CITY OF SOUTH JORDAN
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
September 22, 2026

Present: Commissioner Steven Catmull, Chair Nathan Gedge, Commissioner Michelle Hollist, Assistant, Commissioner Nik Anderson, Commissioner Bryan Farnsworth, Assistant City Attorney Greg Simonson, City Planner Greg Schindler, Planner Joe Moss, Deputy City/Transportation Engineer Jeremy Nielson, Deputy Recorder Cindy Valdez, Director Brian Preece, IT Director Matt Davis, GIS Matt Jarman.

Absent; Commissioner Lori Harding

6:30 P.M.
REGULAR MEETING

A. WELCOME AND ROLL CALL – *(ChairNathan Gedge)*

Chair Gedge welcomed everyone to the Planning Commission Meeting and noted that four (4) of the Planning Commissioner's are present at tonight's meeting. One of our Commissioner is stuck in traffic and will be here shortly and Commissioner Harding is excused from tonight's meeting.

B. MOTION TO APPROVE AGENDA

B.1. Approval of the September 22, 2026 Planning Commission Agenda.

Commissioner Hollist motioned to ammend the September 22, 2026 Planning Commissiom Agenda to change item H.2 and move it up before item H.1. and Chair Gedge seconded the motion. Vote was 4-0 unanimous in favor. Commissioner Harding was absent from the vote.

Commissioner Hollist motioned to approve the amended September 22, 2026 Planning Commissiom Agenda. Chair Gedge seconded the motion. Vote was 4-0 unanimous in favor. Commissioner Harding was absent from the vote.

C. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

C.1. Approval of the September 8, 2026 - Planning Commission Meeting Minutes.

Commisioner Hollist motioned to approve the September 8, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes as presented. Chair Gedge seconded the motion.Vote was 4-0 unanimous in favor. Commissioner Harding was absent from the vote.

D. STAFF BUSINESS

None.

E. COMMENTS FROM PLANNING COMMISSION

Chair Gedge said at our last meeting, we talked about potentially having a training at the end of this meeting. We will not be having that training this evening because of a couple of the items on our agenda. I believe the tentative plan is for our first meeting in October, which at the end of our agenda this evening, we'll ask staff how that's looking.

Commissioner Anderson arrived a the meeting,

F. SUMMARY ACTION

None.

G. ACTION

None.

H. ADMINISTRATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS

H.2. **JOHN PATRICK UNIVERSITY OF HEALTH AND APPLIED SCIENCES-CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT**
Address: 10542 S. Jordan Gateway
File No: PLCUP202600172
Applicant: Glenn Noble, John Patrick University

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

Glen Noble (Applicant) said I'm the chief financial officer and chief operating officer of John Patrick University. We are an online school. We address our students who are part of our university are addressing several healthcare shortages, such as nursing, and specifically around diagnostic imaging and radiation oncology. At this university, what this branch will do is bring students in to train them on a high intensity training using high-tech mannequins and simulation equipment, but there's no dangerous equipment. They come for about a week and they do intense training, and then they leave and we'll bring another wave of students in. But our hope is to continue to make an impact on the significant healthcare shortage that we have in the United States. So, we want to thank you for for having us and hopefully being part of South Jordan. So we're very excited.

Commissioner Hollist said you indicated in your letter that there are just 12 core weeks of on-site instruction, and is that because it's mostly an online program?

Mr. Noble said yes, that is correct. We don't have any brick-and-mortar campus’s, so there's no classroom. They do all their didactic education online, and then for one or two of their semesters, they're in a clinical setting in their home city, so they'll be with a hospital or a clinic, doing actual clinical training, and then they come here for the high intensity, which is part of their education.

Chair Gedge said I have just a couple questions for inquiry. I know they're building a hotel next door, so will you be planning hopefully to use that to maybe mitigate traffic parking concerns?

Mr. Noble said absolutely. We will use that hotel or any other hotels. We will work with a shuttle company here in town to shuttle students, or we'll use rideshare services in town.

Chair Gedge said so that was going to be my question, because I frequent the front runner line daily right there at that location, so I hope maybe that will be encouraged by your attendees as well.

Mr. Noble said absolutely.

Chair Gedge opened the Public Hearing to comments.

Melina Miramontes, Sandy Utah said I wanted to add to Mr. Noble's great explanation about John Patrick University and give a little bit more color is that part of the students' tuition is that John Patrick University will hotel the students. So when they fly in, and I know he talked about shuttling, but the students don't really park at the site at all. So hopefully that eases your your parking concerns and your traffic concerns a little bit further. As he mentioned, they will be shuttled, and there will be maybe a handful of local students here, but most will be coming in, and that will also increase restaurant ordering. We'll be catering for them, so just an abundance of tourism infused into South Jordan, which is pretty cool.

Chair Gedge closed the Public Hearing.

Chair Gedge said sometimes I walk home from the front-runner station, and this is great. I like how they will be hoteling the students nearby. It's not long term. The buildings, parking lots, frequently are not full. So, I think it's a good use of existing space, and it'll be great to see some other people maybe on the sidewalks in the evenings when I'm walking home.

Commssioner Farnsworth motioned to approve File No. PLCUP202600172 John Patrick University of Health and applied Sciences Conditional Use Permit with the following condition:

a. The applicamt shall operate the site consistent with the parking and transportation operations described in the conditional use permit application and shall coordinate with the property management company to monitor and address parking demands during student clinical training cycles.

Chair Gedge seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor. Commissioner Harding was absent from the vote.

H.1. **MASTER AUTOTECH CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT**
Address: 11048 Redwood Road
File No: PLCUP202600160
Applicant: David George

Planner Miguel Aguilera reviewed background information on this item from the staff report. So, in the maps that were provided, there was a property that I included that is not going to be part of this development, and I'll highlight it here. So, this one was included in the maps. It's one of the subject properties as part of the development, but it won't be part of the three highlighted ones.

Commissioner Catmull said could you talk about the noise, we know the Salt Lake County Health Department has a set of standards that I believe drive the requirements that we have during the day and so forth, but there's also inside city code that has noise transmission levels. You talked about the quiet hours, that is after 10:00 p.m. as I recall.

Planner Aguilera said yes, so 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. I believe are the quiet hours. So that's outside of their hours of operation. So they would be required to operate outside of that.

Commissioner Catmull said so inside and outside those hours, in normal daylight hours. It is basically regulated by who? If there's a complaint, they can be dealt with by calling the city, or is it a county thing?

Planner Aguilera said I am not exactly sure how that is regulated during daylight hours. I believe they probably could call the city, and we do have a code compliance department or officer that can look into that if it becomes a problem.

Commissioner Catmull said did we notice at 300 feet or 600 feet? Are there hazardous materials that they may store on site? Is that considered hazardous materials?

Planner Aguilera said according to the code, the use could potentially have hazardous materials, including fluids like motor oil, and other stuff they use during their operations. I am not exactly sure what the entire list of those are, but we can think of motor motor oil as one of the ones that could be hazardous. So they are required to to make sure that they maintain and contain that within the property, and have proper disposure. I think if the applicant comes to speak, we can ask what exactly their process is for Master AutoTech and what the other facilities do in the valley.

Commissioner Catmull said and that's going to be regulated anyway. It's not a city by city how hazardous materials are handled. That's usually a state requirement.

Chair Gedge said you did mention that you did notice 600 feet instead of the normal 300 feet. Correct. And he was asking because there is hazardous waste? What was the true reason why we noticed 600 feet?

Planner Aguilera said so the true reason why it was noticed as 600 feet is because the code requires it. It's it's pretty explicit as to how big the buffer is supposed to be for a use like this. So, generally the buffer would be like 300 feet or like the entire subdivision. But for this one, it just states it has to be 600 feet. It's probably because there are impacts on the neighboring area.

