

**CITY OF SOUTH JORDAN  
ELECTRONIC  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
April 9, 2024**

Present: Chair Michele Hollist, Commissioner Laurel Bevans, Commissioner Steven Catmull, Commissioner Nathan Gedge, Commissioner Ray Wimmer, Commissioner Sam Bishop, Assistant City Attorney Greg Simonsen, City Planner Greg Schindler, Deputy City Recorder Cindy Valdez, Deputy City Engineer Jeremy Nielson, GIS Coordinator Matt Jarman, IS Specialist Ken Roberts, Planner Damir Drozdek, Planner Miguel Aguilera, Meeting Transcriptionist Diana Baun

Others: Chris Watson, Michael Walker, Justin Jones, Patrick Lowdes, Terry Bouck, Chris Rowllins, Jackson, badam's iPhone, Samantha W., Judy

Absent:

**6:33 P.M.  
REGULAR MEETING**

**A. WELCOME AND ROLL CALL – *Chair Michele Hollist***

Chair Michele Hollist welcomed everyone to the Electronic Planning Commission Meeting.

**B. MOTION TO APPROVE AGENDA**

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

**C. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

**C.1. March 26, 2024 - Planning Commission Meeting Minutes**

Chair Hollist noted that Commissioner Gedge was missing from the attendee list on the minutes, and staff noted he will be added to the final draft.

**Commissioner Gedge motioned to approve the March 26, 2024 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes with the noted amendment. Commissioner Catmull seconded the motion; vote was 5-0, unanimous in favor. Commissioner Wimmer was absent from the vote.**

**Commissioner Ray Wimmer joined the meeting.**

**D. STAFF BUSINESS - *None***

**E. COMMENTS FROM PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS - *None***

**F. SUMMARY ACTION – *None***

**G. ACTION – *None***

**H. ADMINISTRATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS – *None***

**H.1. THE MIX AT SOUTH JORDAN SUBDIVISION SITE PLAN**

Address: 11147 S. Redwood Rd.

File No.: PLSPR202300200

Applicant: Justin Jones, Civil Science

Planner Damir Drozdek reviewed background information from the Staff Report.

Chair Michele Hollist asked who will be responsible long-term for the water retention areas of the property, and if there is a chance the city could have to take those over in the future.

Deputy City Engineer Jeremy Nielson responded the HOA will be responsible. There is a process for that type of public takeover, and the process is all spelled out in the city code including approvals from the City Manager and other staff.

Commissioner Nathan Gedge asked for specifics about the drainage system under Beckstead Lane.

Engineer Nielson reviewed those details, much of the water will be detained in underground storm water chambers, with what is released going into a pipe that flows to the north, and eventually to the east down 1030 South into a creek on Cody Circle off 1300 West which is an existing system.

Commissioner Laurel Bevans asked about a shared parking agreement and whether the buildings facing Beckstead will have rooftop decks.

Planner Drozdek responded there will be a note on the plat versus an agreement for simplicity. He also noted that any restrictions on rooftop deck locations didn't make it into the agreement, but the applicant can answer that question when he speaks.

Chair Hollist invited the applicant forward to speak.

**Justin Jones (Applicant – Civil Science)** – regarding the rooftop decks on the units adjacent to Beckstead, there were back and forth discussions with the result being they raised the wall on

those decks to be higher to restrict views. The project, with those walls, is still under the 35 foot height limit.

Chair Hollist opened the public hearing for comments.

**Chris Rowllins (Resident)** – I am the owner of the land to the southeast of this development with the cutout. I appreciate a lot of the things I see in here, like the privacy trees and things like that. I had a question similar to Commissioner Bevans about the end units, the ones that will overlook my property, I don't believe there are any rooftop decks on those. I am looking at page 19 and don't see any stairs leading up to the end units and that's why I'm asking. There was also a note on the plat that might impact me that I had a question about, which is the fence along the south side where it mentions there is a water line underneath and that the fence will be moved five feet away; I am not sure if that refers to the fence or just the footing of the fence that might interfere with the water line. That is a question, if that means that fence will be moved closer to those buildings, and would that imply as well that the waterline cuts across. I appreciate the steps they have taken to make sure the property works with my intended use of building a house there.

Mr. Jones noted the end units similarly will have that taller parapet wall around the balconies to shield Mr. Rowllins' property. Regarding the water line, that was a last minute comment from staff, realizing that there is an existing water line that runs down that property line. Across their frontage it is closer to the property line than across Mr. Rowllins' frontage, so by the time it gets to his property it veers back to the south. Potentially their wall will need to shift north, but they haven't worked through that needing marking by Blue Stakes and actual locations identified still. There is potential that wall will need to shift to the north along their frontage, but he believes once it gets to Mr. Rowllins' property, any fencing he puts up would still be the necessary five feet away.

**Commissioner Gedge motioned to approve File No. PLSPR202300200, Subdivision Plan. Commissioner Catmull seconded the motion.**

#### **Roll Call Vote**

**Yes – Commissioner Gedge**  
**Yes – Commissioner Catmull**  
**Yes – Commissioner Bishop**  
**Yes – Chair Hollist**  
**Yes – Commissioner Wimmer**  
**Yes – Commissioner Bevans**

**Motion passes 6-0, unanimous in favor.**

#### **H.2. DOLLAR TREE SITE PLAN APPLICATION**

Address: 10494 S River Heights Dr

File No.: PLSPR202300203

Applicant: Lance Ridges

Planner Miguel Aguilera reviewed background information from the Staff Report.

Commissioner Sam Bishop asked about the planned bike racks and what kind of requirements or guidance the city gives in terms of their construction, if any.

City Planner Greg Schindler responded there are no city standards for types or locations of bike racks. The city always encourages them, but they are not required anywhere in the city.

Chair Hollist invited the applicant forward to speak, he had nothing to add to the Staff Report. She then opened the public hearing for comments.

**Commissioner Bevans motioned to approve File No. PLSPR202300203, Site Plan Application. Commissioner Bishop seconded the motion.**

**Roll Call Vote**

**Yes – Commissioner Bevans**

**Yes – Commissioner Bishop**

**Yes – Commissioner Gedge**

**Yes – Commissioner Catmull**

**Yes – Chair Hollist**

**Yes – Commissioner Wimmer**

**Motion passes 6-0, unanimous in favor.**

**H.3. CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR NEW HOT YOGA STUDIO**

Address: 10975 S. Sterling View Dr. #100

File No.: PLCUP202400047

Applicant: Severyn Jack Hughes

Planner Miguel Aguilera reviewed background information from the Staff Report.

Chair Michele Hollist invited the applicant forward to speak, they were not present. She then opened the Public Hearing for comments. There were no comments and the hearing was closed.

**Commissioner Gedge motioned to approve File No. PLCUP202400047, Conditional Use Permit, based on tonight's discussion and the Staff Report at the location listed above, specifically Suite #100. Chair Hollist seconded the motion.**

**Roll Call Vote**

**Yes – Commissioner Gedge**

**Yes – Chair Hollist**

**Yes – Commissioner Bishop**

**Yes – Commissioner Catmull**  
**Yes – Commissioner Wimmer**  
**Yes – Commissioner Bevans**

**Motion passes 6-0, unanimous in favor.**

## **I. LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS**

### **I.1. TAMMY LOERSTCHER/CHARLES BOUCK REZONE FROM A-5 TO R-2.5**

Address: 905 W 10400 S  
File No.: PLZBA202400042  
Applicant: Charles Bouck/Tammy Loerstcher

Commissioner Nathan Gedge asked to be recused and to join the public as a resident for this item.

Planner Miguel Aguilera reviewed background information from the Staff Report.

Commissioners and staff discussed the need for a concept plan on this rezone and it was explained that it was only necessary for the lot being rezoned, and there were currently no development plans for that lot.

Commissioner Laurel Bevans asked about emergency access on the private road.

City Planner Greg Schindler responded that a hammerhead was proposed as an option for that road, and will be required when development begins.

Chair Michele Hollist invited the applicant forward to speak.

**Tammy Loerstcher and Charles Bouck (Applicants)** – Ms. Loerstcher noted that this is her father, Mr. Bouck's, property, and she was given a small part of it to build on.

Mr. Bouck added that he has no current plans to develop anything on the big lot. The rezone is being done because Salt lake County is taxing him Commercial-Residential anyway since it's not in compliance with A-5, and none of the lots in the A-5 zoning area are five acre lots. He also explained the reason for the small piece on the property, it had to do with the adjacent development and a new survey that caused the parcel to be marked as his property since the developer at the time went under, it was given to someone else who went under as well and was eventually given to the bank, who then tried to get him to buy it but it was already his. He ended up using it, through purchase, to pay off back taxes and it is now his land. He then asked about keeping his current animals on the lot once rezoned.

Planner Aguilera responded that if the rezone goes through, the property will lose its animal rights.

City Planner Greg Schindler added that animals currently on the property can stay until the begin development.

Chair Hollist opened the public hearing for comments.

**Terry Bouck (Resident)** – I live at the end of the road on the dirt lane, to the south of the lane. I am just curious how they are going to access that property back there. On his deed for the property there is only a 15 foot access that goes for 440 feet down to my father's house, which is the first house on the lane, and then it widens to 30 feet and goes down into his field. Are they going to widen and make it a public road like they did across the street with sidewalk, curb and gutter, making it 45 feet. I own almost two-thirds of the lane that everyone is driving on; we have been to court and had surveys done. Surveys are the interpretation of the man doing the survey, they are not an exact science, so there are probably seven or eight surveys going along and if you look at the survey just shown it doesn't show him going clear to the subdivision fence, and that is a part of his property; that was proven in court in 2020.

**Nathan Gedge (Resident)** – I am the property owner directly to the north of Lot 2. I am in favor of the rezone to 2.5, and I am glad that staff answered one of my concerns, which was to protect the animal rights of Mr. Bouck for his remnant of Lot 2. My other concern is the road, which was just addressed by Mr. Terry Bouck. Lastly, thank you to staff for answering some questions regarding the maps in the Staff Report referencing a survey the County has from 2009. Mr. Chuck Bouck also has a survey that was conducted earlier this year which alleviates all concerns I have regarding properties, including my own property, and I have no concerns with this application. This is probably the best venue for my personal residence.

Chair Hollist closed the public hearing.

Deputy City Engineer Jeremy Nielson addressed the private lane, noting this is a fairly long, dead end road, but it is in existing condition so staff is trying to be sensitive to land owners. There is no concern with adding one more home to the street and a hammerhead at the end. He has no information regarding the ownership of the private lane and that's a civil matter.

**Commissioner Catmull motioned to approve File No. PLZBA202400042, Rezone from A-5 to R-2.5, based on tonight's discussion and the Staff Report. Chair Hollist seconded the motion.**

#### **Roll Call Vote**

**Yes – Commissioner Catmull**

**Yes – Chair Hollist**

**Yes – Commissioner Bishop**

**Yes – Commissioner Wimmer**

**Yes – Commissioner Bevans**

**Abstain – Commissioner Gedge**

**Motion passes 5-0, unanimous in favor.**

## **J. OTHER BUSINESS**

City Planner Greg Schindler reviewed potential items for the next meeting's agenda.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**Chair Hollist motioned to adjourn the April 9, 2024 Planning Commission Meeting. Commissioner Gedge seconded the motion; vote was 6-0, unanimous in favor.**

**The April 9, 2024 Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 8:04 p.m.**

**This is a true and correct copy of the April 9, 2024 Planning Commission minutes, which were approved on April 23, 2024.**

**From:** [Jeremy Nielson](#)  
**To:** [Nathan Gedge](#); [Cindy Valdez](#); [Michele Hollist](#); [Laurel Bevans](#); [Steven Catmull](#); [Sam Bishop](#); [Ray Wimmer](#)  
**Cc:** [Anna Crookston](#); [Greg Schindler](#); [Gregory Simonsen](#); [Diana Baun](#)  
**Subject:** RE: 04-09-24 Planning Commission Agenda  
**Date:** Monday, April 8, 2024 11:03:45 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)

---

Hello Nathan, The lines are based upon the latest information from the [county assessor](#). I also checked the county surveyor's site and appears your property was surveyed in 2009 ([link to survey](#)) and the survey appears to correlate with the county assessor. If there is a dispute about the property line, it's a civil matter and is typically resolved by a property owner hiring a surveyor and recording it with the county surveyor. I'd recommend you start by talking to the county surveyors office if you have questions – this is outside of my expertise.

Regarding ownership of 10400 S, the majority of the road is owned by the property owners to the south. However, there is a significant survey gap between property owners to the north and south of 10400 S (19ft on the west end of 10400 S and 6ft on the east end). [Here](#) is a survey that shows 10400 S and was done in 2019. However, keep in mind this survey was only for the two parcels near 1055 W. The survey does show private right of way lines for 10400 S on your property, but I can't explain why. You could reach out to the surveyor (Benchmark Engineering) and ask what the basis is for showing that. Or maybe start with contacting the county surveyor...

When you're looking at property lines, I've found [this site](#) to be helpful. You can search all the recorded boundary survey's with the County and look them up by property address. Once you find the parcel then click the yellow line and it will link you to any boundary survey. I hope this helps...

Thanks,

**Jeremy Nielson, PE | Deputy City Engineer | City of South Jordan**  
O: 801.253.5203 ext 1353

---

**From:** Nathan Gedge <NGedge@sjc.utah.gov>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 5, 2024 12:56 PM  
**To:** Cindy Valdez <CValdez@sjc.utah.gov>; Michele Hollist <MHollist@sjc.utah.gov>; Laurel Bevans <LBevans@sjc.utah.gov>; Steven Catmull <SCatmull@sjc.utah.gov>; Sam Bishop <SBishop@sjc.utah.gov>; Ray Wimmer <RWimmer@sjc.utah.gov>  
**Cc:** Anna Crookston <acrookston@sjc.utah.gov>; Greg Schindler <GSchindler@sjc.utah.gov>; Gregory Simonsen <GSimonsen@sjc.utah.gov>; Diana Baun <DBaun@sjc.utah.gov>; Jeremy Nielson <JNielson@sjc.utah.gov>  
**Subject:** Re: 04-09-24 Planning Commission Agenda

All, I will need to recuse myself from Item I.1 in this meeting as I have a direct conflict with this item and as a legislative item do not want to put the City or Commission at any risk.

For City Staff, I will be presenting testimony and would like an answer to the following question. From the aerial on page 98, the subject property is shown outlined in red. It appears from this the my personal property (directly North) is being currently utilized by the applicant, including storage of a shipping container, which may conflict with guideline C. How current are the boundaries displayed (as of what date)? What is the source of such information (i.e., Salt Lake County)? What is the process if there is a discrepancy?

Also, who is the owner of 10400 South, it is City or "Private Row"? That question and improvements will be questions during the Site Plan phase.







---

**From:** Cindy Valdez

**Sent:** Thursday, April 4, 2024 4:23:03 PM

**To:** Michele Hollist; Laurel Bevans; Nathan Gedge; Steven Catmull; Sam Bishop; Ray Wimmer

**Cc:** Anna Crookston; Greg Schindler; Gregory Simonsen; Diana Baun; Jeremy Nielson

**Subject:** 04-09-24 Planning Commission Agenda

04-09-2024 Planning Commission Meeting Agenda

04-09-2024 Planning Commission Meeting Agenda with Supporting Documents [Click Here](#)

Zoom Information: <https://ut-southjordan.civicplus.com/254/Planning-Commission>