

SOUTH JORDAN CITY
CITY COUNCIL MEETING

FEBRUARY 3, 2026

Present: Mayor Pro Tempore Jason McGuire, Council Member Patrick Harris, Council Member Kathie Johnson, Council Member Don Shelton, Council Member Tamara Zander, City Manager Dustin Lewis, Assistance City Manager Jason Rasmussen, Assistant City Manager Don Tingey, City Attorney Ryan Loose, Police Chief Jeff Carr, Director of Administrative Services Melinda Seager, Associate Director of Human Resources Corinne Thacker, CFO Sunil Naidu, Fire Chief Chris Dawson, Director of Recreation Janell Payne, Director of Planning & Economic Development Brian Preece, Director of Engineering/City Engineer Brad Klavano, Associate Director of Public Works Rawlins Thacker, Raymond Garrison, PIO/Communication Manager Rachael Van Cleave, GIS Coordinator Matt Jarman, City Recorder Anna Crookston

Absent: Mayor Dawn R. Ramsey

Other (Electronic) Attendance:

Other (In-Person) Attendance:

6:30 P.M.
REGULAR MEETING

Council Member Zander motioned to appoint Council Member Jason McGuire as Mayor Pro Tempore for the February 3, 2026 City Council Meeting in Mayor Dawn R. Ramsey's absence. Council Member Johnson seconded the motion. Vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor.

A. Welcome, Roll Call, and Introduction - By Mayor Pro Tempore Jason McGuire

Mayor Pro Tempore McGuire welcomed everyone present and introduced the meeting.

B. Invocation - By Council Member, Kathie Johnson

Council Member Johnson offered the invocation.

C. Pledge of Allegiance – By Assistant City Manager, Don Tingey

Assistant City Manager Tingey led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Council Member Johnson motioned to amend the meeting agenda to move Item G.1. before Item F. Council Member Harris seconded the motion. Vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor.

D. Minute Approval:

- D.1. January 6, 2026 City Council Study Meeting
- D.2. January 6, 2026 City Council Meeting

Council Member Shelton motioned to approve the D.1. January 6, 2026 City Council Study Meeting D.2. January 6, 2026 City Council Meeting as published. Council Member Harris seconded the motion. Vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor.

E. Mayor and Council Reports:

Mayor Pro Tempore McGuire noted that several council members have been participating in the Legislative Policy Committee (LPC) and are actively monitoring the current state legislative session. He stated that the committee is tracking proposed legislation that may affect municipalities, including issues related to local self-governance and property taxation. He indicated that efforts are ongoing to remain informed about potential impacts to the city.

Council Member Zander reported on a recent community event hosted by the Salt Lake Board of Realtors on the Wasatch Front. She shared that the organization held a basketball tournament featuring teams composed of elected officials, the Board's Government Affairs Committee, and several local brokerages. The final game was between Zander Real Estate and the team of elected officials, with Zander Real Estate winning the tournament. She noted that the event provided a positive and engaging opportunity for interaction between government representatives and members of the real estate community in a fun and collaborative setting.

Council Member Shelton reported that several council members attended Local Officials Day hosted by the Utah League of Cities and Towns (ULCT). He noted that members of the City's Youth Council were also in attendance, providing an opportunity for engagement with students and other local officials. He stated that attendees heard remarks from various state leaders, including Governor Spencer Cox, and described the event as a positive and worthwhile experience.

G. Presentation Item:

- G.1. Herriman High Chinese New Year Celebration.

Students performed for the Council and shared about the Chinese New Year Celebration at Herriman High School on February 5, 2026 (Attachment A).

Mayor Pro Tempore McGuire encouraged the public to attend the upcoming event associated with the Chinese Dual Language Immersion program. He shared that three of his children have participated in the program and acknowledged the significant effort students contribute each year. He expressed appreciation for the educators and organizers who make the event possible, specifically recognizing Ms. Chen, Mr. Liu, Piper Wise, Shirley Lim for their involvement and support. He also thanked the educators and staff within the Jordan School District for providing this opportunity to students.

