION AMENDMENT**

Address: 10067 S. Single Jack Circle

File No.: PLPLA20240061

Applicant: Chris Sepp

Planner Miguel Aguilera reviewed background information from the Staff Report.

Commissioner Steve Catmull asked about Fire approval, noting that it didn't appear to be in the report. The notes contained in the report would not allow for approval, as there is not 125 feet of frontage.

Planner Aguilera noted that it is not required for this application, but there are notes in relation to the fire compatibility in the report. The concept plan for this was reviewed previously and given notes in regards to a turnaround, this is why they were able to meet those requirements without

formal approval as it was done through Engineering previously. This application applies to a separate section of the code, and it does meet those requirements.

City Planner Greg Schindler added that for this application, the site plan is the building permit, which is reviewed by Fire and the Fire Code Official is a part of the Building Department so he is the one who does those reviews. Fire was in attendance at the DRC meeting where this application was presented.

Commissioner Catmull asked if, in the future, the reports could contain those types of notes to show the commissioners that the fire requirements have been met and approved for flag lots.

Chair Michele Hollist invited the applicant forward to speak.

**Chris Sepp (Applicant)** – This will be a family property development; they are not developers, they are planning on living there. He shared that according to his calculations there are 10 properties, including this property, that could potentially be eligible for subdivision within a currently 122 lot subdivision. There was 121 lots, but there has already been a first amendment subdivision application, and with this approval it will be 123. There is code that precludes some of those 10 properties potentially eligible from ever subdividing, but should they all be subdivided, the density of all 132 lots combined would be 0.41 acres; therefore the maximum property would need to meet the threshold of 0.82 acres to be eligible. When going to DRC they spoke with the Fire Representative, and he followed up with emails to ensure the firetruck turnaround was sufficient for their needs and that has been covered.

Chair Hollist noted there were two public comments via email received prior to tonight's meetings (Attachments A and B). She then opened the Public Hearing for comments; there were no comments and the hearing was closed.

Planner Aguilera noted that the Staff Report was amended prior to the meeting, specifically the proposed motion. That amended Staff Report has been attached to this meetings minutes as Attachment C.

**Commissioner Gedge motioned to approve File No. PLPLA202400061, Second Amendment Preliminary Subdivision Amendment. Chair Hollist seconded the motion.**

#### **Roll Call Vote**

**Yes – Commissioner Gedge**

**Yes – Chair Hollist**

**Yes – Commissioner Bishop**

**Yes – Commissioner Catmull**

**Yes – Commissioner Bevans**

**Motion passes 5-0, unanimous in favor. Commissioner Wimmer was absent from the vote.**

**H.4. ACCESSORY BUILDING: CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR THE  
ARCHITECTURAL STANDARDS OF ACCESSORY BUILDINGS IN R-3  
ZONE**

Address: 4051 W Liberty Creek Drive

File No.: PLCUP202400087

Applicant: Brett Catmull

Planner Andrew McDonald reviewed background information from the Staff Report.

Commissioner Nathan Gedge asked why windows were not required on a building of this size for emergency reasons.

Planner McDonald noted that in terms of fire code that would be determined by the fire inspectors, but this building does have multiple access points.

City Planner Greg Schindler noted that windows aren't required by the fire code unless the building is being used as living quarters.

Commissioner Laurel Bevans asked about the setbacks marked and whether they are conforming.

Planner McDonald responded that due to the potential roof pitches, they will not know until the building stage if they need to require an increase on that setback or not.

Chair Hollist invited the applicant forward to speak.

**Brett & Rhonda Catmull (Applicants)** – Brett spoke, thanking Planner McDonald for getting him information when needed and their time. Rhonda noted that they included no windows because they felt that was a theft issue.

Chair Hollist opened the Public Hearing for comments; there were no comments and the hearing was closed.

Commissioner Steve Catmull noted that he would have liked to have seen what neighbors might think about this size of a building going in when it doesn't appear there are any nearby. He worries about this setting a precedence for decisions in the future.

Planner McDonald noted there were about 30 properties noticed with no comments or complaints.

Commissioners feel that, with the letter from the applicant explaining why they were requesting this size of a building, they are comfortable with approving this; especially since there have been no complaints from any of the surrounding residents.

