**CITY OF SOUTH JORDAN**
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**
**CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

**OCTOBER 13, 2026**

Present: Chair Nathan Gedge, Commissioner Michelle Hollist, Commissioner Steven Catmull, Commissioner Lori Harding, Assistant City Attorney Greg Simonson, City Planner Greg Schindler, Planner II Miguel Aguilera, Supervising Senior Engineer Shane Greenwood, City Recorder Anna Crookston, Director of Planning & Economic Development Brian Preece, Chief Technology Officer Matthew Davis, GIS Coordinator Matt Jarman

Absent: Commissioner Nik Anderson, Commissioner Bryan Farnsworth

Other: Shea Bess, Sheri Mattle, Eric Mattle, Vivian Wilson, Emily Oar, Dominick McGurk, Kathie

**6:31 P.M.**
**REGULAR MEETING**

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

Chair Gedge welcomed everyone to the October 13, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting. We have (4) of the Planning Commissioner's present tonight, and I would like to excuse Commissioners Anderson and Farnsworth, they both had conflicts this evening. I am going to turn the rest of the meeting over to Commissioner Harding to conduct this evening. So it's been my goal this year as chair to let each commissioner have a chance to conduct the meeting. So, in the eventuality that I am no longer on the commission the city will have a well prepared city planning commission.

**B. MOTION TO APPROVE AGENDA**

Commissioner Hollist motioned to approve the October 13, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting agenda. Chair Gedge seconded the motion. Vote was 4-0 unanimous in favor. Commissioner Farnsworth and Commissioner Anderson was absent from the vote.

**C.** STAFF BUSINESS

Director Preece said another cyber class came up for all of us, I just wanted to give you a reminder.

**D. COMMENTS FROM PLANNING COMMISSION**

Commissioner Gedge said a few of us on the commission, and I will forward this to staff to enter the public record. We received an email this afternoon from a Crystalline Leeb, regarding the item we heard at our last meeting regarding the Astor Auto Tech, they are the neighboring property to the north of the dance studio, and so they just wanted to let us know their opposition. But we've already taken action on that, but I'll forward that on. One thing I wanted to highlight on that is they said that they are renters of the building and not the property owners. That's why they weren't noticed. So I don't know if there's a way that we want or can even change that.

Commissioner Hollist said also along those lines, should we respond, or should we forward it to somebody on city staff to respond?

Planner Schindler said when it comes to the noticing we follow state law. We only notice what the state requires. So, we don't know who who's renters and who's not so it would be almost impossible to do that unless we just did it by address.

Commissioner Gedge said for the last seven years we have received both the HR update and the City Manager email, and that seems to have stopped. So I'm not sure if there's a reason why. We are required to do city IT training but taken off other emails. So I'm just passing that on.

**E. SUMMARY ACTION**

**F. ACTION**

**G. ADMINISTRATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**G.1.** AUTUMN RIDGE DENTAL CONDOMINIUM PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION
Addressed: 1326 W Shields Ln, South Jordan, UT 8095
File No.: PLPP202600181
Applicant: Shea Bess

Planner II Miguel Aguilera presented information from the staff packet.

Commissioner Hollist said what does subdividing it in this context mean? Does it just mean that a second renter can come in and use that space, kind of like an ADU? Sorry to use a residential equivalent, or does it mean that they can sell that portion and co-own?

Planner Aguilera said so to subdivide it's legally it is it’s own separate unit, whereas right now it's all one building. The property owner could rent out one unit and use the other one. With this subdivision, he hopes to sell the other one and occupy one. We're not sure which one. They're varying sizes. One is approximately 2,000 square feet and the other one is 3,257 square feet. The dentist will occupy one. We're not sure who's going to occupy the other one, so he wants to sell that off. But whoever occupies the second unit will have to comply with the uses permitted.

Commissioner Hollist said does a parking agreement carry with this, or is that a private piece that comes along with this sale, or is the number of spaces according to our ordinances based on the square footage?

Planner Aguilera said the number of spaces is a based on the square footage of the building total. So, the subdivision into a condo will not change the square footage plan, so the parking will not be changed either.

