

**RIVERTON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES  
MAY 14, 2026**

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:**

Crystal Keele  
Gary Cannon  
Evan Matheson  
Shelly Cluff  
Monique Beck  
Joe Marzo

**Staff:**

Matt Cassel, City Engineer  
Tim Prestwich, City Planner  
Lisa Halversen, 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. Commissioner Marzo led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**2. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

- A. "MAJESTIC HOMES REZONE," PLZ-26-4002, AN APPLICATION TO REZONE APPROXIMATELY 3.14 ACRES, LOCATED AT 13172 SOUTH REDWOOD ROAD, FROM THE C-N (NEIGHBORHOOD COMMERCIAL) ZONE TO RM-14 (MEDIUM-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL) ZONE, AND TO AMEND THE GENERAL PLAN FROM MEDIUM-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL TO HIGH-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL. APPLICANT – DAVID LARSEN, KEVIN GUST.**

City Planner Tim Prestwich presented the Staff Report. Aerial, General Plan, and Zoning Maps were reviewed. Mr. Prestwich reminded those present that the Zoning Map indicates what can be done with properties under current laws, and the General Plan Map suggests what the City is willing to consider for the property. The General Plan Map was last amended in August 2020 and would be updated again in 2026 but could be amended at any time with City Council approval.

The subject property was currently designated Medium Density Residential, which is equivalent to the R-4 Zone with 0.25-acre minimum lot sizes. Most properties on the east side of Redwood Road were designated Estate Density Residential, which requires 0.50-acre or larger lots with animal rights. The parcel directly across from the subject property was designated Medium-High Density Residential.

The applicant had requested that the subject property be designated High-Density Residential, which allows for up to 12 units per acre. Mr. Prestwich reported that the

designation was created prior to the adoption of the RM-14 Zone, which allows up to 14 units, but that was the equivalent zoning, and the definition would be modified during the upcoming General Plan update.

Properties in the area were primarily zoned RR-22 and R-4, with some R-3 and commercial parcels. A portion of the subject property was rezoned Neighborhood Commercial ("C-N") in approximately 2006, but remained undeveloped, and the property directly across the street was recently rezoned RM-6. The applicant requested that the subject property be rezoned to RM-14.

Mr. Prestwich reported that three to four townhome projects in the City were zoned RM-14, one of which included some small-lot single-family homes as allowed by the zone. The purpose of the RM-14 Zone is to provide areas of medium residential density with the opportunity for varied housing styles and a maximum density of 14 units per acre. Permitted uses include condominiums and townhomes (attached or detached), and residential planned developments (small lot, single-family homes on private streets). Geographical and other constraints typically limit density in these projects.

An aerial photograph of the subject property was displayed. The property fronts public streets on three sides and shares the south property line with two other property owners.

The conceptual Site Plan was reviewed. Mr. Prestwich indicated that the plan was not up for review but could be helpful in the Planning Commission's deliberations. The applicant proposed attached townhomes with private streets, garage and driveway parking, as well as guest parking and shared common areas. The development would also have several access points.

Several public comments had been received regarding this item. Residents were concerned that approval of the application could change the character of the City and questioned why it was being considered when similar requests had been denied. Mr. Prestwich reported that if a rezoning application meets minimum requirements, it must be considered unless a request for the same zone has been denied within a specified timeframe. In this case, the applicant owned the property and met the minimum acreage requirements. City Staff works with all applicants, but rezoning is a legislative decision that Staff does not advocate for or against.

The State was also applying pressure on cities to address the housing crisis by approving higher density, and as a result Staff was constantly approached by potential applicants interested in constructing multi-family developments on vacant or underutilized parcels like the subject property. Until those properties were all developed, applications would continue to be brought before the Planning Commission and City Council. Elected officials feel pressure from both constituents wanting to maintain the current character of the City and State requirements to allow higher density. The Planning Commission was not elected, but the City Council relied on its opinions and observations.

Staff recently discussed the issue with Mayor Buroker, and the City Council and Planning Commission had been invited to tour high-density projects and identify elements that would and would not work in Riverton. During the General Plan update, they would also be considering areas of the City that may be suitable for higher-density development.

Commissioner Cluff stated that the conceptual Site Plan showed a density of 12 units per acre, but 14 units would be allowed if the property were rezoned. The Planning Commission was sometimes reluctant to approve based on a concept. In response to her question, Mr. Prestwich clarified that the RM-14 Zone would allow stacked condominiums or apartments on the property. However, the Planning Commission could recommend that only townhomes or detached single-family homes be allowed.

Commissioner Matheson remarked that if only single-family homes were allowed, that would equate to a density of approximately eight homes per acre. Mr. Prestwich stated that in that case, the Planning Commission could recommend rezoning to RM-6. However, the difference between zoning that allows 12 units per acre versus four units per acre is not as large as it may sound. An extra four to eight units would not create a lot of additional impacts on roads and neighborhoods, and there were tools available to ensure that the final project would be built to the conceptual Site Plan.

David Larsen and Kevin Gust spoke on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Gust stated that Majestic Homes had owned the subject property for approximately eight years. He and Mr. Larsen had lived in Riverton for over 30 years and had considered many different concepts for the site. The final concept was decided upon, not because it had RM-14 zoning but because they believed it would work best on the property and provide people with an opportunity to live in Riverton. It would have large roads and adequate parking, with both two-car garages and driveways at each home. The concept would fit all requirements for setbacks, ingress and egress, etc., and be governed by a homeowners association. They believe that it was a good product that would work well on the parcel. Traffic could impact some nearby streets, but the property was on a busy street, not in an existing neighborhood. There would also be ample green space.

