

**CITY OF SOUTH JORDAN  
ELECTRONIC  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
January 26, 2021**

Present: Commissioner Michele Hollist, Commissioner Nathan Gedge, Commissioner Catmull, Commissioner Trevor Darby, Commissioner Sean Morrissey, Staff Attorney Greg Simonson, Assistant City Engineer Jeremy Nielsen, City Planner Greg Schindler, Planner Brad Sanderson, Planner David Mann, Deputy Recorder Cindy Valdez

Others: Errol Balfour, Kevin Funk, Morgan Frampton, Tanya Davis, Jon Ruedas, Ross Crow, Brent Fisher, Boyd Woolsey, Dan Langford, Karen Ridge

6:30 P.M.  
**REGULAR MEETING**

I. Welcome and Roll Call – *Commission Chair Michele Hollist*

Chair Hollist welcomed everyone to the Electronic Planning Commission Meeting and noted that all of the Commissioners are present.

II. Motion to Approve Agenda

**Commissioner Gedge motioned to approve the January 26, 2021 Planning Commission Agenda. Commissioner Hollist seconded the motion. Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor.**

III. Approval of the Minutes

**Commissioner Gedge motioned to approve the January 12, 2021. Planning Commission Meeting Minutes as printed. Commissioner Hollist seconded the motion. Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor.**

IV. **STAFF BUSINESS** – *None*

V. **COMMENTS FROM PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS**

Commissioner Gedge said I attended the City Council Study Session last week where they discussed the changes to the Jordan River Plan and the Redwood Road Gateway. It look like their biggest concern was with the proposal on Redwood Road and the current occupants, and what would they do, if on the plan it showing different businesses. Other, than that they seemed favorable with the General Plan that we saw at our last Planning Commission meeting.

VI. **SUMMARY ACTION** – *None*

**VII. ACTION – None**

**VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS –**

**A. TENNEY SUBDIVISION LOT 2 AND BROOKLYN MEADOWS P.U.D.  
FIRST MAENDMENT - SUBDIVISION AMENDMENT**

Location: 10520 South Brooklyn View Lane  
File No: PLPLA202000364  
Applicant: Errol Balfour

Planner Brad Sanderson reviewed background information on this item from the staff report. He said that there were some concerns from the residents that were sent by email, and those emails were provided to the Planning Commissioner's to view the concerns (See Attachment A, B, C, D)

Commissioner Gedge said on one of the comments made by a resident was that they were concerned about their view. I would like to confirm that if we did not approve this tonight, would there still be a home going in on the lot from an action we took last year?

Planner Sanderson said that is correct.

Chair Hollist said does the City offer any guidelines as to what type of fencing will exist between the driveways? The driveways appear to be slightly merged.

Planner Sanderson said there is no requirement for fencing between the driveways. In fact, it is prohibited to have any front yard fencing at all. I think the clear vision site area concern was on the lot to the south of the Tenney lot, and they have a fence that comes up to the corner, but there is no fencing allowed in the front.

Chair Hollist said I thought frontage requirements were 90ft. for some reason, is a cul-de-sac different?

Planner Sanderson said it is different with a cul-de-sac. Whenever you have a property line that diverges on a 20 degree angle, and that is what is typically on a cul-de-sac, and because there is a bend here, in those situations they are allowed to have a 50ft. frontage.

Assistant City Engineer Nielsen said we looked at the site lines from this driveway and we didn't see a concern from a visibility perspective. They have 200ft in each direction which puts you in the intersection to the south, or it puts you to the end of the cul-de-sac, so for access into, or out of the driveway, we didn't see that as a concern from the traffic engineering perspective.

Commissioner Gedge said could you talk about the advantages of having access off Brooklyn View Lane, compared to Temple View Drive. Do you have any numbers regarding that?

Assistant City Engineer Nielsen said it is better to funnel the traffic on to 10550 W. and access from that point, that way all of the cars are coming out of there on to Temple Drive, rather than creating a separate access from the house. It would be engineering's preference and

recommendation to have it access off of that local street first, and then having it go on to a major collector street, and it would be a safer configuration for the driveway as well.

