

South Jordan City
Planning Commission Meeting
April 11, 2006

I WORK SESSION – 6:30 P.M.

PRESENT: Chairman – Kathie Johnson, Planning Commission – Linda Auger, Jon Bronson, Claron Perry, Community Development Director – Brian Preece, Senior Planner – Greg Schindler, City Engineer – Brad Klavano, Secretary – MaryAnn Dean

EXCUSED: John Rosenthal.

A. Roll Call

The Planning Commission was present, as listed above. Commissioner Rosenthal was excused.

B. Review of the Agenda

The Planning Commission reviewed and discussed the items listed on the agenda.

I GENERAL BUSINESS ITEMS – 7:00 P.M.

PRESENT: Chairman – Kathie Johnson, Planning Commission – Linda Auger, Jon Bronson, Claron Perry, Community Development Director – Brian Preece, Senior Planner – Greg Schindler, City Engineer – Brad Klavano, Secretary – MaryAnn Dean

EXCUSED: John Rosenthal.

AUDIENCE: Kirk Brown, Dale Evans, Kathleen Boyle, Terry Flint, Shane Franz, Shaun and Stacey West, Craig Sutherland, Lane Myers, Jackie Short, Sally & Joe McKee, Bob and Shanna Burnside, Michael Martin, Tara Rindlisbacher, John Evans

A. Roll Call

The Planning Commission was present, as listed above. Commissioner Rosenthal was excused.

Scout Troop 940 was recognized and introduced.

B. Approval of Agenda

Commissioner Bronson made a motion to approve the April 11, 2006 Planning Commission agenda, as printed. Commissioner Auger seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous in favor, with Commissioner Rosenthal absent.

C. *Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting held on March 28, 2006*

The Planning Commission noted one change made to the minutes, in the work session.

Commissioner Perry made a motion to approve the March 28, 2006 Planning Commission minutes, as amended. Commissioner Auger seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous in favor, with Commissioner Rosenthal absent.

D. *Citizen Request/Comments*

None.

II SPECIAL BUSINESS ITEMS

None.

III ACTION ITEMS

- A. *Hearing to determine the compliance of all business operations approved under the Home Occupation/Business License #5143 for the operation of Martial Arts & Dance Classes out of a single-family residence, and the renewal of this license. The subject property is located at 4632 West Pale Moon Lane in the Daybreak Development, with the PC Zone, Shaun & Stacey West (applicants).*

Senior Planner Schindler reviewed the background information on this item.

Chairman Johnson asked about the role that the Homeowner's Association plays? Senior Planner Schindler said if the HOA is opposed to this, they would have to file a lawsuit in District Court. Community Development Director Preece said the role of the HOA depends on the enforcement provisions of the CC and R's. Senior Planner Schindler said the homeowners have to take care of the HOA situation themselves.

Chairman Johnson asked how many students are in the dance program? Mr. West said the dance program is not going on at this time. He said in the martial arts program, there are 7 kids and 3 adults. They don't exceed the allowed amount of students. He said the most traffic that they have in the area is parents that park and watch their kids play baseball across the street. He said they don't have a parking problem with their business. He said most of their students walk.

Chairman Johnson asked what are the future plans for the business? Mr. West said if it grows beyond what they can do at their home, they may be able to teach at the

community center. He said he was teaching at the Daybreak Community Center, but a few of his students did not live in Daybreak, and they had to pay an additional \$40 fee to go to that Community Center. Because of that, he moved his classes back to his home.

Commissioner Auger asked if they are also running a daycare in the home? Mrs. West said they had a preschool. She said when they originally applied for their business license, they were told that there was not a category specifically for martial arts so they fell under the preschool umbrella. She said there was just a miscommunication with the original approval. She said the preschool is no longer in their home. She said they know that they have made mistakes, but it was out of ignorance; it was not intentional.

Chairman Johnson said they want people to be able to have home businesses, but they want to keep the impacts to the neighborhood low.

Mrs. West said their home was specifically designed for this business. She said the Daybreak HOA was aware the whole time. They have been operating their business for a year. She does not understand where the HOA concerns are coming from. She said they are currently asking for a variance from the HOA. She said several neighbors have indicated that their business is not causing a traffic problem. She said they feel that they are providing a service to the community.

Commissioner Auger noted that when someone applies for a license, letters are sent to the neighbors. Community Development Director Preece said the HOA may or may not have received a notification about the business.

Commissioner Bronson asked if the neighbors have complained directly to the West's? Mr. West said no.

Chairman Johnson asked if the West's feel that they have a better understanding of the Ordinances and requirements of the license? Mrs. West said yes. They are now seeking a variance from the HOA.

Commissioner Bronson said he feels the original approval was inappropriate, with 18 students allowed. He said that should have been limited to 6 people per day. Chairman Johnson said the applicants can't be held accountable for staff's decisions. The number of students has already been approved.

Mr. West said this has been frustrating because they did not put money down on their home until they had everything from Kennecott approved. He said he believes that their business plans are in writing with the builder.

Commissioner Auger made a motion that the business license for Mr. and Mrs. West be approved. Commissioner Perry seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous in favor, with Commissioner Rosenthal absent.

Commissioner Bronson suggested that staff visit section 17.98 of the Ordinances and see if they can include approvals from the HOA with other government agencies to avoid this problem in the future.

IV PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

- B. *File #LUA-2005.24 Future Land Use Amendment application, from Recreation/Open Space to Low Density Residential and File # REZ-2005.36 Rezone application, from A-5 (Agricultural) to R-2.5 (Single Family Residential) generally located along the East side of Bangerter Highway between 10000 South and 10200 South, approximately 2.8 acres (Land Use Amendment) approximately 14.3 acres (Rezone), Peterson Development, (applicant).*

Senior Planner Schindler reviewed the background information on this item.

Barrett Peterson, Peterson Development, 225 S. 200 E., Ste 300 (SLC), said he understands that the neighbors would like a park. Peterson Development said they would provide a park, if they could have a little higher density. Since they could not do that, they are bringing forward the R-2.5 designation which is in compliance with the master plan. He asked for a positive recommendation to the City Council.

Chairman Johnson opened the public hearing.

Craig Sutherland, 10192 S. 3490 W., said he approves of this zoning change. He said some of the residents wanted a park. He does not feel the appropriate place is at the end of a dead end street. He recommended that they consider putting a park on 3200 West. They need a park in this area.

Michael Martin, 10086 S. 3490 W., said he is in favor of preserving the R-2.5 zoning. He said they would like to have a park and they have worked with the City on that. There is not a park in the area and that is a concern. They would like support to find a suitable property for their children to play.

Kirk Brown, 9961 W. Eden Crest Rd., said he would like a park in the area; there are no parks for the neighborhoods in this area. He said even if it requires the City to buy some of the lots that are developed, they would still like to have a park.

Chairman Johnson closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Bronson made a motion to forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council for Resolution R2006-21 and Ordinance 2006-16-Z. Commissioner Auger seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous in favor, with Commissioner Rosenthal absent.

- C. *File # SUB-2006.10, Application for approval of the preliminary plat for Palomino Cove Subdivision, a 32 lot, single-family residential development in the R-2.5 Zone District located at 11055 South 2700 West, Scenic Development (applicant).*

Senior Planner Schindler reviewed the background information on this item.

Chairman Johnson asked about putting vinyl fencing next to the canal, since they burn weeds, etc. Senior Planner Schindler said the canal road is on this side behind the fence. Commissioner Bronson noted that there is solid white vinyl fencing on the other side of the canal.

Tara Rindlisbacher, Scenic Development, noted that there are existing homes on lots 28, 1, and 7. She said the home on lot 7 faces 2700 West.

Senior Planner Schindler said they need to move the proposed 6 ft. pre-cast concrete fence from lot 7 to lot 6. He said if lot 7 faces 2700 West, the 6 ft. pre-cast concrete fence would not be allowed. That change should be made before the final plat.

Commissioner Bronson asked if there is a structure on lot 17? Ms. Rindlisbacher said there is a barn, but that will be taken down.

Chairman Johnson opened the public hearing.

Spencer Hind, 11067 S. 2700 W., lives across from lot 7. He asked if the home on lot 7 will stay as it is? He was told yes. Mr. Hind asked which lot will be the retention pond? City Engineer Klavano said that has not yet been determined. He proposed that the retention pond be left open, and landscaped, like the one at the Perry Homes development off of 2700 West. He asked what will happen to the side of the home for lot 6? Senior Planner Schindler said a pre-cast masonry wall will be built along that property line. Mr. Hind said most of the homes now are open and beautiful; he wishes that they did not have to install the fencing. He said they could look into making lot 6 the retention pond and leaving it open.

Joe McKee, 10960 S. 2700 W., asked if the pre-cast wall will run from the canal to 2700 West? Senior Planner Schindler said yes, on the north boundary line. Mr. McKee said he is also one of the directors of the Utah Lake Distributing Canal, said they always like a pre-cast concrete wall on both sides of the canal so they can burn the weeds. They have issues with vinyl fencing when they try to burn the weeds.

Mr. McKee asked if the two roads are planned to go into McKee's? Senior Planner Schindler said the streets are showing a stub for the future to the north. Mr. McKee asked if a pre-cast wall will be installed across the stub street? Senior Planner Schindler said yes.

Archie Cox, 11092 S. 2865 W., said the culinary water goes across the west end of the property that Mr. Teeple is currently using for his horses. What will happen with that?

City Engineer Klavano said the water line would probably be abandoned.

Chairman Johnson closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Auger asked about the proposed vinyl fence on the west boundary, where they will be burning weeds. She said they should consider a masonry wall on the west boundary to protect them from the fire.

Chairman Johnson asked how it is determined if a detention pond is fenced or if it is a usable park area? Senior Planner Schindler said if it is going to be a retention pond or if it is temporary, they fence the area. If it is a permanent detention pond, they are usually fenced because of the cost of maintenance. He said sometimes they are left open, if they are 1-2 acres.

City Engineer Klavano said if the canal company can get an increase in the discharge flows, there might not be a detention pond. He said there will likely be something, but it will probably be a small area. Senior Planner Schindler said if it becomes part of a lot, the homeowner is responsible for the maintenance.

Commissioner Perry made a motion to approve File # SUB-2006.10, Application for approval of the preliminary plat for Palomino Cove Subdivision, a 32 lot, single-family residential development in the R-2.5 Zone District located at 11055 South 2700 West, with the following recommendations:

- 1. A 6' high masonry or pre-cast wall is required on both the north and south boundaries.**
- 2. A 6' high masonry or pre-cast wall is required along the west boundary adjacent to the Utah Lake Distribution Canal.**
- 3. Lot 6 cannot access from 2700 West. Collector street fencing is required along the east boundary of lot 6.**
- 4. Any homes remaining on lots within the subdivision must meet ordinance requirements for setback.**
- 5. If unable to discharge into the Utah Lake Distributing Canal, storm water must be retained on a lot. The lot will remain a retention or detention pond until such time as a storm system is available, fenced with a 6' high solid vinyl fence with a locked gate and maintained by the developer until such time as a storm system is available.**
- 6. A letter from Salt Lake County to be submitted approving both the subdivision and street names prior to final submittal.**
- 7. 2700 West to be improved with curb, gutter, 6' sidewalk, 5' parkstrip and asphalt to City standards. 42.5 feet right-of-way from center line is required.**
- 8. All Engineering, Fire, and Zoning requirements are met.**

Commissioner Bronson seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous in favor, with Commissioner Rosenthal absent.

- D. File #SUB-2006.07, Application for preliminary plat approval for Bethany Estates Subdivision, 3 lots located at approximately 10795 South 3200 West, Gordon J. & Denise N. Allen (applicants).*

Commissioner Perry recused himself on this issue, due to a business conflict.

Senior Planner Schindler reviewed the background information on this item.

Gordon Allen, 11523 S. 3600 W., applicant, introduced himself.

Chairman Johnson asked if there is any way to straighten the lot lines out? Mr. Allen said he could move the boundary to the side of lot 1 to the south slightly. He said he will work on that before the final plat. He said he would like to have enough property so he can have horses.

Commissioner Bronson asked if they could make the lot line to the south more perpendicular, and include that as part of lot 2? Mr. Allen said they have to leave 90 ft. of frontage for the church, or it is not a buildable lot. Commissioner Bronson said they could move the east side of the property line of lot 1 further west, and include that acreage with lot 2. Mr. Allen said he was discouraged from doing that. He noted that he is giving the church 1/3 acre; they wanted a 1/2 acre.

It was noted that lot 2 would access 3200 West only.

Mr. Allen said he would be owning lot 1 and 2. He said he does not see an alternative to straightening the lot line.

Mr. Allen noted that staff is recommending a 6 ft. masonry wall on the north boundary. He said he is told that there is a public easement being negotiated regarding a walkway in the area. He was told if the easement was recorded, he would not have to build the wall. He said he would like to wait on the wall requirement to see what happens with the easement. He said he is okay to install the fence, if it ends up being required.

Senior Planner Schindler said the property owner to the north may record an easement for pedestrian access. He said they are trying to work out the liability issues. He said if the easement is recorded, a fence would not need to be installed on the north boundary.

Community Development Director Preece said Mr. Allen could bond for the fence until the easement issue is resolved. Mr. Allen said the residents don't want the 6 ft. masonry wall on the north boundary because it would create an ice patch which would be unsafe. It would also create an alleyway, which could be unsafe.

Mr. Allen asked if there is a way to keep the area between lots 1 and 2 open rather than installing a masonry fence? He said he will own both properties. Community Development Director Preece said a masonry fence is required between animal and non-

animal property. Mr. Allen asked if they could mandate that a wall be put in place should he sell the property? Community Development Director Preece reviewed the code regarding fencing adjacent to animal property. He said he is comfortable not requiring the fence because both lots are within the same development. Mr. Allen said the fence Ordinance went into effect when he was working issues out for this development. He said he was originally told that he would have to do nothing with fencing because they were all in the same zone. He said he does not feel the fencing requirement is fair. Community Development Director Preece said Mr. Allen would have to file an appeal with the City Council.

Mr. Allen asked for an explanation on the dedication of property for the road. He said their property was encroached upon. He asked how could the developers of Jones Meadows determine where the road was going to go? He is losing 27 ft. Community Development Director Preece said when they develop property, the developer does half streets; Mr. Allen is now in the process of developing his half of the property. Any developer would have to do that for their development.

Senior Planner Schindler said when Jones Meadows was developed, the right-of-way requirement was 66 ft.; the requirement for McKee Ridge was a 71 ft. road. He said this road needs to align with the other portion of the road so there is not an offset. He said Mr. Allen is still only required to dedicate 27 ½ ft. He will be compensated for the additional footage.

Chairman Johnson opened the public hearing.

George Lebaron, 3068 W. 10755 S. asked if the fence on the north boundary was resolved? Chairman Johnson said it depends on the decision made tonight.

Mr. Lebaron said they feel that the fence to the north would be a hazard. He said they need to not have ice and snow on that path. They have a girl in a wheelchair that uses the path. The path is used to get to their water, and it is also used as a walking path.

Dale Evans, 3247 Millville St., asked if the sidewalks and parkstrips in front of Mr. Allen's property have to be as wide as planned? She said on 3200 West, there is about 30 ft. of lawn space. Is that for future widening of the road? Senior Planner Schindler said the grass area on the west side of 3200 West is a Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District easement. He said Mr. Allen has to match the current Ordinance requirements for sidewalks and parkstrips.

Brent Bowles, 10755 S. 3009 W., said he has lived on his property for 35 years. He said they have used the easement for years; it was originally used for a bridle path. He is opposed to the block wall. He said they have their irrigation water in a buried pipe. If the church buys the one lot, will they have access to it from 3200 West or from the existing church property? With the road being setback that far, that will interfere with where they take their water. He said there will be problems with the irrigation water when Otto Jones does his development. He said McKee's line runs on the west side of Mr. Allen's

property. If they put the road over that, the pipe will collapse. He noted that when Jones Meadows was developed, they lost water for a whole season.

Norman Steele, 3129 W. 10755 S., said he lives on the east side of Mr. Allen's property. He asked about the proposed fence from lot B to the proposed cul-de-sac? Senior Planner Schindler said there is no fence requirement because the zoning and uses are the same. Mr. Steele said he is in favor of Mr. Allen's proposal.

Joe McKee, 10960 S. 2700 W., said they get their water from the irrigation pipe that Mr. Bowles was talking about. He said it is only 60 psi, and any traffic over the top of it will collapse the line. He said the pipe runs from the highline canal to almost 2700 West; it would be beneficial for the City to upgrade that water line because they could use that line as a secondary irrigation system, when they decide to develop. He said he is concerned about the water line in the area; it runs on the east side of 3200 West.

Chairman Johnson closed the public hearing.

City Engineer Klavano said during the engineering process of the road design, the water line will probably have to be relocated. That will be looked at closely and taken care of. The residents can work with the staff in his office on this issue.

Chairman Johnson asked if the land proposed to be sold to the church will be accessed through the existing church property? Senior Planner Schindler said they are unsure at this time. He said if the church wants access from 3200 West, they would have to get permission from the City.

Chairman Johnson suggested that they leave the fencing as is on the north boundary of lot 1. Senior Planner Schindler said the applicant can either put in the fence or bond for the fence until a determination is made regarding the easement. If no easement is recorded, the developer would be required to install a wall. He said staff is okay to allow the bond for the wall at this time. Community Development Director Preece suggested a 2 year time limit on the bond.

It was noted that if an easement is recorded, there does not need to be a block wall on either side of the path.

Commissioner Bronson made a motion to approve File #SUB-2006.07, Application for preliminary plat approval for Bethany Estates Subdivision, 3 lots located at approximately 10795 South 3200 West, with the following conditions:

- 1. All 3 lots will be accessed from 3200 West Street.**
- 2. Per Section 16-04-200(A-3), a 6' masonry or pre-cast wall is required along the entire east property line of lot 3, the north side of Parcel "A".**
- 3. If the property owner to the north records a pedestrian easement along the north boundary of lot 1, a 6' masonry or pre-cast wall will not be required along that property line. A copy of the recorded easement must be submitted to the City prior to final plat submittal. If no easement is recorded, the**

developer will be required to install the required 6' masonry or pre-cast wall. Prior to final plat submittal, either a copy of the recorded easement for the pedestrian walkway or a bond from the developer must be submitted.

- 4. If the applicant moves his existing home onto lot 2, all ordinance requirements including roof pitch, exterior building materials, and garage size must be met.**
- 5. The existing home on lot 1 is required to meet all ordinance setback requirements.**
- 6. All engineering, fire, and planning requirements are met.**

Commissioner Auger seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous in favor, with Commissioner Rosenthal absent.

- E. File # REZ-2006.10, Application to rezone from R-1.8/Single-Family Residential to A-5/Agricultural. The subject property is located at 11028 South 2200 West, is 5.01-acres, Alfred Nelson (applicant).*

Senior Planner Schindler reviewed the background information on this item.

Lane Meyers, 11463 S. Polo Club Ct., said he represents Mr. Nelson. He said this resolves a clerical error. He said this piece was not supposed to be rezoned. Mr. Nelson wanted this piece of property left agricultural for horses. He read from a contract with a developer that clearly states that this property was supposed to remain as an A-5 piece of property.

Commissioner Bronson asked how does the property on the other side of the canal get accessed? Mr. Meyers said through the canal road, with a gate. Mr. Meyers said Mr. Nelson is trying to make this a nice piece of property that compliments the area.

Commissioner Johnson opened the public hearing.