Mr. Gust stated that they had considered commercial uses for the subject property but were concerned that it would not bring value to the neighborhood. They had reviewed many concepts with Staff over the years, but this was the first that had been brought before the Planning Commission, and the development would meet all City requirements.

Mr. Larsen stated that they had considered many different concepts for the property, including storage units and other commercial projects. They asked Staff what the City would like to have on the property and then worked with Ensign Engineering to create a concept plan. They live in Riverton and wanted to do something that would be nice for the City. He understood that people did not want things to change, but that was the way of life, and he believed it was a good concept that may allow adult children and older residents to stay in Riverton. The development would have garages, driveways, and 14 additional guest parking stalls. They want to do what is right for the community.

Mr. Gust noted that Majestic Homes built the home on the corner and knows the property very well.

Commissioner Matheson stated that no public comments were received in support of the proposal and asked if the applicant had spoken with community members. The property across the street was originally proposed as a high-rise condominium, then townhomes, but conflicts disappeared, and neighbors were happy when they proposed RM-6. Mr. Larsen stated that they had not been in contact with residents of the noticing area, but he knows of several people who would be interested in the development because they are getting older and want to downsize without leaving Riverton. Mr. Gust added that they had spoken with many residents who may not be in attendance. They wanted to achieve a certain density, but it worked on the subject property.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Cluff, Mr. Gust stated that they were unsure of the price point, but the units would be more affordable than single-family homes on large lots, which are unaffordable to many working residents.

Commissioner Beck asked if the intent was to create a senior-living neighborhood. Mr. Gust stated that they originally considered the option, but members of the City Council asked them to consider a development for both seniors and young families.

Chair Park opened the public hearing.

*Louisa Jones* stated that although the applicant presented a good argument, she believed that the many drawbacks outweighed any benefits. The property is next to the elementary school. Last year, she was on safety patrol, and a five-year-old child was almost run over. Fifty additional homes would add too much traffic and cause a lot of problems. The development would also ruin the beauty and uniqueness of Riverton, which already had a lot of its beauty ruined by the widening of Redwood Road and the removal of historic buildings. Single-family homes should be built instead. The applicant mentioned that residents need affordable homes, but smaller homes would meet that need without destroying the town.

*Carrie Christensen* stated that she lives very close to the subject property. When they purchased their home, her family wanted to have choices about how to use the yard. They also wanted a single-level home because their son has cerebral palsy and needs to be able to walk around. They had enjoyed boarding horses, and this year her children would be raising lambs for 4-H. They also have a large garden and fruit trees. Houses in the neighborhood are a testament to their original owners, with some dream houses and others built of cinderblock. There is a variety of scale, an attitude of helping each other, and creative use of properties. The proposed development stood in stark contrast, with no yards or individuality of architecture. It would have a sameness of socioeconomic status and limit owners' freedom to choose how to use their land, paint their house, or even their door. The townhomes could not be modified for accessibility, so she did not

know how they would work for seniors. There would be hardly any green space for children to play. Within a few hundred feet of the proposed development, families were keeping livestock and had built a strong agricultural feeling. She chose to live in the neighborhood, but noise from the livestock could annoy someone who did not value having a yard. The style of the neighborhood may bother her as well. She believes the lot should be turned into something that could seamlessly integrate into the neighborhood. It could remain zoned RR-22 and be turned into six homes or R-4 and provide homes for 12 families, but she did not believe there should be an HOA because it would not fit the current neighborhood culture.

*Dave Mobley* stated that he lives near the subject property and represented a significant number of neighboring property owners. As a resident of the community, he cared deeply about keeping neighborhoods good places where families can thrive. He opposed the Majestic Homes rezone, as changing the corner property from its current zoning to high density would be too much, too soon. There was a much better approach at the corner of 13200 South and Redwood Road, where the developers listened to neighbors, scaled back their plans, and worked cooperatively toward a solution that fits the area. That kind of partnership builds trust, but developers who try to ramrod their way through the process erode it. The proposal would increase intensity on a key corridor that the City had acknowledged was under significant pressure and break up the cohesive medium-density pattern that defined the west side of Redwood Road. He believed that approving high-density townhomes would set a dangerous precedent prior to completing the General Plan update and proper corridor planning. Practical concerns included more traffic on Redwood Road, increased parking spillover into neighborhoods, and safety issues for children walking and biking to school. The representative form of government exists to give citizens a meaningful voice in shaping the future of the community, not just to hand decisions over to developers and bureaucracy. He asked that the Planning Commission recommend denial of the rezone as proposed or approval of RM-6 zoning with detached homes that would properly transition into the existing neighborhood.

*Peggy Jones* stated that she does not live within 1,000 feet of the subject property, but she does live in the neighborhood. The developers indicated that they looked at how the project would fit, but she did not believe that it fit. They said that it may be a great way to keep parents in town when they get older, but the units would be vertical. Without elevators, her parents could not live in a vertical home with so many stairs. Things are changing, and it is up to the City to direct that change. Directing it to destroy neighborhoods and build large, high-density developments would ruin the feel of the community and not be the right choice. It is important to offer home ownership to young people at the lower end of the market, but the dream is a single-family home, not a townhouse. Small single-family homes on small lots would be a better option and would work for the neighborhood. Traffic is crazy in the morning. It is already hard to get out of the neighborhood, and a child was struck by a vehicle due to the amount of traffic. Fifty townhomes did not work for the area. Not everyone wants a 0.50-acre lot, but 5,000-square-foot lots would be in keeping with what Riverton is. She asked that the City please preserve the neighborhood.