Chair Hollist stated that in the future, if they are asked to exceed the 60% of the main footprint rule, she will again consider it but if it is an area zoned like this with a smaller lot, she would be a hard no. This lot is close, but she wanted to state her limit for the future on the record.

**Commissioner Gedge motioned to approve File No. PLCUP202400087, Conditional Use Permit; noting that the exception being made tonight only applies to the accessory building exceeding the 60% footage of the main building. All other city codes and ordinances must be satisfied. Chair Hollist seconded the motion.**

### **Roll Call Vote**

**Yes – Commissioner Gedge**

**Yes – Chair Hollist**

**Yes – Commissioner Bishop**

**Yes – Commissioner Catmull**

**Yes – Commissioner Bevans**

**Motion passes 5-0, unanimous in favor. Commissioner Wimmer was absent from the vote.**

### **H.5. ACCESSORY BUILDING: CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR THE ARCHITECTURAL STANDARDS OF ACCESSORY BUILDINGS IN R-1.8 ZONE**

Address: 2544 W. Van Ross Drive

File No.: PLCUP202400106

Applicant: Ricardo Rodrigues

Planner Andrew McDonald reviewed background information from the Staff Report.

Chair Michele Hollist asked how many properties near this are estimated to have accessory buildings exceeding the footprint of the house.

Planner McDonald responded there are quite a few. This is common on these larger lot size properties.

Commissioners and staff discussed when an ADU and garage would be counted as one unit, specifically a detached ADU. If there isn't access directly from the ADU to the garage, they would be counted as separate units. They also discussed the material being used, and what is normally required since this did not require Architectural Review Committee approval. Planner McDonald noted that this is a metal pre-fabricated type of shed, and the applicant will be using materials as noted in the report on the outside to blend the structure into the other buildings on the lot.

Chair Hollist invited the applicant forward to speak.

**Ricardo Rodrigues (Applicant)** – this has been a dream of theirs to have a garage in their backyard. He also noted that Planner McDonald has been outstanding to work with, and thanked

him for that. The purpose of the garage is for his parents in their late 70s to live in. The intent of the door in question is so they don't have to add another bathroom to the garage level, and those working in the garage can just use the bathroom upstairs. If there is a concern with that they can seal that off and remove that, adding a small bathroom to the garage instead.

Chair Hollist opened the Public Hearing for comments; there were no comments and the hearing was closed.

Commissioner Laurel Bevans thanked Planner McDonald for including his discussions with the applicant in the Staff Report so the commissioners could use those discussions to help make this decision.

**Commissioner Gedge motioned to approve File No. PLCUP202400106, Conditional Use Permit, based on the Staff Report and discussion this evening, requiring that all city codes and ordinance are satisfied. Chair Hollist seconded the motion.**

#### **Roll Call Vote**

**Yes – Commissioner Gedge**

**Yes – Chair Hollist**

**Yes – Commissioner Bishop**

**Yes – Commissioner Catmull**

**Yes – Commissioner Bevans**

**Motion passes 5-0, unanimous in favor. Commissioner Wimmer was absent from the vote.**

#### **H.6. CJ ESTATES PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAT**

Address: 10593 S. 3200 W.

File No.: PLPP202400063

Applicant: Craig Bonham

Planner Andrew McDonald reviewed background information from the Staff Report.

Commissioner Laurel Bevans stated she is an adjoining property owner, but has no financial stake in this application and intends to vote with the commission.

Chair Michele Hollist asked how they would resolve conflicts in fencing requirements on properties like this where the front yard isn't defined per se.

Planner McDonald noted that they would usually look at who has the rear yard, and consider that six foot fence to be their rear year fence. However, with regards to adjacent properties without animal rights, they can't have access to any area within 10 feet of the property line. The enclosures would then have to be kept farther back from that property line to be compliant. Any financial requirements in regards to fencing would be the responsibility of the developer of the project.

Commissioner Bevens asked if those placement requirements for large animals would impose on the property to the north any restriction on where there animals can be on the property, other than what already exists.

Planner McDonald responded it only applies to Lots 1 and 2, nothing changes with the existing property owners.

Chair Michele Hollist invited the applicant forward to speak, but the father of the applicant was the only one present. He was invited forward to speak during public comment. Chair Hollist opened the Public Hearing for comments.

