

CITY OF SOUTH JORDAN  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS

June 28, 2016

Present: Commissioner Mark Woolley, Commissioner Sean D. Morrissey, Commissioner Julie Holbrook, City Planner Greg Schindler, Planner Brad Sanderson, Assistant City Engineer Shane Greenwood, Staff Attorney Steven Schaefermeyer, Planner Jake Warner, City Recorder Anna West

Absent: Commissioner T. Earl Jolley, Commissioner Brady Quinn

Others: See Attachment A

6:30 P.M.  
REGULAR MEETING

I. GENERAL BUSINESS

A. Welcome and Roll Call

Chairman Mark Woolley welcomed everyone and noted that Commissioners Jolley and Quinn are excused from tonight's meeting.

B. Motion to Approve Agenda

City Planner Greg Schindler said tonight's agenda needs to be amended to remove Item C. Blue Envy Preschool. They have withdrawn their application. Also, Item F should not be listed as a Public Hearing it should be under other business. The Public Hearing for that was held at the May 24, 2016 Planning Meeting.

**Commissioner Holbrook made a motion to approve the June 28, 2016 Planning Commission Agenda. Commissioner Morrissey seconded the motion. Vote was unanimous in favor. Commissioners Quinn and Morrissey were absent.**

C. Approval of the Minutes from the Meeting held on May 24, 2016

**Commissioner Holbrook motioned to approve the May 24, 2016 Planning Commission meeting minutes as printed. Commissioner Morrissey seconded the motion. Vote was unanimous in favor. Commissioners Quinn and Morrissey were absent.**

D. Approval of the Minutes from the Meeting held on June 14, 2016

**Commissioner Morrissey motioned to approve the June 14, 2016 Planning Commission meeting minutes as printed. Commissioner Holbrook seconded the motion. Vote was unanimous in favor. Commissioners Quinn and Morrissey were absent.**

II. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS AND OTHER BUSINESS

A. Staff Business

Staff Attorney Steven Schaefermeyer said City Council recently heard about certain neighborhoods having CC&R's that prohibits things like solar panels. They are concerned about that and there is a provision in state law that allows cities to not approved subdivision plats if certain restrictions like solar panels are in their CC&R's. I have a text amendment that has been circulated to staff. It will be on your next agenda on July 12<sup>th</sup> and then will go to City Council on July 19<sup>th</sup>.

Chairman Woolley asked if it addresses just solar or wind as well because that was one of the issues. Staff Attorney Schaefermeyer said under state law we can do both. I haven't been involved in conversations with City Council so right now the draft I have circulated to staff includes other renewable sources.

Commissioner Holbrook asked if it will apply to only new Plats. Staff Attorney Schaefermeyer said yes.

City Planner Schindler reminded everyone that there is no meeting scheduled for July 26<sup>th</sup> because of the holiday.

B. Comments from Planning Commission Members

Chairman Woolley said they had a good join Council meeting. Council said they want to do this quarterly. They were very pleased.

III. CITIZEN COMMENT

Chairman Woolley opened for Citizen Comment. No Speakers. He closed Citizen Comment.

IV. SUMMARY ACTION

None

V. ACTION

None

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND POTENTIAL \*\*ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION ITEMS

\*\*Administrative Action = Less Discretion, Substantial Evidence (Objective Standard)

A.1 Issue: SPRATLING WOODS  
PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION  
Address: 9640 South 2200 West  
File No: SUB-2016.17  
Applicant: Tina Franco, Eagle Pointe Development Group, LLC

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

Commissioner Morrissey asked why we don't make the zoning uniform with the rest of the area. City Planner Schindler said because the minimum lot size in the 1.8, some of these lots wouldn't fit. The minimum lot size in the 1.8 is 1/3 of an acre; the R-2.5 is 12,000 sq. ft. and some of the lots would not work. They wouldn't get as many lots if they went to the 1.8 and had to have all 1/3 acre lots. Because

this is zone R-2.5, regardless of their size they are not allowed to have large animals. There is a requirement that they will have to put in a masonry wall on the south and on any lots on the north that have large animals.

Commissioner Holbrook noted her concern with the one way in and out. Is it correct that they can't change the lot sizes or the number of them?