*Dean Workington* stated that he hoped the Planning Commission would vote against the proposal. Rezoning to RM-14 would allow up to 44 units on the subject property, which would add between 132 and 176 people to the area. There was already not enough water, and they were considering adding 500,000 to 700,000 gallons per month in water going into the homes and sewage coming out. That was not sustainable in a drought area. It would also add up to 88 additional cars that would have to avoid hitting children next to an elementary school. People already park on the street because they cannot get into the school to drop off or pick up their children. He understood that there was pressure from the State, but residents were asking the City to please protect their privileges and desires. They moved to Riverton because they wanted a rural feel. His son lives in an HOA in Payson, where the houses are very close, and he cannot grow a garden. He asked that the application be denied.

*Caden Carter* stated that he did not believe the proposed density was a good fit for the area. He would like to see the property rezoned to RM-6. He and his wife just purchased their home, and townhomes were not much more inexpensive than single-family homes with smaller lots. Regarding seniors living there, anyone who cannot maintain a lawn would have a very hard time with one to two flights of stairs to access any part of their house. His greatest concern was the fact that the property was directly across the street from Riverton Elementary School. The City should be very mindful of the safety of its children. His parents live across the street from townhomes, many of which were turned into rentals. That raised the fear that undesirables could move into the neighborhood in five to 10 years.

*Travis Christensen* stated that he lives next to the elementary school. He likes the idea of individuals and families being able to own homes in Riverton. The story people hear is that high-density housing will provide a pathway to ownership for Utah's children and growing population. However, there were four RM-14 developments within a one-mile radius of the subject property. Of the 324 total units, 32% or 105 were owner-occupied, and the other 68% were owned by someone with a different address. He did not believe that the product would allow the population to own a home, but rather would allow temporary renters. According to the 2024 Census, Riverton had 85% home ownership, which he believed was in part due to the City's zoning. If they wanted to provide people with a chance to own their own home, RM-14 was not the product. Those developments tend to be an island, often with large concrete walls, no sidewalks, and limited parking. He was present because he loves the community and wanted to provide input into how it grows, and he hoped the Planning Commission would consider his points.

*David Cuff* stated that he shared 400 feet of frontage with the proposed development. The applicant had not spoken with him about their plans, and the concept presented at the meeting was different from the one included in the meeting packet. He preferred the original concept, but they both created the same problem of a four-way stop at the elementary school. As an engineer, he understood the challenge of getting people in and out of the development without a four-way stop, but he did not believe that more traffic in

a more complex pattern would work. He was also concerned about water usage and how the project would fit with the community.

*Al Buehler* stated that he lives on the east side of Redwood Road near the subject property. He asked where the trash cans or dumpster would be located. Riverton requires trash cans to be screened, and it brings down the neighborhood when they are in view, which he believed would happen in the proposed development. The homes would be two stories without elevators, so senior citizens would not live in them. The units would turn into rental properties purchased by investors because they are too small to own. He did not believe 14 parking spaces were enough for 44 units, so cars would park on the street. He believed the proposal was too aggressive for the property.

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

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Cluff, Mr. Prestwich reported that the General Plan provides for a range of densities. Medium-High Density Residential allows for five to eight units per acre and is equivalent to the RM-6 and RM-8 Zones. RM-6 is for single-family homes only, and RM-6 includes townhomes, condominiums, and small lot single-family homes. High-Density Residential allows for eight to 12 units per acre and is equivalent to the RM-14, RM-14-Downtown, and RM-18 Zones, which are typically townhomes and condominiums.

Commissioner Cluff asked about the City's ability to restrict purchase, for example, prohibiting corporations from purchasing homes in the proposed development. City Attorney, Ryan Carter, stated that there had been political movements in that direction, but the City did not have the ability to place such restrictions.

Commissioner Cluff stated that she was grateful for the respectful and well-thought-out public comments. When similar developments had been proposed along Redwood Road, her primary concerns were access points, parking, flow, and the impact on the surrounding neighborhood. For example, the property across the street was approved for RM-6 Zoning, but they initially proposed a high-rise on a private road without public parking. The surrounding zoning is important, as a development should make sense in its neighborhood. Utah is one of the best states for upward mobility, and she recently learned that one of the best indicators of upward mobility is mixed zoning.

She liked that the property had multiple access points that were not on Redwood Road and that most of the yards were internal. The properties would be attractive to young families, and she believed the concept was for safer development than had been presented in other proposals. She lives on a one-acre lot and loves the big-lot feel of Riverton, but she liked that the subject property was close to the elementary school and would provide a generally safe route for children to walk there. However, she was concerned about the zoning disparity, as high-density and estate density are polar opposites and may not belong beside each other. She was also concerned about setting a precedent. The project seemed to have been thoughtfully designed by developers with

an investment in the City, other developers would see RM-14 on the subject property and propose similar projects that may not make sense. The sounds and smells of the surrounding agricultural community may not be to townhome owners' liking.

Commissioner Cluff noted that there was a price point difference. Some new RM-6 single-family homes on Redwood Road were selling for \$1 million, and she believed the entry point for townhomes was \$500,000 or \$600,000, which would provide an access point for first-time homebuyers.

Commissioner Beck thanked Louisa Jones for her comments, as speaking publicly at her age can be challenging. She was not in favor of approving RM-14 zoning for the subject property. The concept plan was well thought out. However, her elderly mother cannot use stairs so it would not be appropriate for her, and she did not see how even her stepchildren could afford to live there. She also believed it would bring too much density to the area.

