

**RIVERTON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
NOVEMBER 13, 2025**

The Riverton City Planning Commission convened at approximately 6:30 PM in the Riverton City Hall, 12830 South Redwood Road, Riverton, Utah.

Planning Commission Members:

Gary Cannon
Shelly Cluff
Crystal Keele(excused at 8:00 p.m.)
Evan Matheson
Darren Park (excused from 6:55 p.m. to 8:10 p.m.)

Staff:

Jason Lethbridge, Development Services Director
Matt Cassel, City Engineer
Tim Prestwich, City Planner
Ryan Carter, City Attorney

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Chair Darren Park called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Kenny Crump led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Chair Park reported that item 2C, "Moore Rezone and General Plan Amendment", would be moved to the end of the Agenda to ensure that citizen comments were heard by as many Commissioners as possible.

2. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A. 'LITTLE FOOTSTEPS CONDITIONAL USE,' PLZ-25-2043, AN APPLICATION FOR A CONDITIONAL USE HOME OCCUPATION TO AMEND A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED HOME OCCUPATION TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN FROM 8 PER SESSION TO 12 PER SESSION AT A HOME PRESCHOOL LOCATED AT 13706 ADMIRAL DRIVE. APPLICANTS - LAFONDA SCOTT AND JANESSA PUGH.**

City Planner, Tim Prestwich presented the Staff Report. A Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") was approved for the Home Occupation in 2012, and the Applicant had applied to amend the CUP to allow up to 12 children per session. No complaints had been received against the business.

Zoning and aerial maps were displayed. The subject property was located on a public street in Monarch Meadows Phase 2 near Foothills Elementary School. Public notice was sent to all property owners within 300 feet of the home, and comments were received in support of the application.

The Site Plan identified two classrooms on the lower level of the home. The daycare drop-off plan indicated that parents access the property via Morning Cloak Way or Blue

Admiral Drive and exit in the opposite direction to avoid backing out into the road from the driveway.

Mr. Prestwich reported that per Riverton City Code § 18.90.080, children's group activities like daycares are allowed more intensive use than other Home Occupations. The Planning Commission may approve up to 24 students per day with a maximum of 12 students per session, three sessions, and/or 24 vehicle trips. The Applicant had reported that many of her students either carpool or live in the neighborhood and walk to daycare, and as such, she was confident there would be fewer than 24 vehicle trips per day. Staff was in support of the request to allow the maximum number of students and trips.

Chair Park noted that the motion included in the Meeting Packet would allow up to 36 students per day. Mr. Prestwich indicated that Condition 1 requires compliance with the Home Occupation Ordinance, which limits the total number of students per day to 24, but clarifying language could be added to Condition 5.

In response to a question from Commissioner Cluff, Mr. Prestwich agreed that proposed Condition 8 was in conflict with the Applicant's traffic plan and could be removed from the motion.

The Applicant, Janessa Pugh, stated that they had been teaching at the daycare for 13 years. They had a waiting list, and many potential students were turned away. Current students included children from Saratoga Springs and Orem. They did not allow parents to pull into the driveway and back out into the road because it would create a traffic flow issue, and they wanted to be respectful of their neighbors. In response to a question from Chair Park, Ms. Pugh stated that they began the preschool in 2012 as a temporary endeavor but fell in love with it.

Chair Park asked about the proposed number of sessions. Ms. Pugh stated that the daycare was open three days per week, and their goal was to have three classes each day. However, they would comply with the Planning Commission's determination. Applicant LaFonda Scott stated that they would prefer to have 12 students per session but understood that only eight students per session would be allowed on days with three classes. Ms. Pugh stated that they could easily respect the 24-car maximum.

In response to a question from Commissioner Matheson, Ms. Pugh stated that drop-offs and pick-ups are staggered and occur at the sidewalk beside the home. The children in their older classes are very independent and capable of going to and from their parent's vehicle on their own. Children in the third class are younger but normally begin doing so after approximately three months. Ms. Scott added that one teacher is always outside during pick-ups and drop-offs.

Chair Park opened the public hearing.

Shannon Poulson stated that she lives next door to the preschool since it opened, and she had no concerns with approving the permit. She was also in favor of allowing 12 children per class with three classes per day. Many of the children walk to school, and there are no traffic issues. She indicated that the other next-door neighbor was also in support of the application but was unable to attend the meeting. She believes the preschool is a great asset to the community.

There were no further comments. The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Cluff asked if the Planning Commission had the ability to allow more than 24 students per day. Mr. Prestwich clarified that the 24-student maximum was specified in City Code and no exemption could be granted.

In response to a question from Chair Park, City Attorney, Ryan Carter, confirmed that Condition 5 did not need to be modified as Condition 1 required compliance with the Home Occupation Ordinance.