City Planner Schindler said they could eliminate another lot to have another way out but they would have two too close together.

It was noted that the applicant is present but has no additional comments to make.

Chairman Woolley opened the Public Hearing. There were no speakers. Chairman Wooley closed the Public Hearing.

A.2 Potential Action Item – (See VI.A.1)

**Commissioner Morrissey made a motion to approve preliminary subdivision plat, File No. SUB-2016.17, allowing for subdivision of approximately 4.5 acres of land into 11 single-family residential lots and one parcel. Commissioner Holbrook seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 3-0 in favor. Commissioners Quinn and Jolley were absent.**

B.1 Issue: HARVEST VILLAGE AT SOUTH JORDAN SUBDIVISION PHASE II  
AMENDING LOTS 3, 4 AND 5  
SUBDIVISION AMENDMENT  
Address: 10509 South River Heights Drive  
File No: SUB-AMEND-2016.23  
Applicant: Brandon Peterson, Peterson Development

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

Commissioner Holbrook asked why this was not caught the first time around.

City Planner Schindler said they already knew they were going to have to do the lot line adjustment but when they came forward with it we informed them we couldn't process it with that easement on there.

Staff Attorney Schaefermeyer said the easement could remain if they changed the lot line; the problem is building over it. They have letters from the utilities saying they don't have anything in there.

Chairman Woolley opened the Public Hearing.

**Brandon Peterson**, applicant, said we are trying to do this because there is a group in the mid-west that is doing a Alzheimer's center and we are just trying to get this amended plat to make it easier on them as well as us.

Chairman Wooley closed the Public Hearing.

B.2 Potential Action Item – (See VI.B.1)

**Commissioner Holbrook made a motion to approve subdivision plat amendment of the Harvest Village at South Jordan Subdivision Phase II plat, SUB-AMEND2016.23, subject to the City Council vacating the PUE currently located between lots 3 and 4. Commissioner Morrissey seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 3-0 in favor. Commissioners Quinn and Jolley were absent.**

C.1 Issue: BLUE ENVY PRESCHOOL  
CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT  
Address: 1545 West Heather Downs Drive  
File No: CUP-2016.04  
Applicant: Kari Lockhart

This item was pulled from the agenda because the applicant withdrew their application.

C.2 Potential Action Item – (See VI.C.1)

No Action.

**VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND POTENTIAL \*LEGISLATIVE ACTION ITEMS**

\*Legislative Action = More Discretion, Reasonably Debatable (Subjective Standard)

D.1 Issue: ZONE TEXT AMENDMENT, ORDINANCE NO. 2016.20 AMENDING  
SUBSECTION 17.18.030.50.B.4c OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE TO  
INCREASE THE MAXIMUM ACREAGE THAT CAN BE  
DEVELOPED OR USED FOR SELF-STORAGE USES IN THE  
PROFESSIONAL OFFICE (P-O) ZONE FROM TWO TO THREE  
ACRES  
Address: ZTA-2016.04  
Applicant: Warren Kirk

Planner Brad Sanderson reviewed the background information on this item from the packet staff report.

Commissioner Morrissey asked if there is any requirement as far as limitations outside of the office zone on any type of storage units.

Planner Sanderson said we implemented the office zone into the uses chapter which does have some control measures. Those control measures would depend on its proximity to other uses. For example if a storage use was being proposed next to a residential zone and they have to do certain extra requirements at site plan review such as a sound study or a traffic study. It depends on what uses are nearby or in the vicinity; those requirement would then go into effect for the underlying zone.

Commissioner Morrissey asked how many total acres are allowed for storage facilities. Planner Sanderson said it depends. We allow 6 total acres in the Commercial Zone and 2 acres in the Office Zone.

City Planner Schindler said there is not a limit in the PC Zone. They only place that would be in the PC Zone would be Daybreak and Daybreak already has a storage facility. It is also allowed in the Mixed Use South Center Zone. The maximum there is 3 acres and we have a storage facility down on Redwood by the post office and we also have another one in the mixed use City Center Zone.

Commissioner Morrissey asked how many total that is. Planner Sanderson said this one here on Redwood is 2 acres, the CC Zone is maxed out at 6 acres, the Office Zone has 2 acres and Mixed Use City Center Zone is about 3 acres.