F. Public Comment:

Mayor Pro Tempore McGuire opened the public comment portion of the meeting. There were no comments. Mayor Pro Tempore McGuire closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

H. Public Hearing Items:

- H.1. Resolution R2026-04, Adopting City-Wide Policy 210-01 Purchasing Policy. (By City Manager, Dusitn Lewis)

City Manager Dustin Lewis presented a resolution amending the City's purchasing policy, noting the last substantive updates were made in 2022. He explained that the proposed revisions are primarily clerical clarifications, corrections, and consistency updates intended to improve efficiency and ensure the policy reflects current practice. On page three, the definition of "purchasing officer" was revised to identify the Chief Financial Officer (CFO) or a designee, allowing continuity if the CFO is unavailable. On page seven, previously approved threshold changes from 2022 that were inadvertently omitted have been corrected. The definition of small purchases is updated to reflect amounts from \$0 to \$9,999.99, with corresponding adjustments to the next purchasing tier. On page eleven, language was revised to reference the City Attorney directly, rather than the "office of the," to ensure staff consult the City Attorney specifically when legal clarification is needed. On page thirteen, the process and definition for obtaining quotes were clarified to specify the proper manner and number of quotes required. On page seventeen, the term "selection committee" was replaced with "project manager" for consistency. Page eighteen was reorganized to clarify procedures allowing the city to accept lower pricing from a vendor than what is available under a state contract, ensuring the city receives the best value. On page nineteen, "informal quote" language was added under insufficient response to maintain consistency throughout the policy. Under the non-competitive purchasing process on page twenty-two, language was strengthened to require that department directors shall submit documentation, rather than "should." Leases were also added as qualifying items under that section. On page twenty-three, two exemptions were added: one allowing the city to solicit competitive bids from pre-approved contractors on the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT) list for traffic signal work, and another allowing exemption for medical services to ensure appropriate and qualified medical oversight for the city's EMS program. Additional minor edits were made to clarify language related to purchase orders and contract extensions. Page twenty-five clarifies that if a contract expires before a new one is finalized, a short-term extension may be used solely to maintain coverage during procurement of a replacement contract. He stated the revisions followed a detailed internal review process conducted with CFO Sunil Nadu and all department directors. Each department had the opportunity to review the policy, raise questions, and recommend improvements to ensure clarity, efficiency, and fiscal responsibility. He concluded by recommending approval of the resolution.

Mayor Pro Tempore McGuire opened the public hearing for Resolution R2026-04. There were no comments. Mayor Pro Tempore McGuire closed the public hearing.

Council Member Shelton expressed appreciation for the work completed to update the city's purchasing policy. He noted the importance of ensuring clarity and consistency across

departments, recognizing that many employees are involved in procurement processes. He commended staff for improving efficiency while maintaining a focus on obtaining the best value for residents and thanked those involved for their efforts.

Council Member Zander motioned to approve Resolution R2026-04, Adopting City-Wide Policy 210-01 Purchasing Policy. Council Member Johnson seconded the motion.

Roll Call Vote

Council Member Zander - Yes

Council Member Johnson - Yes

Council Member Harris - Yes

Council Member Shelton - Yes

Council Member McGuire - Yes

The motion passed with a vote of 5-0 in favor.

H.2. Ordinance 2026-03, Amending Chapters 16.36.090 (Monument Signs), 17.60.020 (Development and Design Standards in the C-N Zone), 17.72.080 (P-C Zone Plan), and 17.130.030.030 (Prohibitions in the ADU Floating Zone) of the South Jordan Municipal Code to clarify Development Standards. (By Long-Range Planner, Joe Moss)