Commissioner Marzo stated that many good points had been made. He was glad that an entry point from Redwood Road was not proposed. He lives in an area of the City that has gone through many rezones and understands that it is shocking to live next to a property that is rezoned to high density. He was not in favor of high-density so close to estate-density properties, but could be in favor of RM-6.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Keele, Mr. Prestwich confirmed that an RM-6 or RM-8 development would still require private roads and an HOA. Commissioner Keele stated that there would be an HOA regardless. She understands their cons, but they also have benefits like maintaining uniformity and the ability to restrict rentals. She liked the fact that there was no access from Redwood Road and believed that the development was a good idea, but she would prefer RM-6 or RM-8.

Commissioner Matheson stated that he had lived in Riverton for 30 years and loves the City. The days of large lots were mostly over, but it would be out of place to transition from single-family housing to the proposed development. He was not in favor of the proposal. An RM-6 development would be preferable. His son paid \$420,000 for a townhome in Eagle Mountain, so he understood that single-family homes would be more expensive in Riverton. However, he did not believe that RM-14 belonged in the area.

Chair Park stated that the proposed development was very well thought out. However, the conceptual Site Plan was different from what was originally proposed. Rezoning the property to RM-14 would allow the applicant to return with a Site Plan for more units in a different layout, or to sell the property to a new developer who could do so. He does not believe that affordable housing exists in Riverton's market, which is unfortunate because it will be difficult for his children to live where they were raised. The State was requiring maximum density under the guise of affordable housing and threatening to force higher density on cities. The Housing Commissioner had indicated that they were in favor of 30 units per acre abutting a State road, and the subject property abutted a State road.

Riverton was approaching buildout, but acting on projects like the one proposed benefited the City in that not approving them ran the risk of the State forcing approval of even higher density. The City Council was feeling pressure from both citizens and the State, and the State posed a genuine threat. A balance had to be maintained in how projects along State corridors were developed. The Planning Commission would be involved in the General Plan update and help come up with a plan that would reflect the type of City they wanted at buildout.

Chair Park was not in favor of RM-14 because the proposal and property ownership could change, and the end result could be far worse, but that could also happen due to the State Legislature. He recommended that the item be continued or tabled until after the City Council determined the appropriate General Plan designation for the area.

Commissioner Cluff stated that there were reasonable arguments both for and against the project. It was a political decision, which was the City Council's area. The Planning Commission is a quasi-administrative body, and in that capacity, she believed a recommendation should be made so the City Council could make the final decision. Chair Park noted that the City Council is not obligated to accept the Commission's recommendation.

Commissioner Matheson stated that it would be a disservice to table the item. He believed that the Planning Commission should vote on the item and forward it to the City Council. His sense was that the recommendation would be for denial. Commissioner Cluff stated that she would likely vote against the motion, as it was important to highlight that there were good arguments on both sides of the issue.

Motion language was discussed. Mr. Carter confirmed that the Planning Commission could recommend an alternate density. However, given the unique size and shape of the property, any density recommendations would not have the same level of planning and would be speculative at best. The obvious choice would be to simply recommend denial.

**Commissioner Matheson moved that the Planning Commission recommend DENIAL of Application PLZ-26-4002, "Majestic Homes Rezone," by Changing the General Plan Designation to High Density Residential and Rezoning the Subject Property to RM-14. Commissioner Beck seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Commissioner Marzo–Yes, Commissioner Cluff–No, Chair Park–No, Commissioner Beck–Yes, Commissioner Keele–No, Commissioner Matheson–Yes. The motion failed.**

Chair Park stated that he shared Commissioner Cluff's reasons for voting against the motion but would be willing to reconsider, as the objections were on the record. Commissioner Keele stated that she voted against the motion due to the imminent danger of State action to force higher density. Commissioner Cluff stated that of all high-density options, townhomes are more attractive to families, and their residents tend to have a

good sense of community. She had seen their benefits but was unsure of allowing them in this location. There were strong reasons both for and against the proposal.

Commissioner Matheson indicated that he was opposed to changing the General Plan. Chair Park stated that it was a valid point given the upcoming General Plan review. Commissioner Cluff stated that she did not like the lack of collaboration with the surrounding neighborhood. Other developers had achieved great success by discussing what might be a better fit with neighbors, as evidenced by the development across the street from the subject property.

**Commissioner Matheson moved that the Planning Commission recommend DENIAL of Application PLZ-26-4002, "Majestic Homes Rezone," by Changing the General Plan Designation to High Density Residential and Rezoning the Subject Property to RM-14. Commissioner Marzo seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Commissioner Marzo–Yes, Commissioner Cluff–Yes, Chair Park–No, Commissioner Beck–Yes, Commissioner Keele–No, Commissioner Matheson–Yes. The motion passed by a vote of 4-to-2.**

- B. "KING REZONE," PLZ-26-4004, AN APPLICATION TO REZONE 0.49 ACRES LOCATED AT 13882 AND 13392 SOUTH TRESTLE LANE, AND A PORTION OF 13400 SOUTH TRESTLE LANE AND 2426 WEST 13400 SOUTH, FROM THE RR-22 (LOW-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL, ½ ACRE MINIMUM LOT SIZE), TO THE R-4 (MEDIUM-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL, 10,000 SQUARE FOOT MINIMUM LOT SIZE). APPLICATION IS ALSO TO AMEND THE GENERAL PLAN FROM ESTATE-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL TO MEDIUM-DENSITY RESIDENTIAL. APPLICANT – DAVID KING.**

Mr. Prestwich presented the Staff Report and reviewed the aerial, General Plan, and Zoning Maps. The subject property consisted of multiple parcels, which were currently designated Low-Density Residential and zoned RR-22. The applicant had requested that the property be designated Medium-Density Residential, like the parcels to the west and rezoned to R-4. Nearby properties were zoned R-4, R-3, and RR-22, and solid fencing would be required between the subject property and the adjacent RR-22 parcel.