Commissioner Catmull said speaking of the site visibility from the driveway of lot 2, they would be coming in, as you are leaving that driveway. The west side would be the ones coming from the east side, and that would be clearly visible, so you would have additional visibility for people who may be a little blinded. They would get better visibility because they are already separated from the property, is that part of the assessment?

Assistant City Engineer Nielsen said that is the way we looked at it. When you are exiting the driveway you will look right, and you will be able to see all of the way to the intersection. The cars may be turning into that intersection, but they will have relatively low speed making that turn, so they will have adequate time to respond and make a decision whether they want to enter on to the highway, or not. In the other direction the vehicles will be approaching leaving the cul-de-sac, and from that driveway you can see the end of the cul-de-sac, so it would give them adequate time to enter the lane or not.

Commissioner Catmull said with this driveway on lot 2, will it change anything about street parking for the lot to the south?

Assistant City Engineer Nielsen said I don't think there are any parking restrictions now, and I don't see a need for parking restrictions in the future. Typically, we only restrict parking if it becomes a safety hazard.

**Errol Balfour, Applicant** – said the only thing that we would like to add is the requirement for the fence in the back of the lot. In the City Code 16.04.200, it says: If the lot is existing and the owners do not consent, a fence should not be required. We are bringing that up, so that we do not have that requirement for the masonry fence. We know that when we do put up a fence it will need to meet City Code, but because this lot is existing already it should fall under that requirement of “shall not require.”

Commissioner Hollist said I thought the motion said that a fence was required, are you asking for that not to be included?

Mr. Errol said that is correct.

Planner Sanderson said we can look more into the City Code, but it was not directly in the motion. We can look more into this and have a discussion in the future with Mr. Balfour, but he is correct, this lot is existing, but it is existing with the frontage being on 1300 W. If we are amending this so it is facing the Brooklyn View Lane, it would put a little spin on how the code would be read. I would have to get with the Planning Director and the City Engineer and get their view on how that code is read. I don't know that we have to have that requirement now as it is, but I will have that conversation with those individuals.

Assistant Attorney Simonson said from a legal perspective you cannot have a double access on a lot, and it is my understanding that the purpose of the fence, and the requirement to move the

driveway was to insure that there will not be double access on the lot. I don't know if the requirement of a fence is required under the City Code. This is one of those things where this lot is going to be around for many years, so the most important thing is that it is made clear, that the access is going to be from the Brooklyn View road, and not from Temple View. If Planner Sanderson is unclear if the fence is required, or not, this is an existing lot, so if we can accomplish not having a double lot without a fence that would be up to the Planning Department.

Commissioner Hollist said there is going to be some discussion on this tonight, would you be agreeable to a different kind of fence?

Mr. Balfour said to be clear. We are not asking if the driveway access remains, so I don't think a different type of fencing would meet the City Code. When we are ready to put in the fencing, we are fine with meeting the City Code with a masonry fence. We would just like the option to put in the fence when we are ready. We have talked about bonding for a fence, but we don't want to have to put out the money on the bond if we don't have to. It is not that we don't want a fence, because we have young kids, we would just like to put it in on our timeline. In light of the code, we feel that we should not be held to that requirement.

Planner Sanderson said I would rather have a conversation with Steve Schaefermeyer, since he is the one that interprets the code, and make sure he reads it the same way.

Assistant Attorney Simonson said I agree with Mr. Sanderson that Mr. Schaefermeyer is the interpreter of the code for the Planning Department, but we have the code in front of us, and the Planning Commission has the right to look at that code and determine what the definition of that code is. I will be honest with you, when I read the code I think Mr. Balfour has a good point. It does appear that Tenney is an existing subdivision, so it may be difficult to require it under the code. Perhaps Mr. Balfour would be agreeable to a time frame to put up the fencing, and it is made clear that there cannot be double access. That is something that would need to be discussed with him.

Chair Hollist said how much latitude do we have regarding a time limit, and does something need to be added to insure this takes place?