Commissioner Hollist said I believe we received an email from the townhouses adjacent with somebody indicating they had not been noticed. Do you know if individual townhome owners were noticed, or is that unit owned by a bigger entity that received the notice on their behalf?

Planner Aguilera said so the way the noticing works is that we will send notices to the listed owners under the list that Salt Lake County has. So if there's like a renter,
but the listed owner has an address that's not that physical address there, the notice will go to the owner wherever their address may be.

Commissioner Hollist said you mentioned that the green space to the east of this was going to be left open. Who owns that lot?

Planner Aguilera said the same property owners that own the properties of subs.

Commissioner Hollist said they do have the right to say we're leaving that open. I just want to make sure they're making a promise on behalf of another landowner.

Planner Aguilera said they own all the parcels involved, including that lot, but they're not using that open space as part of this development.

Commissioner Hollist said but will they use it in the future? I didn't necessarily feel like in the conditional use permit that was clear.

Planner Aguilera said it's not part of their proposed concept plan. They did say they intended to keep it open for the community, but perhaps they can elaborate further if they have any future plans for that they didn't communicate to the city.

Commissioner Hollist said so they've only verbally made that assurance.

Planner Aguilera said that is correct. Also during their site plans, they didn't include that section in the concept plans. They didn't include that section as being part of the project.

Commssioner Hollist said okay, and then the other piece I wasn't entirely sure on. I understand the flow that they're planning to use. Do they have agreements with the adjacent property owners or a shared access agreement?

Planner Aguilera said they did state they do have a shared access agreement that wasn't provided. So, for example, the building to the north, I believe, is a dance studio. Some of the parking from that is overflowing into the subject properties because some of it is parking isn't relying on the dance studio's parking. It wasn't taken too much into account for this conditional use permit analysis. So, for example, when this use, if it is approved and it is built out, all their parking stalls are for them. And if they have a shared parking they have enough left over to accommodate or to share, then they can use that. But they have to make sure they provide enough for their use based on the square footage of their building first.

Commissioner Hollist said I guess I'm thinking more of the in and out flow. They are flowing out directly into their neighbor's parking lot. Is that a typical arrangement without?

Planner Aguilera said so this whole development is part of the same agreement. So yeah, they have that shared entrance access and progression through the different parcels as long as they have it cleared with the shared parking agreement, and it's part of the development agreement.

Chair Gedge said on Redwood Road, any concerns with the entrance from the south exit to the north, onto a major? I consider Redwood a major arterial. Any concerns with traffic backing up, stacking onto Redwood Road? If someone can't get into the property, particularly during I don't know the dance pickup time, because they can't get in with neighboring properties, or because they're backed up on this property. Any concerns?

Deputy City/Transportation Engineer Jeremy Nielson said it is a private access. It's 26 feet wide, which is as wide as our residential streets, and so no, I didn't. I didn't foresee any. concerns regarding that.

Chair Gedge said are ther separate entrances and exits to their residential to the neighbors other than the dance studio that shares this this property, are there separate access? I'm just trying to nips things in the bud. If people might come forward and saying that they access this property to access their home.

Engineer Nielson said from what I see, there's three accesses into this whole area, whether you're the commercial business or you're the condominiums, there's three accesses, and it appears they are all accessible.

Chair Gedge said is on street parking allowed on 11000 S? I know I know the answer is no on Redwood Road. Is that striped like some of the places on Beckstead where there's no parking?

Engineer Nielson said it's striped with a very narrow shoulder, but I don't think it's marked as no parking, so people can park there. Not ideal though, because you are in the travel lane. Of course, legally, I believe they can park.

Commissioner Catmull said when we talk about that, when we talk about those detriments, I believe we are talking about the detriments that could not be addressed by a site plan. So, like buffering and noise abatement, those sorts of things. I know we're not doing the site plan today, so we're looking for those things that wouldn't be covered by a site plan.

Chair Gedge said yes, that is correct.

David George (Applicant) said I am representing the the property owner. So just to clarify a couple of the questions. We're also the property owner next door, so there is no conflict with us because we own both of the properties. If we were to sell them, we will do a joint development or a parking agreement that allows parking to go back and forth, between the two, I mean, it makes sense to have good flow on the entire property. So the other things that they stated, you know, we're in agreements with the staff. We'll comply with the necessary conditions and things. As far as the environmental concerns, those are all regulated by DEQ, and Master AutoTech complies with all of those regulations as well in their business. So sound decibels are relatively low. You

know, 70 to 75 on the average in the interior of the building. We don't expect a lot of sound outside of the building because we're designed to where they come in, drop the car off, leave the car with us, and then they'll work on the cars. Any cars that they're not working on, they could take outside or have them ready to go outside. So we don't expect a lot of sound spillover and overage and things. So I don't know if there are other particular questions. Our hours are generally 7 am to 5:00 pm or 6:00 pm Monday through Friday. Don't anticipate being open on Saturdays. Sometimes they modify their hours to 7:30 am for a start time. So it just kind of depends on what it is. They want to be your neighborhood auto and mechanic store. So we want to make sure that we fit in with our neighborhood and are good neighbors.

Commissioner Hollist said can you tell us a little bit about what the majority of your services are? So, we're told that there's 11 bays an everybody will use the same entrance and exit. Are we talking car repairs that take a day, a couple hours, or do you do a lot of emissions and oil changes. What what does your traffic look like?

Brian Everyl, (Mater Auto Tech) said it's light duty repair. We do oil changes, emissions tests, alignments, brakes, front end suspension. We will do anything that like a dealership would do under manufacturer scheduled maintenance.. We also do tires. We we do exhaust as well.

Commissioner Hollist said do you have a waiting room? Do you anticipate that you'll have a waiting area that people will come and stay and wait with their car?

Mr. Everyl said so our model is drop off. You can wait for something like an alignment, emissions test, oil change, but our model is that you drop your vehicle off, and we encourage that. The average we've got is 31 units inside our franchise system. The average store fixes eight vehicles a day.

Commissioner Hollist said have you ever run into a situation where you don't have sufficient parking for the cars on site, customer cars on site, and what do you do if you run into a scenario where you have more cars than you have parking spots?

Mr. Everyl said so when you get busy and you get backed up, that can happen, but we try to just schedule our work, and so everything's scheduled. I suppose there's some stores at times we've said, hey, if you don't pick up your car, there's like a daily fee, but we rarely have to enforce that because people need their cars back.

Chair Gedge said how often do you have deliveries for parts being delivered, or tires, or the removal of used oil, things like that? What is a typical delivery?

Mr. Everyl said I would say that there is at least on average, one delivery per vehicle. We have a lot of inventory that we have in house, but there's so many platforms these days that we rely on, you know, NAPA Auto or O'Reilly to to deliver parts so that we can get the dealerships to get the right gaskets and parts to fix them.

Chair Gedge said and as you mentioned, you have 31 other locations in your block, and so I'm assuming you have a very robust and documented spillage hazardous waste plan for any type of incident that may occur.

Mr. Everyl said yes, everything gets recycled. Metal gets recycled. All of our oil gets recycled. Antifreeze gets recycled, but we do offer that service. So, all of our containers are approved. All of our waste oil is is stored in approved containers with secondary containment. Anything with the drainage we're going to have anything that it goes through typically trench drains, water, oil, water separator, manhole, along with a sampling tank, and then along with a maintenance agreement to to make sure that it stays clean and semiannual cleanup.

Commissioner Anderson said so, question for the property owner: You mentioned that you own the neighboring property. I just want to make sure I have that clear. Is that the dance studio?

Mr. George said yes.

Chair Gedge said and just for my information, the property to the east, which is currently, I guess, open and is not in the concept plan. Do you know what's the current plan is?

Mr. George said it's a park and an amenity for the neighborhood. We expect it to stay that way, and we're happy to put that into whatever agreement we need to do.

Chair Gedge said do you maintain that, or does the the neighbors maintain that?

Mr. George said think the HOA maintains that, so as long as they take care of it, it's nice to have that for the neighborhoods, nice for the businesses that are there for the dance studio.

Commissioner Farnsworth said it was hard to tell from Google Maps. Is that just a grass area?

Mr. Everyl said it is a grass area, and it's fenced as well. It has a small barn and a pavilion or a gazebo, and a picnic table and a small area there for that.

Commissioner Catmull said so, with your other locations, do you have any experience being close to residential? How common is that, or how unique is that to your locations?

Mr. Everyl said I would say this would probably be the closest to residential. We want to be the community trusted, helpful auto expert. I think that noise is probably a concern. I think there are things that we can do to help out with that. For example, I think one of the noisiest pieces of equipment in a shop is typically the air compressor. It costs us about 10 times as much, but I think we'd be happy to invest in a rotary screw compressor. They're very quiet, and they run continuously, and that would keep the noise down quite a bit. A lot of pneumatic tools are going electric, which are typically a lot quieter because you don't have the hammers inside the tools that are hitting. So, I think there's things that we can do and that we want to do to make sure that we're mitigating any noise, even if we do fall inside the county's requirements.

Commissioner Catmull said I was looking at a few other locations and there seem to be a few others, and what I seem to see at least within Kitty Corner are pretty close. You also had homes that were within areas, and I think the West Jordan in particular was like 200 feet, which I think is the same requirement we have here. So it's pretty close.

Commissioner Hollist said can I ask for clarification on something Mr. Catmull just said? So I think that because this is mixed use, there isn't a 200 foot buffer requirement in this case. And I just wanted staff to confirm if that's true.

Planner Aguilera said so, according to that section of the code the 200 foot buffer is to the nearest residential.

Commissioner Hollist said to clarify, there are homes that people are living in that are closer than 200 feet because it is a mixed use land use.

Planner Aguilera said correct. It's mixed.

Commissioner Hollist said if you can't answer this, maybe you can look it up. If you just look at the townhomes to the south of that property, that little unit that will share a drive access, how dense is it? Is this residential density if you just take that land piece?

Planner Aguilera said I didn't do a residential density analysis for this. I could probably look it up in the agreement and see what they required for this.

Chair Gedge said we received emails today and they have been entered into the Public Record.

Chair Gedge opened the Public Hearing to comments.

Cameron Questereit, South Jordan – said I live in the townhomes just southeast of the Automaster Center. I actually have experience, my dad owns a repair shop, so I've been around it. I know the noise that comes out of it, and he was mentioning the air compressor that goes. That's a significant noise. That's not the only noise. You got air hammers, impact wrenches, a lot of noise is generated where you cannot be on a phone inside the building if someone's working on a car. And then there's also the the part where they're marking on the map, that grass section, but from my understanding, that was supposed to be the HOAs, because we are paying to maintain that in the gazebo. That's all included in our cost. And with that noise, that South Bay is right next to a residential house. So even though the residential code says 20 feet, if it's the residential area and mixed use, you're still right next to a house. You're still going to be making a lot of noise for that resident, and they say, "Oh, we're going to close the doors". They can't guarantee that. All it takes is one mechanic to be lazy and say, "I'm going to leave the door open, and then it's open and making noise. And then what if they're using swamp coolers instead of air conditioning? That requires airflow out, so the door has to be cracked for that, right? And then the parking is another concern I have. They say that they have that internal parking and they're not going to be influencing that much, but they said they had 11 bays. Where are those mechanics going to park? Where are the service riders going to park? All those people where are they going to park? And then what

about overnight cars? So sometimes you have to order a part. Takes days to get there. They're using the parking for more than that, right? And then bringing in parts, they said they do all services that a dealer would do. That's engine transmissions. A semi is going to be delivering those things, and the only entrance we have that we can enter through is the dance studio. But during peak drop off and and pick up times for the kids, you can't get in that way. It's blocked. So there's only the one entrance for us to get in for our townhomes. And then the circulation is one thing I have. They're going to exit on the north, but as I said, drop off or pick up that's all blocked. Another concern I have is waste removal. So they said there going have a container when they have to come pick that up. It's going be a big truck coming into our residential area. On top of that, so we talked about pick up for the waste. We talked about parts deliveries, but what about the tool trucks that are coming in. So there's probably four different manufacturers that will drive a big truck to come show mechanics new tools, to sell them. So there's gonna cause more circulation traffic there, and then on top of it, we get how much is going to cost to repair things. Part of it is the concrete, and that might be covered cost where they're entering in. I'm not 100% sure on that, but that is a concern. Another concern is the lighting, lighting going into the the townhomes, and then the customer waiting at that dog park. If the HOA owns it, the customers, if they do end up staying, they're going to be sitting in that dog park, which is for our residents. Those are my concerns with all this, and I'm kind of against it.

Larry Rodanesme, South Jordan - said I also live in the townhomes right in the middle. I actually took some time to go take a look at the master plan. You know the business that would like to come in here. They look like a clean, efficient business. I'm not opposed. I know the owner would probably like to have that developed and I understand that. You know, developing business is important. My biggest concern is the traffic flow. And somebody over here said there were three entrances. There are not three entrances. There are two, but one of them runs through the parking lot for the dance studio. And as was already pointed out, during the evening time, from the time that they start the drop off and pick up, you cannot get out. I'm like, well, you can if you want to fight that traffic, and it's just very difficult to get in the north entrance into the townhomes. So, during those times we only have one entrance, and it's on Redwood Road. When I moved there on Redwood Road, I'm one of the original owners. Redwood Road had two lanes, and then South Jordan removed the turn lane and the bicycle lane and put a third one in. Do you know how many little fender benders there have been right at that point, where people are trying to slow down to turn into the into the the parking lot for both the dance studio and aobviously the townhomes. Traffic stacks up. There have been a number of little fender benders, and I know there was a big major wreck right there as well. It was later in the evening. I don't know the circumstances, but it wiped out the fence. It wiped out all of that. So, if somehow that entrance could be widened, if we could get another entrance, maybe on the south side. There's a big development going in right now. I don't know the answer to this, but as it's proposed, I think it's going to cause a lot of backup and a lot of problems during certain parts of the day when people are trying to get in and out. And if you don't go there and watch the traffic flow while it's actually happening, you're just guessing at how many cars there are. There are a ton of vehicles that come in, dropping off and picking up their kids. And I think we've been very good neighbors with the dance studio. I Have no problem with the dance studio, and I know that I shouldn't be going in that north entrance certain times of

the day, I just come around the block and I go in on the one entrance that works, but I do think traffic's a problem.

Emily Shreeve, South Jordan - said I live in the community we're talking about, and I wrote my thoughts down, so I apologize. I won't be looking at your eyes, but I want to stay on topic. I am also the treasurer of the board of directors for the HOA. I want to begin by saying that I'm not opposed to a development of the vacant property. My concern is whether this is particular use is appropriate this close to existing homes, and whether the potential impacts have been adequately addressed before. My first concern is proximity. This is not a vehicle service center located in an isolated commercial area. This means that the potential impact of noise, vehicle traffic, headlights, idling, deliveries, waste removal, and daily shop operations will be experienced very differently by the people living nearby. Second, I'm concerned about the noise. Vehicle service centers include engines running, tools, compressors, surface bay activity, and frequent vehicle movement. I would ask that the commission not to rely on only assumptions about how much that noise will dissipate. If noise is expected to be adequately controlled, I believe it should be supported by objective analysis and enforceable operating requirements. Third, the proposed hours, as early as 7 a.m. on the weekends. I would ask that any approval include specific limits on those operating hours, including deliveries, waste pickup, vehicle testing, and other outdoor activities, so those hours cannot gradually expand after approval. I'm also concerned about the service bay doors, as others have shared. If keeping those doors closed is an important part of reducing noise, then that should be a clear condition of approval with very limited exceptions. Parking and vehicle circulation also deserve significant closer examination. A repair facility creates constant movement of customer vehicles, employee vehicles, cars waiting for service, and vehicles moving in and out of the bays. I would ask the commission to consider whether the proposed parking and circulation plan truly prevents overflow, congestion, idling, and impact on neighboring properties and the 100 children that visit the dance studio each and every day that are running around in those parking lots. There should also be clear conditions about addressing automotive fluid, waste storage, spill containment, outdoor repairs, overnight vehicle storage, outdoor lighting, headlights, and engine testing. Most importantly, I would ask the commission to recognize that although these nearby homes may technically fall in a mixed-use zoning designation; they are still homes. Families still live there. The real-world residential impact should matter regardless of the zoning label. If the commission believes that this use can operate here without creating significant detrimental effects, then I respectfully ask that those protections be specific, measurable, and enforceable before the permit is approved. And if those impacts cannot be adequately addressed, I would ask that the commission to defer or deny the application rather than approving.

Ana Orpiano, South Jordan – said so under the Utah Land Use Law, a conditional use permit must be denied if it's detrimental, and impacts cannot be mitigated, I am standing here tonight to state that a simple design tweak or layout change will not fix this project. The severe health, safety, and traffic hazards this business brings are completely unmitigable on this narrow lot because it is really a very narrow lot. So the traffic hazard has been discussed by my my neighbors. It is also a very narrow entrance and will be a sole main entrance to our community. And also the the parking lot. The space that they said that they will not touch, that's a dog park. So, you know, liquid or anything that may spill from this mechanic area. It will be detrimental to the dogs also, and you know the fumes. if you see the building where I'm in the middle row, and in front of me is another

townhome. So if you block the right side, or the north side of my area, it will be very very close. My window is right to my neighbor's windows.

Chair Gedge closed the Public Hearing.

Chair Gedge said the property to the east. The applicant testified that he owns that, but the HOA maintains it. I don't know if we can really consider that as part of conditional use permit that we're considering maybe later at the site plan. But that might be a civil matter that this commission doesn't have the perview to review because ownership questions.

Commissioner Hollist said I technically disagree. I think it can be a buffer, a barrier, and so potentially a mitigation. But I'm not exactly sure on who owns it.

Chair Gedge said do we have a property record of who actually owns that property. I know you said it's not part of this application, but it's adjoining.

Planner Aguilera said it’s showing that the property owner is the same property owner as the subject parcels.

Chair Gedge said noise obviously was a major concern, depending on tools, compressors, air tools, and traffic. Just having a building there, there's going to be noise. Obviously it's regulated by various regulations of the county, and I believe it's the county health department regulates in all communities in Salt Lake County.Of course, we have our own city code for hours of operation, the quiet hours, which are 10 p.m. to 7 a.m. but still a concern over weekends and what happens for other deliveries outside of our quiet hours.

Commissioner Hollist said I think it would be appropriate for staff to state how somebody would go about enforcing sound violations? Who would they call? What would happen?

Planner Aguilera said so with a code complaint for example, on a noise nuisance or something like that. The public does have access to go on the city website, and there's a section for code compliance, and they're able to submit a complaint there and describe it, and then the code enforcement officer can review it and investigate and conduct a review of the noise and of the nuisance to address it.

Commissioner Catmull said if there are repeated violations of noise events found, what happens to a property owner? Do they basically have like misdemeanors, or if it's tied to a conditional use, does it potentially put the conditional use at risk?

Planner Schindler said the noise ones are probably the hardest to to prove that they're actually happening, so Salt Lake County will have to investigate the noise ordinances.

Commissioner Catmull said I think from a noise study they will probably do something like a one hour average.

Planner Schindler said you could require a noise study be done before you make a decision on this, you could table the decision until you can review the study.

Commissioner Hollist said I think it's worth mentioning that the applicant has mentioned they'd be willing to implement two different concessions to address or to mitigate that particular concern.The operation with doors closed and the use of the rotary screw compressor.

Chair Gedge said I guess usually because the conditional use will stay with the property even after it sells. So what is the actual use that we are considering?

Planner Aguilera said so, this use falls under a category called automotive services and repairs in the city code.

Commissioner Catmull said with that, as I understand, it's like typically oriented towards overnight or less lubrication services usually indoor.

Planner Aguilera said It does include lubrication services. It's not super specific on the other items you mentioned.

Commissioner Catmull said can it be outdoors or is it required to be indoors?

Planner Schindler said the work that happens has to happen indoors because that's what they're proposing. They can't do any outdoors. It's similar to the Les Schwab up there. They they can't change tires outside. They have to change them in their bays, so the same thing would happen with this business as well. Now, the cars that get dropped off and are not being serviced at the time, they can be parked outside, and in the morning they can be moved in or whatever. The customers will be using the spaces outside to park the cars. If they drop them off they'll be using some of their parking spaces outside.

Commissioner Catmull said is there is any size limitations to what an automobile means in this section of the code?

Planner Schindler said there isn’t anything that I know about.

Chair Gedge said I guess if they can fit it inside the building, it probably would be the same thing.

Chair Gedge said parking was brought up several times, I know the struggles of dance parents who do not know how to be considerate of picking up and dropping off their children. So hopefully, I believe the applicant owns that building and probably leases it to the current dance studio, they can remind their the parents of the attendees to follow the circulation plan or whatever that might be. But is that something you know we need to consider for this type of use with three access points for both a residential community?

Commissioner Hollist said for clarification: I do have daughters that have danced there in the past. There are only two entrances and one of those is only an exit.

Planner Schindler said there are only two entrances. That exit is part of the circulation plan is for the dance studio. So they come in on the north side, but the east side is where they go out.

Chair Gedge said on the parking we've heard that there's 33 total stalls on this proposal. On the concept, 11 of them will be interior, which I believe as they're working on the vehicles up to 11 bays. Of course, there's concerns about the cars that are being dropped off, waiting to be serviced. If you have someone else drop someone off in the car to pick up that individual, and then you also have all the workers, and then of course all the overflow from the neighboring dance studio or any residents who have visitors coming over and might be using that space as well. Obviously, in the code I believe they said it was 6,600 feet, and it was 200 feet per space.

Commissioner Hollist said all I can say is we might not love it. We usually want more parking than our ordinances require. But I'm assuming that the townhomes have the parking that is required. The dance studio has the parking that's technically required. Everybody's meeting our ordinances.

Planner Aguilera said yeah, and the dance studio has its own parking. I believe the townhomes have two car garages.

Chair Gedge said and of course, access to the property off 11000 South and or Redwood Road. I asked Jeremy that previously, he confirmed that there were no issues with this type of use, and the current uses. Obviously, I made the allusion to the dance studio, and every dance studio or daycare we've reviewed at least in my seven years. It's been a concern for the residents and neighbors. We obviously have popular new fast food restaurants appear on 11400 S that could back up traffic. I guess if it does become an issue, we will look at it. Then city public enforcement would get involved, and and people who are backing up impeding traffic could be ticketed, so it would be the owners of those businesses to make sure that their traffic flow is working.

Commissioner Farnsworth said can you just remind me, Redwood Road is controlled by the county, right? And so they were the ones that made the decision to take it from two lanes to three lanes a few years ago to make it consistent from north to south. And then would they ever have an appetite for some sort of a turn lane or like a pull off so you're not in the lane of traffic when you're turning.

Assistnt City Engineer Nielson said It's a UDOT facility. It's a state facility, and the additional lane was added and was restriped by the state. If it was warranted, they would look at that cost-wise. But I would be surprised if they would pay for it by looking at the volumes, I don't think it'd be a priority for the state.

Commissioner Farnsworth asked about the ingress and egress from the townhome development there. It looks like from Google Maps, that the property to the south isn't developed. When that is developed, do you know if there would be a requirement for an exit to the south from that townhome development?

Planner Schindler said it is being developed right now, and there's a wall that goes there. Their site plan shows that there's going to be buildings blocking the the road.

Chair Gedge said some questions were brought up about deliveries and the waste of any materials on the property. The applicant did answer that. And so, the county health regulations and state or federal DEQ requirements are in place. Next thing was a lighting plan and landscape plan. We typically see those during the actual site plan. On those, obviously, there's a development going into the south. There's the dance studio to the north. You know, it's an infill. I guess there could be a concern with light, but we would review that during site plan. And the same thing with landscaping. Other than the dog park, of course, which we need to come up with an answer on how do we maintain that.

Commissioner Hollist said there was an email that I don't think actually falls under our purview, but I think it's worth mentioning. They said that they thought that the cost of replacing the drive, or at least contributing to it, would fall under their HOA expenses, and concern about having to help offset that for commercial business.

Chair Gedge said if there is a repair that needs to be done. I know the answer to this, but so an HOA would would be a civil matter. If there's damage to an HOA-owned road because it's not a city road, they would need to go after the neighboring property for relief if there were to be any.

Commissioner Hollist asked whether the mixed-use agreement establishes a height limit for this particular zone.

Planner Aguilera said the development agreement would be reviewed during the site plan review process to ensure compliance with any limitations on building floor area, height, and number of stories.

Planner Schindler said the development agreement establishes a maximum building height of 45 feet.

Commissioner Catmull said could we expect to see that development agreement on the site plan? It was not included in this packet?

Planner Aguilera said we can definitely share with you. Because of the length of it, it just wasn't included.

Planner Schindler said the development agreement has been amended multiple times, including a first and second amendment. I can provide copies of the agreement and its amendments, noting that the documents total approximately 70 pages.

Commissioner Hollist said were you able to look up what the density of those townhomes?

Planner Aguilera said so it's not clear what the residential portion is, but the townhomes, and also these subject properties, and the building to the north of the dance studio are all part of the 111

subdivision, which has around 10 lots, and that whole density, one subdivision is about 10 units per acre. That's the density of the whole subdivision.

Chair Gedge said with mixed use development, do we have any other automated businesses in other mixed-use developments in the city? I know we asked the applicant and neighboring communities, but in the city, do we know of any examples?

Planner Aguilera said I believe the Bangarder Highway mixed-use zone does have some similar uses on the north side of the road where the Quick Quack car wash is, there's may be a similar use. I think there's a grease monkey over there too, but those are the ones I can think of.

Planner Schindler said the Grease Monkey is located on the north side of 11400 South, with townhomes immediately to the north along the private drive. There is abother Grease Monkey located on the north side of South Jordan Parkway near Smith's, but that location is not near any residential properties.

Chair Gedge said going through the emails, there were a lot of comments about the compatibility with the existing homes that are there and the potential impact on property value or livability concerns of that, I'm bringing those up because they were shared. We're not ignoring those, but I think unfortunately, those types of subjective type of things are in our preview to consider without actual hard evidence of like real estate documentation presented that the property values would go down. Unfortunately, if your view is blocked, that's not something we can consider, the property owner still has property rights on that. We did review those, and we are sympathetic with that, but unfortunately, in our reviewthere's not a lot we can do on that.

Commissioner Catmull said have the potential odors from the proposed use been addressed? Specifically, noting the strong smell of products such as brake cleaner and questioning how those odors would be ventilated from the building. He requested that the applicant return to answer additional questions about operational processes and ventilation. He acknowledged that many of these concerns could be addressed during the site plan review process but wanted to better understand the scope of potential impacts.

Chair Gedge said I am going to invite the applicants to come back forward. If you'd like to please come up, we're going to ask a couple follow-up questions on just processes and things. The property that's being used as a dog park with a gazebo to the east, you are the property owner, correct?

Mr, George said yes, we are.

Chair Gedge said is there was an agreement with the HOA for them to be able to access it.

Mr. Everyl said I've got to go back. It's been a long time, and re-read what that is. When we developed it, we put everything in and then let them use it under the condition that they do the maintenance. I can't remember if it was a written one or we just did it because it's a nice amenity to have there, and it may it probably ties back into the whole development agreement and having

an overall open space. When you look at the density, he's talking about 10 units to the density, but there's a the ones to the east are less dense than the ones to the where the townhomes are. I just have to read through it. I didn't reread the whole thing before we came. Sorry, but we will make sure that we address that. Also, for the record, we think it's a good thing to have there and to keep there. I think there's a way that we can maintain that open space. I think it's good for everybody.

Chair Gedge said a concern was raised about smells, break fluids and oil spills. I know if there's a spill, obviously you have your action plan to mitigate that, but what other things for venting? One of the residents brought up: you have to use a swamp cooler. You'll crack the doors and venting it. What is your air circulation process for your your buildings to try to mitigate, leakage and smells into neighboring properties.

Mr. Everyl said in a pull-through style design shop, we have ventilation system and carbon monoxide detectors just for the safety of our of our crew members because we are operating vehicles. You know we've got to make sure that there's airflow and we're evacuating and circulating the air so it doesn't get out. So any air smells would be evacuated through that system. As far as smells go, I'm trying to think of the stinkiest thing. My wife complains about transmission fluid on my hands. That's usually like what we get the biggest complaint on. But we don't put out like a big odor. Chlorinated brake clean is something that does have a little bit of a smell. We can use non-chlorinated brake clean, but brake fluid that goes in the master cylinder, clutch cylinder, doesn't really have a smell.

Commissioner Catmull asked if they would be willing to consider how and where you vent?

Mr. George said of course, and the same thing with the sound, there are things we could do with the sound to kind of mitigate that too. The whole design is to have everything inside the building, so there's no work done outside. It's not like a typical old style shop, you would have everything done inside, and so it ought to be much easier to help and mitigate those things.

Chair Gedge asked would you be opposed if we required a noise study?

Mr. Everyl said we would be happy to do that.

Chair Gedge said that concerns regarding hours of operation had been raised and suggested addressing those questions while the applicant was present.

Mr. George said the business would be closed on Sundays and would operate reduced hours on Saturdays from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. There would be some overlap in operating hours with the neighboring dance studio, the business would close by 6:00 p.m., minimizing overlap during the evening hours.

Commissioner Catmull said is the customer volume on Saturdays is typically higher, lower, or comparable to weekdays.

Mr. Everyl said the Saturday customer volume varies depending on the community and clientele, but Saturdays tend to be particularly important in blue-collar communities. He stated that employees generally prefer having Saturdays off, and the business would operate five days a week if possible. However, if there is sufficient community demand for Saturday service, they would adjust their hours accordingly.

Commissioner Hollist said if they have a standard building that you use? Can you comment on how tall you think this will be?

Mr. George said the building would require approximately 12.5 feet of clear interior height, with an additional four to five feet to accommodate the roof structure. The tower feature could extend another 10 to 15 feet above the roofline, but the overall building height would remain well below the permitted limit. The original site plan proposed an 18,000-square-foot, three-story building, making the current proposal significantly less intensive than the originally planned development.

Chair Gedge said would the building height would limit the size of vehicles the facility could service and whether the business would provide repairs for recreational vehicles (RVs) or semi-trucks.

Mr. Everyl said the business does not provide boat or RV repairs, they occasionally perform specialized work, such as custom exhaust tubing for generators, but those services are rare and infrequent.

Chair Gedge said the site plan would return to the Planning Commission, providing another opportunity for public comment and a more detailed review of the proposed development.

Commissioner Catmull said with the Commission review each potential impact individually to determine whether mitigation conditions were necessary. The noise was a concern raised during public comment and is there sufficient information to determine its impact on nearby residences. The proposed development would be approximately 40 feet from residential properties, compared to the approximately 50-foot separation between his home and a neighboring residence. Given the commercial-residential boundary within the mixed-use development, so I would have interest in obtaining a noise study to better understand potential noise levels at that distance and whether mitigation would be needed.

Commissioner Hollist said a noise study might be appropriate before site plan review, and I would like to see compare the proposed business's noise levels with existing traffic noise from Redwood Road. I live approximately six houses away from 9800 South and can still hear traffic at night, that roadway noise can be significant.

Commissioner Catmull said I am uncertain about how the proposed noise levels would compare to Salt Lake County ordinance requirements. I have concerns about staff's comments regarding the difficulty of enforcing noise regulations, particularly given the building's proximity to residential properties. Although I generally prefers not to table applications, but I am leaning

toward requesting additional information to better understand the potential noise impacts before making a decision.

Chair Gedge said while potential noise impacts have been raised during public comment, no documentation or evidence has been presented demonstrating excessive noise from the proposed business or similar facilities. Would it be appropriate to table the application and require the applicant to provide additional documentation based solely on concerns rather than an identified, documented detrimental impact. The potential noise mitigation measures, such as requiring service bay doors to remain closed, could be addressed during the site plan review process.

Commissioner Catmull said are thee additional information regarding potential noise impacts that should be required during the conditional use permit review or addressed during the site plan process. We could require studies to evaluate potential impacts, but I am concerned that a conditional use permit runs with the land, making long-term enforcement important, particularly given the proximity to residential properties. My concerns are not specific to the applicant but related to the potential impacts of the use over time.

Chair Gedge said the existing Salt Lake County Health Department regulations, state and federal requirements, and City ordinances already address potential violations.

Director Preece said, if compliance with Salt Lake County noise ordinances were included as a condition of approval and the business failed to comply, the conditional use permit could be brought back before the Planning Commission for review. Although, conditional use permits run with the land, property owners must continue to comply with the conditions of approval, and remedies are available if violations occur, even if the County does not take enforcement action. I reccommend including compliance with Salt Lake County noise ordinances as a condition of approval to provide an additional enforcement mechanism. The applicable health department regulations could also address waste-related concerns, although lighting would need to be addressed separately.

Commissioner Hollist said can the circulation plan include a contingency for situations when the business exceeds its available parking spaces, such as requiring vehicles to be stored at an alternate location.

Commissioners discussed concerns regarding the separate parcel, including how access would be maintained if its use changed and whether it could potentially be used for overflow parking. They acknowledged that the parcel was outside the boundaries of the current application and questioned whether imposing a condition related to its use would be appropriate. The discussion also addressed whether parking or circulation concerns constituted an identified detrimental impact warranting a condition of approval or whether those matters could be addressed through the standard site plan review process.

Chair Gedge said that someone had indicated that maintenance of the dog park was funded through HOA fees but clarified that this did not establish whether the dog park was included as an amenity in the development agreement.

Planner Schindler said I don't believe the dog park was included in the development agreement but I have not specifically reviewed the agreement for the provisions.

Chair Gedge said the development agreement is necessary for the Commission to move forward with the conditional use permit, I would not oppose tabling the application for one or two meetings to obtain confirmation.

Planner Schindler said the City Code requires a sound study for the proposed use, regardless of whether it is submitted during the conditional use permit or site plan review process. The lighting and landscaping plans are required as part of the standard site plan application process.

Planner Aguilera said the dog park or open space amenity is shown in an exhibit included in the second amendment to the development agreement.

Commissioner Hollist said the mixed-use developments can be challenging because they often do not have the same restrictions that apply to other zoning districts. This may be one reason mixed-use developments have become less common. These challenges are particularly evident when residential properties are developed before surrounding commercial uses, as seen in Daybreak. The Commission's ability to address concerns can be limited when specific ordinance standards are not available to guide the decisions.

Commissioner Catmull should the types of vehicles serviced at the proposed facility be limited to the vehicle classifications in City code, including passenger automobiles, light and medium trucks, and light recreational vehicles.

Chair Gedge motioned to approve File No.PLCUP202600160 MasterAutotech Conditional Use Permit.For automated services and repairs of vehicles that are allowed to park in residential zones, subject to all city, county, state, federal regulations being satisfied, and that the property amenities referenced in the second amendment of the development agreement is maintained.

Commissioner Catmull ammended the motion to add all health, safety and regulations by general welfare.

Commissioner Hollist seconded the motion as stated by Chair Gedge and amended by Commissioner Catmull. Roll Call Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor. Commissioner Harding was absent from the vote.

I. LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS

None.

J. OTHER BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Gedge motioned to Adjourn.

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

This is a true and correct copy of the September 22, 2026 Planning Commission minutes, which were approved on October 27, 2026

Outlook

FW: Public Comment for File Number PLCUP202600160 – Opposition to Proposed Master Autotech Shop

From Greg Schindler <GSchindler@sjc.utah.gov>
Date Mon 9/21/2026 4:01 PM
To Nathan Gedge <NGedge@sjc.utah.gov>; Michele Hollist <MHollist@sjc.utah.gov>; Steven Catmull <SCatmull@sjc.utah.gov>; Lori Harding <LHarding@sjc.utah.gov>; Bryan J. Farnsworth <BFarnsworth@sjc.utah.gov>; Nikora Anderson <nanderson@sjc.utah.gov>; Cindy Valdez <CValdez@sjc.utah.gov>; Anna Crookston <acrookston@sjc.utah.gov>
Cc Miguel Aguilera <MAguilera@sjc.utah.gov>; Brian Preece <BPreece@sjc.utah.gov>; Gregory Simonsen <GSimonsen@sjc.utah.gov>

See email below:

From: Ana O. [redacted]
Sent: Monday, September 21, 2026 1:21 PM
To: Greg Schindler <GSchindler@sjc.utah.gov>
Subject: Public Comment for File Number PLCUP202600160 – Opposition to Proposed Master Autotech Shop

Dear Mr. Schindler and Members of the South Jordan Planning Commission,

I am a resident of the One Eleven Townhome community located immediately south of the subject property for **File Number PLCUP202600160**. I am writing to formally submit my serious concerns regarding the conditional use permit and site plan proposed for the auto mechanic shop, Master AutoTech, adjacent to our neighborhood.
Please include these comments in the official public record for the upcoming hearing. Our community has several major safety, environmental, and structural objections to the current layout:

1. **Traffic Safety and Critical Ingress/Egress Constraints:**
   The proposed project relies heavily on the shared access point along South Redwood Road. This driveway serves as the sole main entrance and exit for our entire townhome community. South Redwood Road experiences rapid, high-volume traffic. Forcing additional heavy commercial vehicles, tow trucks, and vehicles requiring mechanical service into this bottleneck will severely exacerbate an already hazardous traffic situation.
2. **Noise and Environmental Pollution:** An automotive repair facility so close to a dense residential community introduces continuous noise pollution (from impact wrenches, air compressors, engine revving, and bay doors) and chemical air emissions. This directly impacts our quiet enjoyment and raises valid health concerns regarding toxic fumes near our homes.
3. **Severe Visual Encroachment and Blocked Views (Units 25–26 in the diagram):**
   The middle-row townhome units in our community feature a single facade with windows. The

current layout places the rear and side of the proposed mechanic building directly against our property line. This will completely block the side views and daylighting for Units 25 and 26 in the diagram, whose front views are already obstructed by the townhomes facing them. This creates a claustrophobic, walled-in effect for those residents.

4. **Incompatible Adjacency to Children's Facility (Dance Studio):**
   The existing building immediately north of this proposed shop houses a prominent dance studio heavily frequented by young children. Introducing an active automotive repair shop directly next door creates an industrial conflict of use, putting small children in close physical proximity to moving vehicles, hazardous fluid handling, and industrial workspaces.
5. **Community Devaluation and Quality of Life:**
   The cumulative weight of these safety hazards, environmental impacts, and lack of adequate buffer space will result in immediate negative impacts on our community's health, safety, and long-term property values.

Given these critical issues, I urge the Planning Commission to deny this permit or, at minimum, require a complete redesign that relocates the automotive business to an appropriately zoned commercial corridor away from residential townhomes and children's facilities.

Thank you for your time, leadership, and consideration of our neighborhood's safety.

Sincerely,

Ana Orpiano
[redacted]
South Jordan, UT

Outlook

FW: Opposition to Master AutoTech CUP – File No. PLCUP202600160

From Greg Schindler <GSchindler@sjc.utah.gov>
Date Tue 9/22/2026 8:01 AM
To Nathan Gedge <NGedge@sjc.utah.gov>; Michele Hollist <MHollist@sjc.utah.gov>; Steven Catmull <SCatmull@sjc.utah.gov>; Lori Harding <LHarding@sjc.utah.gov>; Bryan J. Farnsworth <BFarnsworth@sjc.utah.gov>; Nikora Anderson <nanderson@sjc.utah.gov>; Cindy Valdez <CValdez@sjc.utah.gov>; Anna Crookston <acrookston@sjc.utah.gov>
Cc Miguel Aguilera <MAguilera@sjc.utah.gov>; Brian Preece <BPreece@sjc.utah.gov>; Gregory Simonsen <GSimonsen@sjc.utah.gov>

See email below:

Greg Schindler, AICP | City Planner | City of South Jordan
1600 W. Towne Center Drive | South Jordan, UT 84095
Office: 801.253.5203 ext 1291

AMERICA 250 | UTAH SOUTH JORDAN CITY

From: Ryan Putnam [redacted]
Sent: Monday, September 21, 2026 10:13 PM
To: Greg Schindler <GSchindler@sjc.utah.gov>
Subject: Opposition to Master AutoTech CUP – File No. PLCUP202600160

Dear Mr. Schindler and Members of the Planning Commission,

I am writing to formally oppose the proposed Master AutoTech Conditional Use Permit, **File No. PLCUP202600160**, for the approximately 6,600-square-foot automotive service building.

I am not writing as someone who is simply concerned about a new commercial development in the area. **I live in the townhomes immediately adjacent to the proposed building and serve as President of the Board for our Home Owners Association.** The proposed facility would be directly next to my home and the homes of my neighbors. As a resident who would experience the impacts of this development firsthand, I have serious concerns about whether an automotive service facility of this size and nature is appropriate for this location.

The proposed site plan and architectural renderings are particularly concerning. The proposed building includes numerous large roll-up garage doors and service bays, and the building is situated immediately adjacent to residential townhomes. This creates a very different relationship between the commercial use and the residential neighborhood than would exist with a less intensive commercial use.

The anticipated hours of operation are also significant. The facility is proposed to operate **7:00 AM to 6:00 PM Monday through Friday and 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM on weekends**. In other words, this is not simply a weekday commercial operation. Residents immediately next door could potentially experience vehicle traffic, garage-door activity, noise, deliveries, lighting, exhaust, and other activity **seven days a week**.

I am particularly concerned about the following:

1. Direct impact on adjacent residents

The proposed facility is immediately adjacent to our townhomes. The people living here are not separated from the project by a substantial commercial corridor or another parcel of land. The proximity makes noise, vehicle activity, lighting, exhaust, and other operational impacts especially important considerations.

2. An automotive service use is particularly intensive

The plans show multiple vehicle service bays and numerous large roll-up doors. Automotive repair facilities inherently involve vehicles arriving and departing, vehicles being moved around the property, engines running, equipment being operated, garage doors opening and closing, deliveries, and other activities that can affect neighboring residential properties.

3. The proposed hours extend into weekends

The proposed operating schedule includes both Saturday and Sunday. Residents should be able to reasonably expect that their homes will not be subjected to commercial activity immediately next door throughout the entire week.

4. There are already numerous automotive service options nearby

There is already a substantial number of automotive repair and service businesses serving this area. Based on local businesses I have identified, **there are at least eight automotive service/repair options within approximately a five-minute drive of this location.**

I believe the Planning Commission should consider whether adding another relatively large automotive service facility—particularly one immediately adjacent to residential homes—provides a sufficient community benefit to justify the additional impacts on the residents who live here.

This is an important distinction: **I am not arguing that there is no need for automotive repair services in South Jordan.** There are clearly businesses already providing those services. My concern is whether this particular location, directly next to an established residential community, is an appropriate place for another intensive automotive use.

5. Compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood

The Planning Commission should consider not only whether the proposed use can technically operate on the property, but also how the proposed use will function next to the existing residential community. The site plan appears to put the proposed automotive facility in very close proximity to the townhomes, making the potential impacts substantially more personal and immediate for those of us who live here.

I respectfully ask the Planning Commission to consider the perspective of the residents who will have to live with this decision every day—not just the immediate requirements of the proposed development.

I understand that City staff has recommended approval. However, I respectfully ask the Planning Commission to independently evaluate whether this proposal is compatible with the adjacent residential community and whether this particular location is appropriate for an automotive service facility.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Planning Commission deny the proposed Conditional Use Permit. At a minimum, I ask that the application be deferred so that the impacts on the adjacent townhome residents—including noise, traffic, lighting, vehicle circulation, exhaust, hours of operation, and buffering—can be more thoroughly evaluated and addressed.

Thank you for considering the concerns of the residents who live immediately adjacent to this proposed development.

Sincerely,

Ryan Putnam

President of the One Eleven Townhomes HOA Board

[redacted]

South Jordan, UT

[redacted]

Outlook

FW: File No. PLCUP202600160: Public Comment: Strong Opposition to Proposed Master AutoTech Service Station (11048 Redwood Road)

From Greg Schindler <GSchindler@sjc.utah.gov>
Date Tue 9/22/2026 8:00 AM
To Nathan Gedge <NGedge@sjc.utah.gov>; Michele Hollist <MHollist@sjc.utah.gov>; Steven Catmull <SCatmull@sjc.utah.gov>; Lori Harding <LHarding@sjc.utah.gov>; Bryan J. Farnsworth <BFarnsworth@sjc.utah.gov>; Nikora Anderson <nanderson@sjc.utah.gov>; Cindy Valdez <CValdez@sjc.utah.gov>; Anna Crookston <acrookston@sjc.utah.gov>
Cc Miguel Aguilera <MAguilera@sjc.utah.gov>; Brian Preece <BPreece@sjc.utah.gov>; Gregory Simonsen <GSimonsen@sjc.utah.gov>

See email below:

Greg Schindler, AICP | City Planner | City of South Jordan
1600 W. Towne Center Drive | South Jordan, UT 84095
Office: 801.253.5203 ext 1291

AMERICA 250 | UTAH SOUTH JORDAN CITY

From: Candace Murray [redacted]
Sent: Monday, September 21, 2026 8:47 PM
To: Greg Schindler <GSchindler@sjc.utah.gov>
Subject: File No. PLCUP202600160: Public Comment: Strong Opposition to Proposed Master AutoTech Service Station (11048 Redwood Road)

Dear Members of the South Jordan City Planning Commission,

I am writing as a resident of the One Eleven Townhomes to express my strong opposition to the proposed Master AutoTech vehicle service station on the vacant parcel located between our townhomes and the dance studio at 11048 Redwood Road.