Long-Range Planner Joe Moss reviewed prepared presentation (Attachment B). He noted updates to the monument sign ordinance. The current code states that monument sign height is measured from the sidewalk, while also allowing signs to be placed on a berm or other elevation feature. The proposed amendment clarifies how height is measured in those situations. The code will specify that the maximum six-foot height applies on an upslope as illustrated in the ordinance, and that signs on a downslope or level ground will continue to be measured from sidewalk grade. The intent is to ensure consistent interpretation and application. He addressed revisions to the C-N (Commercial Neighborhood) zone regarding roof design. While the existing code requires pitched roofs, it does not define how much of the roof must be pitched, which has led to inconsistent interpretation. The proposed amendment establishes a requirement that at least 75 percent of the roof be pitched. Limited flat roof areas would still be permitted to accommodate mechanical equipment, provided they are screened from the public right-of-way and adjacent residential properties. Dormer features would be allowed up to 10 percent to maintain architectural flexibility. He outlined updates to the P-C (Planned Community) zone to remove outdated references to a prior general plan and paper submittal requirements that are no longer applicable. The amendment requires all necessary information to be included in current application materials while eliminating obsolete language. He discussed clarifications to the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) ordinance. Existing languages prohibit ADU entrances from being visible from the public right-of-way. Staff noted that this has generally been interpreted to prohibit entrances on the front façade or corner-facing elevations, but not side-yard entrances that may be partially visible from certain angles. The proposed amendment clarifies that side entrances, including basement stair access, are permissible so long as they are not prominently visible from the public right-of-way.

Mayor Pro Tempore McGuire opened the public hearing for Ordinance 2026-03. There were no comments. Mayor Pro Tempore McGuire closed the public hearing.

Council Member Zander asked inquired whether there are existing monument signs in the city that approach the six-foot height threshold described in the proposed amendment.

Long-Range Planner Moss responded that he was not certain about the overall inventory of monument signs in the city, noting that he does not directly administer monument sign permits. However, he stated that the six-foot maximum height has remained consistent in the code and continues to be applied when such permits are reviewed. He clarified that the amendment does not change the permitted six-foot height for monument signs but instead clarifies how that height is measured. He explained that when a sign is placed on a slope or berm, the full six-foot height would still be permitted, consistent with the City's traditional interpretation. He stated that the purpose of the amendment is to make that measurement standard explicit within the code.

Council Member Zander clarified that the monument sign height itself is not changing, only the method of measurement, and expressed appreciation for the clarification. She then asked a follow-up question regarding the proposed ADU entrance language. She stated that, in her view, the city should not prohibit a basement ADU entrance on a corner lot that includes a stairway. She asked whether the revised wording in the ordinance clearly protects property owners in that situation or whether it could leave room for inconsistent interpretation in the future. She expressed concern about avoiding ambiguity in the code and ensuring the city does not overreach in regulating residential properties.

Long-Range Planner Moss responded that the amendment is intended to clarify, not change, the existing requirement. He explained that staff have consistently interpreted the ordinance to prohibit ADU entrances on the front façade of a home and, for corner lots, on the street-facing corner elevation. He stated that the proposed language maintains prohibition for corner-facing entrances. However, for interior lots, side-yard ADU entrances, such as basement stair access, would continue to be permitted, as is commonly seen. He emphasized that the amendment is intended to reflect the City's longstanding interpretation in clearer terms to avoid confusion.

Council Member Zander sought clarification, asking whether a basement ADU entrance would be permitted on a corner lot, provided it is not located on the street-facing exterior side of the property.

Long-Range Planner Moss clarified that on a corner lot, a basement ADU entrance would be permitted so long as it is not located on the side of the home that faces the street. He explained that if the entrance were placed on the interior side of the lot, facing the adjacent residential property rather than the intersecting street, it would comply with the ordinance. The prohibition applies only to the elevation facing the additional street frontage.

Council Member Zander asked a hypothetical question regarding flexibility for property owners. She stated that she supports property rights and asked what would occur if a resident on a corner lot proposed an ADU entrance on the street-facing side due to practical constraints, such as the interior layout of the home. She inquired whether the city would be required to deny the request

outright based on the ordinance or whether there would be any flexibility to consider the circumstances.