Photographs of the subject property were reviewed. It included vacant land and an existing nonconforming duplex. Trestle Lane formerly occupied the City-owned portion of the property, which had been vacant since 2010. That parcel was zoned RR-22 but was not large enough to accommodate two 0.50-acre lots. The applicant hoped to purchase the parcel to combine with his property for future development. Mr. Prestwich noted that the City Council had not yet decided to sell the property.

Notices were sent to property owners within 1,000 feet of the subject property, and several calls and emails were received. One neighbor expressed concern about the narrow

section of Trestle Lane in front of the subject property, which creates a hazard if vehicles are parked on the street. However, that issue would be addressed in the Site Plan review.

In response to a question from Chair Park, Mr. Prestwich confirmed that the adjacent property to the east was zoned R-4.

Chair Park asked why the width of Trestle Lane was not maintained when the road was moved. Mr. Prestwich reported that some improvements were constructed within the last few years, and there were existing utilities that limited location options. In response to a question from Commissioner Matheson, he confirmed that the narrow road section had curb and gutter. He believed that the section was only two feet narrower than typical roads, which was common on roads with similar constraints.

Chair Park asked about the previously approved flag lot in the area. Mr. Prestwich reported that the private lane was installed, and he believed that the lot had been sold.

The applicant, David King, stated that he owns the existing duplex, and he hoped to improve the aesthetic of the neighborhood. The property was currently very dry and had a lot of weeds. The utilities would be moved at his expense. The duplex would remain, but the shed would be removed. He planned to build a single-family home on the new lot that would be created from portions of his existing property and the land he would acquire from the City.

In response to a question from Commissioner Matheson, Mr. King stated that he had been discussing purchasing the property from the City for six years.

Commissioner Cluff asked where the driveway would be located. Mr. King stated that it would be on the north side of the house, alongside the existing driveway.

In response to a question raised by Chair Park, Mr. King stated that the duplex was a rental property. He had no plans to live in the future single-family home, and it may become a rental as well.

Chair Park opened the public hearing.

*Charlie Newman* stated that Trestle Lane was 29 feet wide at the property, and residents park on the road. Trestle Lane is a school bus route, with three to four school buses each day. He had spoken with several neighbors who indicated that they had almost been hit by traffic. It is a blind corner and is not wide enough for street parking. If a house is built on the property, the driveway will either need to be at least 20 feet from the intersection or be located on 13400 South.

*Tyler Lemons* stated that he lives directly north of the subject property and was shocked that no one had been struck by traffic. However, he supported Mr. King's proposal. It

would be a challenging and probably expensive project, but he was in favor of improving the property.

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

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Cluff, City Engineer, Matt Cassel stated that residents can submit a request for the Traffic Calming Committee to investigate the area. If the road is 29 feet wide, they may consider limiting street parking. However, if the roadway is too wide, drivers may take the corner at speed, which could cause a higher incidence of accidents.

Commissioner Keele asked if widening the roadway into the City-owned parcel would be helpful. Mr. Cassel stated that widening the road greater than 29 feet may induce higher speeds.

In response to a question raised by Chair Park, Mr. Carter stated that although the width was a concern, it is a functioning road, and the narrow portion may serve as a traffic-calming measure. Opening the road was a concern for residents on both sides of Trestle Lane, and the Traffic Committee has many tools available that would not require widening the road.

**Commissioner Cluff moved that the Planning Commission recommend APPROVAL of Application PLZ-26-4004, “King Rezone,” by Changing the General Plan Designation to Medium Density Residential and Rezoning the Subject Properties to R-4. Commissioner Beck seconded the motion. The motion passed with unanimous consent of the Commission.**

**C. “DOUGH RE MI LLC,” PLZ-26-2023, A CONDITIONAL USE APPLICATION FOR A HOME OCCUPATION TO SELL COOKIES AND PASTRIES FROM A RESIDENCE LOCATED AT 1837 WEST 13070 SOUTH. APPLICANT – TODD NEILSON.**

City Planner, Lisa Halverson, presented the Staff Report and indicated that the application was for a home bakery to be located at 1837 West 13070 South in the Pueblo Del Montana Subdivision in southeastern Riverton. The property is approximately 0.25 acres and zoned R-4. Adjoining properties are similarly zoned. The lot has approximately 80 feet of frontage on 13070 South. The home is a single story with a two-car attached garage, a drive approach on the northeast side of the home, and an extra-wide parking area.

The applicant, Todd Neilson, had requested a Conditional Use Permit to use a room in the basement to store and sell baked goods such as cookies and pastries. Customers would place orders online and schedule delivery. Mr. McAndrew would be baking at a commissary kitchen in American Fork, and there would be no customers or deliveries at

the home. The applicant's father owns the home, and both gentlemen participate in the business. There would be no non-resident employees.

The Site Plan was reviewed, indicating basement shelving and a refrigerator/freezer in the business portion. Less than 50% of the basement will be used by the business.

Ms. Halverson reported that a Conditional Use Permit was required as the business deals with food or drink. Notices were sent to neighboring property owners, and no comments were received.

Chair Park invited the applicant to the podium. Sheldon Neilson stated that he was trying to help his son get ahead economically. It would be a part-time business as the Utah Department of Agriculture limits annual sales to \$50,000, after which the business would need to move to a different location. They researched how to run the business profitably and legally and determined that utilizing a commissary kitchen would allow them to sell to restaurants and coffee shops, whereas cottage businesses can only sell to individuals.

In response to a question raised by Chair Park, Mr. Neilson confirmed that no customers would come to the home.

Commissioner Matheson asked about the commissary kitchen. Mr. Neilson stated that commissary kitchens are certified by either the Utah Department of Agriculture or Salt Lake County Health Department, and he will rent time to use their equipment for baking. As it is an approved production facility, he will be able to sell goods commercially. They rent equipment only; Dough Re Mi will provide its own material and do its own baking. Goods will then be stored at the home prior to delivery to customers.

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

**Chair Park moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE Application PLZ-26-2023, "Dough Re Mi LLC," Conditional Use – Home Occupation Permit, at 1837 West 13070 South, 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 other outside agency 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. **Applicant may use up to 50% of the basement for business use.**
6. **No visitors in conjunction with the home occupation before 7:00 a.m. or after 7:00 p.m.**

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

- D. **“ROCK RIDGE AMENDED,” PLZ-26-8011, AN APPLICATION TO AMEND THE ROCK RIDGE MASTER SITE PLAN FOR COMMERCIAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT 12653 SOUTH 3600 WEST, THE PROPOSAL IS FOR CHANGES TO LOTS 6 AND 7. APPLICANT – BRANDON HARRIS, ALTUS DEVELOPMENT GROUP.**

Mr. Prestwich presented the Staff Report and indicated that the subject property was located on the corner of 3600 West and 12600 South. America First Credit Union and Goddard School are also part of the development.

The Master Site Plan was reviewed. Lot 7 was originally proposed as a hotel, but no interested parties had stepped forward. The applicant was now requesting a Site Plan amendment to change the use and layout. The proposal would modify Lots 6 and 7 for Office and Medical Office uses, which would require additional parking stalls as well as modification of the parking configuration and traffic patterns. Mr. Prestwich reported that the amended Master Site Plan met all requirements, and Final Site Plans for each lot would be submitted to the Planning Commission for review and approval. To address concerns about additional traffic on 3600 West, the City Engineer added a Condition of Approval requiring that mitigation measures be included in the Final Site Plans.

In response to a question from Chair Park, Mr. Prestwich confirmed that the two-story medical office building would require more parking stalls than a hotel.

Phillip Winston spoke on behalf of the applicant. His company typically purchases land next to hospitals to build physicians' offices. Doctors are great tenants who never leave.

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

Chair Park stated that he looked forward to reviewing the Final Site Plan as Mr. Winston and his company build beautiful structures.

**Commissioner Marzo moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE PLZ-26-8011, “Rock Ridge Amended Master Site Plan,” subject to the following:**

**Conditions:**

- 1. Approval A Final Plan for each phase shall be reviewed by Staff and approved by the Planning Commission before construction may begin.**
- 2. Architecture and landscaping shall meet Riverton City requirements and will be reviewed during each Final Plan application.**
- 3. Shared Access or Cross Access agreements for all internal properties shall be formalized and recorded with each Final Plan.**
- 4. Storm drainage systems and accommodations comply with the Riverton City Standards and Ordinances, and with the recommendations of the Riverton City Engineer.**
- 5. The site, utilities, and structures shall comply with any and all applicable Riverton City Standards and Ordinances, including the International Building and Fire Codes.**
- 6. Proposed Final Plans which introduce buildings or uses different than indicated on the Master Site Plan, and this Amendment may be required to complete additional engineering studies for traffic. 3600 West impacts may result in requirements for traffic mitigation including turn movement restrictions on 3600 West.**
- 7. Mitigation for increased traffic shall be included with the first Final Site Plan Application for Lot 6 or Lot 7.**

**Commissioner Keele seconded the motion. Commissioner Cluff abstained. The motion passed with unanimous consent of the Commission.**

Mr. Prestwich reported that Site Plans may be submitted soon for the restaurant pads in the development.

- E. “TABLE OF COMMERCIAL USES,” PLZ-26-5004, AN APPLICATION TO AMEND THE TABLE OF COMMERCIAL USES FOUND IN RIVERTON CITY CODE 18.190.010 TO ALLOW “AMBULANCE SERVICES” AS A CONDITIONAL USE IN THE C-G (GATEWAY COMMERCIAL) ZONE. APPLICANT – GOLD CROSS AMBULANCE.**

Mr. Prestwich reported that the agenda contained a typographical error, as the application was to allow Ambulance Services as a conditional use. The applicant, Gold Cross Ambulance, planned to build a facility in Riverton that would have two garage bays, sleeping quarters, a kitchen, and an activity room. The company transports patients between facilities and does not provide emergency services, so they typically do not need to use sirens.

The applicant was considering a property on 12600 South to the west of Riverton High School. However, the Text Amendment would apply to all properties in the C-G Zone and would modify the ordinance as follows:

1. "Ambulances" would be removed from the "Motor Vehicle Services" category in the Table of Uses.
2. A new category for "Ambulance Service/Emergency Medical Services Facility" would be added as a Conditional Use in the C-G, C-R, and PCC Zones only.
3. The following definition would be added to RCC § 18.05.030:
  - a. **Ambulance Service/Emergency Medical Services Facility.** A facility used for the deployment, staging, and housing of ambulances and emergency medical personnel, excluding hospitals and emergency rooms. The use may include administrative offices, staff living facilities, and vehicle storage but shall not include routine patient intake or long-term patient care.
4. Add the following conditions to RCC § 18.195.060: Special Standards and Considerations Governing Particular Uses:
  - o **(5) Ambulance Service/Emergency Medical Services Facility.** Conditional use approval shall be given based on compliance with all other standards in this chapter, and upon compliance with the following conditions and considerations:
    - a. Vehicles stored indoors or screened.
    - b. Siren use limited to emergencies.
    - c. No walk-in public services.
    - d. Adequate parking and circulation.
    - e. Compatible site design and landscaping.