Commissioner Matheson moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE Application PLZ-25-2043, "Little Footsteps Conditional Use," Located at 13706 Admiral Drive, subject to the following:

Conditions:

- 1. The site, structures, and use shall remain in compliance with any and all applicable Riverton City Standards and Ordinances, specifically the City Home Occupation Ordinance (18.190) and applicable Building and Fire Codes.**
- 2. Applicant must obtain and maintain a Riverton City business license.**
- 3. Applicant must obtain and maintain applicable State and Health Department approvals.**
- 4. Home Occupation must operate within the Fixed Standards, and applicable Qualifications and Conditions as outlined in the Home Occupation Ordinance and with this approval.**
- 5. The Home Occupation may have up to 12 children per session.**
- 6. The Home Occupation may have a maximum of three sessions per day.**
- 7. The Home Occupation may have up to 24 vehicle trips per day by customers/parents.**

8. **Customers will be instructed to either continue straight on Admiral Drive or turn right on Blue Admiral after drop-off and pick-up; no U-turns allowed.**
9. **Pick-up and drop-off times shall be staggered to avoid congestion.**

Commissioner Cannon seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

- B. **'READER CONDITIONAL USE - SHORT-TERM RENTAL,' PLZ-25-2042, AN APPLICATION TO RENT THE PROPERTY AT 4851 MURDOCH PEAK CIRCLE AS A SHORT-TERM RENTAL. THIS ITEM WAS CONTINUED FROM A PREVIOUS MEETING. APPLICANT - GENE READER.**

Chair Park moved that the Planning Commission CONTINUE Application PLZ-25-2042, "Reader Conditional Use - Short-Term Rental," to the December 11, 2025, Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Keele seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

- C. **'MOORE REZONE AND GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT,' PLZ-25-4007, AN APPLICATION TO AMEND THE GENERAL PLAN AND REZONE APPROXIMATELY 1.45-ACRES LOCATED AT 13153, 13171, AND 13191 SOUTH REDWOOD ROAD. THE PROPERTY IS CURRENTLY DESIGNATED AS 'ESTATE DENSITY RESIDENTIAL' IN THE GENERAL PLAN, AND ZONED RR-22 (SINGLE FAMILY, RESIDENTIAL WITH 1/2-ARCE MINIMUM LOTS). THE APPLICANT IS REQUESTING THE GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION BE CHANGED TO 'HIGH-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL' AND THE PROPERTY REZONED TO RM-14D WITH AN SD OVERLAY AND/OR DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT TO ALLOW UP TO 15 TOWNHOMES. APPLICANT - TAYLOR MOORE.**

Development Services Director, Jason Lethbridge, presented the Staff Report and indicated that the subject property included several parcels along Redwood Road and 13200 South. The property was previously occupied by a floral shop, which was a legal non-conforming use, but it was not zoned commercial. The building was removed when the road was widened, and the property had remained vacant since that time.

The application was for a Development Agreement, including rezoning and preliminary Site Plan approval. If approved, technical details of the project would be reviewed by Staff and the Final Site Plan presented to the Planning Commission at a future public hearing.

The proposed zoning was RM-14-D, which would allow for a maximum density of 14 units per acre. This zone is typically restricted to the downtown area of Riverton and would not

normally be extended but the Development Agreement would allow it to be applied to the subject property. The agreement would also exempt the 1.45-acre property from the two-acre minimum parcel size required in the RM-14-D Zone. Setbacks would be compliant with the zone.

Mr. Lethbridge reviewed the proposed architectural renderings, which would be incorporated into the Development Agreement. All buildings must comply with the proposed design. A total of 15 units would be allowed for a density of approximately 10 units per acre. All units would have two-car garages, but the five rear-loading units along 13200 South would not have full driveways.

The Applicant proposed a three-rail fence along the property, which would be a deviation from zone fencing requirements. To address concerns about the fencing style, a proposed Condition of Approval would require a "picket style" fence with vertical rails. The Conditions of Approval were then reviewed.

Concerns were expressed to Staff about technical elements of the Site, including proximity of the driveway to Redwood Road. It was reported that the proposed configuration met City requirements, and a traffic memo was included in the application. The driveway would be reviewed in detail during the Final Site Plan approval process, as would fencing, stormwater management, etc. Any element not specified in the Development Agreement would be required to conform to RM-14-D Zone requirements and other Riverton City Standards and Ordinances.

In response to a question from Commissioner Matheson, it was clarified that a solid masonry fence would be required between the development and the commercial property to the east.

Chair Pro Tem Cluff indicated that a public comment had been received regarding a potential Site Plan overhang onto adjacent properties and highlighting an active irrigation ditch. Mr. Lethbridge reported that Staff had not had time to research the matter as the comment was received earlier that day. Any issues with property lines or surveys must be addressed and existing irrigation ditches abandoned or relocated as necessary prior to Site Plan approval.

In response to a question from Chair Cluff, City Engineer Matt Cassell reported that the traffic study indicated that the 15 homes would generate 100 trips per day. Traffic studies are based on industry standards for specific use types. A single-family home generates nine trips per home. Mr. Lethbridge added that commercial trips depend heavily the specific use.

Commissioner Matheson noted that the application appeared to be incomplete as it did not appear to be completely filled out. Mr. Lethbridge clarified that the public document was redacted to remove personally identifiable information like phone numbers and email

addresses. Mr. Carter indicated that the Development Agreement and associated documents met all City requirements and were considered complete.