Commissioner Morrissey asked if everything is maxed out now. Planner Sanderson said the Office Zone is not maxed out technically. There is a proposal and a site plan that has been approved by this Commission for over here on 13<sup>th</sup> west and South Jordan Parkway. They have not constructed it yet. If built, that will exhaust the 2 acres that are allowed now which is why the applicant is proposing 1 additional acre.

Commissioner Morrissey asked if there are any other zones that allows for storage. City Planner said there is the CF Zone that is not filled at this time. He said we have had one come before you that has been approved for that site and is about to expire.

Commissioner Holbrook said evidently the applicant wants this changed and if I read the other request correctly, also a rezone to professional office. Planner Sanderson said that is correct. That is why I said earlier that then next item will make more sense because that is exactly the intent.

Commissioner Morrissey asked if it currently zoned agriculture. Planner Sanderson said it is zoned A-5.

Commissioner Morrissey asked if the applicant owns any more land to the south.

Planner Sanderson said they are here and you can speak to that. They don't currently own it but they have arrangements with the property owner.

Chairman Woolley opened the Public Hearing.

**Warren Kirk**, applicant, I see Commissioner Morrissey's concern if we plan to overbuild with storage within this community. That is not our intent. We believe we have a first class facility. Storage is usually used for odd shaped pieces of ground and we created this last acre. We do not own the acreage directly south of Think Storage. That has been held with a family that has developed a lot of property here in this community. I think staff has done a good job presenting the fact that it is less than 1% of what currently exists as a P-O Zone. All we are trying to do with the one-two step process in this change in the text amendment is try to lead you into finishing off an odd shaped piece of ground.

Commissioner Holbrook asked if there is a reason why you don't want it zoned Commercial.

City Planner Schindler said the future land use on the property is Office. So, if we went to Commercial like the rest of the project is, they would have to change that land use to Commercial as well. That piece did not get changed to Commercial because residents in the area did not want any Commercial uses on the property of retail type. So the applicant left that piece as future office because at that moment they didn't have an office use. If it turns out they are not going to get an office use we don't want to run the risk of something else occurring there that the neighborhood would not be happy with. They were perfectly clear they didn't want any retail that far down on River Heights Drive.

Mr. Kirk said that is a reasonable explanation because the last time we were here we did offer to meet with the residents and the last time we were in here on this project the residents did ask what Greg has implied.

Chairman Wooley closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Morrissey asked if this will fill the 3 acres in the P-O Zone. Planner Sanderson said it would. This would max it out.

Commissioner Holbrook said my concern is that although it would be nice to help this gentleman out but then you have other P-O zones throughout the City that now you are allowing an industrial use instead of, in my opinion, a storage facility instead of office use and we need our office space rather than storage.

City Planner Schindler said that is part of the reason we want to add the one more acre to make it three. Once this is approved and they build that then there is no more office space available either.

Commissioner Holbrook said yes but I am talking about if we rezone anywhere else, like the Redwood Road or any zone that is in the P-O Zone can have up to now 3 acres. City Planner Schindler said there are 3 acres for the entire zone for the entire city. There won't be any more.

Chairman Woolley said let's ask our legal counsel. I personally like cleaning up that parcel and it is a wonderful facility so I am in favor of that. My question is, from a legality standpoint, if we go ahead and amend this acreage in the P-O Zone and allow for this does that open up the city for a precedent in another P-O Zone, do we have to consider then expanding this use in that zone?

Staff Attorney Schaefermeyer said no; because it is a legislative decision. If an applicant wanted to build one acre of storage somewhere else in the P-O Zone and beat this applicant to the table then that would be a different story.

Chairman Woolley said and such is the one on Parkway if we were to go ahead and grant this, its 3 acres, if that acre site falls through then there would be 2 acres somewhere else. Staff Attorney Schaefermeyer said yes.

D.2 Potential Action Item – (See VI.D.1)

**Commissioner Morrissey made a motion to recommend to the City Council that it approve Ordinance 2016-20, amending Subsection 17.18.030.50B.4.c of the South Jordan City Municipal Code to increase the maximum acreage that can be developed and used for self-storage uses in the Professional Office Zone from two to three acres. Commissioner Woolley seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 3-0 in favor. Commissioners Quinn and Jolley were absent.**

E.1 Issue: THINK STORAGE PHASE 4 REZONE  
Address: 10622 South River Heights Drive  
File No: REZ-2016.11  
Applicant: Warren Kirk

Planner Brad Sanderson reviewed the background information on this item from the packet staff report.

Chairman Woolley said with the circulation now and with those two ingress and egress being so close would it be a one way so that the new south entrance would only be an exit?

Planner Sanderson said we haven't fully determined that. We have discussed it with the applicant. There is a sufficient separation now. Our code only requires a 30 foot separation between driveways and they certainly have more than that. When the site plan comes around we can bring that up again.

Commissioner Holbrook asked if he did not own this piece of property when the rest of it was done.

Planner Sanderson said that's correct. They have done this in phases as demand has increased.

Commissioner Holbrook asked if there are no plans for new buildings at this time. Planner Sanderson said I am sure they have plans; we don't have a site plan right now.

Chairman Woolley opened the Public Hearing. No speakers. Chairman Wooley closed the Public Hearing.

Chairman Woolley said I like the fact that it cleans up the parcel. It is a good use. I like the fact that this will not set a precedent. It is adding one acre to the overall P-O Zone.

City Planner Schindler said this is a collector street and code requires a 100 foot separation between access points. It is probably better if it is one way in and one way out.

#### E.2 Potential Action Item – (See VI.E.1)

**Commissioner Holbrook made a motion to recommend to the City Council to approve Rezone Ordinance 2016-10-Z, rezoning one acre of property at approximately 10622 South River Heights Drive from the Agricultural (A-5) Zone to the Professional Office (P-O) Zone. Commissioner Morrissey seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 3-0 in favor. Commissioners Quinn and Jolley were absent.**

F.1 Issue: ZONE TEXT AMENDMENT – AMENDING SECTION 17.130.040  
(FARM ANIMAL FLOATING ZONE) OF THE SOUTH JORDAN  
CITY MUNICIPAL CODE  
File No: ZTA-2016.03  
Applicant: Melvin & Eileen Luker

Planner Jake Warner reviewed the background information on this item from the packet staff report. He said there were some emails that were received after the packet was prepared for this item (Attachment B). The Public Hearing for this item was held May 24, 2016. H noted that there is an error on many of our documents throughout. The file number is ZTA-2016.03 not ZTA-2016.02. Staff's proposal, out of concern for the potential impact on adjoining properties, was to clean up this portion of the code. Staff agrees this portion of the code is a bit complex so staff presented that no substantive changes but revisions to clean up this portion of the code. We had a lot of discussion during the Public Hearing and other issues that were brought up and the Planning Commission requested that the applicant meet with other interested residents and provide additional recommendations to address some of the issues. The applicant provided staff with a letter and in summary of the applicant's recommendations on those additional issues. To the point system, the resident group is recommending no changes. As far as the animal classifications, they are proposing that donkeys be moved from medium to large classification. To their original proposal they are proposing that large animals be reduced from 20 points to 15 points. One other issue that the applicant mentioned there was significant discussion about was to allow parcels that are close to but don't qualify for farm animals based on the ½ acre minimum lot size and ½ acre increments for additional points, that we allow some flexibility so that parcels that are close would be allowed to have those farm animal rights. Essentially, their proposal is to allow parcels that are within 10 percent of the minimum required lot size to also be allowed farm animal rights. Staff is not opposed to any of their recommendations, except for the concern staff has for the potential impact on adjoining properties. If the Commission is inclined to consider bullet point number four, staff has some suggestions that might make it easier to administer.

Essentially, if you allow a 10 percent exception to the ½ acre minimum requirement you are allowing farm animal rights to a .45 acre lot and you would be allowing full points for a .9 acre lot. There are some cities around us that base their points on square footage instead of acreage and for example, instead of basing it on the ½ acre they base it on every 20,000 sq. feet. If the Commission is inclined to some revisions in this area, staff is suggesting that we go that route; to base our points on square footage instead of on acreage to keep it clean as the code is written. I mentioned earlier you have to have a full ½ acre to be awarded additional points, so to go from 30 points you would not get an additional point until you get to 1 acre where you would be awarded an additional 30 points. Staff is suggesting that another option may be to prorate the point system. Right now if you have a property that is .99 acre you would still only have points of ½ acre. Staff is presenting the options to the Planning Commission for discussion and staff has not prepared an additional recommendation at this time. There are some options to consider. If there are proposals amongst these options that the Planning Commission is inclined to recommend to the City Council, those text changes would need to be made. We did provide a clean copy of the revisions that staff has made in your packet.

Chairman Woolley asked if the R-1.8 minimum lot size is 1/3 acre. City Planner Schindler said yes. Chairman Woolley asked if we have not current zoning in our city that the minimum size is ½ acre. City Planner Schindler said no.

Chairman Woolley said if we were to consider a minimum flexibility in lot size what kind of an impact is that going to have with the properties that are ½ acre based on what we are looking at here. I am struggling with, are we going to have some unintended consequences with lots that, while they are close, they don't meet that minimum ½ acre and the impact it will have on surrounding neighbors.

City Planner Schindler said I don't know if any property less than ½ acre have ever had any rights to have animals.

Chairman Woolley said that is not what I am saying. How large is that impact and if you have ½ acre which currently you have animal rights, my understanding is that if it goes for a period of 1 year without any animals then you are no longer grandfathered; is that correct?

Planner Warner said you would have had to have the right in the first place, but currently the minimum required lot area is a half-acre. You have to be in the R-1.8 zone or in an Agricultural Zone and have a half-acre. At one point it was ¾ of an acre minimum and that was reduced to ½ acre in 2011.

Chairman Woolley said while this is not a Public Hearing, I would like to invite Mrs. Luker or a representative to share the groups comments and narrative.

Eileen Luker said we held a meeting at my home and we had 17 people attend. We had a lively discussion about all of these issues. We discussed the point system regulating farm animals and I had done some additional research on other cities so they would have some comparison. A couple of the Commissioners at the May 24<sup>th</sup> meeting were concerned about the point system and the complexity of it. We discussed whether it would be a good idea to eliminate the point system. We decided that they point system really wasn't that bad because it provides an opportunity to mix and match animal sizes. As far as categorizing farm animals, I did more research with four other cities; West Jordan, Sandy, Riverton and Herriman, just so you could see how the animals were listed. If you go through my letter that I submitted most of them are brief. South Jordan goes above and beyond in naming and identifying a large animal. We didn't see that it really hurts anything to be so detailed. We did think the mule should be moved from the medium size to the large size and all others should remain as listed. I didn't want to have anything detract from my main request which is to reduce the number of points for large animals so I just wanted to make sure that

didn't get lost in the shuffle. As we went into this issue of slightly undersized rural lots there were several members in the meeting that do have just slightly under. One person had .98 acre and another one had .49 acre, just slightly under ½ acre. We talked about that for a considerable length of time and I found that it was addressed in cities in different ways. We did come up with 10 percent flexibility there if that is something you would be willing to make in your recommendation to City Council. It would make a lot of people happy. Especially those that are just under ½ acre would allow them the opportunity to have some large animals. The parcel that is two lots away from our parcel is one of those that is just slightly under ½ acre and he has had one horse on his property and the way it is written he can no longer have even one horse. That seems unreasonable and unfair to him.

Commissioner Morrissey said I have a question about the minimum lot size. Based on your review of other cities what are other cities doing as far as minimum lot size and the 10 percent flexibility.

Mrs. Luker said in West Jordan that had in their code the following; legally created lots in the rural residential lots that are between 18,000 sq. ft. and 20,000 sq. feet. 20,000 square feet is considered a half-acre even though in reality it is 21,780 square feet. It is an easy number to work with and is a way to round it off so you can figure it out easier. In Sandy, where I worked in the Planning Department, we considered 40,000 square feet to be an acre and 20,000 to be a half acre. Most cities do it with the square footage. We suggested the acreage and did include a ¾ acre lot.

Chairman Woolley said he appreciates the involvement of staff and with the citizens going through this. I like the move of the donkeys to the large animals and I like the point system. After we had our discussion with staff, it is a little complex but when you look at it you understand why you have to have something like that to manage it. I don't have a problem with a prorated point system for acreage above ½ acre but it must be a full ½ acre or we will have unintended consequences on adjoining properties.

Commissioner Holbrook said that was my concern too. Also, if we reduce the points for large animals I think you will open up a Pandora's Box. I am a rural person but our city isn't rural anymore and it is not moving toward rural. We have added so much housing in the last few years and it is a shame. I don't like it but it is happening. This has been on the books for 12-15 years so like our Chairman is pointing out we are going to have a lot of unintended consequences so I am not ready to make those big changes other than the classification of the donkey.

Chairman asked for input from the Commissioners with regards to the prorated points. For example say you had a .78 acre lot, would you restrict that to the point system and say you can only have two horses in this case or would you say you don't have a full acre so you can't have 4 but you can have 3.

Commissioner Holbrook said I could see that working.

Commissioner Morrissey asked are you okay with the point system being reduced to 15. Commissioner Holbrook said no. If she is not ready to do that then I propose that we table it until we have a full panel here to make a conclusion on that issue. With this panel of three it is not going to pass today.

#### F.2 Potential Action Item – (See VIII.B.1)

**Commissioner Morrissey made a motion to Table Zone Text Amendment Ordinance 2016-14 for two weeks to the July 12<sup>th</sup> Planning Meeting to have a full panel of Commissioners. Commissioner Woolley seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 3-0 in favor to table. Commissioners Quinn and Jolley were absent.**

Chairman Woolley directed staff to move this item to our next agenda for further discussion. The sticking point seems to be the reduction and how to deal with item number four. Sounds like to me from this body ½ acre is the minimum and we might consider a proration.

Commissioner Morrissey said I am in favor of the large animal point reduced from 20 to 15. I made that very clear last time. Under the motion last time to table we did want to consider other items as well it seemed like and make sure that we included a full briefing of what we could do to help make a meaningful impact on this going forward and something that would be sustainable going forward. The minimum lot size I am still questioning as far as that flexibility and I am in favor of making sure that there is a standard minimum; either that's a half-acre or 20,000 square feet. I am not in favor of making it a prorated point; nothing less than a half-acre.

Chairman Woolley said if we go to a 20,000 square feet instead of the ½ acre you're going to have a ton of potential problems.

Commissioner Morrissey said I am not saying I am in favor of minimum lots; that's the one questionable out there for me.

#### VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

None

#### ADJOURNMENT

**Commissioner Holbrook made a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Morrissey seconded the motion. Vote was unanimous in favor. Commissioners Quinn and Jolley were absent.**

The June 28, 2016 Planning Commission meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

Meeting minutes prepared by City Recorder Anna West.

**This is a true and correct copy of the June 28, 2016 Planning Commission meeting minutes, which were approved on July 12, 2016.**

*Anna M. West*

**South Jordan City Recorder**



JUNE 28, 2016

## PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING SIGN IN SHEET

<u>PRINT NAME</u>	<u>ADDRESS</u>
Cheryl Diener	10510 S. 3010 W. S. Jordan
DANIEL DIENER	10510 S. 3010 W. S. Jordan
CAROL MUNK	10573 S 3010 W S. JORDAN
BILL WHITNEY	5879 S. MEADOWCREST MURRAY
Tina Franio	9450 S. Redwood Sq
Paul Stringham	2535 Valley View JLC
Kristen Staples	3294 Ephraim Cir. So Jo.
DAN LONG	11563 S 25700 S Jo
CLARK Mounce	11 11
Jay Wyle Scott	10500 S 3010 W
WARREN KIRK	225 S. 200 E. / 10506 So. RIVER HEIGHTS DR
Mel & Eileen Luker	2928 W. 10755 So. - S. Jordan
Thomas Swallow	9389 Cameo Park Circle - S. Jordan
Kristi Collins	10749 S 2200 W. SJ

## Jake Warner

---

**From:** Paul Salin <psalin@q.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 23, 2016 12:07 PM  
**To:** Jake Warner  
**Subject:** large animals on 1/2 acre lots

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

I cannot make the meeting on Tuesday so I am writing you today to express my concern about large animals on smaller lots. By the time you put a house and yard on a 1/2 acre lot you have maybe 1/8 of an acre left. Too small to adequately take care of large animals. It is not fair to the large animal or the neighbors that are so close to the animal. If someone wanted horse or cow property they should have bought property zoned for large animals (there is a lot of it in South Jordan it just costs more). So please vote against the zoning change.