Staff recommended approval of the application with amendments as described. Mr. Prestwich reported that the item was only noticed on the City website. If approved, the applicant would then apply for a Conditional Use Permit, which would be noticed to property owners within 1,000 feet.

Chair Park asked that the Zoning Map be displayed. Mr. Prestwich reported that the zone began on the edges but had spread throughout the City. He then identified all C-G areas in Riverton and confirmed that, if approved, the use would be allowed throughout the C-G Zone.

Commissioner Cluff asked if it would be appropriate to add a condition prohibiting sirens within a certain distance of residences. There is a home very close to the applicant's location, which could be a nuisance. Mr. Prestwich stated that the violation must be easy to identify and enforce. For example, prohibiting sirens until they leave the property may be easier to enforce than a specific distance.

Property owner, Gordon Clinovic and Mike Orfanakis of Gold Cross Ambulance spoke on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Orfanakis stated that their intent was to build a station on the property to better service facilities in the southwest corner of the Salt Lake Valley. It is an ideal location, near Riverton Hospital and with good access to other facilities. They currently had ambulances in Riverton but no station, and the station would give crews a place to rest and allow them to better service local facilities. He did not believe the Text Amendment would open other areas of the City because emergency medical services are regulated by the State, which recently granted final approval authority to cities. Riverton contracts with Unified Fire Authority ("UFA"), which would continue to provide emergency services. Gold Cross Ambulance performs inter-facility transfers and offers backup when needed.

Mr. Clinovic stated that no sirens or lights would be used until the vehicle was on 12600 South. The facility would look exactly like other buildings in the development, and the other property owners had written letters of support for the application.

Commissioner Matheson asked about the difference between Gold Cross Ambulance's services and those provided by UFA. Mr. Orfanakis stated that their role changes depending on location. In Salt Lake City, they assist the fire department with 911 transports. They do not respond to those calls in Riverton unless requested by UFA. Otherwise, they strictly provide inter-facility transports. They expected to perform 20 to 30 transports daily from the facility, which will be staffed with advance life support paramedic units. They work closely with UFA throughout Salt Lake County, and Fire Chief, Dominic Burchett had submitted a letter of approval for the application. In response to a follow-up Commissioner Matheson, Mr. Orfanakis confirmed that transports also occur at night.

Chair Park asked for more details on the anticipated call volume. Mr. Orfanakis stated that Riverton Hospital would be their primary destination, followed by Primary Children's Hospital in Lehi and various smaller facilities. They initially expected between 20 and 30 calls per day from the facility, which was in line with current volume. They were currently rotating ambulances through the City and would like to have dedicated ambulances in the area. The hospital had allowed them to use its facilities, but they would like to give their crews a place to call home for their 24-hour shifts. It will be their tenth station in the Salt Lake Valley. Chair Park commended Mr. Orfanakis on the plans, as it will be better for employees and improve patient care.

Chair Park asked if there were any anticipated traffic issues. Mr. Clinovic stated that there would be a direct driveway from the garage to the street, and it was wide enough for two

lanes of traffic. Ambulances will usually make a right-hand turn toward Riverton Hospital. The zone allowed car dealerships and vehicle service. The facility will have equipment to wash the ambulances, but they will not be serviced on the property.

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

Chair Park recommended that the text be modified to require vehicles to be stored inside, not merely screened, and that the use be limited to inter-facility transfers, with no emergency response permitted. Gold Cross Ambulance and Unified Fire Authority had a standing agreement for mutual aid but it was the option of last resort. South Jordan, Draper, Bluffdale, and other fire-based providers would be called upon first. After discussion, it was then recommended that a contract with a 911 provider be required. Mr. Carter indicated that maximum operational standards would have to be stated and neutrally applied. However, the C-G Zone allowed fairly intensive uses.

Commissioner Cluff asked if Chair Park's concern was about the potential for vehicles responding to emergency response calls and using sirens at all hours. Chair Park stated that the business model was for inter-facility transfers. The call volume was potentially higher than 911 response, but they were lower-priority calls that were typically planned and did not require lights and sirens until they reached the first facility. Mr. Orfanakis reported that approximately 5% of calls were anticipated to be emergency response. Chair Park stated that if UFA decided to stop providing ambulance services, a private company could begin running 911 service out of that type of facility.

Commissioner Matheson stated that if the use were approved as conditional, each Conditional Use Permit application would then be evaluated on its own merits. Mr. Carter stated that the approved use must include standards for approval, and those operational standards could not be avoided. The use may need to be studied further to determine if it was a good fit for the C-G Zone.

Chair Park stated that the text was fine based on the current operational environment. However, should that change and a private ambulance service becomes the 911 response service, it could be problematic.

Commissioner Cluff asked if a fair condition would be to evaluate noise concerns for a specific facility. For example, the applicant could be asked how often they respond to emergencies with sirens on. The Planning Commission could then evaluate their answer to determine if the use were appropriate for the specific location. Mr. Carter stated that a condition could be set that the use of sirens shall not unduly cause disturbance to the neighborhood. However, the Commission would then need to decide if the noise was excessive and how to mitigate the issue.

Chair Park stated that he supported Gold Cross Ambulance having a facility in Riverton for their staff. He also did not want to limit their ability to respond to a 911 call when needed.