Shane Franz, 11113 Old Rose Bud Lane, said he supports a couple of horses on this property. He said he is concerned about the potential for a conditional use permit to board horses. He said he does not believe that Mr. Nelson lives at this address. He noted a large number of RV's stored on this property. Can Mr. Nelson rent out this property for RV storage?

Bob Burnside, 2266 Old Rose Bud, said the HOA for Triple Crown Estates takes care of the retention pond. He said he is not sure how Mr. Nelson would access the retention pond. He said he does not mind horses on the subject property. In the past, Mr. Nelson has said that he would sell his property for the horse boarding facility that was proposed on the property to the south. He said he is not in favor of a 3 story building, with a horse operation. He said he is not sure how Mr. Nelson retained a ½ acre retention pond for the HOA to maintain.

Jackie Short, 2234 W. Autumn Farm Dr., said there is no access to the retention pond. Will they build a bridge across the canal? She asked how are they counting the 5 acres of

property? Senior Planner Schindler said it includes both of Mr. Nelson's properties. He said the retention pond will be accessed how it is currently being accessed. The zoning would not change the access to the retention pond. Mrs. Short asked why would the City rezone this property, when for five years it has been residential?

Jeff Longson, 11047 S. Old Rose Bud Lane, said his biggest concern is that this property has been neglected in the past. He is afraid that if they allow Mr. Nelson to take on more responsibility with horses etc., it will become a huge problem.

Mr. Franz said with the canal easement, that is a big piece of property that is unavailable to the applicant. He said the question is if there is really 5 acres at stake? Can they rezone that? Chairman Johnson said if Mr. Nelson has a legal description and is paying taxes on the property, he has rights invested in the property. Mr. Franz said a large portion of the property is not usable. The retention pond is un-developable. Senior Planner Schindler said the County considers this all one piece of property. He said they would have to determine if they count only usable property when they are determining the number of horses allowed on the property. The only thing that this zone changes is the size of the barn that is allowed. A commercial stable would be a conditional use in either the residential or the agricultural zone.

Chairman Johnson said she feels the canal is a huge buffer for the residents against the horse property. Commissioner Bronson concurred. He noted that the property to the north is still agricultural.

Mr. Franz concurred with the comment that the subject property has not been well kept.

Senior Planner Schindler reviewed the requirements in the Ordinance regarding buildings on the property. He said there is not a limit to the number of buildings that can be on the property. There is a limit to the amount of land that can be covered with buildings. He said an accessory building can't exceed the size of the footprint of the main building.

A resident indicated that they just added to the existing structure last year. Senior Planner Schindler reviewed the building height requirement.

Chairman Johnson closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Bronson said a lot of the comments tonight are appropriate for a plat approval hearing. He said he feels this property is a nice buffer to the subdivision and consistent with the historical use of the property.

Commissioner Auger said she has concern where they will put a barn on this property. Those issues will be addressed with the plat submittal. She asked if the residents can file a complaint about the storage on the property? Senior Planner Schindler said they will have the code enforcement officers look into the storage and what the property is being used for, as well as the addition made to the existing building.

Commissioner Perry made a motion to forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council for Ordinance 2006-17-Z, with the following condition:

- 1. If approved, the applicant understands that this does not give him approval to build the barn, but only the option to propose one, which is to be addressed through a separate Site Plan/Conditional Use Permit application.**

Commissioner Bronson seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous in favor, with Commissioner Rosenthal absent.

Chairman Johnson made a motion to take a break. Commissioner Bronson seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous in favor, with Commissioner Rosenthal absent.

- F. Resolution R2006-20, A Resolution Amending General Land Use Categories Section of the Land Use Element of the General Plan of South Jordan City, Utah. Ordinance 2006-08, An Ordinance Amending the Land Use (Zoning) Ordinance, Title 17 adding Sections 17.45 and 17.46, Creating a R-4 Zone and a R-5 Zone, Respectively, Eliminating RM-4 Density use from within the RM Zone, and changing the number of required sets of plans from 5 to 6 for Development Applications within Title 16 Development Code of the City of South Jordan, Utah.*

Development Services Director Preece reviewed the background information on this item.

Chairman Johnson suggested that they eliminate the term “high density” and rename it. She said she feels that label sets off an emotional trigger.

Commissioner Bronson asked if the City Council directed staff to get rid of the R-1.8 zone? Community Development Director Preece said no; that was done by staff. He said they rarely get a request for the R-1.8 zone. He said the R-1.8 zone allows 1/3 acre lots, just less of them. He said ½ acre lots don’t allow horses any longer. There is not a lot of demand for a larger animal lot. If there is that request, they feel that 1 acre lots would be better for horses anyway. He said if there was an undeveloped property currently zoned R-1.8, they could develop an R-1.8 subdivision. If a property is future land used rural residential, they would have to develop under the A-1 or A-5 zoning.

Community Development Director Preece discussed the sustainability of the community in the future. He said it is having the right balance of uses in the community to have the money they need to pay for the services that are demanded. He noted that there is also a state mandate to provide some affordable housing.

Commissioner Bronson asked why are they striking the top paragraph on page 2? Community Development Director Preece said they are doing a study to look at the amount of commercial property needed to obtain the City’s sustainability. He said that paragraph is also restrictive.

Commissioner Bronson asked about the effective date of 2-21-06? Community Development Director Preece said that should be changed to the date that the Ordinance is passed.

Commissioner Bronson asked what are the coordinates of the Jordan Gateway corridor? Senior Planner Schindler said the south border is Draper City and the north border is Sandy City. He said the east/west corridor is I-15 and the Jordan River.

Chairman Johnson opened the public hearing.

Dale Evans, 3247 Millville St., asked where is the South Jordan canal? Senior Planner Schindler said it is immediately east of the Arbors development. It goes along approximately 1600 West.

Ms. Evans said the Mayor had expressed frustration that there was only an RM-4 zone and not an R-4 zone. They discussed having it in the high density designation. She said with this proposal, they are addressing a lot more changes. This proposal changes the entire philosophy and the land use plan of the City. She said they are re-doing the entire city map. She said she feels that the residents of the entire City should be notified of this change; this is a major change to the City. She said some people that now have high density zoning will discover that they will no longer be able to do what is planned on their property. She said people with low density planned next to them will discover that a higher density is now allowed next to them. She said a change this sweeping should have more public knowledge and more public comment. She said she is okay with the R-4 change, but she is not in favor of the other changes. She said the size of homes is decreasing in the proposed R-5 zone. She said the new R-4 zone would allow 7500 sq. ft. lots, if it is a PUD. The City Council had envisioned ¼ acre lots with the R-4 zone. She feels that the proposal needs further review and discussion; it goes too far. She said they may need to wait until the studies are done because that could impact these decisions. She does not see a reason to do away with the R-1.8 zone; it serves as a transition between horse property and R-2.5 zoning. She said she believes that the Mayor was looking for more options, not less.

Archie Cox, 11092 S. 2865 W., suggested that they table this issue for awhile and give the public a chance for more input.

Joe McKee, 10960 S. 2700 W., asked what would this do for him as a property owner? Community Development Director Preece said it gives them more options as landowners.

Community Development Director Preece said he believes this request is in harmony with the City Council's request.

Mr. McKee said he feels there are too many unknown factors with this proposal.

Community Development Director Preece said there has been no request to rush this issue through.

Chairman Johnson said it may be appropriate to table this issue for a month, especially considering that Commissioner Rosenthal is not present.

Senior Planner Schindler discussed the public notice that was put in the newspaper.

Dale Evans noted a typo on page 2, under the Rural Residential section, change *R-1* to *A-1*.

Chairman Johnson closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Perry made a motion to table this issue until May 9, 2006. Chairman Johnson seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous in favor, with Commissioner Rosenthal absent.

Community Development Director Preece said staff will re-notice this issue for the May 9th meeting.

V OTHER BUSINESS

A. Calendaring Items

None.

B. Planning Department Matters

None.

VI ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Bronson made a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Perry seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous in favor, with Commissioner Rosenthal absent.

The April 11, 2006 Planning Commission meeting adjourned at 10:05 p.m.