The Applicant, Tanner Webster stated that his team reviewed the October 2025 Planning Commission meeting and incorporated as much of their feedback as possible, including decreasing the proposed density and requiring that the first property owner live in the unit.

Chair Cluff asked the Applicant to address parking concerns as public street parking was not available near the development, five of the proposed units would not have driveways, and only minimal visitor parking was proposed. Mr. Webster indicated that the development would have more parking than required by code. Chair Cluff stated that all other townhomes in the City are up to code, but they have access to public street parking. Mr. Webster could not provide the specific number of parking stalls but indicated that they would not be able to sell the homes if they had insufficient parking. Mr. Lethbridge clarified that City Code indicates that driveways can count as guest parking if a garage is available, so the 10 units with driveways would count toward guest parking requirements. It was within the Commission's scope to determine if that was sufficient, but the proposal met the minimum standard.

Commissioner Matheson referred to a public comment that indicated people often use garages for storage and park in the driveway. Mr. Webster stated that garage use would be controlled by the HOA, and residents would be encouraged to park in their garage. In response to a follow-up question from Commissioner Matheson, Mr. Carter stated that the development would include common areas, so an HOA would be required.

Chair Cluff asked if the Applicant had explored the possibility of a single-family development on the parcel. Mr. Webster stated that they researched it extensively and tried to consider feedback received from the City Council, Staff, and the public, and the proposal represented their best effort.

Chair Cluff opened the public hearing and noted that the Planning Commission could not consider general public outcry in its decisions. However, the City Council could consider public outcry as they are a political body, and the item would be heard by the City Council. She then reviewed the commenting rules.

Dave Mobley stated that he lives on Jared Circle and was speaking on behalf of the Riverton Heritage Group of citizens who live east of Redwood Road between 12800 South and Bangarter Highway. He then summarized a letter from the group.

"We are here tonight to state our firm opposition to the proposal by DRH Holdings and any changes to the current Riverton City General Plan for our area. Our opposition is based on two main points. (1) Our citizens were deeply engaged in developing our current General Plan. We did this with full knowledge of the UDOT Redwood Road expansion and the excess land it would create. In fact, many of us accepted lower compensation from UDOT based on the understanding that our neighborhood's 0.50-acre

zoning integrity would be maintained. Our vision has always been that this excess land would be acquired by neighbors or combined to create new single-family, 0.50-acre lots, consisted with the plan we all agreed on. (2) We reject the notion that our General Plan must be changed to accommodate speculators. These groups purchase excess land from UDOT with full knowledge of the current General Plan and its zoning. We believe they are now trying to pressure the City into granting a zoning change for their profit at the expense of the neighborhood's integrity.

We ask that you give greater consideration to your citizens than those speculators. Therefore, we propose that Riverton City place a moratorium on all applications for zoning changes in this area. This would give us time to form a committee of citizens, City Council members, and staff to develop a specific plan for this UDOT excess land. The RHG has a 20-year history of successfully working with the City, and we are fully prepared to work with you again to ensure that the land complies with the spirit of our General Plan and beautifies the entrance to our City.”

Commissioner Cannon reported that Commissioner Keele needed to be excused due to a family emergency. As a result, the Planning Commission no longer had a quorum. However, out of respect for the citizens in attendance, the public comment period would continue. Mr. Lethbridge stated that if the item was continued, it would be re-noticed to affected property owners. A transcript would be provided to all Commissioners so those not in attendance could be made fully aware of the public comments received during the current meeting.

Commissioner Keele was excused at 8:00 p.m.

Craig Hiller gave his address as 1621 West 13200 South and asked how many public comments had been received. Mr. Lethbridge stated that all comments received were made part of the record and read by the Planning Commission, but he did not know the specific number. Mr. Hiller asked what had changed between the current application and the one that was rejected in October, as he did not see a difference and did not understand why it was being considered. He objected to the application and believed the RR-22 zoning and current land use should stay in place.

Travis Christiansen stated that the proposed rezoning should not be approved. According to Riverton City Code, the combined parcels would not meet two of the qualifications. The parcel size of 1.45 acres did not meet the minimum requirement of two acres. If combined, they still would not conform to the requirement. Additionally, the lots are not in the downtown area, and therefore, the zoning would not be applicable. Riverton City Code § 18.57.50 designates three zones that do not have a minimum area requirement: R-2, R-3, and R-4. RM-6 is a higher-density zone that could apply, and § 18.45.50 indicates the zone can be approved by the City Council on parcels of at least 0.50 acres that have frontage on a major street and where the use is in compliance with the General Plan. He believes that creating an exception and rezoning the parcels to RM-14-D should be denied, as the request did not comply with City Code. The City and its Planning

Department developed the standards that formed and shaped the community that his family is part of. Deviation from the standards would set a precedent that Riverton is more interested in development than following its standards and General Plan. He also believed approval would make denial of future noncompliant rezoning requests more difficult and recommended that the Planning Commission consider denial of the request.