Long-Range Planner Moss explained that under the current ordinance, ADU entrances are not permitted on elevations visible from the public right-of-way. He stated that the proposed amendment is intended to provide flexibility by clarifying that side entrances on interior portions of a lot, such as between neighboring homes, would be acceptable, even if they may be visible from certain angles. He emphasized that the intent is not to allow entrances on the front façade or on the side of a corner lot that directly faces a street, but rather to clearly permit side-yard entrances that are not street-facing.

Council Member Zander thanked Long-Range Planner Moss for the explanation and stated she would like the Council to consider more flexible language in the ordinance. She expressed support for allowing homeowners the opportunity to petition the city on a case-by-case basis, particularly in situations where practical constraints make a street-facing entrance the most feasible option. She suggested that mitigation measures, such as landscaping or screening, could address visibility concerns. She emphasized the importance of providing flexibility for residents, particularly those who may rely on ADU rental income to remain in their homes and stated she would prefer an approach that allows for discretion rather than a strict prohibition. She invited other council members to discuss whether they would be open to considering additional flexibility in the ordinance.

Council Member Shelton asked for clarification, confirming whether Council Member Zander's suggestion would allow a basement ADU entrance to be located on the front of a house, rather than just the side or interior elevations.

Council Member Zander clarified that she is not proposing ADU entrances on the front façade of homes. She referenced the diagram in attachment B, slide 6 showing a corner lot with a side entrance and explained that, under the current ordinance, such entrances on the street-facing side of a corner lot would be prohibited. She expressed concern that this restriction could prevent residents, particularly those needing additional income, from accessing their basement ADU in a practical way. She proposed that the Council consider more flexible language to allow side entrances on street-facing elevations under certain circumstances, with mitigation such as landscaping or attractive façades to minimize visibility. She emphasized that the goal is to provide residents with reasonable options without compromising aesthetics and invited other council members to indicate whether they support exploring this flexibility.

Mayor Pro Tempore McGuire sought clarification, noting that Council Member Zander's proposal would apply only to basement ADU entrances and not to larger exterior staircases or other significant structures shown in the diagram.

Council Member Zander clarified that her proposal applies solely to basement ADU entrances, not larger staircases or other exterior additions. She explained that many residents, particularly aging homeowners with large lots, may need a basement entrance to generate rental income and remain in their homes. She emphasized that the configuration of basements sometimes limits where an entrance can be placed, and in some cases, the only feasible location may be on the side of the

house facing the street. She stated that she does not want the city to outright prohibit such entrances. Instead, she proposed allowing them with mitigation measures, such as landscaping or other treatments, to maintain aesthetics. She reiterated that her goal is to give residents flexibility while ensuring the exterior appearance remains visually appealing.

City Attorney Ryan Loose asked Long-Range Planner Moss a clarifying question regarding the current ordinance. He asked whether a basement ADU entrance on the street-facing side of a corner lot would be allowed if it were fully fenced and screened, such as with a six-foot fence extending to the street line, enclosing the entrance behind a gate. He noted that under the current code, even if the entrance is not visible from the street due to fencing or screening, it would still not be permitted because of the way the ordinance is written.

Long-Range Planner Moss responded that, under the current ordinance, a basement ADU entrance on a street-facing side of a corner lot is generally not permitted, even if it is fully fenced or screened. He noted, however, that in a situation where the entrance is completely enclosed and not visible from the street, there may be some room for interpretation, though it would be arguable under the existing language.

City Attorney Loose asked for clarification on how the ordinance has been enforced in practice. He referenced situations where a street-facing ADU entrance might be fully screened with landscaping, bushes, trees, or a six-foot solid fence that meets code requirements. He asked whether, under current staff interpretation, or under the proposed amendment, such an entrance would be allowed, noting that understanding this would help him respond to Council Member Zander's suggestion about providing flexibility and drafting appropriate language.

