

**CITY OF SOUTH JORDAN
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
February 24, 2026**

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

**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 (5) of the Planning Commissioner’s are present at tonight’ meeting. We still have an opening on the Panning Commission if anybody in the audience or online is interested.

MOTION TO APPROVE AGENDA

B.1. Approval of the February 24, 2026 Planning Commission Agenda

Commissioner Hollist motioned to approve the February 24, 2026 Planning Commission Agenda. Chair Gedge seconded the motion. The Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor.

B. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

C.1. Approval of the February 10, 2026 - Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.

Commisioner Farnsworth motioned to approve the February 10, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes. Chair Gedge seconded the motion. Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor.

C. STAFF BUSINESS

Director Brian Preece said we do have an applicant for the vacant Planning Commissioner. The Mayor's been pretty busy with with the legislature, so she probably won't look at it till after that.

D. COMMENTS FROM PLANNING COMMISSION

F. SUMMARY ACTION

G. ACTION

H.

H.1. AUTUMN RIDGE DENTAL SITE PLAN

Address: 9828 S Temple Drive

File No: PLSPR202500195

Applicant: Shea Bess

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

Chair Gedge said for anybody who is joining us online, we may be experiencing some technical difficulties. We just want to give you a heads up if that does happen, you might have to just join back into the zoom call, for those here in the chambers and for our recording, there should be no interruption.

Commissioner Harding said is that entrance in and and out? It kind of seems narrow. I just want to confirm that.

Planner Aguilera said I do believe it is in and out, but I think Jeremy can confirm that.

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said it's full access and there is adequate space there for cars to pull in and out.

Chair Gedge said all aspects of city code and the development agreement have been satisfied per your review. I believe I saw in the staff report that they had to make a couple of revisions from their initial submission.

Planner Aguilera said that is right. It mainly had to do with the landscape uppers along shields lane and the north property line that borders the gas company that originally didn't meet the city code, so they had to edit that to make sure it was 10 feet on the north side and minimum of 20 feet along shields lane.

Chair Gedge said you did mention that right now it over parks, six spaces over the minimum 27.

Planner Aguilera said thats right. They do have a little bit more parking spaces than they are required by the code.

Chair Gedge said we did receive one the public comment by email prior, which addressed some parking concerns. Do you see any concerns if there happened to be any street parking along shields lane, either on the south side or north side of the road? I know there's a parking strip, It's a bike lane because it's one of our bike routes. Any concerns if there happened to be overflow onto shields lane or temple drive?

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said as I recall, there's not enough shoulder there for cars to park on shields lane, and we wouldn't allow that per state law. They shouldn't be parking in bike lanes.

Commissioner Lori Harding said what was decided for the fence?

Panner Aguilera said when the City Council approved the agreement, they had the option in the agreement that if the applicant could agree with the gas company to have them landscape their property, they wouldn't have to install a masonry fence there. It resulted that the gas company didn't agree with Shea Best to landscape that property so, that turned out to have him be required to have a masonry wall there. So they will be required to put a mainstream wall across that entire northern property line.

Commissioner Harding said on that property, will there be access further up on shields lane to access their property, like another in and out on that property after the curve, or not?

Planner Aguilera said I don't think so, and there wasn't any proposal in this application for them to include any sort of access from that side. It wouldn't be allowed, because they would have to have the mainstream wall there on the gas company's property. I don't know that they would have another access permitted there.

Russ Naylor from Nichols Naylor Architects – said we are the architects for this project. Actually, my son was the project architect, but it's his 50th birthday today, so I'm a stand in. We've been working on this project for, I think, probably two years. He originally purchased the part of the property from the city and part of the property from the water district. And obviously, there were a lot of legal issues related to the city's code about having to be so far away from having, drugs and so forth, related to the dental practice. So we're finally here and not your issue, but we had some real difficulties getting the civil engineer pulled along with us, and he has a requirement to vacate his existing office the first of October of this year. And at least at this point, there's no way we're going to get his building constructed in time. So hopefully, he's worked out something so that he can stay where he's at for a few more months. But it's been an interesting property with all the issues that have arisen related to, the location and shields lane access and so forth. To answer your question. Commissioner Harding, the gas company will still have access tied against the north property line from both shields lane on the east or on the west and and from Temple Drive on the east, onto their right-away. So we're not anticipating, nor have we been asked to provide any access off of the dental's property. I found from this project and other projects that the new gas company is not good to work with and not willing to cooperate. I mean, we were more than happy to landscape their gas easement, rather than do the masonry wall, but they had absolutely no interest, nor did they think that they would. When we initially had asked if they'd let us park on it, they told us no on that as well. So anyway, other than that, I'm sure you've seen the elevations. It did come to the ARC Committee and the general comment was that they were okay with what we were proposing for materials and the architectural design, it is a pretty contemporary building. You know, my preference would have been to make it look more like the houses across the street, but we have to try to satisfy our

clients. So anyway, if you have any questions, I would certainly attempt to answer those or get the answers for you.