This specific parcel of land is entirely inadequate to accommodate a commercial vehicle service station. The lot is simply not large enough to house a business of this nature without causing severe disruptions to both the local residents and the patrons of the neighboring dance studio.

Our primary concerns regarding this proposal include:

- **Severe Traffic and Access Issues:** The additional vehicle traffic generated by an automotive repair shop will make entering and exiting our neighborhood nearly impossible. Redwood Road is already heavily trafficked, and adding a high-turnover automotive business to this tight space will create dangerous gridlock.

- **Parking Shortages:** The small parking lot between our townhomes and the dance studio is already at capacity during the late afternoon and evening hours when classes are in session. A service station will completely overwhelm the available parking, leaving nowhere for residents or dance studio patrons to park.
- **Economic and Property Impact:** The presence of a noisy, high-traffic service station immediately adjacent to residential homes and a youth dance studio will inevitably lead to a loss of business for the dance studio and a significant drop in property values for our townhomes.

I strongly urge the Planning Commission to conduct a site visit in the late afternoons. Seeing the existing congestion firsthand when dance classes are underway and residents are returning home from work will make it clear that this lot cannot support any additional business pressure, let alone a vehicle service station.

Thank you for your time, consideration, and dedication to maintaining the safety and character of our South Jordan neighborhoods. I respectfully request that the commission deny the application for this service station.

Sincerely,

Candace Taylor
[redacted]
One Eleven Townhomes Resident

Sent from my iPhone

Outlook

FW: File number: PLCUP202600160

From Greg Schindler <GSchindler@sjc.utah.gov>
Date Tue 9/22/2026 11:32 AM
To Nathan Gedge <NGedge@sjc.utah.gov>; Michele Hollist <MHollist@sjc.utah.gov>; Steven Catmull <SCatmull@sjc.utah.gov>; Lori Harding <LHarding@sjc.utah.gov>; Bryan J. Farnsworth <BFarnsworth@sjc.utah.gov>; Nikora Anderson <nanderson@sjc.utah.gov>; Cindy Valdez <CValdez@sjc.utah.gov>; Anna Crookston <acrookston@sjc.utah.gov>
Cc Miguel Aguilera <MAguilera@sjc.utah.gov>; Brian Preece <BPreece@sjc.utah.gov>; Gregory Simonsen <GSimonsen@sjc.utah.gov>

See email below:

Greg Schindler, AICP | City Planner | City of South Jordan
1600 W. Towne Center Drive | South Jordan, UT 84095
Office: 801.253.5203 ext 1291

AMERICA 250 | UTAH SOUTH JORDAN CITY

From: Reyna Rope [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2026 8:51 AM
To: Greg Schindler <GSchindler@sjc.utah.gov>
Subject: RE: File number: PLCUP202600160
Importance: High

Hello, I would like to vote **against** the vehicle service center, Master AutoTech, next to my townhome and the dance studio at 11048 Redwood Road. I do not believe this will be a good idea, Parking is limited already for our visitors (for the townhouses) and with the amount of traffic the dance studio already gets its to much. Adding the service center would congest this area even more. Not to mention the amounts of cars that would be parked waiting for repairs. There just isn't room.

Thanks Reyna Rope
[redacted]
South, Jordan UT 84095
[redacted]

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: **RedRocK HOA Management LLC** <noreply@goenumerate.com>
Date: Mon, Sep 21, 2026 at 10:41 AM
Subject: Notice of public hearing: proposed vehicle service center at 11048 Redwood Road
To: [redacted]

ONE ELEVEN TOWNHOMES

Powered By
Enumerate
Central

Notice of public hearing: proposed vehicle service center at 11048 Redwood Road

To all residents,

The South Jordan Planning Commission will hold a public hearing on a conditional use permit for a vehicle service center, Master AutoTech, on the vacant parcel between our townhomes and the dance studio at 11048 Redwood Road.

Hearing: Tuesday, September 22, 2026, at 6:30 PM

Location: City Council Chambers, 1600 West Towne Center Drive

File number: PLCUP202600160

The proposal is a roughly 6,600 square foot building. Anticipated hours are Monday through Friday, 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM, and weekends, 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM. City staff is recommending approval. The Planning Commission makes the final decision and can approve, approve with conditions, deny, or defer the application.

If you wish to comment, written comments must reach **Greg Schindler gschindler@sjc.utah.gov** by 3:00 PM on September 22. Please include the file number. If you want to speak at the hearing, you must attend in person. Zoom attendees may watch but cannot comment.

We have attached an image from the city's staff report showing the proposed site plan so you can see the layout for yourself. The full Planning Commission packet is available on the South Jordan City website under Planning Commission agendas.

One Eleven Board of Directors

Dixie Kramer, AMC, CMCA
RedRocK HOA Management
801.706.6968
PO Box 540265
North Salt Lake, UT 84054
redrockhoa.com

DOWNLOAD OLN SOUTH JORDAN PROPOSED BUILDING.PNG

For questions or comments, please reply to this email or contact RedRocK HOA Management LLC at hoa@redrockhoa.com. This email was generated by the Enumerate Central platform.

Outlook

FW: Opposition to proposed building

From Greg Schindler <GSchindler@sjc.utah.gov>
Date Tue 9/22/2026 2:17 PM
To Nathan Gedge <NGedge@sjc.utah.gov>; Michele Hollist <MHollist@sjc.utah.gov>; Steven Catmull <SCatmull@sjc.utah.gov>; Lori Harding <LHarding@sjc.utah.gov>; Bryan J. Farnsworth <BFarnsworth@sjc.utah.gov>; Nikora Anderson <nanderson@sjc.utah.gov>; Cindy Valdez <CValdez@sjc.utah.gov>; Anna Crookston <acrookston@sjc.utah.gov>
Cc Miguel Aguilera <MAguilera@sjc.utah.gov>; Brian Preece <BPreece@sjc.utah.gov>; Gregory Simonsen <GSimonsen@sjc.utah.gov>

See email below:

Greg Schindler, AICP | City Planner | City of South Jordan
1600 W. Towne Center Drive | South Jordan, UT 84095
Office: 801.253.5203 ext 1291

AMERICA 250 | UTAH SOUTH JORDAN CITY

From: Adam Prusse [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2026 1:30 PM
To: Greg Schindler <GSchindler@sjc.utah.gov>
Subject: Opposition to proposed building

The proposal is a roughly 6,600 square foot building. Anticipated hours are Monday through Friday, 7:00 AM to 6:00 PM, and weekends, 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM. City staff is recommending approval. The Planning Commission makes the final decision and can approve, approve with conditions, deny, or defer the application.

Hello,

I just wanted to share my opinions about the proposal to have the vehicle service center open up.

Case: PLCUP202600160

There is absolutely no benefit for this community to have this building added. There will be more traffic in and out of the lots, and that will endanger both the neighborhood kids that ride bikes around, and the kids that are running to their cars from the dance studio.

The overflow from this building will inevitably take parking spots from the community. Even if there are posted signs, there will be cars parked in reserved spaces.

The parking lot fills up every single weekend for additional parking whenever there are football, soccer, or activities happening at the park, dance pickup times, parades, the city festival, and whenever neighbors have singles ward FHE. This is without taking away 20+ parking spots that will only add more vehicles.

There is a Jiffy lube down the street that almost never has a wait time that serves the exact same purpose. If there really is a use for this space, it does not need to be an auto shop.

Please do not approve this proposal.

Thank you,
Adam Prusse

SOUTH JORDAN
UTAH

SEPTEMBER 22, 2026

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING SIGN IN SHEET

PRINT NAME	ADDRESS
Ana Orpiano	[redacted]
Derek Cam	
Joby Kamp	
Julie Humenuk	
Melina Miramontes	
Glenn Noble	
Cameron Questereit	
Emily Shreeve	
Jaswant Kaur	
Rodayne Esmay	