Long-Range Planner Moss explained that, as currently written, the ordinance prohibits an ADU entrance on any elevation facing the primary street frontage, including the side elevation of a corner lot that faces a street. He indicated that this language applies regardless of screening or fencing, meaning the prohibition is based on location rather than visibility.

City Attorney Loose clarified that, under the current ordinance, there might be an arguable case allowing a basement ADU entrance on the street-facing side of a corner lot if it were completely screened, such as with a solid fence, but he was unsure how consistently that has been administered. He noted that, under the proposed new language, such an entrance would not be permitted at all. He confirmed that this distinction addresses the question about potential flexibility and enforcement.

Mayor Pro Tempore McGuire asked whether the Daybreak community has any special exemption from the current ordinance, noting that many homes there were built with ADU entrances visible from the side.

Long-Range Planner Moss explained that Daybreak has its own architectural requirements, which restrict where ADUs can be constructed. He noted that, to his understanding, city-permitted ADUs in Daybreak are allowed only in very limited circumstances, primarily above detached garages. As a result, there are very few permitted ADUs within Daybreak, and the majority of ADUs in the City are located in neighborhoods outside of Daybreak.

City Attorney Loose clarified that Daybreak is a master-planned community governed by its own Master Development Agreement and detailed architectural guidelines. He explained that for a legal ADU in Daybreak, homeowners must first obtain approval from the Homeowners Association (HOA) in accordance with those guidelines before seeking a city permit. The only permitted ADUs in Daybreak are detached units above garages on certain lot sizes with specific requirements. He emphasized that any amendments to the City's ADU ordinance would not affect these existing Daybreak entitlements.

Council Member Harris asked City Attorney Loose to clarify how visibility requirements would apply to future developments outside of Daybreak. He noted that often the builder does not install fences, and the homeowner adds them later. He asked whether a new home built with a basement ADU but without a fence would be considered out of compliance under the current or proposed ordinance, and how such situations would be handled.

City Attorney Loose explained that an ADU, by definition, is an accessory dwelling unit, it isn't automatically considered an ADU just because it's built as a separate apartment. He clarified that homeowners must apply for a permit to establish an ADU. During the permitting process, staff asks whether the unit will be rented and then evaluates whether it meets visibility requirements. Under the current ordinance, if the ADU entrance is visible from the street, the permit would not be approved. However, if the homeowner mitigates visibility, such as by installing a fence or other screening, then the ADU could arguably comply with the ordinance. He emphasized that this is how the visibility standard is currently administered.

Council Member Harris clarified that if a builder constructs a home with an ADU designed to be open or visible, the homeowner will need to take action, such as installing a fence or other screening, before the unit could be legally used as an ADU. This would be required to meet the City's current visibility standards during the permitting process.

City Attorney Loose clarified that the homeowner could still occupy and use their house with a door on the street-facing side, but they would not be allowed to legally operate it as an ADU.

Council Member Johnson added that a basement or side entrance would be legally permissible as long as the unit is not being used as a rental ADU, meaning the visibility restrictions apply only when the space is intended for rental occupancy.

City Attorney Loose clarified that houses with side doors or entrances are not regulated by the city if they are not being used as ADUs. He noted that any prior design standards that might have restricted such entrances were removed three years ago, so the city no longer regulates non-ADU entrances in that context.

Council Member Harris noted that the challenge is that a side or basement entrance could still be visible, but if the unit is not being used as an ADU, it is not an enforcement issue. He emphasized that the ordinance is intended to regulate active ADUs, not to restrict appearances or aesthetic concerns from certain viewpoints. He suggested that this underscores the need for some flexibility in the code to accommodate practical situations while still addressing visibility and compliance when the ADU is actually in use.

Director of Planning & Economic Development Brian Preece explained that the original intent of the ADU regulations was to prevent single-family homes from appearing like duplexes. He stated that he would personally support allowing a corner-lot basement ADU entrance on a street-facing side if it were properly screened, such as with a six-foot solid fence or similar barrier, to maintain visual separation and minimize impact on the streetscape.