Chair Gedge said each of the units I guess, lease out various offices within there, so there could still be more than two businesses within each unit, because I believe in the original application the applicant stated that his wife does some sort of medical service as well and so that was going to be one of the uses. If this were to be sold, and if that was to be there we're already up to three businesses. I'm just wondering what would be allowed. How many could be allowed?

Planner Aguilera said perhaps that's something they could do, but I'm not entirely sure on the legality of that, but whatever goes in there, whether they rent it out or sell it, any use has to comply with the agreement. The available parking and things like that, the parking does vary slightly between uses. So, like a medical use will have a very slightly different parking ratio, perhaps, like an office or a consultation office.

Commissioner Catmull said it is my understanding that the parking was over parked anyway. I don't know if that is the right term, but there was a surplus of parking for the size of the building.

Planner Aguilera said the building does have a few more spaces than it requires. I do not remember the exact number off the top of my head, but I can look it up in the staff report.

Commissioner Gedge said I drive by this several times a day, I know the pavement has gone in, the building is almost completely finished, I think it’s just the landscaping left before a certificate of occupancy can be issued.

Planner Aguilera said so before that Certificate of Occupancy is issued, we will have to do an inspection. So we'll go on site to make sure that, for example, all the landscaping is in and that it is made as designed in a site plan that was approved, and any building code requirements that are required by the building department. And once, that is all signed off by the staff inspectors who go do that, then they can receive their Certificate of Occupancy.

Director Preece said so it doesn't really change anything other than kind of ownership in a condominium. All the property underneath the building, the parking lots, everything is owned by the condo association. It is similar to a homeowners association, you are really just selling the air rights to that building and the property line between the units, rather than this being one unit with no property lines all around here, you get the boundary property line and then property lines around the units. I believe the second unit has not applied for a tenant finish permit yet, and when they do, they will treat that property line as a property line with the building department, and they may have to have firewalls between it, whereas you may not have had to, because there was no property line there, but other than that, the development agreement still applies. I mean, you could have had multiple business licenses the way it was, because if you recall, there's

service businesses, personal services that could come. So if someone was coming to do physical therapy they would have their own business license, and there might be a chiropractor and he has a physical therapist come in or something. I don't know. Probably not a good example, but they would have multiple businesses but, they wouldn't split it into more units, and you could still sublease. So it really doesn't change anything.

**Dr. Shay Bess (applicant)** said thanks for taking the time to discuss my project tonight. I have been working with South Jordan City for some time now in getting this building completed. I've had lots of interactions with many different people at the city, from the mayor and city council, City does a great job at working with its citizens. In all the interactions with me, they have been respectful, thoughtful, and professional. It makes me proud to be a citizen here. Tonight, I seek to make this property into two condos so I can sell the additional 2,000 square feet office space that I have. It continues to be my intention to move into the south side of the building with Dr. McGinnis and practice there until my death or retirement, whichever occurs first. Our target date to begin to see patients in the building is November 9th. Hopefully, all goes well. We have a few potential buyers that are considering the available space on the north side. Each of these prospects would be a great addition to the city, and will meet the land use agreement that is in place. A few of the current potentials include a dentist, a pediatrician, and a mental health care provider. We intend to be good neighbors to the surrounding community and look forward to the opportunity to meet a few new people. As I said at the beginning of my statement, South Jordan has been good to work with. However, through the process of planning and building, there have been some frustrations. Sometimes the city has rules, regulations, and codes that make sense generally, but in a specific situation, don't make any sense at all, and it can be frustrating when the city requires things that are pointless or cost 1000’s of dollars. I will mention one: to change this property into two condos, the city has a list of requirements. I hired a civil engineer (engineering firm) to accomplish the list. They did the work, and the city has approved all of their work. The total dollar amount charged to me by the civil engineer to do the work was $951.00 South Jordan City has a fee to review all of this work and to change the property into two condos. That fee is $6,995, which is $6,044 more than what the engineers charge to actually do the work. I emailed city officials about this fee and shared my opinion that it was way too high. I was assured by city officials that the fee is established by a third party, and can only be adjusted by the city council, and that the fee is fair. These things add up through the process, and making the building far more expensive than is needed. It is my hope that the city will look into what they can do to lower costs to those that choose to build in South Jordan. I do not believe that there is any mal intent by any city official or any employee. I believe they are genuinely doing their best to do the right thing, and I'm appreciative of anyone who really tries to do the right thing. I appreciate your time tonight. I continue my pledge to the South Jordan community to do what I can to be a good neighbor, to provide high quality dental care in my new facility, and ensure that I honor the commitments I have made at this location.