**Craig Bonham (Father of Applicant)** – general contractor for 50 years. My son Craig and his son CJ are in Ecuador right now doing a humanitarian project, building a school down there. He has asked me to show up for him and watch this development. I see this as a pretty easy project, as it matches everything in the area. My son has been building homes in Bison Ridge, this won't be any different than what they have been building. As homeowners grow older the properties change because their kids sell them. My son is just going to build a couple of houses there that will match what he has been building in Bison Ridge. I had an opportunity to meet the next door neighbor, and I think I have made a new friend. I assured him we would not be a problem with him for horse rides, he was there first and he will not have any problems from us. He is concerned with the fence lines, but they have been there for a lot more than 16 years and as a developer myself I know that 16 years determined the property lines. I can't see a single negative with this project my son is planning to do.

Chair Hollist there was a public comment received prior to this meeting (Attachment D)

**Gerald Bryan (Resident)** – me family owns the property just north of that place. My only concern really was over the animal rights. I have flood irrigation, and I can deal with trying to keep from flooding their basement. The neighbor before had meadow there so flooding was not a problem flooding his lower area, but I will obviously need to correct that and I can do that. I don't have any objections as long as the animal rights remain.

**Commissioner Bevens motioned to approve File No. PLPP202400063, Preliminary Subdivision Plat, subject to all findings and conclusions in the Staff Report. Chair Hollist seconded the motion.**

#### **Roll Call Vote**

**Yes – Commissioner Bevens**

**Yes – Chair Hollist**

**Yes – Commissioner Bishop**

**Yes – Commissioner Gedge**

**Yes – Commissioner Catmull**

**Motion passes 5-0, unanimous in favor. Commissioner Wimmer was absent from the vote.**



## **I. LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS - *None***

### **I.1. Moderate Income Housing Plan Amendment**

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

Commissioner Steve Catmull pointed out some formatting and other grammatical errors, Planner Schindler will ensure those are corrected before this goes before the City Council. He also asked if any changes would refer to the newly annexed areas of the city, informally referred to as “Daybreak 2.0.”

Planner Schindler responded that no, the PD Overlay Zone is being applied to the other project on the corner of 11800 South and Bacchus highway. The referenced area above, Daybreak 2.0, will have a separate development agreement that likely won’t require the PD Overlay Zone and will be negotiated between the property owners and the council.

Commissioners and staff reviewed the current strategies being submitted by the city to the state listed in the report and how those strategies are being implemented in terms of parking and transit. Specifically discussing the current issues with parking and transit in Daybreak, specifically the lack of parking there and overparking in the common areas of the city, that they have learned from for the future.

Chair Michele Hollist opened the Public Hearing for comments; there were none and the hearing was closed.

**Commissioner Gedge recommended, based on the Staff Report and discussin this evening, forwarding a positive recommendation of the Moderate Income Housing Plan Amendment with the minor changes noted at the beginning of the discussion. Chair Hollist seconded the motion.**

### **Roll Call Vote**

**Yes – Commissioner Gedge**

**Yes – Chair Hollist**

**Yes – Commissioner Bishop**

**Yes – Commissioner Catmull**

**Yes – Commissioner Bevans**

**Motion passes 5-0, unanimous in favor. Commissioner Wimmer was absent from the vote.**

## **J. OTHER BUSINESS**

City Planner Greg Schindler reviewed potential items for the next meeting’s agenda.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**Chair Hollist motioned to adjourn the June 25, 2024 Planning Commission Meeting. Commissioner Gedge seconded the motion. Vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor; Commissioner Wimmer was absent from the vote.**

**The June 25, 2024 Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 8:51 p.m.**

**This is a true and correct copy of the June 25, 2024 Planning Commission minutes, which were approved on July 9, 2024.**

*Anna Crookston*

**South Jordan City Recorder**

**From:** [Miguel Aguilera](#)  
**To:** [PLANNING COMMISSION](#)  
**Subject:** FW: subdivision amendment meeting  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 18, 2024 4:05:06 PM

---

Hello all,

This is a comment from a resident I received for a project on Net week's agenda.

Thank you,  
Miguel

---

**From:** David Peterson <DPETERSON1795@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 18, 2024 9:52 AM  
**To:** Miguel Aguilera <MAguilera@sjc.utah.gov>  
**Subject:** Re: subdivision amendment meeting

Chris Sepp, 10667 S. Single Jack Cir  
Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 18, 2024, at 9:11 AM, Miguel Aguilera <[MAguilera@sjc.utah.gov](mailto:MAguilera@sjc.utah.gov)> wrote:

Hi David,

Thank you for your comment. We will include it in the record for the hearing on this project. Can you please specify as to which project your comment pertains to or the address of the property for the subdivision in question?