Commissioner Cluff asked about existing noise restrictions in the C-G Zone. Mr. Prestwich stated that if the use were conditional but no noise limits were specified in code, noise concerns would be a weak argument for denial. However, the Planning Commission was discussing a hypothetical future scenario. If State Code or UFA changed its arrangement, the City could amend the ordinance in response.

In response to a question from Chair Park, Mr. Orfanakis stated that the State Legislature recently passed a bill giving cities the ability to choose their 911 and inter-facility providers. UFA could decide to perform all inter-facility transfers in Riverton, but they had chosen to focus on 911 service and contract with Gold Cross Ambulance for inter-facility transfers. If they did make that decision, the City would have to approve it.

Commissioner Keele stated that most C-G properties are located on main arteries. If the concern were noise from sirens, they would be pulling out of the parking lot onto a main artery where they should have lights and sirens on.

Chair Park stated that, based on the information provided by Mr. Orfanakis, his original recommendation to limit the use to inter-facility transfers was no longer necessary. However, he recommended that the vehicles be housed inside the facility, and a contract with UFA be required. Mr. Orfanakis stated that he was unsure of the specific contract, but they had a strong working relationship, and Chief Burchett had written a letter of support for the facility.

Commissioner Cluff recommended that a condition be added prohibiting sirens until the ambulance reaches the main road.

**Commissioner Cluff moved that the Planning Commission recommend APPROVAL of Application PLZ-26-5004, amending Section 18.90.010, Table of Commercial Uses, with the amendments as described herein:**

- 1. Strike the words “or screened” from vehicle storage requirements.**
- 2. Sirens may not come on until the vehicle is on a public road.**

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

**3. DECISION ITEMS**

**A. "VSM EAST LOT 5," PLZ-26-8013, A DETAIL (FINAL) PLAN FOR LOT 5 OF VILLAGE AT SOUTH MOUNTAIN EAST AT 3988 WEST 13400 SOUTH, IN THE SLR PROJECT AREA. APPLICANT – NATE REINER WITH CIR CIVIL ENGINEERING.**

Mr. Prestwich presented the Detail Plan and reported that the subject property was located at the intersection of Old Liberty Way and 13400 South. The Village at South Mountain West was built out, and The Village at South Mountain East had two remaining pads, including the subject property on Lot 5. The property was in the SLR project area, which had specific approval requirements, including approval from the master developer and property owner, Land Reserve. That approval was included with the application. Staff had determined that the Detail Plan met all City requirements.

The Master Site Plan and elevations were reviewed, and Mr. Prestwich indicated that only areas outlined in magenta on 4050 West and 13400 South were public; all internal streets were private. The Lot 5 Site Plan included a drive-through on one end and parking stalls in front of the building. All parking and landscaping requirements had been met. Some engineering redlines remained, but Staff was confident that they would be cleared and construction could begin soon. Landscaping would be low impact with rock, trees, and shrubs. All architecture met both the SLR agreement and the current City ordinance. Staff recommended approval with conditions as outlined in the Staff Report.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Matheson, Mr. Prestwich reported that an incorrect parking diagram was included in the meeting packet, and Staff would confirm that site parking met City ordinance. The 10 parking stall maximum between islands and the requirement for 20 trees per acre could not be changed, and he always verified those numbers after construction. In response to a follow-up question from Chair Park, he confirmed that the 10-stall maximum was consistent across all commercial zones. A variance could only be granted for storefronts.

Nate Reiner of CIR Engineering and Aaron Hardy of Clemente Group spoke on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Reiner stated that they were excited to move forward with the project. He would ensure that there were only 10 parking stalls between islands. In response to a question raised by Chair Park, he reported that tenants would be Domino's Pizza, City Vet, and Hello Sugar, plus two smaller food establishments. They did not have a completion date but anticipated that construction would begin before winter.

Mr. Prestwich presented corrected drawings with 9.5-foot-wide parking stalls and 10 stalls between islands.

**Commissioner Cluff moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE Application PLZ-26-803, "VSM East Lot 5" Detail (Final) Plan, to be located at 3988 West 13400 South, subject to the following:**

**Conditions:**

- 1. This Detailed Plan shall comply with the terms and conditions approved with the Block Scale Plan, with the SLR Project Area Master Development Agreement, and with the approvals of the Master Developer.**
- 2. Site Improvements and the Building, including the exterior finish, dumpster enclosures, and landscaping, and all other improvements shall be consistent with the plans presented to the Planning Commission except where otherwise noted.**
- 3. Rooftop mechanical shall be screened from view.**
- 4. Wall-mounted service panels shall be painted to match the building.**
- 5. The site and structures shall comply with any and all applicable Riverton City Standards and Ordinances, including the International Building and Fire Codes.**
- 6. Applicant shall correct or resolve the remaining Staff redlines.**
- 7. Storm drainage systems and accommodations shall comply with Riverton City Standards and Ordinances, and with the recommendations of the Riverton City Engineering Division. An offsite Storm Drain Pond must be built by others prior to this site getting occupancy from Riverton City.**
- 8. The Applicant must create and agree to follow a Long-Term Storm Water Management Plan according to Riverton City standards and ordinances prior to receiving building occupancy.**
- 9. A Land Disturbance Permit must be issued by the City prior to any construction grading on the site.**
- 10. The applicant must obtain final approval from utility providers.**
- 11. The owner of VSM East Lot 5 shall maintain the parkstrip along the Lot 5 frontage on 13400 South Street.**

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

**4. MINUTES**

**A. MINUTES FROM THE APRIL 23, 2026, PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING.**

**Commissioner Beck moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of April 23, 2026, as presented. Commissioner Matheson seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.**

**5. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:35 PM.