Chair Harding opened the public hearing.

**Sherry Maddle (Resident)** – I reside at 1270 West Lampton Road, which is just around the corner from the-I don't know if it was Bess Dental before, and now it's Autumn Ridge. I don't know what-it's different names on the thing are. I'm here to express my opposition for the Autumn Ridge Dental property, which would allow the existing office property to be converted

to office condominiums. My concern goes beyond the change itself; it's the way the history of this property, the decisions that have already been made, and the responsibility we have to ensure that our city's planning decisions serve the long-term interests of the community. The land was previously owned by the city of South Jordan and designated as a neighborhood park. It was land intended to serve the residents of the community. However, the property was sold to Dr. Best by the city manager without public input from the citizens who would be affected by that decision. I realize it was all legal. I'm just restating my position. An opportunity for a neighborhood park was lost, and residents were not given a meaningful voice in that decision, in that outcome. Since then, the property has already changed from its original intended use as residential to office space. Now we are being asked to consider another change to allow office condominiums. At what point do we step back and consider the bigger picture? When land originally designated for public benefit is transferred to private ownership, and its intended use continues to change, we have a responsibility to ask whether these decisions reflect thoughtful, consistent planning and the long-term interests of the neighborhood. I recognize that the property is privately owned. Excuse me. However, private ownership does not mean that every proposed zoning change is automatically appropriate. That is precisely why we have a planning process and a planning commission. I ask you to consider whether this additional change is truly necessary, whether it is consistent with South Jordan's adopted plans, and what precedent approval might establish for other properties in our community. How, just as importantly, I ask you to remember that a neighborhood is more than a collection of properties and zoning designations. It is a community of people, and he says he drives past it several times a day. I certainly do as well. I live just around the corner. It is a community of people who deserve to have their concerns heard and their interests considered when decisions affect where they live. The original designation of this property as a neighborhood park represented an opportunity to provide something of lasting value to the community. That opportunity was lost without public input. We cannot undo that decision, but we can ensure that future decisions receive careful scrutiny and meaningful public consideration. I am not really asking that you deny it. I mean, you're not going to. I know that. One of my concerns I have about it is the landscaping because I know one of the things that they addressed is they didn't require him to put a fence. The original thing was to have a fence to divide his property, and I think the gas company is who has the property to the on the west side that's adjacent. And I've noticed all summer that has been very delinquent. There've been weeds. It hasn't been landscaped as promised. It looks like they are working on some landscaping now. So I would like. I don't. I'm not allowed to ask him questions, but I would invite you to ask. I would like to know what's really happening with the fence. Is it going to be a beautiful space, or is it going to be an eyesore with weeds, which it has been all summer.

**Vivian Wilson (Resident)** – said I reside at 9811 South Temple Drive, South Jordan. Basically, I just want you to consider this. I mean, somebody said it's not going to change anything, but if it's sublet, we don't really know how many parking places are going to be needed. You know, because everybody's trying to make a business, right? They're trying to do as much as they can in a small space. I am really still concerned about parking. It's an island. I just don't really like the encroachment in the neighborhood, and right now that might look like there's enough, but you know, that's my concern. So I hope that it's addressed, as far as the new businesses coming in or whoever's there, that is that something that you can follow like a certain amount of parking.

Chair Harding closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Gedge said we have other types of business condominiums subdivisions, which have been presented to and approved by the commission and/or council in the past, and so we would not be setting a new precedence this evening. We're just following what's been applied for and following city code. Just want to get confirmation on that for the record.

Director Preece said State Code has special rules that we have to follow, that didn't make this just a simple plat amendment. It was the whole condominium, there is state law, there's all kinds of CCNR's that have to be reviewed. There's things that make it much more complicated than a subdivision.