Assistant Attorney Simonson said I think that as long as it is stated for the record, it would be sufficient. As I look at the code it is requiring fencing on a new development, not an existing one. He is joining with an existing development, and we are here tonight for a subdivision amendment. I don't know that you want to require it, but it might be better to put a time frame, rather than leaving it open ended.

Commissioner Morrissey said I think we should ask Mr. Balfour his thoughts about adding a timeline for putting in the fencing before we start the Public Hearing.

Mr. Balfour said we are amenable to a timeline. We would prefer that the timeline start after the completion of the home. We would prefer that the construction enter on the 1300 W neighborhood, so we wouldn't want to put up a fence before that, but if there is going to be a timeline, we would like it from the completion of the home, not the approval.

Commissioner Hollist said when do you anticipate building this home?

Mr. Balfour said we are waiting for the complete financing, so based on the approval we can go back to the bank and they can do the appraisal based on a combined lot, so ideally we would like to start in the next couple months.

Commissioner Hollist said Mr. Balfour would you be ok if we added putting in the fence 12 months after construction?

Mr. Balfour said when I initially spoke with Planner Sanderson we talked about a bond in 12 months. The reason we want it as it is written, is because of the uncertainty of what finances are going to look like after we complete the house. We eventually want a fence, but we are looking at about 24 months after the house is completed. We don't want to be locked into something in 12 months that could potentially be a hardship and we wouldn't be able to keep that requirement.

Commissioner Morrissey said I think a 24 month agreement is a great solution for tying up those loose ends. I think if after the motion we added an agreement for the fence to be up within 24 months after the home is built, that would be sufficient.

Assistant Attorney Simonson said at the end of construction they will receive some kind of permission for occupancy after the final inspection, so it would be for whatever time was agreed upon after the final inspection.

Commissioner Catmull said what part of the code give us the authority to put a time frame on this?

Assistant Attorney Simonson said that is a great question. I would say given the wording in the statute, if the wording is not clear, it would be interpreted in favor of the applicant. If we were going to be disputing this, the applicant is in a pretty good position. The applicant has expressed his willingness to put up the fence within a certain timeframe, so I don't think you want to put it down as something we are requiring, but it is an agreement. We are requiring that there will be no access from the back of the house, so this is not like a legal stumbling block if the applicant is agreeing to it.

Chair Hollist opened the Public Hearing to comments.

**Kevin Funk, South Jordan** – said I would like to state for the record that I am in favor of the Balfour's being able to build on the Tenney Subdivision Lot 2 facing Brooklyn View Lane. I think it would be a great addition to the neighborhood. I think there are a few things that the Commission ought to consider in addition to the things that have been brought up already. I has been mentioned that there are CC&R's associated with the Brooklyn Meadows Subdivision. The subdivision is a planned unit development, and the CC&R's are a conjoined with the PUD, so I wonder if there would be a better option in including this home to the PUD itself, rather than amending the subdivision without amending the PUD in the CC&R's. I bring that up because I am concerned that the City may end up amending the lot divisions on a map, but ignoring that

there are other binding contracts that would prohibit that, unless there are other voting rights that have taken place with those CC&R's. I am in favor of this, but I would like to recognize that there is more than one group that needs approval in order for this to happen. I am concerned that we could create more confusion, than benefit, if the City is approving the change of property lines without getting the approval necessary through the CC&R's, or the PUD.

Chair Hollist closed the Public Hearing.

Chair Hollist said Mr. Simonsen will you take a minute to address the issues that have been raised.

Assistant City Attorney Simonson said with CC&R's whether they are in a PUD, or any other type of subdivision they are private covenants between the property owners, so they are in the nature of a contract. I have not reviewed the CC&FR's, but Mr. Funk may be entirely correct that there are requirements that need to be taken by the subdivision. If there is an approval tonight, it was just indicated that they have met City requirements, and that is all we are being asked to rule upon tonight. I think you are clear to approve, or deny, because the applicant has met the City requirement, so what they do with their private covenants is up to them. There are many good reasons that City's do not involve themselves in private covenants.

Commissioner Catmull said I am not inclined to have the fence requirement from what I am reading in the code.

Commissioner Gedge said I agree, I don't know that we should be adding a fence or a timeline.