Commissioner Hollist said can you confirm that it is a one story building.

Mr. Naylor said yes, it is. There are some different slopes on the roof, and there's a section of that's lower but, it's just a one story building.

Chair Gedge said at this point, we're going to open this portion of the meeting to the general public, but before I do that I want let you know we did receive one email regarding this item from Vivian Wilson. We received that yesterday from the planning department and was passed on to the Planning Commissioner's and the Recorder's Office. The concern was about the parking, which we have addressed with our city engineer about street parking.

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

Commissioner Harding motioned to approve File No. PLSR202500195, the Autumn Ridge Dental Office Site Plan. Chair Gedge seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 5-0 unanimos in favor.

I. LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS

I.1. PARK PLACE PHASE 5 LAND USE AMENDMENT & REZONE

Address: 11011 S 1055 W South Jordan, UT 84095

File No: PLZBA202500205

Applicant: Derek Rindlisbacher

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

Commissioner Harding said so, which direction would the homes face? What would the address actually be with that new road? And I notice it ends, but is it planning then, to connect?

Planner Aguilera said that would be on the east side, I'm not sure who owns that property, but it looks like it's some sort of trail. It's not connected to the road. Currently on the west side is 1050 that's where 1055 West ends. And so this would improve on that northern side. I'm not sure exactly what would happen to 1055 West. I'm not sure what engineering has planned for that part, but based on the concept, it would connect flow through.

Planner Schinder said on 1055 West it is privately owned, so I don't know that the city has any plans for that. This will open up access from the north on that private part of the 1055 West for those residents to go south through new Berkshire lane, and out to Jordan River Drive, and then go over to Riverfront Parkway. They will have a quicker access out to 11400 South for those residents. There is a Lifetime Fitness over there, but the going northbound probably wouldn't save anybody's time in the existing subdivision, or this amendment, or this addition to go

northbound to get to South Jordan Parkway, because it's still faster to go over to Riverfront Parkway. The speed limit is higher and it's a double wide road, so it's much quicker that way. But, that's until that portion of 1055, or whatever becomes public, but the city has no plans for it.

Commissioner Harding said So familiarize me with the red section, and then the piece that comes down like that is anticipating the driveway to both locations.

Planner Aguilera said so that would be for emergency access.

Planner Schindler said it's a turnaround for fire, if they have to come down, so our emergency vehicles can back in and then go back out, and also for garbage.

Commisioer Hollist said the agreement makes it clear that there still needs to be a pedestrian or biking access to the Beckstead canal trail at the end of this road. Or can they fence that off?

Planner Schindler said on that piece of road that the city's purchasing. It will belong to the city, but I don't know.

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said it doesn't all belong to the city. Now, whether the development's actually going to connect, like physically connect the trail, there may be a slight gap in the trail from the trail that's built by this development, and then there's the trail that goes north to south, that's along the backstead ditch. There might be a 10 foot gap that might need to be connected.

Commissioner Hollist said the picture that you're showing shows that there is a connection at the same time. I'm just asking if that's going to be maintained. The previous picture shows there's a dirt connection. It's open on that field to the Beckstead canal trail.

Planner Auilera said it looks like there's a physical connection. As far as improving on that, it is a separate property. So, I think that would have to be worked out with the city.

Planner Schindler said no, there's nothing to block it, It's still open. And so if there's access to it now, it should be made the same because that will be a publicly owned road and I don't think their going to put a fence up to block that off for any reason.

Derek Rindlisbacher (Applicant) said 'm with Bach Homes, or the applicant for the Park Place five subdivision. So just to add some clarification for that trail on the end of that red section on the concept plan, we do not have any intention of blocking that off. The development agreement specifies that we are to construct a six foot trail from 1055, all the way to the end of that, and connect it to Beckstead trail. And, so we will be doing that, and then that turnaround spot that you guys were referencing, we anticipate that being a curb cut with a concrete drive back into it. And so included in the staff report there's a concept plan with the lot layout we are proposing, if approved to construct two new single family homes on lot two and three, with lot one remaining as an existing home. And so the plans for this development will be identical to what we did. And because we developed Park Place one through four, we anticipate putting an equal or greater product here, and in regards to the single family product that we do build. And so by extending

Berkshire Lane, this project does create a secondary access for lot one, and also the residents that are along that right a way as well on the west side of the property. And so we feel it is a benefit to the city, and it's providing improving emergency ingress and egress for the area, especially because that's just one long road going north to south. We initially came to the city, not planning to connect that, and then after further discussion, it just became apparent that that was the right decision, and it actually creates a better feel for the overall community. And so we appreciate the time and effort that staff has put into this application, the development agreement, as well as the land use amendment, and they've done a great job, and we've appreciated that, and we respectfully request your recommendation for approval the City Council.