Blaine Withers stated that he lives near the subject property, and his family were original landowners in Riverton who had been in the City for over 150 years. He cares deeply about what kind of community he lives in, what kinds of neighbors he has, and the quality of life. He requested that the request be rejected and the 0.50-acre zoning be left in place. He believes a lot of people would like the land to raise animals or grow food, and that opportunity is lost when a development like this is approved. Residents had been fighting rezoning for three years, as it is their home and they want it left as-is. He served a mission in England, where centuries-old villages are still intact, and he believes this area of Riverton should be preserved.

Dean Warkentin stated that he lives across the street and north of the subject property. He moved to Riverton 27 years ago and raised his eight children here because it was rural, had a sense of family and community, and did not feel like downtown. He believes the City's founding fathers intended for it to be open, with large lots to raise families and have animals. He expressed concern about water usage, which he calculated to be 150,000 gallons per month for the proposed development. The City was struggling with infrastructure problems, and continuing to add high-density homes would further diminish resources. Citizens want the land to remain rural, and he believed the application should be denied.

Mike Merritt gave his address as 1606 West Dapple Gray Circle, northeast of the subject property. The proposal was very similar to proposed developments on Redwood Road north of Riverton Ranch Road that were rejected at least twice by both the Planning Commission and City Council. It would empty onto a single street and have very little parking. He did not believe it was a good fit for the area or Riverton.

Commissioner Park returned to the meeting at 8:10 p.m.

Ryan Rudd stated that he grew up on the east side of Interstate 15 and moved to Riverton 11 years ago for the 0.50-acre family parcels and trees. He recently subdivided and sold three parcels near the subject property. At that time, he could have requested that the properties be rezoned for higher density, but he decided to protect the area and retain the 0.50-acre single-family residential parcels. He is a real estate and construction attorney who frequently attends municipal meetings and he understands that sometimes a different use or zoning is appropriate for unique parcels, but that was not the case with the subject property. He subdivided and sold the nearby parcels for a lot of money, and the Applicant had the ability to do that as well. It was not a scenario where the land could not be sold or used as intended, and therefore, he believed the current zoning should be maintained. He did not believe there would be resistance if they were seeking a variance

for a small portion of the property. He moved to Riverton because this type of use was not allowed, and he asked that the Planning Commission reject the proposal.

Ashley Mobley stated that she lives on Jared Circle near the proposed development, and her family has lived in Riverton for generations. Residents are told that no one wants to live or build on Redwood Road unless it's high-density housing, but that was not the only answer. It was simply the most convenient one for the parties who stood to profit. She believes people would be willing to live in single-family homes on Redwood Road if they had the option to, but the parcels were not marketed that way, and you can't generate demand for something you have chosen not to offer. Residents were repeatedly asked to compromise their lifestyles, property values, and the character of the community so developers could pursue a more lucrative plan. The parcels were purchased with full knowledge of the zoning, and the developer could make money within the rules everyone else follows. She believed rezoning would set a precedent for high-density developments on Redwood Road and rewrite the community's identity. No proposals had been brought forward that aligned with the current zoning. She believe it was about respecting the purpose of zoning, residents' investments, and the safety and character of the neighborhood. Not every parcel is meant to be maximized for profit. She urged the Planning Commission to prioritize the people who live and raise families in Riverton and would remain long after developers moved on to their next project.

Jenny Burbank gave her address as 13717 South Lovers Lane and indicated that she had lived in the City for almost 40 years. Her family moved from Holladay and loved the country feel of Riverton. It was terrifying to see so much pushback from the City when residents just want to keep what they have always had. She did not believe variances from the master plan should be allowed when it had only recently been finalized and asked that the Planning Commission reject the proposal.

Mike Kurz stated that he has lived on Dapper Gray Circle adjacent to the subject property for over 30 years. He agreed with his neighbors and asked that the current zoning be retained. The Applicant had made no changes since the proposal was first heard a few months previously, and a similar development on Riverton Ranch Road was denied by the City Council. He was concerned that the proposed development would create a safety issue for neighborhood children. 13200 South is a busy road, and children walk to the school next door. Fifteen units would add 100 trips per day, which would make the intersection more dangerous. Riverton is growing and developing, but he believes developments like this would push residents like him out. He asked that the application be denied and the property owner find another option.

Randy Moore stated that the application was not the same as the one heard previously because the first application was for 27 units, and the new application was for 15. All units would have two-car garages, 10 units would also have parking for two cars in the driveways, and there would be nine guest parking stalls. If that were increased to 10 stalls, it would allow for four vehicles per unit or 60 total vehicles on the site. He has lived in the area for a long time and seen a lot of changes. Redwood Road has eight traffic

lanes and is one of the busiest roads in the valley, and property adjacent to the proposed development was zoned commercial. He asked what would happen to this property and other remainder parcels if it they were not developed appropriately. The Planning Commission had a difficult job, but they needed to consider the heavy adjacent uses.

Al Buehler stated that he lives on Riverton Ranch Road. He could not believe the Applicant's hutzpah in asking for so many exemptions from the RM-14-D Zone. If they were allowed to rewrite the zoning ordinance, it would open the door for development throughout Riverton, and he did not believe the proposal was fair to residents with 0.50-acre lots.