Thank you,  
Miguel

---

**From:** David Peterson <[dpeterson1795@msn.com](mailto:dpeterson1795@msn.com)>  
**Sent:** Saturday, June 15, 2024 8:18 PM  
**To:** Miguel Aguilera <[MAguilera@sjc.utah.gov](mailto:MAguilera@sjc.utah.gov)>  
**Subject:** subdivision amendment meeting

I am not in favor of allowing changes to our subdivision. I am an original property owner in this subdivision. In 1978, South Jordan was master planned for 1/3 acre lots or larger. That is why we moved here. There is enough (too much) high density housing now in the city without changing our subdivision. If this person wants to live in an area of high density, they can sell this lot and move somewhere else that is zoned for that purpose.

Thank you,

David Peterson

# Attachment B

**From:** [Cindy Valdez](#)  
**To:** [Miguel Aguilera](#); [PLANNING COMMISSION](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Public Hearing- 10667 S Single Jack Cir  
**Date:** Monday, June 24, 2024 9:24:46 AM

---

I will save this as an attachment.

**Cindy Valdez | Deputy City Recorder | City of South Jordan**

1600 W. Towne Center Drive | South Jordan, UT 84095

O: 801.254.3742 ext. 1279 | F: 801.254.3393



---

**From:** Miguel Aguilera <MAguilera@sjc.utah.gov>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 24, 2024 9:24 AM  
**To:** PLANNING COMMISSION <PlanningCommission@sjc.utah.gov>  
**Subject:** FW: Public Hearing- 10667 S Single Jack Cir

Hello everyone,

This is another comment I received for the Flag lot subdivision amendment on tomorrow's agenda.

Thank you,  
Miguel

---

**From:** Christy Clark <[christy\\_clark93@yahoo.com](mailto:christy_clark93@yahoo.com)>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 24, 2024 8:45 AM  
**To:** Miguel Aguilera <[MAguilera@sjc.utah.gov](mailto:MAguilera@sjc.utah.gov)>  
**Subject:** Public Hearing- 10667 S Single Jack Cir

Dear South Jordan City,

My family has lived here in our home for over 10 years which borders the property that is being reviewed for subdivision amendment. The reason we moved to this neighborhood is for the large lots, horse property and room for our boys to play and grow in an area that is not over housed and crammed together. They ride their bikes and play in Single Jack Circle.

We are absolutely against multiple homes on the single lot in the circle. No other properties in this subdivision have flag lots. It takes away from the natural flow and beauty of our subdivision and starts overcrowding our neighborhood and roads. Over the past several years we have watched a large majority of South Jordans horse properties nearby be overtaken by investors and reducing the beauty of the city.

Thank you for taking our decline of the subdivide into consideration. The Clarks,  
2221 W Rustic Roads Drive, South Jordan.

**SOUTH JORDAN CITY  
PLANNING COMMISSION REPORT**

**Meeting Date: 06/25/2024**

---

**Issue:** Country Roads Subdivision Second Amendment  
**PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION AMENDMENT**  
**Address:** 10667 S Single Jack Circle  
**File No:** PLPLA202400061  
**Applicant:** Chris Sepp

**Submitted by:** Miguel Aguilera, Planner I  
Jared Francis, Senior Engineer

---

**Staff Recommendation (Motion Ready):** I move that the Planning Commission **approve** the Country Roads Subdivision Second Amendment, File No. PLPLA202400061.

---

**ACREAGE:** Approximately 1.02 Acres  
**CURRENT ZONE:** Single-Family Residential (R-1.8)  
**CURRENT USE:** Single-Family detached home  
**FUTURE LAND USE PLAN:** Stable Neighborhood (SN)

**NEIGHBORING ZONES/USES:** North – Single-Family Residential (R-1.8)  
South – Single-Family Residential (R-1.8)  
West – Single-Family Residential (R-1.8)  
East – Single-Family Residential (R-1.8)

---

**STANDARD OF APPROVAL:**

The Planning Commission shall receive comment at a public hearing regarding the proposed subdivision amendment. The Planning Commission may approve the amendment if it finds good cause to amend the subdivision, and the amendment complies with City Code Chapter 16.14, other City ordinances, and sanitary sewer and culinary water requirements. The Planning Commission may only deny the amendment if there is no good cause for amending the subdivision and the proposed amendment does not meet all provisions of City Code Chapter 16.14, other City ordinances, and sanitary sewer and culinary water requirements.