Chair Gedge opened the Public Hearing to comments.

Milo Tinney, South Jordan - said I guess my only concern is opening up 1055 West to the through traffic. That's a road that is very narrow. We have to pull over and wait for wait for people to go back and forth and things like that. So I have some concern about about opening that up, although I admit that when I want to go south, I can zip through that new neighborhood, easily, but I do think it creates some potential problems with traffic on 1055 West.

Chair Gedge closed the Public Hearing.

Assistant City Attorney Simonson said let me apologize in advance for the question I'm about to ask my friend Jeremy Nelson. I wish I had caught this sooner, and hopefully it's not a problem. But, included in the packet of materials is a infrastructure analysis prepared by the engineering department. It says along the top there that this is a one to an R.1.8 whereas our staff report says it's R, 2.5. My guess is that the 1.8 is an error, and that we are going for a R.2.5. But then going beyond that, I just want an assurance that the infrastructure analysis is still valid. My guess is that it is because it's still only servicing three lots. It says in the first paragraph the subject property is located at with three proposed residential lots. So I'm guessing that the infrastructure analysis has not changed. But I kind of wanted to ask Mr. Nelson about that.

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said I didn't notice that till you pointed it out, Mr. Simonson, but yeah, that does appear to be an error, but the the remainder of the infrastructure analysis still applies.

Chair Gedge said we did have one public comment about 1055 West. And from what I've heard, it's going to stay private. So where does the public ownership at 1055 west and north of this property go, does it go to the cemetery? Approximately how much further south does 1055 West go from public to private.

Planner Aguilera said according to the city's GIS map, the city owns pretty much to where the close of this is, the front lot where the house currently exists, the lot that's being acquired by the city, that's still owned by River Park LLC that borders city property. So it looks like that's the city line. I think that's where 1055 W ends.

Chair Gedge said so I understand, because this is going to be Phase Five of a current development that has CC&R's. That means that this new development is going to be under this HOA, it could be a private community, and if they so choose, in the future to block or restrict access to their portion of 1055 West, they would have that in their authority to do so. Correct?

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said 1055 W is a pretty complicated road because it's so old. There's pieces the city owns, and there's pieces that were privately owned. So, from what I can tell from the parcel map, the only portion that's completely privately owned by a private resident along 1055, is about 500 feet to the north of this where it would tie in the parcels in between, this development and that 500 feet. There's patches that are owned by the city, there's patches that are owned by the resident, and so it's, it's kind of mixed. I'm sure there's prescribed rights to a certain extent, for those that have been using it in the past. So it's just kind of complicated, but probably the biggest concern from an engineering perspective and from a fire perspective, is just providing a second access to all of those residents, whether it's privately owned or publicly owned, providing a secondary access is a prudent thing to do.

Assistant City Attorney Simonson said it sounds like it could keep me fully employed for about a month to analyze the ownership and the history on that. But, from everything I know about 1055 West, is it has been a public access. The public access has been allowed for many years, and somebody would have a very difficult time challenging that.

Chair Gedge said to modernize the road to current standards, that would be a difficult process. It's probably not going to occur, because the one resident gave testimony that you have to wait for a single car to pass. Sometimes you can't get two down, so it's probably difficult. And of course, you just mentioned the secondary emergency access, probably for our fire and other services.

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said that's correct. The city, did do a pretty significant project widening and just improving 1055, down to where the Kings Landing development is, which is maybe 800 feet north of this development. This is kind of that last stretch of road that is in private ownership. So so we didn't proceed with that project past that point.

Commissioner Hollist said I have one comment to address Mr. Simonson's concern. We could certainly make a motion to approve or disapprove with the caveat that we'd like them to ensure that infrastructure study is relevant with the difference in zoning, but in the development agreement. I just wanted to point out on page 84 of our packet, it does indicate in that development agreement that they are rezoning to a 2.5 so that was the intent.