Josh Aune stated that he owned the Crane House next door to the subject property and his wife runs the Our Journey Montessori School. The developer had not spoken to him about their plans. He has been watching the property for some time, and it was auctioned at a very high price. He believed the proposal for high-density housing was an attempt to recoup that money, but he did not believe someone's poor business decisions should affect the rest of the community. The Crane House fence is as close to the irrigation ditch as possible. A fence on the subject property may be over the property line, and he did not think the application should be moved forward when there was a valid property boundary dispute. He also indicated that the Applicant's traffic engineer may have failed to contemplate the Crane House access, as he did not believe City and UDOT requirements could be met. He recommended that the Applicant not install vinyl fencing. Both the Aunes and the other adjoining neighbor have livestock, and the neighbor was forced to cull lambs due to complaints. Allowing high-density housing near livestock would create more complaints because they are incompatible uses.

Paul Sharp stated that he owns the property to the north of the proposed construction project. He has lived in Riverton for over 70 years and raised his family and animals in the City. When Redwood Road was widened, UDOT took 150 feet of his property, including his home. Three other homes were also taken. He often receives notices indicating that Riverton does not have enough water for its residents, but they took away four houses and wanted to build in their place. He moved to Riverton to raise his children and grandchildren in a place where they could ride a horse or have sheep and cows. His home was gone, but he still raises animals on the property. The people who moved in behind him wanted him to get rid of his animals, and he did not have the money to fight them, so he had to get rid of all four-legged animals, with the exception of his mule. If 15 homes were built next door, they would complain about manure.

There were no further comments. The public hearing was closed. Chair Cluff thanked those present for their comments and clarified that the Planning Commission does not control the agenda. Developers have the right to propose projects on their own land.

Commissioner Cannon applauded the citizens' for their passion for the community. He has been a real estate broker and developer for 40 years, and he was a volunteer member of three state water boards. The Planning Commission tries to make the best decisions

for both residents and the City as a whole. They were dealt a rough hand by UDOT when they widened Redwood Road, and he was involved in the negotiations on behalf of homeowners. Mr. Sharp had the opportunity to sell his entire parcel but chose to retain a portion of the property.

He noted that the item received the most public comments he has heard in his seven years on the Commission. Property costs are based on risk and return, and the average age of first-time homebuyers has increased to 40 years old. First-time homebuyers generally cannot afford a \$550,000 home, but the proposal was by far the nicest townhome product he had seen introduced at this price point. However, he understood that the citizens present did not believe it was the highest and best use of the property.

Commissioner Cannon reported that the property beside Stampin' Up! has zoning that allows for a 55-and-older community, but neighbors rose up against that development. When he pointed out that the zoning would also allow industrial and warehouse uses, residents indicated that stopping the project was worth the risk. A new developer proposed warehouse storage units on the property, and neighbors again spoke out against the project. He cautioned that the Utah State Legislature was close to passing a bill that would remove the City's right to refuse high-density development on major corridors.

Commissioner Cannon indicated that the proposed access to the property was the best possible access, regardless of what was developed there. He hoped that the developer and residents could work together to determine the highest and best use for the property. The proposal for 15 units was considerably less than the original proposal and in his opinion, was medium density.

Commissioner Park understood citizens' apprehension. The Planning Commission rejected the original proposal for 27 units because it was not the right fit for the property. His concern was that the legislature seemed determined to take these decisions away from the community. If cities did not choose to act, he feared that they would no longer be able to do so. They needed to find middle ground. It was a sensitive property, but they had to be realistic about how it could be developed and the risk of a much worse project being approved by the State in the future.

Commissioner Matheson stated that he rode a tractor down a dirt road in that area of Riverton when he was five years old, and he seized the first opportunity he had to return there as an adult 29 years ago. Riverton is growing, and his son cannot afford to buy a house in the City. Compromises needed to be made. The proposal had been downsized, and he did not believe the project would have a big negative impact on the neighboring 0.50-acre properties. He believed the proposal was a compromise, and it might be a good thing. Regarding water concerns, if two property owners removed their turf and replaced it with xeriscape, that would cover the water needs of five townhomes.

Chair Cluff stated that there are a lot of competing interests in the area. She saw the value in the community wanting to curate the area to control zoning and maintain a certain atmosphere. Multiple projects with similar density had been approved in other parts of the City, but she had difficulty determining the project's suitability because the area is very low density and there would be a large disparity in property values of the townhomes versus surrounding homes. She was concerned that the proposed parking was not adequate. However, she liked the appearance of the townhomes. High-density housing would be denied in other areas, but it made more sense on properties like this on main corridors. A townhome complex near her parents' home in Herriman sold out instantly. They are in demand because people want to be homeowners but cannot afford to buy homes on 0.50-acre lots. She understood both sides of the argument, but she was inclined to recommend denial of the application due to the property location.