City Code § 16.14.020

**BACKGROUND:**

The applicant is requesting that the Planning Commission approve a preliminary subdivision amendment for a property located at 10667 S Single Jack Circle and within the Country Roads Subdivision. The proposed amendment will divide the current lot into two separate lots. One of those lots will be a flag lot. City code defines flag lots as ‘A lot having a larger area or "body" at

*the rear (resembling a flag or pan) and which is connected to the street by a narrower portion (resembling a flagpole or handle) which does not meet the lot width or frontage requirements of the zone'. The property meets the conditions needed to establish a flag lot as it has a lot area at least twice the size of the average lot in the subdivision and will not exceed the density of the R-1.8 zone.*

The current property is on a cul-de-sac. When subdivided, the regular lot (Lot 16A) will be 0.509 acres; the flag lot (Lot 16B) will be 0.513 acres. Lot 16B will have a 31.16 foot wide “flag pole” connecting it Single Jack Circle and Lot 16A will have the minimum required 50 foot frontage on Single Jack Circle.

### **STAFF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATION:**

#### **Findings:**

- There is no development agreement associated with this application.
- The property was given a demolition permit on February 20, 2024 and the home has since been demolished.
- Both new lots will be required to follow the Single-Family (R-1.8) development standards.
- Both properties will maintain the required acreage and zoning to qualify for the Farm Animal Floating zone.
- Fencing along property lines shared with other properties will not require masonry walls because they also qualify for the Farm Animal Floating zone.
- Lot 16B will have the Emergency Services Access Easement and Turn around.

#### **Conclusion:**

- The proposed preliminary subdivision amendment application meets the City Code requirements and as such should be approved.

#### **Recommendation:**

- Based on the Findings and Conclusions listed above, Staff recommends that the Planning Commission take comments at the public hearing and **approve** the Application, unless during the hearing facts are presented that contradict these findings or new facts are presented, either of which would warrant further investigation by Staff.

#### **ALTERNATIVES:**

- Approve an amended Application.
- Deny the proposed Application.
- Schedule the Application for a decision at some future date.

#### **SUPPORT MATERIALS:**

- Location Map
- Current Zoning Map
- Future Land Use Map
- Proposed Subdivision Amendment Plat

*Miguel Aguilera*

---

Miguel Aguilera  
Planner I, Planning Department



South Jordan City Planning Commission

To South Jordan City

Regarding proposed zoning change of lot at 10593 South 3200 West, South Jordan, Utah 84095. We own the lot next to that lot and have animal rights and water rights to irrigate that property. We wish to retain our animal rights and ability to irrigate the central and lower area which can be done at this time. The neighbor and prior owner did have animal rights and used them. if the change of that lot does not change our rights then we will not strongly oppose such a change but if the change further restricts our rights then we oppose the change.

Our lot is at 10583 South and 3200 West adjacent to the lot in the proposal .

Thank you,

Gerald and Bonney Bryan

## Attachment E

**From:** [Andrew McDonald](#)  
**To:** [Diana Baun](#)  
**Subject:** RE: CUP (PLCUP202400087) - Accessory Building  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 25, 2024 11:58:17 AM

---

No problem. I had Greg add your email to the Outlook group for Planning Commission. You should be included in any future email threads.

---

**From:** Diana Baun <[DBaun@sjc.utah.gov](mailto:DBaun@sjc.utah.gov)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 25, 2024 11:05 AM  
**To:** Andrew McDonald <[AMcDonald@sjc.utah.gov](mailto:AMcDonald@sjc.utah.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: CUP (PLCUP202400087) - Accessory Building

Andrew,

Thank you for including me in this thread – it makes things so much easier for the minutes when I have everything beforehand to reference!! I'll make sure and collect all the replies together and into one document right before the meeting so it's easily reference in the minutes.

