

**CITY OF SOUTH JORDAN
ELECTRONIC
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
December 8, 2020**

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, Planning Intern Meadow Wedekind, Deputy Recorder Cindy Valdez

Others: Gary Langston, Mike Johnson, Travis Farran, Jen Gardner

6:30 P.M.
REGULAR MEETING

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

Chair Hollist welcomed everyone to the Electronic Meeting and noted that all of the Commissioners have joined the meeting tonight.

II. Motion to Approve Agenda

Commissioner Hollist made a motion to approve the December 8, 2020 Planning Commissioner Agenda. Commissioner Gedge seconded the motion. Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor.

III. Approval of the Minutes

Commissioner Hollist motioned to approve the November 10, 2020 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes as published. Commissioner Gedge seconded the motion. Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor.

IV. **STAFF BUSINESS - None**

V. **COMMENTS FROM PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBERS**

Chair Hollist said Commissioner Gedge and I attended the City Council Meeting last week on November 17, 2020 where they were discussing what was being proposed with the accessory dwelling units. In the presentation it was interesting to see the charts they had created that showed where our current ordinances fall in respect to the neighboring Cities. The City decided not to make any changes that night, but I feel that they may make changes in the future to try and clarify what that ordinance is and what they are trying to accomplish with it.

Commissioner Gedge said I agree, I thought it was a very thorough discussion, and I am looking forward to when it comes back to the Planning Commission next year.

Chair Hollist said I will entertain a motion to continue to have electronic zoom meetings for the next 30 days.

Commissioner Hollist motioned to continue to hold the Planning Commission Meeting virtually for the next 30 days. Commissioner Gedge seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor.

Chair Hollist read the Notice of Meeting without an Anchor Location due to Substantial Risk to Health and Safety.

I, Michelle Hollist, Chair of the South Jordan City Planning Commission, hereby determine that conducting the Planning Commission meeting at an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location. The President of the United States, The Governor of Utah, the Salt Lake County Health Department, Salt Lake County Mayor, the South Jordan City Mayor and City Council, and the World Health Organization have all recognized a global pandemic exists related to the new strain of the coronavirus, SARS- CoV-2 and outbreaks of the coronavirus disease COVID-19 that has now spread globally including in the State of UTAH. Due to the State of emergency caused by the global pandemic, the current situation in Utah and specifically in Salt Lake County, and the manner in which the COVID-19 virus spreads in groups, I find that conducting a meeting at an anchor location under the current state of public health emergency constitutes a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location. According to information from State Epidemiology, the State is currently in an acceleration phase, which has the potential to threaten the State's healthcare system. This determination not to meet in an anchor location shall be valid for thirty days.

VI. SUMMARY ACTION – *None*

VII. ACTION – *None*

VIII. ADMINISTRATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS –

A. DAYBREAK VILLAGE 10 NORTH PLAT 3, PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION

Location: 5570 West 10880 South
File No: PLPP202000307
Applicant: Daybreak Communities

Planner Schindler is having problems getting his sound to work, so the applicant Gary Langston will Daybreak Communities will review the background information on this item from the staff report.

Gary Langston, Daybreak Communities – said this project site is for the subdivision to create the beginning phases for a future apartment project. It is located at approximately South Jordan Parkway and Grandville Avenue, on the east side of Grandville. The actual project site will be

split into a northern, and southern portion, and the public road of Pipestone will be extended east and connect to Grandville Avenue. Obviously, this falls within our Town Center, and obviously, we are looking for ways to increase the density around the TRAX Station. If you are looking at the map on the lower left hand side, that is where the current TRAX Station is on the north end of Daybreak. This particular subdivision has (3) lots, there is M-101, and M-102, and they will be the apartment developments in the future, and M-103 is the future development parcel that is likely to be multi-family housing in that location. I think I have covered everything, and I am here to answer any questions that you may have.

Chair Hollist said I see that it is 14 acres, but do you know what the gross residential density works out to be?

Mr. Langston said we don't have the final count yet, but I can give you a rough range. It would be about 30 to 35 units an acre, which is about right for apartments.

Chair Hollist said it looks like in respect to the TRAX Station that you may be eligible for reduced parking. Do you anticipate requesting that accommodation, or will you be meeting the standard ordinances for this apartment complex?

Mr. Langston said for this particular project we are not requesting a reduction. We are actively exploring other parking alternatives that could occur near the north TRAX Station in the future, but for this project we intend to follow the ordinances.

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

Commissioner Gedge motioned to approve Project No. PLPP202000307 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.

B. DAYBREAK VILLAGE 11A PLAT 7, PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION

Location: 11750 South between 6615 W. and 6865 W.

File No: PLPP202000324

Applicant: Daybreak Communities

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

Commissioner Gedge said how large does the garage need to be? Does it need to be a one, or a two car garage, because there is always a concern about on street parking?

Planner Schindler said the requirement is to have a one car garage, but I believe all of the townhomes will have a two car garage.

Gary Langston, Daybreak Communities – said Planner Schindler is correct, the minimum is 20ft, which allows for a two car garage. The requirement is to have one, but we have doubled

that and there is still the typical on street parking that we have in this area. This is a little larger subdivision and I think I have explained to the Planning Commission before that in Daybreak we have (4) different product types that people can purchase from, there is (Active Adult), (Luxury), (Move Up), and (Value). This represents our inventory lots for our value segments, and obviously, as we are getting closer to 11800 S. through Daybreak Parkway you are seeing the density increase. Therefore, there are a few more townhomes than you would see as you work yourself more north into the project. We in Daybreak are reaching a 1,000 home sales for the year 2020, which is pretty incredible, all things considering. There have been quite a few plats come before you as we are trying to keep up with the demand, and you will see several more plats come before you in the coming months. There is quite a bit of activity going on in Daybreak, and we are excited to get started. Upon approval of this project we will get started with construction and we are anticipating delivering these lots next summer.

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

Commissioner Darby motioned to approve Project No. PLPP202000324 subject to the following:

- 1. That all South Jordan City Requirements are met prior to recording the plats.**

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

**C. 9800 SOUTH CHURCH SUBDIVISION, FIRST AMENDMENT –
SUBDIVISION AMENDMENT**

Location: 1409 West Shields Lane (9800 South)

File No: PLPLA202000332

Applicant: Aaron Bleak, Evans and Associates Architecture

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

Chair Hollist said if someone wanted to come in and develop on this property they could put (5) homes on 1.8 acres in this type of zone, is that about right?

Planner Sanderson said approximately.

Commissioner Gedge said this item, and the next item are both in my neighborhood, and I didn't see any Public Noticing on the properties. I am assuming that the Utah Public Noticing was done, but I would like to know if the Public in this radius was notified.

Planner Sanderson said we don't put public notices on a property unless it is a rezone, or a land use change. In a subdivision amendment the notices would go to the property owners themselves, because they are the one affected. The noticing also went out to the owners, and the affected entities (utility companies, other cities, and etc.) Any future development would require a larger notification.

Chair Hollist opened the Public Hearing to comments.

Commissioner Gedge motioned to approve the 9800 South Church Subdivision, First Amendment, file number PLPLA202000332 as proposed. Commissioner Hollist seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor.

D. PARKVIEW ESTATES, PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION

Location: 10336 South 1000 West
File No: PLPP202000347
Applicant: Tausha Strang

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

Commissioner Gedge said the property directly to the west currently accesses off of this road, so when they make the improvements, I want to make sure they will still be able to access their property. I want to make sure we don't land-lock this property while the improvements are being made.

Planner Sanderson said it is my understanding that they will need to maintain the access to that property owner during the construction of this development. They will have prescriptive rights to utilize this as their access, and we will work with the contractor that gets selected to make these improvements, and let them know they need to maintain this access for the property owner.

Commissioner Gedge said when we reviewed this item for the rezone in the spring, I had a concern regarding the new office business condo to south. How wide will 10400 S. be, because of cars parking on the street, will they be able to access the road in either direction if cars are parked from the office condo on the street?

Planner Sanderson said our standard right-of-way for a cross section for a residential is 55 feet. They are going to maintain the same amount of asphalt width, which is 28 feet, plus they will have their gutter-pan, which is an additional 2 feet, so it is 32 total feet for drive isles, and that is standard for a residential road. In fact, the improvements on the north side will be maintained to our standard.

Commissioner Gedge said I know that when we did the rezone it was proposed that there would be (4) lots, is there a reason why it was changed?

Planner Sanderson said when the rezone came through it included the property to the west, and I think if they could have worked together a little better they could have collectively got the additional lot, but they decided to go with the larger lots, which is not necessarily a bad thing.

Chair Hollist said who would ultimately have the easement right on this property?

Planner Sanderson said I don't have that information in front of me, but there never was a property line dispute between these (2) property owners, and they seem to be agreeable and are working together moving forward with this proposal.

Commissioner Catmull said what is the shoulder width on the south side?

Planner Sanderson said we don't necessarily have a fog line on residential roads.

Commissioner Catmull said it is a residential road and slow traffic, so someone could stay the same distance away from traffic because the width is the same, is that correct?

Planner Schindler said that would be correct. There is 32 feet of area, and (2) travel lanes and (2) parking lanes on either side.

Commissioner Catmull said I was also considering bike travel next to South Jordan Parkway, and making sure it would still be safe.

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

Commissioner Gedge motioned to approve the Parkview Estates Subdivision, File No. PLPP202000347 subject to the following requirements:

- 1. All accessory buildings shall be removed prior to recording a final plat.**
- 2. Within one year of the existing vehicular garage being removed, a new 22' X 22' garage, or equivalent thereof, shall be constructed on the east lot, per the requirements of the R-3 Zone.**
- 3. Prior recording a final plat, the applicant shall provide the following;**
 - I. A public assess easements for all sidewalk and park strips areas located outside of the proposed dedicated right-of-way.**
 - II. A special warranty deed, dedicated property located beyond the applicant's property as public right-of-way, per the proposed plans.**
- 4. The applicant shall provide written approval from either the irrigation ditch master or water uses in order to abandon the private irrigation system, or provide an alternate design, including any necessary easements, which is approved by the City Engineer and allows continual use of the private irrigation system.**
- 5. The applicant shall complete all on-site and off-site infrastructure improvements prop to the City issuing any building permits.**

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

E. STUDIO ELEV8, CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT

Location: 10623 S. Redwood Road
File No: PLCUP202000369
Applicant: Aaron Johnson

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

Chair Hollist said are they going to occupy the entire building?

Planner Mann said there will be 2, or 3 tattoo artists in the building.

Chair Hollist said do we know what there operating hours will be?

Planner Mann said I am not sure what there operating hours will be, but they will be doing most of their clients by appointment only.

Commissioner Gedge said does the City have any limits or cap on this type of business?

Planner Schindler said we wouldn't have a cap in this zone. We would have a cap on Cash Stores, because they have to be 1 mile apart from one another. We also require Storage Facilities to be capped by the number of acres they have, but nothing for this type of business in this zone.

Mike Johnson, South Jordan – said our hours are listed to close at 6:00 p.m. If we running late we may be there later in the evening. We also do private appointments for women who have had breast cancer, and those appointment can be done in the evening, so the latest we would probably be there is 9:00 or 10:00 p.m.

Chair Hollist said how many customers will you see per day?

Mr. Johnson said we will see 1-3 clients per day, and I do my consultations at 5:45 p.m. I have 2 other employees that work with me, but we all work different shifts, but we do cross paths during the day.

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

Commissioner Gedge motioned to approve File No. PLCUP202000369 for the use of a tattoo studio located at 10623 S Redwood Road as presented to the Planning Commission. Commissioner Hollist seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor.

F. FERRAN OFFICE PARKING LOT, SITE PLAN

Location: 11336 S. Beckstead Lane

File No: PLSPR202000328

Applicant: Travis Ferran

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

Chair Hollist said I assume the applicant is aware of what the parking requirement are for office buildings, and whatever he builds will lock him into a certain size limit.

Planner Mann said he is well aware of the number of parking stalls, and that it limits the size and there is a maximum height allowed, as well as the overall space that is left to build a building there, and I think this building will be smaller than the building to the north.

Chair Hollist said does staff see any concern with having a parking lot without a building.

Planner Mann said it would be similar to other shopping centers where you have a vacant building pad, with an existing parking area. It will be maintained and landscaped, so it won't appear like it is half done, it is just missing the building.

Travis Ferran, South Jordan (Applicant) – said we are working on the building drawings, and I didn't want to rush getting plans drawn now. Our hopes is to have a building on it next year and to have the parking lot done before winter hit us, but we are a little bit behind at this point.

Chair Hollist said do you have any details on what kind of office building will be there?

Mr. Ferran said if you noticed the building I just finished this year, it should be fairly similar to the aesthetics and the appearance of it. We are trying to keep things matching as far as the outside. I did send in a drawing to the planning department that is a temporary drawing, but I am making quite a few changes to it right now. My goal because I own the building to the north of this building, is I want it to compliment that building.

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

Commissioner Darby motioned to approve File No. PLSPR202000328 for the construction of a parking lot located at 11336 S. Beckstead Lane as presented to the Planning Commission. Commissioner Hollist seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor.

IX. LEGISLATIVE PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT – ADOPTING THE SOUTH JORDAN SUB AREAS PLAN FOR REDWOOD ROAD CORRIDOR AND JORDAN RIVER GATEWAY

Location:

File No: RESOLUTION R2021-2

Applicant: South Jordan City

Intern Meadow Wedekind review background information on this item from the staff report.

Chair Hollist said can you please re-state what you want added to the proposal.

Ms. Wedekind said this is to add a condition that changes the language addressing the existing park-strips along Redwood Road, and the Cities plan for those.

Planner Schindler said is the language in there already? And what does it say about the park-strips on Redwood Rd?

Ms. Wedekind said the language is not in there yet, but Director Schaefermeyer has talked to the consultants about changing that language. I think it is about acknowledging those smaller park-strips that exist currently, and what the Cities plan is for maintaining them.

Commission Catmull said is this effectively a grandfather type clause, so that if it already exists it can stay that way?

Planner Sanderson said I think it is a desire that in the future it will make a consistent feel with the park-strips along Redwood Road.

Ms. Wedekind said the language in the plan right now is really focusing in the development areas, and we want to make sure the existing areas are acknowledged as well, and that those areas would be maintained as well.

Commissioner Catmull said I would like to clarify if that is out of the sub-area.

Ms. Wedekind said that would be in the Redwood Road corridor sub-area.

Planner Schindler said I think what we are saying: is that all future development will have to meet the standard for a 12ft. park-strip, but those that have already developed and don't have that will stay that way until the City will find a way to finance a program to bring those other ones in so they are conforming with what the code will eventually require.

Planner Sanderson said the Merit Medical has expressed a desire to maintain the office park development, and they are north of 10600 S. On their main campus their sidewalk meanders and the park-strip is 20ft in most cases, so they want it to have an office park kind of feel.

Commissioner Gedge said going back to the language that we have been discussing, I am wondering if it is really necessary, because it is dealing with future developments. I don't see the need to have that language to protect the homeowners, because if I am right, there isn't a forcibility or punitive action for existing uses, so in my personal opinion, I think it muddies the waters.

Commissioner Catmull said I have similar thoughts to what Commissioner Gedge has stated.

Intern Wedekind said I can take your feedback to Director Stephen Schaefermeyer, and the consultants and discuss it and see if it is really necessary. I just know, they had heard there were concerns about the maintenance, and they realized the language had not been included in this document.

Chair Hollist said the maintenance would be different than the concerns from current landowners. Is this just saying that the City will continue to maintain the properties that it already does?

Intern Wedekind said I am not sure of the detail regarding this, but I think it was for providing guidance between the City and Landowners.

Planner Sanderson said I don't see anything wrong with putting this in here, it is just the City Guideline type of document. It would be enforceable with new development, but the way they are structuring this, it is to try and put a cohesive plan together with these type of spotty areas. I may also be a way that the City can incentivize, or find a plan. In many cases there is funding that will back up a plan, but if it is not in the plan, it is not that easy to accomplish the funding and what it is purposed for.

Intern Wedekind said the reason for the language specifically, from Director Schaefermeyer is because the City Maintenance has a concern about safety now that there is no shoulder on Redwood Road. They only maintain the small existing park-strips, and so they wanted to put language into the plan, so that the non-conforming park-strips would be different from the new park-strips in a way that they wouldn't need to meet the requirements for these park-strips, but they would be safer.

Commissioner Catmull said when I look at this, it just isn't clear to me. I see that the new development is outlined there, and we have non-conforming existing, which would stay until there is some development trigger and then it would stay conforming. I think what I just heard, is that there would be a third state that you might want to make a change to make it closer, but not exactly what was lined out on bullet point number two.

Jen Gardner (Consultant) - said I don't think there is a third, it is just the non-conforming and they would conform to this new standard. As Intern Wedekind said it is about maintenance, I don't think there needs to be any additional language put in here. I think is talking about how there is no longer a shoulder on Redwood Road and there are some smaller park-strips now that the Cities maintenance department feels unsafe maintaining, with the sprinkler heads, and things of that nature. What we have discussed tonight is that if it is existing the change, it wouldn't happen until an application was triggered anyway, so I don't think there would be much of a change in the language to accommodate that.

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

Commissioner Gedge said I am comfortable with what was prepared in the packet. I am just not comfortable with recommending language that we haven't seen, or don't feel that it is necessary.

Commissioner Darby said I am in agreement with what Commissioner Gedge said. I am ok approving it as it reads, but I am not ok approving something we haven't seen.

Commissioner Catmull said if part of our action is that we took the input from Mr. Schaefermeyer and we don't see the specific need, but we did pay attention to it, is that enough to let him make the case in the City Council meeting, or do we table it. I just don't understand how important it is to Mr. Schaefermeyer.

Chair Hollist said how detailed of a report is City Council given, or is it just the minutes they receive from our meetings.

Planner Schindler said they received the same report you received for this project, and they also get the minutes, but not what your conversation was. I have feeling the Mr. Schaefermeyer would rather you make a motion one way or the other, rather than to table it.

Chair Hollist said I would be happy to email Mr. Schaefermer what Commission Catmull stated, if the makes you more comfortable moving forward, and then he could relay that to City Council.

Commissioner Catmull said I am comfortable moving forward, I am just recognizing it as an unknown.

Intern Wedekind said I would just add that when Mr. Schaefermeyer recommended this, I don't think that he anticipated quite so much back and forth, or discussion. I think it was just a matter of wanting to incorporate feedback into the plan we had received, so if it is really something that is important, and staff feels that it would be necessary, it is not that big of a deal to come back and make an amendment to the plan later on. It could also just be that you don't need to add the language and it is as good the way it is.

Commissioner Morrissey said based on the discussions, and the opposition because of the questions, I would recommend to table this tonight. I don't see a need for us to move forward with this quickly, because it is a supplement only, so that would be my recommendation.

Commissioner Gedge motioned for the Planning Commission to table Resolution No. 2020-02 until the next Planning Commission Meeting given directions from City Staff to come back to the Planning Commission with direction and language regarding the applicability of the park-strip recommendations on the Redwood Road Corridor of the Sub Area Plan. Commissioner Hollist seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor.

X. OTHER BUSINESS

Assistant City Attorney Greg Simonson said I do have some concerns about these virtual meetings being recorded, and the minutes are taken. I know we always have excellent records for these, but when we get some of these glitches as we occasionally do, and tonight there were two that come to mind. We almost couldn't have a staff member that was assigned to give the report do so, and the applicant almost had to give the staff report. I don't know if the rest of you were having difficulty hearing Brad Sanderson during portions of his report. I know there were portions of it that were obscured, and I don't know if that came through to the people that are recording and taking the minutes, and if they were able to get a clear recording. I would say what happened tonight is probably not a big concern, but I am wondering if we were able to get a full recording of what was said, in respect to those interruptions.

Chair Hollist said we have had some glitches in some of the meetings. What do you propose that we do? At this point we are modeling what City Council is doing for consistency.

Assistant City Attorney Simonson said I think we need to move forward the best that we can, but I am reminding everyone that we do have that requirement. I am not proposing anything, I am just making everyone aware that I have some concerns about this.

Chair Hollist said I agree with what our staff attorney has said, so if our IT person Jon Day, or our Deputy Recorder Cindy Valdez moving forward senses that we are not getting a clear recording, please indicate, and we will pause and try to resolve that. I also agree with Mr. Simonson that we should not have applicants making the staff report. The staff reports are very detailed and very clear and I get the sense that the Commissioners have reviewed them thoroughly, so think any Staff person, or Planning Commissioner could do a sufficient job presenting it.

Assistant City Attorney Simonson said I think what we should do as staff, is before the meeting begins at 6:00 or 6:15 pm every member of staff should get on the meeting and make sure that everything is working, and then we won't have to put any of you Planning Commissioners in an awkward position. I think if we can get these things ironed out before time, we should not run into a problem where we wouldn't have to cancel, or postpone a meeting.

Director John Day said let me know what time you would like me to start having the meeting opened, and I can do that. If 5:00 or 6:00 works better I can open the meeting earlier.

Chair Hollist said I think 6:15 is sufficient.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Hollist motioned to adjourn the December 8, 2020 Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Gedge seconded the motion. Vote was unanimous in favor.

The December 8, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

This is a true and correct copy of the December 8, 2020 Planning Commission minutes, which were approved on January 12, 2021.

Cindy Valdez

South Jordan Deputy Recorder

Meeting minutes were prepared by Deputy Recorder Cindy Valdez