- 1. Commissioner Harding motioned to recommend to approve Resolution R2026-04, Authorizing the Mayor of the City of South Jordan to enter into a development agreement with Bach Land and Development LLC.**
- 2. Commissioner Harding motioned to recommend to approve Resolution R2026-05, Amending the land use from Agricultural Preservation to Stable Neighborhood.**

- 3. Commissioner Harding motioned recommended to approve Ordinance 2026-02-Z, rezoning from Agriculture (A-1) to Single-Family Residential (R-2.5). Chair Gedge seconded the motion.**

Commissioner Hollist motioned to amend the motion to include that city staff, specifically engineering review the infrastructure report associated with this packet to ensure that it's applicable to an R 2.5. Chair Gedge seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor.

I.2. PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL USES IN THE MU-R&D ZONE TEXT AMENDMENT

Address: 1682 W Reunion Ave #4A South Jordan, UT 84095

File No: PLZTA202600019

Applicant: Chloe Judd

Planner Miguel Aguilera reviewed background information from the staff report.

Commissioner Catmull said often times we'll go to a conditional use before permitted, I can't say we've ever done anything like this, but generally, a conditional use would be here if there could be some sort of impact. Could you give us just a little peek into any discussions you had around conditional versus allowing everything to be permitted, and we're using permitted instead of conditional use here.

Planner Aguilera said so the conditional uses were not an ideal option or route to go for uses allowed under the category of personal uses here, just considering mitigating factors, it would be difficult to come up with those. As far as we looked at those listed uses, personal uses, and uses code, we did find those two that we're wanting to exclude to be probably not ideal in the zone, which is why we would just not make those conditional at all, just exclude them from the specific mixed use zone.

Commissioner Catmull said so is there already existing uses that were occurring here? We've had conversations about this in the past, and usually, my understanding is that there's a business license review, and people are checked for compatibility with their zones there, correct?

Planner Aguilera said so the code has office uses and it also has professional uses which could overlap. Office uses are more general, it's a broader definition, and because of that, if you look at what's located currently there, there's like tax offices, law firms, a dental office, which could fall under the broad category of office, which is why they would be permitted to be there. But professional services focuses on a little bit more on those specific uses that are described in the report, which is why we think it's a good idea to include them.

Chair Gedge said maybe this is a question for Mr. Simonson, and I don't mean to open a can of worms, but are there any legal concerns to the city by excluding two specific uses that are allowed under personal services and other areas of the city. I know we're calling out tattoo and

massage and so other concerns by people who might be affiliated with those types of business uses. Are we discriminating against them with this type of recommendation to the city council.

Assistant City Attorney Simonson said no, I don't believe there's a problem there. The legislative authority of the City Council is enough to meet that.

Chair Gedge opened the Public Hearing to comment. There were none, Closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Hollist said why do we have so many differentiations between mixed use zones, and especially this R&D one, it's very narrow on what it allows. And so is it the most straight forward path to alter this particular zone to say, we will include this additional use, or would it make sense to combine some of these mixed uses?

Planner Schindler said maybe we had it because of a lot of mixed uses on Redwood Road were approved in 1998 with the Redwood Road mixed use plan. And so there's several different mixed uses like this. City Hall is in a mixed use community, and then Harmons is in mixed use city center. And probably most of them have certain ones that are in all of the zones. But then, for some reason, 1998 they eliminated certain ones and nothing's ever changed. The only reason that Harmons can have grocery stores over there is because they were in a mixed they changed the mixed use to city center from something else. I don't remember what it was, but they did a rezone on that property, but they still use the mixed use zone to emphasize. And the original thing was to emphasize that the mixed use would be whatever commercial uses, plus residential. However, the only residential that turned out to be allowed was at least third acre lots. And so that really didn't pan out to be a mixed use.

Director Brian Preece said I think you make a good point, it's probably a good discussion for future general plan amendment.

Planner Schindler said the uses of section of our code was adopted in 2016 I believe. And since then, none of these road mixed uses were added to that section until recently. And then all of them were added into that section. So before, when it was listed as an office use, they probably used the old definition of office, as Miguel might have mentioned, that could include the personal services like barber shops and beauty salons and so forth. They are separate different definitions in the section title 1718 that says, under office it does not include beauty parlors and so forth. So, the applicant did not know that when she leased the property, she's leased two suites and has completed her remodel of those two individual suites to rent those out to individuals. And then when she applied for the business license, I had denied it because this wasn't allowed. And so when she was given the option to either, not do it, or apply for a zone text change, we did tell her that staff would recommend in favor of that zone text change, because it also will clear up the issues with the the CPAs, different accounting firms and lawyers that are already there that would also be in violation.

Commissioner Hollist said I assume merit medical was notified.

Planner Schindler said Merit Medical owns the building that she's in, so they know, but they did not get a notice.