**Diana Baun | Meeting Transcriptionist | City of South Jordan**  
1600 W. Towne Center Drive | South Jordan, UT 84095

---

**From:** Andrew McDonald <[AMcDonald@sjc.utah.gov](mailto:AMcDonald@sjc.utah.gov)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, June 25, 2024 9:19 AM  
**To:** Steven Catmull <[SCatmull@sjc.utah.gov](mailto:SCatmull@sjc.utah.gov)>; Andrew McDonald <[AMcDonald@sjc.utah.gov](mailto:AMcDonald@sjc.utah.gov)>; Anna Crookston <[acrookston@sjc.utah.gov](mailto:acrookston@sjc.utah.gov)>; Carlos Vargas <[CVargas@sjc.utah.gov](mailto:CVargas@sjc.utah.gov)>; Cindy Valdez <[CValdez@sjc.utah.gov](mailto:CValdez@sjc.utah.gov)>; Damir Drozdek <[DDrozdek@sjc.utah.gov](mailto:DDrozdek@sjc.utah.gov)>; Greg Schindler <[GSchindler@sjc.utah.gov](mailto:GSchindler@sjc.utah.gov)>; Gregory Simonsen <[GSimonsen@sjc.utah.gov](mailto:GSimonsen@sjc.utah.gov)>; Jeremy Nielson <[JNielson@sjc.utah.gov](mailto:JNielson@sjc.utah.gov)>; Laurel Bevans <[LBevans@sjc.utah.gov](mailto:LBevans@sjc.utah.gov)>; Michele Hollist <[MHollist@sjc.utah.gov](mailto:MHollist@sjc.utah.gov)>; Miguel Aguilera <[MAguilera@sjc.utah.gov](mailto:MAguilera@sjc.utah.gov)>; Nathan Gedge <[NGedge@sjc.utah.gov](mailto:NGedge@sjc.utah.gov)>; Ray Wimmer <[RWimmer@sjc.utah.gov](mailto:RWimmer@sjc.utah.gov)>; Sam Bishop <[SBishop@sjc.utah.gov](mailto:SBishop@sjc.utah.gov)>; Steven Catmull <[SCatmull@sjc.utah.gov](mailto:SCatmull@sjc.utah.gov)>; Steven Schaefermeyer <[sschaefermeyer@sjc.utah.gov](mailto:sschaefermeyer@sjc.utah.gov)>; Diana Baun <[DBaun@sjc.utah.gov](mailto:DBaun@sjc.utah.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: CUP (PLCUP202400087) - Accessory Building

Good Morning Commissioners,

Until recently, the R-3 did not allow for guesthouse ADUs. The recent amendment to the ADU zoning requirements now allows for ADUs if the lot size of the subject property is equal to or greater than 14,520 sf<sup>2</sup> (.33 acre). This particular property is only 10,454 sf<sup>2</sup> (.24 acre), give or take. The property would not be allowed to have any detached guesthouse ADUs. The application does not propose having any ADU space. Lots in the R-3 Zone are required to be at least 10,000 sf<sup>2</sup> (.23 acre). Most of the R-3 Zoned properties in the City are standard interior lots that do not meet the minimum lot size requirement for a guesthouse. However, there are some lots zoned R-3 in the City

that could qualify. These are typically lots on the bulbs of cul-de-sac streets, or in some cases corner lots. Guesthouse ADU applications are reviewed on a case by case basis to determine if the application is in full compliance with all applicable City Ordinances.

---

**From:** Steven Catmull <[SCatmull@sjc.utah.gov](mailto:SCatmull@sjc.utah.gov)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, June 25, 2024 12:20 AM

**To:** Andrew McDonald <[AMcDonald@sjc.utah.gov](mailto:AMcDonald@sjc.utah.gov)>

**Subject:** CUP - Accessory Building

Hi Andrew,

Can you clarify this statement on the meeting materials for tonight's meeting?

"The R-3 Zone does not permit guesthouse ADUs."

Is that because there are no R-3 lots that meet the [new updated sq feet criteria](#)?

Thanks,

Commissioner Catmull

June 25, 2024

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING SIGN IN SHEET

PRINT NAME

ADDRESS

BRETT CATMILL

4051 W. LIBERTY CRK. DR.

Rick + Becky Rodriguez

2544 W. Van Ross Dr.

Rulon Dutton

392 Winchester Dr. Murray.

Mikaela Bryan