Council Member Johnson raised a concern about corner-lot ADU entrances on street-facing sides. She noted that in one example she is aware of, the ADU is rented and occupants park near the corner, creating a potential parking issue even though the street is public. She emphasized that, in addition to visibility, traffic and parking impacts should be considered when evaluating flexibility for side entrances on corner lots.

Council Member Zander suggested to strike sections 17.130.030.030 from Ordinance 2026-03 and asked staff to review and revise the language. She explained that she is not comfortable approving the ordinance as currently written due to concerns about restricting residents' ability to establish basement ADU entrances, particularly on corner lots. She emphasized that staff should consider community practices and feedback to refine the language, ensuring flexibility while maintaining appropriate standards. Council Member Zander stated her confidence that the ordinance can be revised without overstepping or creating rules that would later need to be undone.

Council Member Zander motioned to strike section 17.130.030.030 (Prohibitions in the ADU Floating Zone) from Ordinance 2026-03 and approve Ordinance 2026-03 Amending Chapters 16.36.090 (Monument Signs), 17.60.020 (Development and Design Standards in the C-N Zone), and 17.72.080 (P-C Zone Plan) of the South Jordan Municipal Code to clarify Development Standards. Council Member Johnson seconded the motion.

City Attorney Ryan Loose confirmed that, to his understanding, Council Member Zander's motion is to approve Ordinance 2026-03 while excluding section 17.130.030.030, effectively striking that portion from the ordinance and directing staff to review and return with revised language. Council Member Zander confirmed that was correct.

Council Member Harris added that, as staff reviews and revises that section, they should carefully consider how builders are actually constructing ADUs and what future development trends might be. He emphasized that, while the discussion is not about Daybreak, any ordinance adjustments should align with anticipated ADU patterns across the city to ensure the regulations remain practical and effective.

Council Member Johnson noted that builders should be responsible for understanding and complying with the city's regulations when constructing homes. She suggested that it is the builder's duty to be aware of applicable ordinances and ensure that homes, including potential ADU features, are designed in accordance with those rules.

Mayor Pro Tempore McGuire acknowledged that it is the builders' responsibility to know and follow the City's regulations. However, he agreed with Council Member Harris that the Council should first review current practices and realistic scenarios before finalizing the ordinance. He

noted that if an entrance already exists, whether the unit is rented or not may have little practical impact, and the ordinance should reflect what is reasonable and workable for residents and builders. He added that the homeowner should be allowed to use the entrance for any purpose they choose. If the entrance is being used for an ADU, he sees no reason it would interfere with anything else, implying that the ordinance should allow reasonable flexibility for practical use.

Council Member Harris added that as new homes are being built, designs are responding to buyer demand and public preferences. He emphasized that the Council should ensure any ordinance changes do not conflict with current market trends or the types of homes people want. His point was to pay attention to practical realities and resident expectations when revising the ADU regulations.

Council Member Zander added that there are two distinct situations to consider: new construction and existing homes. She emphasized that for residents in older homes, such as those built in the 1980s, she wants the City to provide enough flexibility to allow them to establish a basement ADU. Her view is that the ordinance should be structured to fairly address both existing homes and new builds, ensuring it works for all homeowners.

Roll Call Vote

Council Member Zander - Yes

Council Member Shelton - Yes

Council Member Harris - Yes

Council Member Johnson - Yes

Council Member McGuire - Yes

The motion passed with a vote of 5-0 in favor.