Commissioner Hollist said looking at the code and what Mr. Balfour has read to us, I don't know that it is outside of our rights to enforce a fence. It is a lot and they are asking for one amendment to the other, and adding to the lot, so it is inherently changing. I have to admit if the applicant is willing to agree to a 24 month timeline, I am inclined to be very flexible. I am ok with that if all the parties are in agreement.

Commissioner Morrissey said I believe that I share the similar sentiments as you do, as far as if the applicant is willing to agree. I am ok moving forward with a motion based on his willingness, but before that willingness was expressed, I was a little apprehensive including that in our motion, but I am ok with it based on what the applicant has said tonight.

**Commissioner Gedge motioned to approve the Tenney subdivision and Brooklyn Meadows P.U.D. First Amendment, file number PLPLA202000364 as proposed. Commissioner Hollist seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 4-1 unanimous in favor.**

**B. DAYBREAK VILLAGE 10 NORTH PLAT 4 PRELIMINARY  
SUBDIVISION**

Location: Generally Southwest of 5600 W. and 10200 S.

Fi No: PLPP202000367

Applicant: Daybreak Communities

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

**Gary Langston, Daybreak Communities** – said really what we are looking to do is put a subdivision in place for this piece of property so a deal can be put together. At the time this plat was conceived we had someone that was doing some due diligence on the property, and they have since selected to go with someone else due to some utility conflicts and some other things. What this really allows us to do is put the frame work in place for the future. We are creating the “P” lots to finish up with what was started many years ago with the Bingham Creek area, and then there are the two “C” lots, and really C101 is the only one that is developable, and C102 could potentially have a road on it, but it falls within Bingham Creek and has some environmental restrictions as well.

Chair Hollist opened the Public Hearing to comments. There was none. She closed the Public Hearing.

**Commissioner Gedge motioned to approve File No. PLPP2010900367 subject to the following:**

- 1. That all South Jordan City requirements are met prior to recording the plat. Commissioner Hollist seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor.**

**C. DAYBREAK WATERCOURSE PLAT PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION**

Location: Generally West of Prosperity Road between Copperhawk Dr.  
(11000 S.) and Lake Avenue (11550 S.)  
File No: PLPP202000350  
Applicant: Daybreak Communities

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

**Gary Langston, Daybreak Communities** – said this is our subdivision plat that allows us to put the framework in place, and to ultimately be able to transfer the water course over to the Home Owners Association. This is a public amenity and it will not be managed by the City of South Jordan. As you can see on the very bottom of the screen we have lot P-108, that would probably be the only section in the future that would require a site plan. We intend to build recreation center, or clubhouse, a facility of some sort that will sit on that particular parcel. The remaining park lots will be a combination of landscaping and water. They will all have elements where people can access the water, and locations where they wouldn't have direct access. There are also a variety of bridges that are part of the infrastructure where cars will be able to drive over the top, and some cases it will allow for watercraft to move beneath the bridges as well. There are a small variety of bridges that will not go from one side to the other.

Chair Hollist opened the Public Hearing to comments.

**Josh Gross, South Jordan** - said I thought I could kayak from one end of the water course to the other, and I thought Mr. Langston said they are separated and I would not be able to do that. I would like some clarification.

**Ross Crow, South Jordan** – said I talked to Planner Schindler, and Attorney Simonson earlier today regarding the parcel on the northwest corner of South Jordan Parkway, and Prosperity, so I would like to know if one of them could speak to the density plan or vision for that parcel. I would also like to know what solutions the developers have for water flow, and cleanliness, so we don't have the same issues here that we have seen at the big lake.

Chair Hollist closed the Public Hearing.

Chair Hollist said there was a question about connectivity, so can staff address that.

Mr. Langston said generally speaking, you can kayak for most of it, especially going north and south. There are a couple of portions that will have culverts underneath the road that allow for the water features that do exist, but you won't be able to kayak to those locations. The reason for that is, this is a water amenity that also serves as a storage pond, so in a rainy or flood condition it will raise a little bit, and drop down in time. There are larger vehicle bridges that will make their way north and south, and we have (8) culvert bridges, and some of those are larger and will allow a kayakers to go underneath. We are intending in the future to have a small buffy boat to have its way around the lake, and the kayakers will be able to go underneath, but the buffy boat will not.

Chair Hollist said Mr. Langston there was a question about the northwest corner, are you in a position to share what type of business plans you have for that area?

Mr. Langston said I spoke to Mr. Crow a little earlier this evening and shared some of my thoughts with him, but the parcel he is referring to is one that is at the northwest corner of South Jordan Parkway and Prosperity, it is on the eastside of lot P-106. The question is, what kind of construction can occur on that piece of ground, and we have a few different concepts of what it could look like. We will likely have townhomes along South Jordan Parkway, which is really just a continuation of it anyway. As you move your way north it goes to a little larger lot, and then what we call a small lot and those home would be very similar to what is across the street. We are actively working on our Village 9 plans right now, and at some point we will bring back another subdivision

Chair Hollist said what can you tell us about water flow, cleanliness, and how that will be maintained?

Mr. Langston said when we started this process we engaged a variety of experts in the area of water, whether it be water or lakes and rivers. The idea here is that we will use the same water here for the water course, it comes from Utah Lake canals, and within the system itself there will be a variety of circulation systems, as well as aeration of water. In this particular situation, I think it is even better than Oquirrh Lake, because we have the ability to add storm water to it. We will also use the water for irrigation around the landscaping that surrounds the water itself. If my memory serves me correctly, we were circulation the water every few hours, with the volume of water there. All so the water comes from the Daybreak Water Company, and part of that system will have a flocculation system where we settle out the dissolved solvents in our search



pond, which is up near the Daybreak Commerce Park. If there are any other question from the residents, they can call and talk to me about it, and I can share more details with them.

**Commissioner Gedge motioned to approve Project No. PLPP202000350 subject to the following:**

**1. That all South Jordan City requirements are met prior to recording the plat. Commissioner Hollist seconded the motion. Roll. Call Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor.**

**D. DING TEA, CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT**

Location: 10382 S. Redwood Rd

File No: PLCUP202100015

Applicant: Hieu Nguyen

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

Chair Hollist said based on their square footage, how many parking stalls are required for this use?

Planner Schindler said it would be (1) stall for every 100ft, or (1) stall for every (4) seats.

Commissioner Gedge said I would like to make sure because this is a conditional use permit that if we approve this for a restaurant, that it would float any subsequent owner's leases of this space. I would also like to know if the next door owner (FIZZ) is operating their business under a conditional use permit, and are we setting this up for conflict if down the road a Sodalicious, or Swig want to go in next door to a (FIZZ).

Planner Schindler said the conditional use permit runs with the land, and the property for this suite. If the same type use wants to go in here some other time that conditional use will already be in place. The owner next door (FIZZ) is also running under a conditional use permit. However, they were not the original applicant, but ever since that place opened for business about 20 years ago, it is has been a restaurant of various types. Regarding the conflict question, there are business that build next to each other all of the time, and we cannot tell someone they can't build a building next to a competitor, we don't get involved in that.

Commissioner Gedge said I am assuming the business were notified about tonight's meeting?

City Planner Schindler said the property owners were notified, so if business owners do not own the building, they would not have been noticed. Also, the adjacent property owner within 300 ft. were notified.

**Hieu Nguyen, Applicant** – said I really don't have anything more to add, but I would like to thank staff for allowing this application to be heard at this meeting.

Chair Hollist opened the Public Hearing to comments. There was none. She closed the Public Hearing.

**Commissioner Catmull motioned to approve application PLCUP202100015 to allow Ding Tea to operate a restaurant out of a suite in a multi-tenant commercial building located at 10382 Redwood Rd. Commissioner Hollist seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 4 in favor and 1 Commissioner Gedge abstained.**

**E. BINGHAM CREEK REGIONAL PARK PHASE 1 SITE PLAN AND  
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT**

Location: 10004 South 4800 West  
File No: PLSPR202000323  
Applicant: Jonathan Ruedas

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

Chair Hollist said how specific of a plan are we approving tonight, and will we see different phases come before us? And in what format.

Planner Mann said it will be similar to set of plans that is about 75 to 80 pages, and it will be quite extensive, so what is before you tonight is just the first phase. The things highlighted in yellow were all reviewed by staff to make sure that they all meet the City Code, so what you are approving tonight is for the first phase, all the other phases will come before you in the future.

Chair Hollist said a portion of this still appears that it needs to be rezoned, so will we see that in the future to forward a recommendation to City Council and they will ultimately make the decision on rezoning?

Planner Mann said yes that is correct, it is scheduled to come before you at the next Planning Commission Meeting.

**Jonathan Ruedas, Applicant** – said I am the representative from Salt Lake County Parks and Recreation, and I am the project manager over this project. I don't really have anything to add, I think Mr. Mann did a great job with the summary of this project.

Commissioner Catmull said as far as lighting on the eastern edge where the existing homes are, I didn't see a lighting plan, has this been evaluated?

Planner Mann said that was submitted to City staff and reviewed, and we didn't see anything that would cause us to bring it to you for a conditional use permit. It met all of the required codes, and there wasn't any light pollution spilling on to the neighboring properties. I does meet the City Codes it just wasn't included in the packet.

Commissioner Catmull said are those soccer fields in the southeast corner? and will they be lit?

Mr. Ruedas said they are multipurpose fields, and currently we do not have lighting in this phase. We may potentially look at lighting in the future as the budget allows, but currently we do not have a lighting plan for this phase.

Chair Hollist opened the Public Hearing to comments.

**Brent Fisher, South Jordan** – said how are you planning on handling traffic in the intersection On 10200 South and 4800 West, and also at the park entrances?

**Mr. Musto, South Jordan** – said I live on across the street on the southeast corner of the park. I would like to know how many parking spots there will be in the southeast corner of the park.

**Boyd Woolsey, South Jordan** – said I am concerned about allowing parking on the east part of the complex on 4800 W. The way it sits now there are bike lanes on both sides, and there was a comment earlier about “no restricting.” I do have a concern about living by other soccer fields and people are parking up and down the street, because it is going to severely impact our ability to come out of our complex and see on both sides, and with pedestrians walking back and forth it could cause some hazardous situations. We want to make sure the bike lanes are kept intact, and that parking is not allowed to be on the street, and should be maintained in the park.

**Dan Langford, South Jordan** said I have live in this neighborhood for quite some time, and I think these plans look great, and we are looking forward to getting into the park and using it. I also represent the Daybreak Disk Golf Club and I am curious there is a Disk Golf Course planned for phase1. I would also like to know how useable the mountain biking trail is planned to be in phase1.

**Karen Ridge, South Jordan** – said I am in the 55 plus community across the street from these soccer fields. I would like to know if there is going to be any kind of perimeter fence on it, or any kind of gates that will close when the park is closed. I am just concerned about parties in the park after hours, because I live directly across the street.

Chair Hollist closed the Public Hearing.

Chair Hollist said the first question was about traffic controls on 10200 S and 4800 W, so could we get staff to address that.

Assistant City Engineer Nielsen said as far as exiting the park and the access on Bingham Rim Road which is 10200 S and 4800 W those will be stop controlled. At this point there are low enough traffic volumes on both of those roads, so we don't see a need for anything more than stop controls on those accesses. The access at Bingham Rim Road and 4800 the City did see a need to put a traffic signal there in the future, but currently that signal is programed to be installed in the fall of 2022. It is not funded yet, but that is where it falls in our CIP schedule.

Chair Hollist said could you comment on what the accesses will look like?

Assistant City Engineer Nielsen said they will be full access for the entrances, and when traffic volumes change as development continues, it can be re-evaluated at any time if that presents a hazard. The entrances are setback far enough from major accesses that we didn't see a problem with allowing full accesses.

Chair Hollist said there was a question about how many parking spots were going to be in the southeast corner of the park (associated with the fields).

Mr. Ruedas said we have approximately 400 parking spaces on the east and south sides of those fields, and we have planned for phase 3, another 117 overflow parking to the west.