Commissioner Cannon suggested tabling the item until a full quorum was present. Commissioner Park stated that all absent Commissioners would be supplied with a transcript of the meeting, as well as all written comments received on the item. It was a very sensitive topic, and the Planning Commission wanted to ensure that it was given thorough consideration. Mr. Carter added that due to the circumstances, it would be best to table the matter to a later date, as that would cure any procedural problems that may have arisen due to the circumstances. Mr. Lethbridge stated that items are typically tabled to a date certain, but transcripts take longer to obtain than meeting summaries. The item would be re-noticed so the public would be aware of the new meeting date.

Commissioner Cannon moved that the Planning Commission TABLE Application PLZ-25-4007, "Moore Rezone and General Plan Amendment," to a date uncertain. Commissioner Park seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

Commissioner Park stated that the Planning Commission is not trying to delay a decision. Rather, they wanted to ensure that they are doing the best they could for the community, and to do so they need input from every Commissioner.

- D. 'UTAH COLLECTIVE SD REZONE,' PLZ-25- 4008, AN APPLICATION TO REZONE APPROXIMATELY 1.28-ACRES LOCATED AT 2673 WEST 11800 SOUTH. THE PROPERTY CURRENTLY OPERATES AS A PRIVATE SCHOOL IN AN RR-22 RESIDENTIAL ZONE UNDER A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT. THE APPLICANT IS REQUESTING A SPECIAL DESIGNATION ZONING OVERLAY BE CREATED FOR THE PROPERTY TO ALLOW FOR A NUMBER OF SPECIFIC EXEMPTIONS FROM THE EXISTING ZONING CODE. APPLICANT - BEN MILAR**

Commissioner Cluff moved that the Planning Commission TABLE Application PLZ-25-4008, 'Utah Collective SD Rezone,' to the December 11, 2025, Planning

Commission Meeting. Commissioner Matheson seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

E. 'SYCAMORE GLEN TOWNHOMES PHASE 2,' PLZ-25-8008, A PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION APPLICATION FOR A RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION AND MULTIFAMILY SITE PLAN TO BE LOCATED AT 11851 SOUTH REDWOOD ROAD. APPLICANT - KEATON MORTON.

Chair Park was excused at 6:55 p.m.

Mr. Prestwich presented the Staff Report and stated that the project has been in process since 2021. The subject property is on Redwood Road near the north end of the City and was rezoned to RM-14-SD in early 2025 to match the unit count and setbacks of Sycamore Glen Townhomes Phase 1. Phase 1 was approved with 10 townhomes, two five-plexes, and a number of single-family homes. The single-family homes were completed but construction had not yet begun on the townhomes. At the time Phase 1 was approved, an existing detention pond was sold to the developer by the Utah Department of Transportation ("UDOT"). The proposed Phase 2 townhome development on that property would mirror the footprint, style and layout to the planned Phase 1 townhomes.

Zoning and Aerial Maps were reviewed. Mr. Prestwich noted that the property included a narrow remnant piece of land, which would be addressed in the Conditions of Approval. He also reported that public notices were mailed to all affected property owners, and no comments were received.

The Site Plan indicated 10 townhomes in two buildings. Each unit would have a two-car garage and a two-car driveway. Driveways would be limited common elements, and backyards would be common area. The development would include a private street, Redpointe Road, which would be accessed from Redwood Road and connect to Phase 1 via Maple Brook Lane. If Maple Brook Lane was not constructed, a temporary turnaround for emergency vehicles would be required.

Fencing would include an existing eight-foot masonry fence on the eastern property line, a six-foot masonry fence on the western property line, and a new eight-foot masonry fence with two gates and driveway openings on the southern property line. The single-family residential property to the south was zoned commercial, so conditions were added to restrict the gate and openings to residential use only. Additionally, an agreement was required because driveway access from Redwood Road to the existing home would be removed and the property would only be accessible via the new driveway openings.

Mr. Prestwich reported that the Phase 1 townhomes were approved when the subject property was zoned single-family residential, and as a result, an eight-foot masonry fence was required on the northern property line. As the uses were now compatible, Staff recommended amending the requirement to allow the developers of Phase 2 to install a

six-foot vinyl fence. If Phase 1 were to be completed prior to Phase 2, he recommended that the Phase 1 Site Plan be amended to remove the masonry wall requirement. As Phase 1 had been sold to a different developer, it was uncertain which project would be completed first.

The Landscaping Plan indicated waterwise landscaping along the front of the development and driveways including mulch, rock, ground cover, and drip irrigation. Sod backyards would be required.

Mr. Prestwich reviewed the building elevations and concept renderings and noted that the building design was identical to Phase 1, and any aesthetic or layout changes would require an amended Site Plan. He then reviewed the recommended Conditions of Approval.

Chair Cluff asked if there would be one HOA for both phases. Mr. Prestwich stated that the City did not have information on the HOA structure. However, whether there would be one or two HOAs for Sycamore Glen would not affect the decision.

The Applicant, Dave Morton, stated that they began the Sycamore Glen project approximately five years previously, and Phase 2 represented the opportunity to make use of the former detention pond land. They worked with the adjoining landowners and UDOT to reduce access from Redwood Road and make the area safer.

Chair Cluff stated that she liked the additional access Redpointe Road would provide to the Phase 1 townhomes.

Commissioner Cannon thanked Mr. Morton for his patience with the process as it had been a long negotiation.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Matheson, Mr. Morton reported that the minimum square footage was set by ordinance. The unit footprint would be small, but they would each have three stories. The single-family homes in Phase 1 were selling for almost \$1 million, and their goal for the townhomes was between \$550,000 and \$650,000. Commissioner Cannon stated that at that price, buyers would need an income of \$120,000 per year to qualify for a loan.

Chair Cluff opened the public hearing.

Dean Warkentin stated that he had lived in Riverton for 27 years and planned to make it his home for life, but developers are not told “no,” so properties that were supposed to have two homes now have five. He thought the proposed townhomes were ugly and would not have room for children. More people would be added to a city with a water shortage and infrastructure problems that were not being dealt with. The application sounded like it had already been approved, and he was disappointed that the City could not move forward in a way that involves more residents and controls growth. Townhomes

and high-density housing were being constructed everywhere, which was making the City ugly and causing traffic and water problems. He asked the Planning Commission to consider those issues.

Merrill Kunz prefers to live in a community without high-density housing, but he valued freedom more. Many people in the community are members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints but did not read or understand Section 134 of the Doctrine and Covenants, which states that individuals should have the right and control of property. He believed it was a moral issue. If someone purchases property but does not have the right to develop it as they see fit, they are denied their property rights. If someone cannot develop their property and has to sell it for less than they paid, he believes that is theft. He does not believe individuals have the right to compel their neighbors. He also believes that zoning punishes everyone because a few people abuse property rights, and that the Planning Commission did not have the right to stop development.

Kenny Crump lives on Melba Lane off of Redwood Road. People who use his road as a cut-through speed and make U-turns, and he was concerned about adding more traffic. He was not opposed to the project, but he believed there needed to be a solution to the traffic problem.

Ryan Rudd stated that the City Council, Planning Commission, and City committees do not represent one individual; they represent the community as a whole. When individuals purchase property that is zoned for residential use, the purchase price is based on that intended use. If the same property is zoned multi-family, its purchase price is significantly affected. He did not believe it was immoral for an individual to ask that the property be rezoned, but it was also not immoral for governing bodies to understand that the individual paid a reduced price because the property was not zoned for multi-family. Maintaining the zoning that was in place when the individual purchased the property was not immoral. However, he was not opposed to the current application and was pleased that there were areas of the City where multi-family housing made sense and had less negative impacts.

Donald Stephensen, a resident on Melba Lane, reported that the developer indicated that the townhomes will not affect traffic, but he sometimes cannot get out of his driveway onto Melba Lane. Traffic from 11800 South and 1300 West comes through his neighborhood. Residents fought against the current project but it still passed, and he did not believe the Commission cared how it affected residents. Traffic on his road is very heavy and many people make U-turns in front of his home, but the City has not done anything to correct the problems. He asked the Commission to take a stand and help long-time residents.

There were no further comments. The public hearing was closed.

In response to a question raised by Chair Cluff, City Engineer Matt Cassell stated that the City would conduct traffic counts on Melba Lane.

Commissioner Matheson lives near Melba Lane and agreed that U-turns are an issue. He asked if that could be addressed by the City or if it had to be referred to UDOT. Mr. Cassell stated that the problem was created by UDOT installing medians on Redwood Road. UDOT would be responsible for installing “no U-turn” signs, but he would ask that they consider doing so. Commissioner Matheson stated that he did not believe the proposed development would negatively impact Melba Lane, and in fact Redpointe Road would likely help ease traffic problems there. However, he agreed that it would add traffic to Redwood Road.

Chair Cluff stated that it would be nice if UDOT addressed the U-turn problem. She liked that Redpointe Road would direct traffic down a different street. She clarified for members of the public that the Planning Commission was considering a Subdivision application only; the property was not being rezoned.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Cannon, Mr. Prestwich reported that the property was formerly a UDOT detention pond. The subject property was rezoned in early 2025, and Phase 1 of the development was approved in approximately 2022.

Commissioner Cluff moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE Application PLZ-25-8008, “Sycamore Glen Townhomes Phase 2 Subdivision,” to be located at 11851 South Redwood Road, subject to the following:

Conditions:

- 1. Subdivision and Site Plan layout shall follow the previous approvals for the SD Designations in Ordinance 25-02.**
- 2. Subdivision lots and Site Plan shall be consistent with the plans presented to the Planning Commission except where otherwise noted in this approval.**
- 3. Building Architecture, design and materials shall match the renderings shown to the Planning Commission.**
- 4. Final Plan and Plat to be reviewed and approved by City Staff.**
- 5. Final Plat must be recorded with Salt Lake County prior to building permits being issued.**
- 6. Applicant must fix any outstanding Riverton City Staff redline comments on the Plat and plans.**
- 7. Storm drainage systems shall comply with the Riverton City Standards and Ordinances, and with the recommendations of the Riverton City Engineering Division.**

8. **The Applicant must create and agree to follow a Long-Term Storm Water Management Plan according to Riverton City Standards and Ordinances.**
9. **A Land Disturbance Permit must be issued by the City prior to any construction grading on the site.**
10. **Developer shall coordinate with downstream users for the continuation and relocation of existing irrigation turnouts and supply ditches.**
11. **The site and structures shall comply with all applicable Riverton City Standards and Ordinances, including the International Building and Fire Codes.**
12. **The applicant must obtain any necessary approvals or permits from applicable outside agencies or jurisdictions.**
13. **Any necessary easements or agreements on the property must be recorded with Salt Lake County Recorder.**
14. **Redpointe Road shall be a private Street with private maintenance provided by the HOA, and signage for "No Parking" according to Fire Code.**
15. **To obtain clearance for building permits, Maple Brook Lane in Sycamore Glen Townhomes Phase 1 must be installed and approved by the City. Otherwise, the developer must install a temporary fire turnaround approved by Unified Fire Authority and provide for any removal or reconstruction once Maple Brook Lane is installed.**
16. **Perimeter fencing must be installed as shown on the plans and described in this report prior to building permits being issued for the property.**
17. **If north property line is not fenced with 8-ft masonry by the owners of Sycamore Glen Phase 1, then the developers of Sycamore Glen Phase 2 shall install a 6-ft vinyl fence along the north property line prior to building permits being issued.**
18. **All landscaping shall be installed prior to occupancy.**
19. **The HOA shall be responsible for maintaining the common and open-space parcels within the subdivision.**

20. **Prior to the Subdivision Plat being recorded, a boundary adjustment must be completed with the south adjoiner to fix the property boundary according to Riverton City Code.**
21. **Gate and road access for parcel 27-27-201-006 is for residential use only.**

Commissioner Matheson seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

- F. **'TRESTLE ESTATES SUBDIVISION.' PLZ-25-1005, A PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION APPLICATION FOR A TWO-LOT RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION TO BE LOCATED AT 13331 SOUTH TRESTLE LANE. APPLICANT – RYAN ALMOND.**

Mr. Prestwich presented the Staff Report and indicated that, like the previous item, the item was an administrative action. The Planning Commission's role was to determine if the proposal met the Zoning Ordinance for the property. Zoning and Aerial maps were displayed. The subject property is located off 13400 South. The property is approximately 1.25 acres in size and backs onto the Utah and Salt Lake Canal, and the Applicant proposed to create a two-lot subdivision with a flag lot similar to the subdivision to the south that was approved in 2024.

Mr. Prestwich reported that when the City completed improvements to Trestle Lane, it was determined that the recorded plats did not match the lot configuration, as a portion of the Applicant's front yard was recorded as part of the neighbor's property. That issue would be corrected prior to recordation of the Subdivision Plat.

The Subdivision Plat indicated that the existing home would be on new Lot 2 and a new, larger lot would be Lot 1. The lots met all RR-22 zoning requirements. A private lane would run along the front of the property, and its proposed turnaround met all Fire Department standards. A private drainage system would be installed, and both the drainage system and private lane would be owned and maintained by the homeowner. A six-foot masonry fence would also be required along the canal.

Public notices were sent to neighboring property owners, and no comments were received.

The Applicant, Ryan Almond stated that they had worked with Staff regarding the fire turnaround, storm drainage, etc., and the current application would finalize the preparatory work on the project.

Chair Cluff opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Keele moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE Application PLZ-25-1005, "Trestle Estates Subdivision," to be located at 13331 South Trestle Lane, subject to the following:

Conditions:

- 1. Subdivision lots and private lane layout shall be consistent with the plans presented to the Planning Commission except where otherwise noted.**
- 2. Applicant must Apply for a Final Plan Approval.**
- 3. Final Plan and Plat to be reviewed and approved by City Staff.**
- 4. Final Plat must be recorded with Salt Lake County.**
- 5. Applicant must fix any outstanding Riverton City Staff redline comments on the Plat and plans.**
- 6. The applicant must obtain any necessary approvals or permits from applicable outside agencies or jurisdictions.**
- 7. Include a temporary turnaround on the property to meet City and Fire Department requirements.**
- 8. Storm drainage systems and accommodations comply with the Riverton City Standards and Ordinances, and with the recommendations of the Riverton City Engineering Division.**
- 9. The Applicant must create and agree to follow a Long-Term Storm Water Management Plan according to Riverton City Standards and Ordinances.**
- 10. A Land Disturbance Permit must be issued by the City prior to any construction grading on the site.**
- 11. The site and structures shall comply with all applicable Riverton City Standards and Ordinances, including the International Building and Fire Codes.**
- 12. The private lane and utilities in the private lane are to be owned and maintained by the property owners. No City maintenance will take place on infrastructure outside the Public Right of way or established city easement.**

13. Prior to the subdivision plat being recorded, a boundary adjustment must be completed with the north adjoiner to fix the property boundary as shown.

Commissioner Matheson seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

3. **DECISION ITEMS**

- A. NONE.

4. **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

- A. NONE.

5. **MINUTES**

- A. MINUTES APPROVAL – OCTOBER 23, 2025.

Commissioner Matheson moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of October 23, 2025, as reported. Chair Cluff seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

6. **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:00 PM.