I. Staff Reports and Calendaring Items:

Director of Engineering and City Engineer Brad Klavano provided an update on the U-111 realignment off Backus Highway. He explained that construction will begin next week. Initially, only one lane in each direction was planned, but after discussions, the project will now include four lanes with a center turn lane. He noted that he had previously asked UDOT to consider a five-lane alternative to evaluate costs, and with bid savings and additional funding, the full five-lane section will now be constructed. The realignment will start near where South Jordan Parkway intersects Backus Highway (U-111) just past the landfill and will extend straight south through South Jordan to Herriman Parkway and into Olympia. The project is expected to span approximately two construction seasons, with completion anticipated around fall 2027. He added that while many stakeholders contributed to expanding the project to five lanes, there is also ongoing work on a jurisdictional transfer for the section north to 7800 South. He explained that the road north of 7800 South is currently a state road, whereas the section south of 7800 South is not, and the transfer may come before the Council for consideration later this year.

City Manager Dustin Lewis provided several updates and reminders for the Council. He confirmed that Council members were invited to attend an event at Herriman High School on Thursday and noted that three members planned to attend. He reminded the Council several council members

were registered for the State of the Chamber of Commerce lunch on February 11, with details available in their calendars. Additionally, he updated the Council on the transition to new computer technology. The February 17 council packet will be distributed through Microsoft Teams, allowing members to access large files digitally. He encouraged members to report any issues promptly so staff can ensure all information is received.

Council Member Johnson motioned to adjourn the February 3, 2026 City Council Meeting. Council Member Zander seconded the motion. Vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor.

ADJOURNMENT

The February 3, 2026 City Council Meeting adjourned at 7:26 p.m.

This is a true and correct copy of the February 3, 2026 City Council Study Meeting Minutes, which were approved on March 3, 2026.



South Jordan City Recorder

ATTACHMENT A

**PLEASE JOIN US AS WE
BRING IN THE YEAR OF THE HORSE**

At Herriman High School
11917 Mustang Trail Way
Herriman, UT 84096

Cultural Presentations in The Commons : 4:30-5:55p.m.

Assembly in the Auditorium: 6-7p.m.

**February 5
2026**



City Council

2.3.26




Administrative Code Updates


Ord. 2026-03



Monument Signs



UPSLOPE MONUMENT SIGN HEIGHT DIAGRAM



LEVEL AND DOWNSLOPE MONUMENT SIGN HEIGHT DIAGRAM


3. In the C-N Zone, **the following additional standards apply:**
 - a. ~~e~~ Exterior walls of buildings shall be constructed with a minimum of fifty percent (50%) brick or stone. The balance of exterior wall area shall consist of brick, stone, glass, decorative integrally colored block and/or no more than fifteen percent (15%) stucco or tile. Other materials may also be used for decorative accents and trim in the C-N Zone with development approval.
 - b. ~~Roofs in the C-N Zone~~ **A minimum of seventy-five percent (75%) of the roof plan area (measured from an overhead plan view) shall be hipped or gabled with a minimum six to twelve (6:12) pitch. Roof areas with a pitch lower than six to twelve (6:12) shall be concealed from view of surrounding residential uses and from public rights-of-way. Projections such as dormers consisting of a combined total of less than ten percent (10%) of the overall roof area are exempt from this requirement.**

17.72.080: P-C ZONE PLAN

- A. ~~The P-C Zone may only be established in an area designated as "large scale master planned community" by the general plan in accordance with provisions of chapter 17.22 of this title.~~ A plan for the P-C Zone shall be submitted for review by the Planning Commission and City Council at the time of rezoning. The plan shall govern development within the P-C Zone but may be amended through standard rezoning procedures. The following information shall be provided **in the application submittal** ~~on a twenty four inch by thirty six inch (24" x 36") sheet (7 copies) and an eleven inch by seventeen inch (11" x 17") reduced copy, unless otherwise required by the Planning Director:~~

17.130.030.030: PROHIBITIONS

The installation of additional outside entrances ~~visible from the street~~ **located on the front or primary elevation of the primary dwelling (as defined as the most prominent elevation facing the primary street frontage) or on a side elevation that faces a street of a corner lot**, separate utility meters, mailboxes, and addresses, is not permitted as such elements may compromise the appearance of the primary dwelling as a single-family dwelling. Internal ADUs shall not be rented or offered as rental units for any period less than thirty (30) consecutive days.



Thank You