Chair Gedge said I know in a previous meeting you mentioned that we're going to be combining chapters, 16 and 17 in the code, and maybe a new 18 with a change like this. Will this be a grandfathered permitted use, because it'll be an existing, and just how will that be incorporated with these, with the new work that's being done now.

Director Preece said we're looking to bring all the definitions from all these different definitions, and make one, so that they are the same throughout.

Commissioner Catmull said I didn't see it in the staff report. I may have missed it. How many other acres of the property are in this same zone that we may be impacting, and opening up some other uses for, I don't remember it.

Planner Schindler said it's very limited. The mixed use R&D includes the properties that merit medical owns, and that's about it.

Chair Gedge said just to confirm there are no current of the two excluded zonez that are being recommended in that current area, that we are now excluding, anybody who might be potentially doing business as a massage parlor.

Planner Schindler said not in that zone.

Commissioner Hollist motioned to recommed approve Ordinance 2026 -05, Personal and Professional Uses in the MU-R&D Zone Text Amendment. Chair Gedge seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor.

J. OTHER BUSINESS

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Hollist motioned to adjourn. Chair Gedge seconded the motion

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 7:27p.m.

This is a true and correct copy of the February 24, 2026 Planning Commission minutes, which were approved on March 10, 2026.



Re: Parking Concerns Regarding New Dentist Offices about 9828 S. Temple Dr.

From Cindy Valdez <CValdez@sjc.utah.gov>

Date Tue 2/24/2026 10:55 AM

To Miguel Aguilera <MAguilera@sjc.utah.gov>; PLANNING COMMISSION <PlanningCommission@sjc.utah.gov>

Thanks Miguel, I will save it 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: Tuesday, February 24, 2026 10:03 AM

To: PLANNING COMMISSION <PlanningCommission@sjc.utah.gov>

Subject: FW: Parking Concerns Regarding New Dentist Offices about 9828 S. Temple Dr.

Hello Commissioners,

Here is a public comment on tonight's Autumn Ridge Dental Item.

Thank you,

Miguel Aguilera | Planner II | City of South Jordan

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

O: 801.253.6306 Ext. 5022 |C: 385.395.5042



From: Brian Preece <BPreece@sjc.utah.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2026 9:32 AM

To: Anna Crookston <acrookston@sjc.utah.gov>; Miguel Aguilera <MAguilera@sjc.utah.gov>; Jason Rasmussen <JRasmussen@sjc.utah.gov>; Jeremy Nielson <JNielson@sjc.utah.gov>; Greg Schindler <GSchindler@sjc.utah.gov>; Gregory Simonsen <GSimonsen@sjc.utah.gov>

Subject: Fw: Parking Concerns Regarding New Dentist Offices about 9828 S. Temple Dr.

All, for tonight's meeting regarding the Shea Bess Dental application—Brian

From: Vivian Wilson <bjwilson2@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 23, 2026 5:22:33 PM
To: Brian Preece <BPreece@sjc.utah.gov>
Cc: Miguel Aguilera <MAguilera@sjc.utah.gov>
Subject: Parking Concerns Regarding New Dentist Offices about 9828 S. Temple Dr.

Brian Preece, Planning Commission, and City Council,

I am writing regarding the new dental offices to be built across the street from our home. We are concerned about the potential impact on residential parking. There are also bike lanes on both sides of the street that would also be impacted.

Specifically, we are worried that employees or patients from the new dental office may park along our side of the street, directly in front of our homes. Our street has historically been used for residential parking only, and additional commercial overflow parking could create congestion, limit access for homeowner and guests, and negatively affect the character of our neighborhood.

We have trailers and we need the access to be able to back in and out of our properties without being in the middle of a busy street.

Jason Rasmussen, the Assistant City Manager indicated that if parking becomes an issue with encroachment, they could install "no parking" signs.

We would appreciate the city to help us to have these signs installed when we will need them when encroachment starts to happen.

We respectfully request that the city, planning commission, and city council consider steps to ensure that parking related to the new commercial offices does not spill over into the surrounding residential area.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Vivian Wilson
9811 S. Temple Dr.
bjwilson2@gmail.com



February 24, 2026

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING SIGN IN SHEET

PRINT NAME

ADDRESS

Russell Naylor 10459 So Temple dr #201

Tim Hollist 9722 S Pendleton way

Scott Higbee 2327 W Dayton Crest Cir

CHARLES HOFFEINS 2346 HOBBS DR.

Scott Jensen 9394 S Cameo Plz Cir

CACHE HORSBUGH 2037 E Village Point Way

Milo & Sandra Terry 10937 S 1055 W

Greg Rindlisbacher 11119 S. New Liberty Court
