CITY OF SOUTH JORDAN
ELECTRONIC
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
JANUARY 28, 2025

Present: Commissioner Michele Hollist, Commissioner Laurel Bevans, Chair Nathan Gedge, Commissioner Sam Bishop, Commissioner Steven Catmull, Assistant City Attorney Greg Simonsen, City Planner Greg Schindler, Deputy City Recorder Cindy Valdez, Deputy City Engineer Jeremy Nielson, Planner Joe Moss, Planner Andrew McDonald, IT Director Matt Davis, GIS Coordinator Matt Jarman

Others: John Thibeault, Celeste Thibeault

6:32 P.M.
REGULAR MEETING

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

Chair Nathan Gedge welcomed everyone to the Planning Commission Meeting and noted that all Planning Commissioner's were present

B. MOTION TO APPROVE AGENDA

Commissioner Hollist motioned to approve tonight's agenda as published. Chair Gedge seconded the motion; vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor.

C. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

C.1. January 14, 2025 - Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

Commissioner Hollist motioned to approve the January 14, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes. Chair Gedge seconded the motion; vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor.

D. STAFF BUSINESS

City Planner Greg Schindler said I would like to introduce our new long range planner, Joe Moss, I am going to turn over the time to him to present some staff business.

Planner Joe Moss said thanks Greg. You might notice that some of the things in your packet look a little different than they have in the past. One of the things that I've been working on since I

started at the City is trying to create some templates and some more uniformity to our staff reports and updating the format. So again, we're looking at some updates to standardize and making things a little more consistent, to make sure that we're bringing you the same type of graphics and maps and things in the future. I will say all of these are a bit of a work in progress, so they're still kind of firming up, so you may still see some additional changes. If you have any feedback that you'd like to provide staff, just feel free to send me an email or reach out to me.

E. COMMENTS FROM PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBER

Commissioner Hollist said I would like to know how the State of the City went from those who attended.

Chair Gedges said I attended and I think it went really well. The mayor and her guests shared a lot from Larry H Miller Company, former legislative rep Pulsifer County and Mayor Wilson were there. They shared some things that we have already seen here on the planning commission. So we've already seen the expansion to the county pool that was announced publicly. The opening date for the Salt Lake Bees will be the second Tuesday in April, which we have a scheduled Planning Commission meeting that night. I am a ticket holder so I will not be able to attend that meeting because I want to attend the opening day. They made a couple other announcements for the new library out at Daybreak as well as the County Library. We are also going to be awarded a new County Art Center, similar to the Rose Wagner downtown. It is being fully paid for by the Larry H. Miller charities, but it will be ran by the county. The Mayor spoke about how well the city staff has done helping plan and getting some things under some tight windows, especially with the ballpark. Oh, and of course, the new track station will open the week before the baseball stadium.

Planner Greg Schindler said before you move on to the items on the agenda, you had mentioned the the Art Center which reminded me of something. The architects, the contingent from the county and Larry H Miller will be coming to the ARC meeting tomorrow morning. I was wondering who was going to be attending that meeting.

Commissioner Bevans said I will be attending the ARC Meeting in the morning.

Commissioner Catmull said I can be your backup to attend the meeting’s when needed.

Commissioner Bevans said thank you.

Commissioner Bishop said I have question with regards to the track station. I know that we need a station area plan, so will the Planning Commissione see that? I'm just curious.

Planner Scindler said I don’t think the stationary plans come before the Planning Commission or City Council, it was something that WFRC had to submit to them.

Planner Moss said I have been working on both of those. We just had our daybreak stationary plans approved by WFRC at their committee meeting last week. We are currently in the process of working on the front runner stationary plan with our consultants, which should be on track to

be complete sometime this spring. And then we will get that again through that WFRC adoption process.

Commissioner Bevans said as s reminder, I will not be in attendance at the next Planning Commission Meeting.

F. SUMMARY ACTION – *None*

G. ACTION – *None*

H. ADMINISTRATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS

H.1. G**UESTHOUSE ADU TOTAL FLOOR AREA** Address: 1099 W. Shields Lane File No: PLADU202400215 Applicant: John R. Thibeault

Planner Andrew McDonald reviewed background information on this item from the staff report.

Commissioner Hollist said I am just confirming that there's not a window within 20 feet of a property line on the second floor.

Planner McDonald said there are windows, but they are well beyond that.

John Thibeault (Applicant) said my wife Celeste is also here tonight. I understood that the square footage was part of the conditional use of permit, and I'm not asking for conditional use of permit. Am I mistaken?

Planner McDonald said there is no CUP permit. Staff cannot approve the accessory dwelling unit permit without planning commission approval because it's larger than what the property is allowed.

Commissioner Hollist said is it just a single bedroom?

Mr. Thibeault said yes, it is upstairs.

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

Commissioner Hollist said I have several things I want to say. Just for precedence, they are asking for an exception and that is why it is here tonight. I'm usually the one with the loudest objections to exceptions. However, in this case I don't feel like this was built with a future intent of trying to skirt the code. I feel like both the home and this building are modest and well within the character of the neighborhood. It is an existing building that has been there for a long time, converting the use and it is by square footage, not that much over what is allowed with the 35% although it is 47% of the total dwellings space. So for once, this is an exception that I'm in favor of considering.

Commissioner Catmull said I have similar comments. I just want to thank the applicant for coming today, you are getting exposed to this part of the process. Coming from someone who's

been steeped in this for a few years now, it's an important part of the process and I appreciate you being willing to do that. I feel like it fits the neighborhood and we received one public comment supporting it, so I have no problems or concerns.

Chair Gedge said as Commissioner Catmull stated, We did receive a email in favor from High Wolf that has been entered into the public record in support of this project.

Commissioner Bevans said just want to add that I think this is a great use of space in our city. South Jordan definitely needs more affordable housing. Converting this and and allowing our kids to have their own space, and space to stay within the city is a great use of this property, so I'm in favor of this.

Commissioner Bevans motioned to approve File No: PLADU202400215 Guesthouse ADU based on the conclusions and findings listed in the staff report. Chair Gedge seconded the motion; Roll Call Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor.

Roll Call Vote
Yes – Chair Gedge
Yes – Commissioner Hollist
Yes – Commissioner Bishop
Yes – Commissioner Catmul
Yes – Commissioner Bevans

I. LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS

I.1. **PLANNED DEVELOPMENT FLOATING ZONE TEXT AMENDMENT**
File No: PLZTA202500012 Applicant: South Jordan City

Planner Joe Moss reviewed background information on this item from the staff report.

Commissioner Hollist said you cited under the general plan conformance the live goal one, which is a reference to moderate income households, affordable housing, etc. Do you have any way of ensuring that that's what will happen? We saw an application in this area right against the river, where it was going to be a high end density product.

Planner Moss said part of the housing element is looking at ways to include more affordable housing. We don't know what that would look like, because this is just adding another tool to our tool box, it is part of the PD process. So if somebody were proposing housing as part of that PD process there could be some specification about what is affordable and what's not, and that would go before you and the Council for consideration as to what is appropriate in in that regard.

Commissioner Hollist said is there anything that caps in these areas? The density that can be requested?
Planner Moss said here currently this is not a density request, again, that's generally planned. Developments are sort of a one off district that are kind of customized to that specific

developmenst needs. And as you know, the city council would have full, legislative authority to either approve or deny an application, including those density numbers.

Commissioner Hollist said so with this change you are still requiring that they apply for a PD rezone. What advantage does including this in our code accomplished, versus just having it be considered as part of the development plan that the city approves.

Planner Moss said so the main advantage of this particular segment opens up another area that would be eligible for potential mixed residential, commercial uses. Currently, the area, largely north of the South Jordan Parkway is inside the front runner station area plan and is eligible already. However, the main amount of land that you could feasibly do something like that with and add more housing would be on that southern portion between 11400 S and the South Jordan Parkway on the east of the front runner. There is already kind of commercial areas and some development there, so it would allow additional housing uses in that area which fall outside the station area plan in a PD request.

Commissioner Hollist said so does this simplify that process in the future, where they're just asking for a rezone, but not a different land use?

Planner Moss said so currently they're not zoned for any residential use, so the only way that a residential use could be introduced would be through the PD process. So that would be a new use that would come through the PD process. This just allows us to consider, as a city if a residential product of whatever density is appropriate in that area.

Planner Moss said there's not a inherent right to residential development. You would still need to rezone into a PD in order to accommodate residential development.

Commissioner Hollist said so does it eliminate a step? I'm not actually seeing the step being eliminated, because I think you can request almost anything, anywhere.

Planner Moss said currently we limit where you can request a residential density of over eight units per acre. So, right now you can only have eight units per acre in circumstances where either the city is the applicant, or if you are within a station area. This would just add a third area that is eligible and that's east of the Front Runner.

Commissioner Hollist said but you would still have to come get a PD?

Planner Moss said I think that the introduction of the limitation on the plan development request was fairly recent. Greg, if I'm not mistaken, I believe it was introduced within the last few years.

Planner Schindler said I think it's even sooner than that, because the city council has approved anything over eight, or too much over eight.Thet still will have to come back to city council to have discussions with them before they can get any of this, or any higher density. I don't think the code has set current limits to eight units per acre in the PD floating zone, but it seems to be it's more in certain areas. It's just nothing in code, but it's certain areas of the city where we don't want higher density, but other areas we think it's going to be beneficial to have higher density for

various reasons. And also remember that Daybreak really doesn't have higher density as a whole. There are spots, just like everywhere else in the city that have higher density, but overall when Daybreak is built out, it will still be five units per acre.

Commissioner Catmull said I would love to see it with a boundary to include the Freeway between the freeway, and that bount box be a little more explicit. Instead of just saying east of there, because its not like we're going to take over parts of sandy or annex Sandy, but, but just to be a little more clear there would be great. I listened to the council session you had on this, and maybe something to think about is a comment that came out saying how this would affect the east west travel. We do feel like there's a lot of density there by the freeway, but I have looked at some of the stuff that's performed or the jobs, and everything there is becoming a center over in Daybreak, in that commercial scene. If you think about downtown daybreak would we make the problem of East West worse by putting a large amount of density here. What I would love to see is some way to mitigate that, whether it's part of the decision to do a traffic study, or as we think about traffic studies being required to build in that area to make sure you know the height and density requirements.

Commissioner Bevans said I see on our map that there may be some land that's not fully developed. Is there any undeveloped land that we're looking at with this in mind? Or is it just laying it over the entire area, and if anyone decides to redevelop, that's where,

Planner Moss said it would be at a applicant's discretion as to what they wanted to propose, and they would have to bring that forward to the city to rezone into a planned development. There are currently a few vacant parcels, and there is some commercial developments that are 20 or so years old, that may redevelop in some manner in the future. Again, this is just giving us the ability to consider a sort of mixed use project in this area.

Commissioner Bishop said this is a question for my own understanding, if an applicant wanted to introduce housing in this area, would they have to go through the PD process, or would there be other avenues of doing that.

Planner Moss said currently we do have a zoning in place that is commercial freeway, so there are no residential uses in the current zoning. So if they wanted to introduce those, they would need to come forward with a proposal. In this circumstance, we don't necessarily have a mixed use zone that might be easily applicable, and a lot of times for planned developments in smaller circumstances that it's a sort of unique custom district that again allows us to sort of customize those regulations to the that particular site and that particular development need. That is generally how most developers would would approach the request with the plan development unless we have a default zoning district that might be a better fit for their need. However, I don't know if we would for the general plan necessarily look at an exclusively residential district that's in our current boundary or our current menu of zoning districts that would necessarily be a good fit.

Commissioner Catmull said my understanding was that a lot of these projects, at least from that discussion, are combinations like commercial with a residential component. When that comes into play I think the only other option in our code, for the most part, would be like a mixed use

sort of thing, and that comes with a different feel. I think that's what's going on, right? The Mixed Use doesn't fit there, residential alone probably wouldn't fit there either. Commercial doesn't fit and so we're proposing, the way I'm understanding this is so we want to be able to put plan developments to fit a unique circumstances in this particular area.

Planner Moss said it would just enable the city to consider requests for residential components to projects in this particular area, which is quite limited in the scope of the city, but an important sort of employment center that does rely on those sorts of supporting uses, particularly as we see the commercial market evolve, where it takes more people to support less square footage. A lot of times developers are relying on that residential product to make things balance out and feasible financially. And so given that we're anticipating dense residential uses per general plan in this area anyway we thought this was a easy way to approach that solution.

Commissioner Bevans said there is nothing in this area that we're looking at currently in the underlying zone that you could not put this PD overlay on top of the underlying zoning that it has now? Is that correct that you have to rezone it different?

Planner Moss said you can introduce uses generally, you would pick a base district and modify it with your PD. In this circumstance, it's commercial freeway is the underlying zoning currently. And so you could say, Okay, well, we're following commercial freeway standards, but we're going to add, you know, this particular use, and it's limited in X, Y and Z way.

Commissioner Bevans said the overlay on the commercial freeway zone allows them to put the residential in without rezoning their piece to another base zone, so they don't have to go to a mixed use zoning and put the PD over top of it but they can put it on top of the commercial?

Planner Moss said they they could consider that if that was something that worked better for whatever development they needed, but I don't think it wouldn't be a blanket required.

Chair Gedge said my only concern would be if City Council were to adopt this based on whatever recommendation we make. There is potential for elementary age school kids from South Jordan elementary on 13th West, and obviously the middle school and high school are further away, but we need to have a safe walking routes. I would just like to make sure that the districts were properly notified to be part of that conversation, just to make sure that they could adequately house the students, or accept the students in their schools. Also, that the whole planning of transportation or access to the schools are there for the students, especially with the two busy roads. And of course, obviously, if we were to prove some sort of residential there the barriers, fencing would have to go in with a PD zone with with a major freeway on one side and a high speed rail line, slash Amtrak rail line on the other side. I would like to make sure there's some protections in place for public safety.

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

Commission Bevans said I don’t have any questions, but I appreciated having some clarity on the Code. I think it's a great location to put this kind of overlay zone on, and we definitely need that area to have to have more of the high density.

Commissioner Catmull said I feel like it brings clarity to potential future applicants about where they can put the density that they may want, and this opens up a place that makes sense. My only thing is, I would love to see some sort of boundary, even if it just says east of front runner and within the city boundaries.

Commissioner Hollist said my only concern again, is a cap. Even Daybreak has a cap on certain areas within their development, because I'm here to promise you, we'll see somebody push what we're willing to consider. And then I'll be curious to see if this truly restricts the request for density over eight to the said areas, or if we'll continue to see exceptions.

Chair Gedges said I echo comments from my fellow Commissioners. and I would agree with maybe adding a recommendation to City Council to consider a defined boundary. Again, it is probably inferred, but just be as clear as possible. Also, we probably need to address some sort of cap, because people will take advantage. We need to make sure we protect the city at all costs especiallyin this unique area, as well.

Commissioner Bevans said I would probably vote no on a motion that capped it. I would vote no on a motion that caps the height and the density.

Commissioner Hollist said I'm torn, I think, with the right development you do it. But that's the example that stands out in my mind, because I remember talking to Mr. Schaefermeyer when I very first started on this commission about that property. There were several things that they never lived up to. They said that it turned out to be too expensive to do a green roof, and they never did anything about the retaining wall, still to this day that just frustrates me.

Commissioner Catmull motioned to send a positive recommendation City Council to approve File No. PLZTA202500012 Plannned Development Floating Zone Text Amendment and add feedback that the council consider a more detailed boundary description for the area, to be more specific. Chair Gedge seconded the motion

Commissioner Hollist amended the motion to add Ordinance 2024 to the first recommended approval to City Council. Chair Gedge seconded the motion; Roll Call Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor.

Roll Call Vote
Yes – Chair Gedge
Yes – Commission Hollist
Yes – Commissioner Bishop
Yes – Commissioner Catmull
Yes – Commissioner Bevans

J. OTHER BUSINESS

J.1. Planning Commission Discussion regarding Commission Rules..

The Planning Commissioner's continued their discussion in preparation for the Commission Rules for the calendar year 2025.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Hollist motioned to adjourn the January 28, 2025 Planning Commission Meeting. Chair Gedge seconded the motion. Vote was 5 to 0 unanimous in favor;.

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

This is a true and correct copy of the January 28, 2025 Planning Commission minutes, which were approved on February 11, 2025.

From:	Andrew McDonald
To:	Andrew McDonald; Anna Crookston; Carlos Vargas; Cindy Valdez; Damir Drozdek; Greg Schindler; Gregory Simonsen; Jeremy Nielson; Laurel Bevans; Michele Hollist; Miguel Aguilera; Nathan Gedge; Sam Bishop; Steven Catmull; Steven Schaefermeyer
Subject:	FW: PLADU202400215, Property at 1099 W. Shields Lane
Date:	Tuesday, January 28, 2025 9:56:08 AM

Good Morning All,

Please see the below comment received regarding tonight's ADU permit item.

From: Nephi Wolf <nephiwolf@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2025 9:46 AM
To: Andrew McDonald <AMcDonald@sjc.utah.gov>
Subject: PLADU202400215, Property at 1099 W. Shields Lane

My name is Nephi Wolf and I live on Chosen Way. The front of my property looks directly onto the barn and horse pasture at 1099 W. Shields Lane. I wanted to voice my support for the requested updates to this property. I know that this 'barn' that they are remodeling has been there before any of the other houses in our neighborhood and I think he should be able to remodel it and make it into a livable residence. I have no objections and fully support their efforts.

Thanks,

Nephi Wolf