Commissioner Catmull said on the without this condominium application, the parking ratio things wouldn't change, right? What I'm getting at is, as business uses change within the building, that's when parking is evaluated. Where the lot lines and condo property lines and all that doesn't really have a bearing on it. Does it have a bearing on the parking?

Planner Aguilera said the parking will still be for the entire building, and it was calculated for the entire square footage of the building, which for this building at the time of approval was one spot per every 200 square feet of building floor area. Most uses that the applicant talked about potentially going in there all fall under that category, so they would still be within the parking requirement.

Commissioner Catmull said if there happened to be within the bounds of the development agreement other uses that had different parking ratios. The city has a method, process by which they resolve and figure out what that parking ratio is. I seem to recall another application we've had in the last few years where it had mixed use, and we part of the application process we went through how the city calculated the parking ratio.

Planner Aguilera said so, for example, for a general office use, the ratio changes slightly to one per 300 square feet. So, if a use comes in that falls under that, but not under not under medical, then I guess at the time of business licensing, that analysis will be done to make sure that the requirement is still fulfilled.

Chair Harding said I just need to summarize this because it's in a condominium, it's got an association, and that's what's going to govern the two owners, and they're still under the guidelines of the city, but that's why we're calling it a condominium.

Director Preece said it's under the guidelines setting the development agreement. When someone comes and gets a business license, they'll review to make sure it meets not only city code but the development agreement, and that the parking is sufficient for what the use is.
Commissioner Hollist said so landscaping, it's obviously still under construction. I drive by too. Is the final walkthrough before the city signs off? Does it review things like the landscaping being met?

Planner Aguilera said in the planning inspection, we have to review the entire landscape, make sure it comes with the approved landscape plan. We won't sign this off the CO checklist until that is done. As far as the other landscaping comments, so at the time of the development

agreement or the rezone approval, it was in the agreement that either the property owner Shea Bess will landscape or will install a fence along that board that border with the northern property. If that property owner, which I think is the gas company, does not landscape that area as well, or if they do landscape that area, then he was not required to install a mainstream fence. I believe it was, but at this time of site plan approval, we learned that the property under the gas company did not want to landscape that, so Shea will be installing a fence as that complies with the city code.

**Commissioner Gedge motioned to approve File No.PLPP202600181 Autumn Ridge Dental Condominium Preliminary Subdivision. Chair Harding seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 4-0 unanimous in favor. Commissioner Farnsworth and Commissioner Anderson were absent from the vote.**

## I. LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS

## J. OTHER BUSINESS

## ADJOURNMENT

**Commissioner Gedge motioned to Adjourn.**

**The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 7:03 p.m.**

Greg Simonson conducted a 1hr training for the Planning Commissioner's.

***Effective 5/6/2026***
**10-20-902. Applicant's entitlement to land use application approval -- Municipality's requirements and limitations -- Vesting upon submission of development plan and schedule.**

(1) (a) (i) An applicant who has submitted a complete land use application as described in Subsection (1)(c), including the payment of all application fees, is entitled to substantive review of the application under the land use regulations:

(A) in effect on the date that the application is complete; and

(B) applicable to the application or to the information shown on the application.

(ii) An applicant is entitled to approval of a land use application if the application conforms to the requirements of the applicable land use regulations, land use decisions, and development standards in effect when the applicant submits a complete application and pays application fees, unless:

(A) the land use authority, on the record, formally finds that a compelling, countervailing public interest would be jeopardized by approving the application and specifies the compelling, countervailing public interest in writing; or

(B) in the manner provided by local ordinance and before the applicant submits the application, the municipality formally initiates proceedings to amend the municipality's land use regulations in a manner that would prohibit approval of the application as submitted.

(b) The municipality shall process an application without regard to proceedings the municipality initiated to amend the municipality's ordinances as described in Subsection (1)(a)(ii)(B) if:

(i) 180 days have passed since the municipality initiated the proceedings; and

(ii) (A) the proceedings have not resulted in an enactment that prohibits approval of the application as submitted; or

(B) during the 12 months before the municipality processing the application, or multiple applications of the same type, are impaired or prohibited under the terms of a temporary land use regulation adopted under Section 10-20-504.