Thanks  
Paul Salin

P.S. I have complained about the tree hanging over the roads in my neighborhood for the past two years to no avail (multiple times). I have a 5th Wheel trailer that is about 13.3 feet tall and as I drive through the neighborhood my trailer hits tree limb after tree limb. I thought the ordinance was 7 feet on side walks and 14 feet on the road side. If you go down Settlers bend road, North Forty way, and Rustic roads drive there are multiple trees that are on the side walk and roads that violate this ordinance. Please get someone to take care of this problem because when I ask to have it resolved nothing happens.

## Jake Warner

---

**From:** Kim Sorensen <dkims73@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 27, 2016 9:38 AM  
**To:** Jake Warner  
**Subject:** FW: Horse Property Ordinance Change

Mr. Warner

Please see below. I had the e-mail address incorrect.

Thank-you

**D. Kim Sorensen**  
**[Dkims73@msn.com](mailto:dkims73@msn.com)**

---

**From:** Kim Sorensen [<mailto:dkims73@msn.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, June 27, 2016 9:37 AM  
**To:** [jwarner@sjc.com](mailto:jwarner@sjc.com)  
**Subject:** Horse Property Ordinance Change

Mr Warner,

I recently heard that the City was considering changing the large animal ordinance to allow for properties less than 0.5 acres to have horses. I would be adamantly opposed to this and see this as an attempt by a select few to RAM their lifestyle down everyone else's throats. The number of people who want this cannot be very large. It would be a mistake and I for one would move if the 0.40 and 0.4 acre lots around me brought in horses. We now have horses on the property behind us. There is nothing that can be done about it. The lot is larger than 0.50 acres and they have two horses. They had three in violation of the ordinance and those around us complained. After several months they removed one of the horses. I don't like it and will never be happy with the situation. You need more than a back yard fence as a buffer between horse property and non-horse property. There are time when we cannot stand to be in the back yard as the odor is terrible. Then there are the flies. Large horse flies buzzing around our doors, just waiting for the opportunity to invite themselves into our home. In addition we have only evaporative cooling so sometimes the odor invades our home. I should not be forced to install AC just to keep horse S... from invading my home. I'm sure the smell does not bother the horse owners, but it is foul and I am not happy with the situation. Several years ago our neighbors had horses, in violation of the ordinance. They had as many as seven on a 0.49 acre lot. The odor and flies were horrible. We tried to be good neighbors. We didn't complain and we let it go, but the situation was intolerable. Eventually they moved. Looking for a larger property for the horses. Now we have not had horses around for many years and from polling our neighbors nobody wants these horses around either. But our hands are tied. I understand that our neighbors have filed for a zoning variance. That is not good. If they are allowed to have more than they now have I will personally campaign against any city councilman who approves the variance. I will do the same for anyone who approves the proposed ordinance change. It is flatly ridiculous that what amounts to less than 5% of the population be allowed to impose their will on the other 95%. We have lived here for 24 years and have really enjoyed the city, but this attempt to return South Jordan to the 1950's is ridiculous on its face. If it passes we will start a petition drive to have it repealed and the City will wind up with the expense of that on their hands all to placate a select few who think everyone should embrace their life style.

Thank-you for your consideration in this matter.

**D. Kim Sorensen**  
**Dkims73@msn.com**

## Jake Warner

---

**From:** Pamela Sorensen <pams1959@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, June 27, 2016 12:15 PM  
**To:** Jake Warner  
**Subject:** Animal Rights

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Jake,  
I have lived in South Jordan for 24 years.  
We purchased a home with a .47 lot.  
There were to be no farm animals allowed.  
Now I have a new back fence neighbor trying to change the ordinance. They have 2 horses. They have had 3 and expect that to be the case soon. All the others that lived on the property did not have large animals.  
I don't want this farm animal ordinance to pass. I will have to leave South Jordan and I like living in South Jordan. Please keep the farm animal ordinance from PASSING!

Thank you,  
Pamela Sorensen 801 875-9154 [pams1959@hotmail.com](mailto:pams1959@hotmail.com)

Thank you

Sent from my iPhone