Chair Hollist said there was a question about parking on 4800 W, and would that impact the bike lanes.

Assistant City Engineer Nielson said right now the shoulder there is only about 4 feet, so it wouldn't be real comfortable for cars to park there, but it is allowed. It is not marked as "No Parking" so it could be modified if it needed to be, because it presented a hazard to anyone, or anything like that. I think with the initial opening of the park we would not put on-street parking restrictions at this time.

Chair Hollist said there was a question about what was going to be available in phase 1 in respect to disk golf and mountain biking.

Mr. Ruedas said I have communicated with Mr. Langford in the past and tried to work with the disk golf community. We are planning for an 18 Hole disk golf course in phase 1, and most of that will take place to the north of the multipurpose field, and kind of to the west. We are planning on two areas for mountain biking that will have bike skills and trails. We put in for a grant relating to mountain bike trails, and other trails. We did receive that grant, so that should help us to develop those two biking areas, which are in the northeast corner of the site. I want to make a correction on the parking, because my consultant just texted me with current information. There are 400 parking stalls from the east of the fields to the south of the fields. There is a small parking lot north of the future courts, and in the center is a future destination with a playground planned south and east of the bike skills area, and then we have additional parking planned to the north. All of the combined parking is about 317 additional parking spaces, on top of the 400 we already had.

Chair Hollist said there was also a question about a perimeter fence, and if the park would have gates that would be closed in the evening.

Mr. Ruedas said currently we don't have anything planned at the entrances to close that off at night. As far as perimeter fencing, we only have what is already there, we are not proposing fencing along 10200 S, but we may consider looking at that in the future. There is a difference between this park and other parks, because this is going to be controlled by a park authority. We have set hours that we try to keep, but if we have issues that occur after hours we would get Law Enforcement involved. We are not opposed to looking at gates, but we do not have any planned at this time.

Chair Hollist said what is the timeline for phase 1?

Mr. Ruedas said we have been working on the grading and utilities, so in the next month we hope to start construction which will go until summer of 2022, or possibly the fall of 2022.

Commissioner Gedge said to follow up with the fencing and the gate question, and using the park authority to patrol it. If, Law Enforcement had to get involved and because this this a County Park would it Unified Police that would respond, or would it be the City Police, and who would have the actual enforcement?

Mr. Ruedas said that is something that we can discuss with our Parks Director of Operations. This is going to be a joint venture between the City, and County, so I could see them using both.

Commissioner Catmull said is this bike park going to be similar to Little Valley in Draper?

Mr. Ruedas said I am not familiar with Little Valley, but is sounds similar.

Assistant City Engineer Nielsen said it is similar to Little Valley, but Little Valley is in corner canyon so it has a slope to it. This will be flat, but it will have more features than there is in Little Valley.

Commissioner Darby said to give full exposure, I live in the neighborhood that is north of the park being proposed, and I was pleased to hear about the parking along 4800 W and their willingness to be responsive to that. If you park 2 cars, one on each side, and try to get a car through that it is a pretty narrow space, and the people drive fast on that road. I would be concerned if there are cars parking on either side, but it sounds like there is sufficient in the park, but sometimes people want quick egress so they park on the street to get out faster. I am glad the City is going to watch this area and see how people are acting regarding parking.

**Commissioner Gedge motioned to approve File No. PLSPR202000323 for the construction of a regional park located on the north west corner of 4800 West 10200 South as presented to the Planning Commission, with the following provision:**

- **That the eastern portion or the property is rezoned to the OS (Open Space) zone.**

**Commissioner Hollist seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor.**

## **IX. LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS –**

## **X. OTHER BUSINESS - None. STAFF BUSINESS – None**

## **ADJOURNMENT**

**Commissioner Gedge motioned to adjourn the January 26, 2021. Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Hollist seconded the motion. Vote was unanimous in favor.**

The January 26, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Meeting minutes were prepared by Deputy Recorder Cindy Valdez

**This is a true and correct copy of the January 26, 2021 Planning Commission minutes, which were approved on February 9, 2021.**

*Cindy Valdez*

**South Jordan Deputy Recorder**