(c) A land use application is considered submitted and complete when the applicant provides the application in a form that complies with the requirements of applicable ordinances and pays all applicable fees.

(d) A subsequent incorporation of a municipality or a petition that proposes the incorporation of a municipality does not affect a land use application approved by a county in accordance with Section 17-79-803.

(e) Unless a phasing sequence is required in an executed development agreement, a municipality shall, without regard to any other separate and distinct land use application, accept and process a complete land use application.

(f) The continuing validity of an approval of a land use application is conditioned upon the applicant proceeding after approval to implement the approval with reasonable diligence.

(g) A municipality may not impose on an applicant who has submitted a complete application a requirement that is not expressed in:

(i) this chapter;

(ii) a municipal ordinance in effect on the date that the applicant submits a complete application, subject to Subsection 10-20-902(1)(a)(ii); or

(iii) a municipal specification for public improvements applicable to a subdivision or development that is in effect on the date that the applicant submits an application.

(h) A municipality may not impose on a holder of an issued land use permit or a final, unexpired subdivision plat a requirement that is not expressed:

(i) in a land use permit;

(ii) on the subdivision plat;

(iii) in a document on which the land use permit or subdivision plat is based;

(iv) in the written record evidencing approval of the land use permit or subdivision plat;

(v) in this chapter;

(vi) in a municipal ordinance; or

(vii) in a municipal specification for residential roadways in effect at the time a residential subdivision was approved.

**10-20-504. Temporary land use regulations.**

(1) (a) Except as provided in Subsection (2)(b), a municipal legislative body may, without prior consideration of or recommendation from the planning commission, enact an ordinance establishing a temporary land use regulation for any part or all of the area within the municipality if:

(i) the legislative body makes a finding of compelling, countervailing public interest; or

(ii) the area is unregulated.

(b) A temporary land use regulation under Subsection (1)(a) may prohibit or regulate the erection, construction, reconstruction, or alteration of any building or structure or any subdivision approval.

(c) A temporary land use regulation under Subsection (1)(a) may not impose an impact fee or other financial requirement on building or development.

(2) (a) The municipal legislative body shall establish a period of limited effect for the ordinance not to exceed 180 days.

(b) A municipal legislative body may not apply the provisions of a temporary land use regulation to the review of a specific land use application if the land use application is impaired or prohibited by proceedings initiated under Subsection 10-20-902(1)(a)(ii)(B).

(3) (a) A municipal legislative body may, without prior planning commission consideration or recommendation, enact an ordinance establishing a temporary land use regulation prohibiting construction, subdivision approval, and other development activities within an area that is the subject of an Environmental Impact Statement or a Major Investment Study examining the area as a proposed highway or transportation corridor.

(b) A regulation under Subsection (3)(a):

(i) may not exceed 180 days in duration;

(ii) may be renewed, if requested by the Transportation Commission created under Section 72-1-301, for up to two additional 180-day periods by ordinance enacted before the expiration of the previous regulation; and

(iii) notwithstanding Subsections (3)(b)(i) and (ii), is effective only as long as the Environmental Impact Statement or Major Investment Study is in progress.

**10-20-911. Exactions -- Requirement to offer to original owner property acquired by exaction -- Exaction for right-of-way improvements -- Improvement completion assurance requirements.**

(1) A municipality may impose an exaction or exactions on development proposed in a land use application, including, subject to Section 10-20-912, an exaction for a water interest, if:

(a) an essential link exists between a legitimate governmental interest and each exaction; and

(b) each exaction is roughly proportionate, both in nature and extent, to the impact of the proposed development.

(2) If a land use authority imposes an exaction for another governmental entity:

(a) the governmental entity shall request the exaction; and

(b) the land use authority shall transfer the exaction to the governmental entity for which it was exacted

**This is a true and correct copy of the October 13, 2026 Planning Commission minutes, which were approved on October 27, 2026**

SOUTH JORDAN
UTAH

# OCTOBER 13, 2026

## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING SIGN IN SHEET

| PRINT NAME | ADDRESS |
| --- | --- |
| Sheri Mattle | [redacted] |
| Eric Mattle | |
| Dominique McGuirk | |
| Vivian Wilson | |
| Emily Oar | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |