

MINUTES OF THE DRAPER CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 2026, IN THE DRAPER CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

PARTICIPATING: Andrew Adams, Chair
Lisa Fowler, Vice-Chair
Commission Member Susan Nixon
Commission Member Mary Squire
Alternate Commission Member Laura Fidler
Alternate Commission Member Christine Green

EXCUSED: Commission Member Gary Ogden
Commissioner Member Kendra Shirey
Traci Gundersen, City Attorney

STAFF: Jennifer Jastremsky, Community Development Director
Todd Draper, Planning Manager
Nick Whittaker, City Planner
Lori Stout, Executive Assistant
Brien Maxfield, City Engineer
Spencer DuShane, Assistant City Attorney

6:30 PM Business Meeting

Chair Andrew Adams called the meeting to order at 6:34 PM.

1. Items for Commission Consideration.

A. Public Hearing: Fratto Farms Development Agreement, Zoning Map Amendment and Land Use Map Amendment Requests (Legislative Items)

On the request of Troy Dana of Westland Development, representing Fratto Farms, LLC, A development Agreement, a Land Use Map Amendment from the Residential Medium-Density to Residential High Density land use designation, and a Zoning Map Amendment from the RA2 (Residential Agricultural, 20,000 ft² min. lot size) to RM2 (Multiple-Family Residential, 12 dwelling units per acre maximum) zone for approximately 2.03 acres, located at approximately 791 E. 12200 S. Known as applications 2025-0013- MA, 2025-0014-MA and 2025-0299-DA. Staff Contact: Nick Whittaker, (801)576-6522, Nick.Whittaker@Draperutah.gov.

City Planner Nick Whittaker presented the staff report. The Land Use Map Amendment would allow higher-density development, a Zoning Map Amendment to allow smaller lots, and a Development Agreement to create a 15-lot residential development of detached single-family homes.

Vicinity, aerial, land use, and zoning maps were displayed. The subject property is located at the intersection of 12200 South and 800 East. Its land use designation is Residential Medium Density, with surrounding properties designated both residential and commercial. The proposed Land Use Map Amendment would change the land use designation to Residential High Density. The Zoning Map Amendment would rezone the property from RA2, which has a 20,000 square foot minimum lot

size, to RM2, which allows for up to 12 dwelling units per acre or approximately 24 dwelling units on the 2.3-acre property.

Key components of the proposed Development Agreement were reviewed.

- No more than 15 lots are permitted in the development.
- The housing type is limited to detached single-family homes.
- Each lot is limited to one detached single-family home.
- Maximum building height of 35 feet.
- Walkability and pedestrian design are incorporated.
- The developer will provide sidewalks, curb, gutter, park strip and street trees along 800 East and 12200 South.
- Design standards ensure that the development will not be closed off from the community and require some lots to face 800 East.
- A Master Plan is incorporated into the agreement.
- Variances from RM2 setback requirements are specified.
- Driveway depth requirements had been modified for three lots to allow five feet of the 20-foot driveway to be located in the public right-of-way.

The Master Plan and site photographs were reviewed. Two homes will face 800 East, and nine homes will be accessed via a through street from 12200 South to 800 East.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Squire, Mr. Whittaker confirmed that 35 feet is the standard height for residential zones. Commissioner Squire expressed concern about allowing very large homes on the small lots. Mr. Whittaker stated that there had been no discussions on how the homes would look, but they were designed to be smaller.

Commissioner Fowler noted that the Public Works Department had not signed off on Page 12 of the staff report. City Engineer, Brien Maxfield, reported that he had been out of the office but had since reviewed and signed off on the staff report. In response to a follow-up question from Commissioner Fowler, it was confirmed that all units in the nearby townhome development were visible on the aerial map.

Chair Adams asked if the property is inside the Kimballs Lane Station Area Plan. Mr. Whittaker reported that approximately 50% of the property is in a 0.50-mile station area radius. Community Development Director Jennifer Jastremsky stated that the plan did not concentrate on that specific area of the grid. State law requires the City to review the area within the radius and determine which properties are suitable for redevelopment. There are existing residential and commercial properties within the radius that are not likely to be redeveloped. When the City evaluated the areas around Kimballs Lane Station, they focused on the farm and the actual Utah Transit Authority ("UTA") property.

Chair Adams asked if State law or the station area plan affected density on the subject property. Ms. Jastremsky reported that the 0.50-mile radius is based on walking distance, and the State required that cities reevaluate density and development within it. The City focused on properties that they

know will be redeveloped rather than speculating on what individual private property owners may do in the future.

Commissioner Fidler stated that when the property was last considered, the Planning Commission discussed performing an overall assessment of expected development in the area. She asked if updated information was available. Mr. Whittaker stated that the property is within the transit-oriented development area, and higher density would be appropriate to meet those development goals. Ms. Jastremsky added that there were two hearings in 2025, each with a different proposal for the subject property. The City Council met with neighboring property owners, and staff presented information on existing densities and land uses, but no master planning was done for the specific area. Commissioner Nixon indicated that neither of the two prior applications went to the City Council.

Tyler Kirk of Think Architecture spoke on behalf of the applicant. No homes had been permanently designed, but he anticipated a maximum size of 2,500 square feet, with some homes under 2,000 square feet. The Commissioners discussed whether the maximum size was specified in the Development Agreement and how large the homes could potentially be.

Commissioner Squire remarked that the city had made many concessions in the Development Agreement and, in return, was only receiving curb and gutter that were already required by City Code. Many lots in Draper have very large homes built to the minimum setbacks, and in this case, there were no minimum setbacks. In response to a question from Chair Adams, Mr. Whittaker reported that, without the Development Agreement in place, rezoning the property to RM2 would allow up to 24 units. Chair Adams indicated that the 15-unit limitation was a developer concession. Mr. Whittaker added that the housing type would also be limited to detached single-family homes only.

Chair Adams stated that when the last application for the subject property was reviewed, the Planning Commission was concerned about the amount of traffic the proposed 24 homes would generate. He believed that the proposals were improving with each iteration. However, he agreed with Commissioner Squire that they do not want large homes with a six-foot gap between them. Mr. Kirk stated that the standard side setbacks were not modified.

Commissioner Fowler asked if the applicant had engaged with neighboring property owners. Mr. Kirk stated that he did not know.

Commissioner Nixon stated that when the Planning Commission last reviewed a proposal for the subject property, they were concerned that it would alter the neighborhood's general character. At that time, the Commission expressed a preference for R4 zoning. She agreed with Commissioner Squire on what the city would receive under the agreement. The Site Plan showed a park on Lot 15, but the Development Agreement specified that a home could be developed on the lot, so including it in the plan was somewhat deceptive.

DCMC Section 9-5-200(C)4 specifies that a Development Agreement must include:

A statement of the benefits and value the Development Agreement will have for the City as a whole, including, but not limited to, assurances of design standards, dedication and

improvement of open space, parks, trails, amenities, or infrastructure such as public rights-of-way or utilities.

Commissioner Nixon asserted that if the park was not required, that criterion was not met. The proposal also requested encroachment on the public right-of-way for the driveways at Lots 10, 11, and 15. She indicated that the three lots should have a minimum 18-foot length driveway, not including encroachment into the public right-of-way, which is the standard parking stall length. In response to a question from Chair Adams, Mr. Whittaker stated that the Site Plan was included in the Development Agreement. Chair Adams stated that the Lot 10 driveway could be moved to the interior roadway.

Commissioner Nixon stated that she believes new projects should meet the City Code. She was not in favor of allowing a private development to encroach on the City right-of-way, especially when it is in opposition to the approval criteria, but would be in favor of allowing reduced setbacks for Lots 1 through 5. Mr. Kirk stated that the proposal would allow for ramblers on those lots. If the driveways did not extend into the right-of-way, those homes would have a smaller footprint and need to be taller. Chair Adams stated that the developer had presented several proposals with progressively lower density, but it would make sense to either allow smaller setbacks or reduce the number of lots so that the driveways could be outside the public right-of-way. Otherwise, cars parked in those driveways would block the right-of-way.

Chair Adams opened the Public Hearing.

Dave Hansen stated that he has attended several public hearings regarding the property and that the proposal has improved. However, he preferred that the current zoning remain in place. When the property was purchased, the owner was aware of its zoning. He was not opposed to the property being developed, but was opposed to the zoning being changed solely for someone's profit. Neighbors were vocally opposed to the change. Mr. Dana had not reached out to him.

Kimberly Henrie stated that she lives in the neighborhood, and Mr. Dana had not spoken with neighbors about the plan. It is similar to one that was presented previously. She was opposed to changing the zoning as it could set a precedent for other properties in the area. Her home was built 12 years previously, and they were told that the zoning would not change. She understands that projects around the train station should be higher density, but Edge Homes is building over 300 homes down the street. The current proposal was better than previous ones, but she believed it should be handled through the Development Agreement without changing the zoning.

Jim Duncan stated that he lives adjacent to the subject property. He flew a drone across the property, and his calculations differed from the application. He also believes 35 feet is too tall. He has accepted that he will lose his view of the mountains, but he does not want to look at a 35-foot-tall home from his backyard. He had spoken with Mr. Dana several times and conveyed information from those conversations to his neighbors. Mr. Dana indicated that the homes would be one-story with basements, but he wanted small lofts above the garages.

Jerry Thomas stated that he lives directly east of the subject property, and his two-story house is approximately 22 feet tall. He asked if the 35-foot measurement was to the peak of the roof. The

road will be widened at some point, which will affect the driveways that encroach into the right-of-way. He appreciated that Mr. Dana had decreased the proposed density, but he would prefer that the development have only eight homes.

Cindy Romero stated that she lives west of the subject property. She was concerned about traffic, parking, and spot zoning. She has lived in her home for over 50 years, and six small children live there as well. The houses do not need to be 35 feet tall. She also believes there should only be 12 to 14 homes. Mr. Dana knew that he was buying property in an 0.50-acre zone, and it should not be rezoned.

Ralph Broderick stated that he does not live in the neighborhood, but he owns a larger property one-half block from the proposed development. He would not want a similar development on his property. When it is developed, it will be with 0.50-acre lots to keep the neighborhood as-is. Residents have lived in the area for a long time, and the proposal went against what they were told when they moved to Draper. The City Council will not get in trouble with Governor Cox if they downsize the project. His property is closer to the TRAX station, and he hopes the City Council does not tell him that he must develop it with high-density housing. He believes that 35 feet is too tall. Most houses in the area are one story, and the homes will look like towers.

Lois Duncan stated that she lives near the subject property, and two of her bedrooms will have a view of the development. She believes that allowing two-story homes will invade her privacy. She was also concerned about traffic and whether people could safely walk down the street.

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

In response to a question from Chair Adams, Mr. Whittaker confirmed that the current zoning would allow four homes. All residential zones have a maximum height of 35 feet, measured from the average finished grade to the midpoint of the peak. Chair Adams reviewed zoning and noted that the developer did not want to ruin their land. In his experience, four \$2 million homes would not sell in the area, and continuing to deny applications due to public clamor may result in the final development being worse than the proposal. He viewed the proposal as more favorable than another townhome development. In response to his question, Mr. Kirk confirmed that the homes will all have two-car garages.

Chair Adams stated that he had an issue with Lots 10, 11, and 15. If all lots were accessed from within the community, Lots 10 and 11 would need to be combined. Commissioner Nixon pointed out that the Development Agreement requires those homes to face 800 East, which she would not oppose if the driveways did not encroach into the right-of-way.

The Commissioners discussed the proposed Development Agreement. Commissioner Nixon noted that it mentions cottage-style homes, but she could not envision a 35-foot-tall cottage. Cottages would fit the lot size, but the Development Agreement did not specify a square footage requirement. She favored smart planning and believed the proposal had improved, but disagreed with Chair Adams' statement that the proposals would only get worse. The City Council does not have to approve anything. Chair Adams stated that the developer could not be prevented from building a rehabilitation center.

Commissioner Fowler stated that Development Agreements benefit the neighborhood by locking the developer in. However, she believes that eight homes would be a better fit for the property. Commissioner Squire stated that she likes the layout, but the property was better suited to eight to 12 homes. Chair Adams clarified that the Planning Commission could only recommend approval or denial of the application before them.

Ms. Jastremsky suggested that the Planning Commission could include its comments in the recommendation. If they were concerned about driveway width, home size, or building height, that should be included in the motion. Commissioner Nixon stated that she was not comfortable making a positive recommendation with a laundry list of changes. She preferred to vote no. Ms. Jastremsky clarified that the motion for a negative recommendation could be made on the basis that the agreement does not discuss specific items.

Commissioner Nixon stated that 35 feet is a standard residential height, but that does not mean a two-story home will be 35 feet tall. Additionally, views are not protected, and development will happen.

The Commissioners discussed issues that should be called out in the motion. It was noted that the Development Agreement should provide assurances that Lot 15 will be a park, and the number of lots should be reduced due to the problematic driveways on Lots 10, 11, and 15. The Development Agreement also did not meet the fourth criterion for approval. Due to these issues, the majority of the Commission was not comfortable recommending approval of any part of the application.

Chair Adams stated that he believes Draper needs further development, as in the current proposal, and that the subject property is a suitable location for it. In his opinion, it represents a happy medium for affordability.

Land Use Map Amendment

Motion: Commissioner Fowler moved to forward a NEGATIVE recommendation to the City Council for DENIAL of the Land Use Map Amendment, as requested by Troy Dana, Application 2025-0014-MA, based on the following Findings for Denial listed in the Staff Report dated February 24, 2026:

Findings for Denial:

1. The proposed Land Use Map Amendment is not consistent with goals, objectives, and policies of the City's General Plan.
2. The proposed Land Use Map Amendment is not harmonious with the overall character of existing development in the vicinity of the subject property.
3. The proposed Land Use Map Amendment will adversely affect adjacent property.

4. There are not adequate facilities and services intended to serve the subject property, including, but not limited to, roadways, parks and recreation facilities, police and fire protection, schools, stormwater drainage systems, water supplies, and wastewater and refuse collection.
5. The proposed Land Use Map Amendment does not comply with DCMC Section 9-2-020(F).
6. The legislative body may reject any amendment to the General Plan Land Use Map that the legislative body considers appropriate.

Second: Commissioner Nixon seconded the motion.

Vote on Motion: 4-to-1 in favor.

Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstained	Not Participating	Absent
Chair Adams				X	
Fowler	X				
Squire	X				
Nixon	X				
Shirey					X
Ogden					X
Fidler, Alternate		X			
Green, Alternate	X				

Zoning Map Amendment

Motion: Commissioner Squire moved to forward a NEGATIVE recommendation to the City Council for DENIAL of the Zoning Map Amendment, as requested by Troy Dana, Application 2025-013-MA, based on the following Findings for Denial listed in the staff report dated February 24, 2026:

Findings for Denial:

1. The proposed Zoning Map Amendment is not consistent with goals, objectives, and policies of the City's General Plan.
2. The proposed Zoning Map Amendment is not compatible with the subject property's existing Land Use Designation and is not harmonious with the overall character of existing development in the vicinity of the subject property.
3. The proposed Zoning Map Amendment will adversely affect adjacent property.
4. There are not adequate facilities and services intended to serve the subject property, including, but not limited to, roadways, parks and recreation facilities,

police and fire protection, schools, stormwater drainage systems, water supplies, and wastewater and refuse collection.

Second: Commissioner Nixon seconded the motion.

Vote on Motion: 4-to-1 in favor.

Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstained	Not Participating	Absent
Chair Adams				X	
Fowler	X				
Squire	X				
Nixon	X				
Shirey					X
Ogden					X
Fidler, Alternate		X			
Green, Alternate	X				

Development Agreement

Motion: Commissioner Nixon moved to forward a NEGATIVE recommendation to the City Council for DENIAL of the Development Agreement, as requested by Troy Dana, Application 2025-0299-DA, based on the following Findings for Denial listed in the staff report dated February 24, 2026, as well as concerns expressed during the meeting:

Findings for Denial:

- 1. The Development Agreement does not provide for a density range on the property that best meets the interests of the community and the applicant.**

Second: Commissioner Green seconded the motion.

Vote on Motion: 4-to-1 in favor.

Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstained	Not Participating	Absent
Chair Adams				X	
Fowler	X				
Squire	X				
Nixon	X				
Shirey					X
Ogden					X
Fidler, Alternate		X			
Green, Alternate	X				

**B. Public Hearing: Juan Diego Text Amendment Request
(Legislative Item)**

On the request of Joe Colosimo, representing Skaggs Catholic Center, LLC, a request for approval of a Zoning Text Amendment to Table 9-10-090 Draper City Municipal Code (DCMC). The purpose of the request is to allow private schools as a conditional use in all residential zones. Known as application 2026-0006-TA. Staff contact: Maryann Pickering, (801) 576-6391, maryann.pickering@draperutah.gov.

Ms. Jastremsky indicated that the Text Amendment would add private schools as a conditional use in all residential zones. She then reviewed the recommended changes to the text included in the staff report. It was recommended that it be allowed as a conditional use only in the R3 Zone as a small-scale auxiliary use for existing private schools. This would allow an existing private school to expand without allowing new large-scale schools.

In response to a question from Commissioner Fowler, Ms. Jastremsky clarified that the Planning Commission would be making a recommendation to the City Council. If approved, any Conditional Use Permits (“CUP”) would come before the Commission for review. The applicant is a private school, and the property they hope to expand into is in the R3 Zone. The recommended modifications would limit use to the specific project or to auxiliary use on one-acre or larger properties in the R3 Zone.

Commissioner Nixon expressed concern about the practice of creating a Text Amendment for one specific property. Chair Adams agreed. Ms. Jastremsky stated that limiting the size and requiring it to be auxiliary to an existing school would allow existing schools to expand without allowing new schools to come into the zone. Private schools were not currently allowed in residential zones as either permitted or conditional uses, and all existing private schools in those zones are legal nonconforming. Whether private schools should be a permitted or conditional use was discussed. Chair Adams noted that the term “ancillary” should be clearly defined.

In response to a question from Chair Adams, Ms. Jastremsky reported that private schools are permitted as conditional uses in commercial zones.

Commissioner Nixon noted that the original text of the Staff Report would have allowed new private schools in all residential zones, and she favored including the recommended changes.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Fowler, Assistant City Attorney Spencer DuShane reported that “arbitrary and capricious” is a legal standard generally affiliated with punitive behavior by the governing body. The current item was a policy consideration and legislative action. The Planning Commission was free to make any recommendation for which there was a good policy reason, including limiting the use to R3 or other zones. As it is a legislative decision, the City Council may accept or discard their recommendations. A good policy reason for the change is that the City does not want to allow private schools in all residential zones.

The applicant, Joe Colosimo stated that they purchased the property four years ago and demolished the existing structure. They would now like to build a greenhouse there to provide farm-to-table education for their students. They like the R3 Zone because it is a good fit for the area, and they did

not believe that a request to rezone the property to commercial would be approved. He understands the need for a CUP to review requirements for parking, lighting, etc.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Fowler, Mr. Colosimo stated that the property is north of 11800 South and adjacent to the school's west entrance. In addition to the greenhouse, they plan to grow trees for the existing campus. They will start with a 20-by-20-foot greenhouse, and crops and berries will also be planted on the property.

Chair Adams opened the public hearing.

Ava Wagner stated that she and her fellow students, their project manager, their teacher, and principal were all present to speak in favor of the application.

Rylee Logan stated that they are in a class called "Food and You," where they learn where food comes from and sustainable gardening practices. Principal Vanessa Jacobs and teacher Sidney Johnson had also provided a graphic with more information about the project.

Olive Kiger stated that they were all students at Saint John the Baptist Middle School, which has an enrollment of 352 students in grades six through eight. The Skaggs campus educates children from six weeks old to their senior year.

Elle Breen stated that they purchased the lot on the north side of the campus four years ago and would now like to use the land for a farm-to-table project that provides students with a hands-on learning experience. The middle school will lead the project, but the entire campus will take part in and benefit from the program.

Rylee Logan stated the farm-to-table project has three phases. They secured a \$7,500 grant through Captain Planet Foundation and had already started planting seeds, including peppers and lettuce, and hoped to begin the first phase this summer with a small vegetable garden and improve the soil with a cover crop. God asks us to be good stewards of his creation, and we can do that by improving this area, making it beautiful, and pursuing the long-term goal of producing food for the cafeteria.

Ava Wagner stated that she has attended the Skaggs Catholic Center she was in pre-kindergarten. She would love to see the campus grow food for the lunchroom so all students can take part in the learning experience, whether through eating what they grow, having a hands-on experience in the "Food and You" class, or home-based classes.

Camila Morales stated that, as noted in Ecclesiastes, there is a time for all things, and they hoped for the City's support to give them time to plant.

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

Motion: Commissioner Fowler moved forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the City Council for APPROVAL of the Juan Diego Zoning Text Amendment, as requested by Joe Colosimo, representing Skaggs Catholic Center, LLC, Application 2026-0006-TA based on the

Findings and Criteria for Approval listed in the Staff Report dated March 3, 2026, and subject to the following additional recommended modifications:

- 1. The Conditional Use will be allowed in the R3 Zone only;**
- 2. The use will be limited to properties one acre in size or less that are ancillary to an existing private school campus within the City;**
- 3. Site coverage with buildings and structures is limited to no more than 2,000 square feet;**
- 4. Maximum height of buildings and structures limited to 25 feet; and**
- 5. The term “ancillary” is to be defined in the DCMC.**

Second: Commissioner Green seconded the motion.

Vote on Motion: 5-to-0 in favor.

Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstained	Not Participating	Absent
Chair Adams				X	
Fowler	X				
Squire	X				
Nixon	X				
Shirey					X
Ogden					X
Fidler, Alternate	X				
Green, Alternate	X				

C. Public Hearing: Highpoint Office Building II Site Plan and Deviation Requests (Administrative Item)

On the request of Riley Young of Mint Architecture, representing Highpointe Partners, LLC, Site Plan and Deviation Requests for the construction of a new office building on approximately 1.02 acres located at approximately 193 East Highland Drive. Known as Applications 2024-0350-SP and 2024-0217-VAR. Staff contact: Maryann Pickering, (801) 576-6391, maryann.pickering@draperutah.gov.

Planning Manager, Todd Draper, presented the Staff Report. The vicinity, aerial, land use, and zoning maps were reviewed. The subject property is designated Neighborhood Commercial and zoned CR. Changes to the existing site include removing approximately 50% of an existing planter island and replacing it with one additional parking stall. A second Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”) stall will also be added to replace an ADA stall in the parking garage that does not meet minimum size requirements. A total of 310 parking stalls will be provided.

The landscape and site plans were reviewed, as well as elevations and conceptual renderings. All landscaping is in place with the exception of plantings that will be placed near the building. The building will have a walk-out basement with an adjacent seating area. Mr. Draper reported that no floor plans had been provided, so ADA access will be verified prior to issuance of a building permit. All elevations comply with the DCMC.

Mr. Draper reported that a parking deviation had been requested. The applicant's parking study indicated that 317 parking stalls would be required at peak times, which is seven stalls less than provided. If the natural deviation was applied, DCMC would require approximately 322 stalls. Staff reviewed the parking study and recommended a Condition of Approval that the reception center only be allowed to operate after 6:00 p.m. However, it was noted that the parking study specified an opening time of 5:00 p.m., so a modification may be appropriate. All other proposed onsite uses would average 283 stalls.

Mr. Draper next reviewed the recommended Findings for Approval and noted that in the parking study, the engineer indicated that all uses requiring five parking stalls per 1,000 square feet of space would be acceptable in the development. However, staff determined that the engineer's conclusion was not appropriate. Parking needs for specific uses should be addressed on a case-by-case basis. No on-street parking is allowed on Bangerter Highway or Highland Drive, so no overflow parking will be available.

Site photographs were displayed. In response to a question, Mr. Draper stated that no other options to increase the number of parking stalls had been identified. Most of the islands are standard sizes, and the required landscaping on the islands cannot be removed. The overall site has 21% landscaping, and 20% is required by the DCMC.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Squire, Mr. Draper reported that the reception center is an existing business, and a new restriction would be imposed on that business. Although she understood why it was proposed, Commissioner Squire took issue with adding the restriction to an existing business. Mr. Draper clarified that without the restriction in place, the parking study did not justify the deviation. Ms. Jastremsky reported that uses like the reception center typically have different hours, and uses change over time. The Planning Commission should consider whether any conditions could be added that would make them comfortable with the reduced number of parking stalls.

Commissioner Nixon shared Commissioner Squire's concerns. However, without the limitation, the reception center could theoretically be rented out every day for conferences.

Greg Goffin of Thrive Development spoke on behalf of the applicant. Jason Watson of Focus Engineering and Riley Young of Mint Architecture were also present. Mr. Goffin stated that the proposed 25,806-square-foot office building would be on Lot 2. The existing building is approximately 75,000 square feet. Table 4 of the Staff Report classified approximately 5,000 square feet of the building as Personal Care. There is a surgical center on the first floor and a plastics clinic on the second floor. The plastics clinic has three doctors, two nurse practitioners, a registered nurse, and one physician's assistant, and has the same owner as the surgical center. Ms. Jastremsky confirmed in a December 5, 2025, email that it would be considered Medical Service, which requires

only three parking stalls per 1,000 square feet, or 25% fewer than office uses. Financial services are classified as General Office and require four stalls per 1,000 square feet, as does the event center. They have improved the parking for the existing building.

The report stated that peak demand would be 283 stalls, and the site has 310 stalls, which he believes represents a 27-stall surplus, not a 12-stall deficit as indicated by Staff. If the Personal Care classification was corrected, 349 stalls would be required by the DCMC, or 315 with the 10% deviation under Section 9-25-090-0. There are 310 stalls onsite, which leaves a gap of five stalls or 1.6%. The parking study confirmed that those stalls were not needed as peak demand was 283 and the average observed demand across 12 count days was 155 stalls. On the busiest recorded day, demand was 291 stalls. When the parking study was conducted, they assumed that the 42 stalls in the parking garage were fully occupied, but it is never full.

Regarding transportation alternatives, the Draper City Mass Transportation Plan adopted in 2019, and the Active Transportation Plan adopted in 2020, identified Highland Drive as a designated bicycle corridor with existing bicycle lanes. UTA Route 871 runs 30-minute headways all day on the corridor, and route F-514 provides 30-minute peak services. The TRAX Blue Line terminates at Draper Town Center, with 15-minute weekday headways. FrontRunner commuter rail operates in Draper with 30-minute peak headways.

Mr. Goffin stated that the applicant was also concerned about the reception center. That tenant has an existing lease that has been in effect for approximately two years and does not restrict operations to evenings or weekdays. A Site Plan condition that restricts operation beyond what the lease allows would put them in a position where City approval conflicts with the contract, and they cannot amend those rights without exposing themselves to a breach of the agreement. He believes there is ample parking without that condition. If the reception center operates during business hours, the math would still work.

Commissioner Fowler asked if the seating area in the southwest corner of the building was ADA compliant. Mr. Goffin stated that the ADA-accessible public amenity space will be on the east side of the building, and there will be a door to the outside from the basement level. In response to her follow-up question, Ms. Jastremsky confirmed that two amenities are required, but they do not both need to be ADA-accessible from the outside. If the southwest area is accessible from the basement, it will meet all requirements.

In response to a question from Commissioner Nixon, Mr. Goffin reported that all tenants have access to the 42 parking stalls in the garage.

Commissioner Green indicated that the parking lot is often empty during the day. Mr. Goffin agreed and noted that work-from-home positions have freed up parking stalls. The financial services tenant had indicated that both employees and clients now prefer to meet through Zoom.

Mr. Goffin requested that Conditions 3 and 4 be removed.

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

Commissioner Nixon asked the staff to address the parking discrepancy. Mr. Draper reviewed the parking study and clarified that the peak usage of 283 stalls did not include the 34 stalls required by the reception center. The site has a deficit of 7 parking stalls if all uses are at peak simultaneously. Staff's concern was in regard to future uses that may exceed the study's calculations. Another option would be to reduce the building's square footage. Whether to approve the deviation was a Planning Commission decision, but the study did not support it without the recommended conditions.

Commissioner Fowler remarked that the applicant had requested the removal of Conditions of Approval 3 and 4. She was in favor of removing Condition 4 because of the existing lease agreement, but future tenants should still be subject to review. Commissioner Nixon agreed but was not in favor of approving the deviation without restrictions to bring parking into compliance. The condition limiting use is what makes that possible.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Fowler, Ms. Jastremsky clarified that if the item were approved with Condition 3, the Planning Commission would not review future uses. If a new use were proposed, the staff would require updated parking numbers from the applicant to confirm that the property remains compliant. That condition would apply to new businesses in both buildings. Mr. Draper added that the staff would not be opposed to eliminating Condition 4 because many of the concerns it was written to address would be covered by Condition 3. However, the new building was calculated at a rate of 3.65 stalls per 1,000 square feet, which means all uses would need to have a parking requirement of less than 3.65 stalls to remain in compliance.

Mr. DuShane stated that the City strives to make its code clear, objective, and enforceable. The City does not conduct studies for property owners, but it does trust the numbers presented in parking studies.

Parking Deviation

Motion: Commissioner Fowler moved to APPROVE the Parking Deviation as requested by Riley Young of Mint Architecture, representing Highpointe Partners, LLC, Application 2024-0127-VAR, based on the Findings for Approval listed in the staff report dated November 12, 2025, and as modified by the following additional findings or conditions:

1. Condition of Approval 4 is stricken.

Second: Commissioner Fidler seconded the motion.

Vote on Motion: 4-to-1 in favor.

Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstained	Not Participating	Absent
Chair Adams				X	
Fowler	X				
Squire	X				
Nixon		X			
Shirey					X
Ogden					X

Fidler, Alternate	X				
Green, Alternate	X				

Site Plan

Motion: Commissioner Fowler moved to APPROVE the Site Plan, as requested by Riley Young of Mint Architecture, representing Highpointe Partners, LLC, Application 2024-350-SP, based on the Findings for Approval listed in the staff report dated November 12, 2025, and as modified by the following additional findings or conditions:

1. Condition of Approval 4 is stricken.

Second: Commissioner Fidler seconded the motion.

Vote on Motion: 4-to-1 in favor.

Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstained	Not Participating	Absent
Chair Adams				X	
Fowler	X				
Squire	X				
Nixon		X			
Shirey					X
Ogden					X
Fidler, Alternate	X				
Green, Alternate	X				

The commissioner took a quick break at 8:57 pm and reconvened at 9:04 pm.

**D. Public Hearing: Kimballs Junction Development Agreement Amendment Request
(Legislative Item)**

On the request of Mike Winters, representing Edge Homes, for an Amendment to the Kimballs Junction Development Agreement in order to set Design Standards and a Concept Plan for approximately 21 acres of land located at 632 E Kimballs Ln in the RM2 (Multi-family Residential) zone. Application Number 2025-0293-DA. Staff contact is Jennifer Jastremsky at 801-576-6328 or jennifer.jastremsky@draperutah.gov.

Ms. Jastremsky presented the staff report. The original Kimballs Junction Development Agreement was approved in 2025. It set a density range of 25 to 27 units per acre, called for workforce housing units, and required a future amendment to approve the design standards and Concept Plan. The subject property is located at Kimballs Lane and 11900 South, directly across the street from the Kimballs Lane TRAX Station. It is designated as High-Density and zoned RM2. The Station Area Plan looked specifically at this property and called for extensive residential development. The proposed amendment would maintain the approved density.

The Concept Plan complied with all parking standards and would rename Kimballs Junction to Kimballs Station. Extensive amenities were proposed, along with a public trail along the East Jordan Canal and good-faith efforts to preserve existing trees. The canal trail is also on the Draper City Trails and Open Space Master Plan. Access to 11900 South would be limited to emergency vehicles only.

Design standards include specific building elevations, architectural designs, and materials. Buildings may be up to 54 feet in height, with three- and four-story condominium buildings and three-story townhomes. DCMC requires sidewalks on both sides of the street, but the amendment proposed a pedestrian sidewalk system on one side connecting all buildings and amenities. Parking stalls would be reduced by two feet in length, with 18-foot driveways, carports, and 20-foot parallel spaces. Open space requirements would be reduced from 30% to 25%, and Ms. Jastremsky noted that it is sensible to approve the open space reduction as the project is a Transit-Oriented Development (“TOD”).

A 10-foot setback from public roadways was proposed. Current City setbacks were based on the structure's height. Buildings under three stories can have setbacks between five and 20 feet, and over three stories require 15 to 30 feet. A 10-foot setback was proposed between buildings, a deviation from the 15 feet required by DCMC. Alleys would be 20 feet wide, and through streets would be 27 feet wide. The applicant proposed eliminating the landscape buffer along the west property line adjacent to Juan Diego High School, while retaining the 10-foot buffer and eight-foot wall adjacent to the existing residential area to the west. Two monument signs were proposed that would comply with monument sign height and area standards. Kimballs Lane would have an integrated sidewalk with trees rather than a traditional park strip and sidewalks.

Ms. Jastremsky reported that the amendment would allow staff to approve small deviations to the agreement during the approval process, if those deviations did not affect the overall design and development standards. If there is a conflict between the Development Agreement and DCMC, preference shall be given to the Development Agreement unless the matter involves life safety or fire protection.

The Concept Plan and elevations were reviewed. In response to a question raised by Commissioner Fowler, Ms. Jastremsky reported that the 20-foot alley width is sufficient for two-way traffic. Commissioner Fowler stated that if a car is parked in the alley, a fire truck will not be able to get through. Mr. Maxfield clarified that the affected homes have driveways, and no parking will be allowed in those alleys. Ms. Jastremsky stated that the driveways will be 18 feet deep. The townhomes will have two-car garages, and the condominiums will have a row of parking garages on the ground floor as well as covered parking. A community clubhouse was proposed, along with several smaller amenities throughout the development. There would be a pool, seating areas, and open spaces.

Ms. Jastremsky reviewed the recommended Conditions of Approval outlined on page eight of the staff report. The first two conditions concerned the rights-of-way. Mr. Maxfield stated that condition three would require a 50% cul-de-sac at the end of 11900 South for emergency access. If the other side is developed, the remaining 50% of the cul-de-sac will be required. The triangle indicated at the

east entrance on the site plan is intended to ensure that the buildings do not encroach on vehicle sightlines.

In response to a question raised by Chair Adams, Mr. Maxfield confirmed that no fencing was proposed for the individual units. The typical standard for Kimballs Lane would be a 12-foot dedication behind the curb and gutter. A 10-foot sidewalk was proposed, so the right-of-way would be reduced by two feet.

Commissioner Fowler asked for clarification on the sidewalk deviations. Mr. Maxfield stated that in the eastern portion of the project, east of East Jordan Canal, and along the west side of Kimballs Lane, there would be a 10-foot concrete sidewalk with trees in the first four to five feet. Typically, it would be 12 total feet, including a park strip. Staff had no issue with the deviation.

Commissioner Nixon stated that the city plans show a creek trail, and this development presented an opportunity to expand it. She wanted to ensure that the developer would be required to install the trail and dedicate it to the city. Ms. Jastremsky clarified that the East Jordan Canal Trail is called out in the Development Agreement exhibits. It also states that the developer will make a good-faith effort to preserve trees along the canal. However, it was not shown on the Concept Plan.

Paxton Guymon spoke on behalf of Edge Homes. They are committed to installing the trail along the East Jordan Canal and would be open to adding confirming language to the Development Agreement. The trail is an important part of the community amenity package.

When the land was rezoned in 2025, the applicant was adamant that they wanted to build a for-sale project, not rentals. They were now presenting the details, which complied with that zoning. They are very excited about the project. They worked very closely with the staff and reached an agreement on all but one issue. Edge Homes agreed with two of the three recommended conditions. During the 2025 public hearing, there was public outcry over traffic on 11900 South. As a result, they decided to install collapsible bollards and only use that access point for emergency ingress and egress. The Fire Marshall agreed with that approach.

11900 South currently dead-ends at Juan Diego High School, and Mr. Guymon believes there is little likelihood that it will be developed through that property to connect to a public road. The applicant's position was that the request to add a cul-de-sac was made to solve a problem that the development did not create. The City does not own anything to the west of the current dead end, and residents of Kimballs Station would not benefit from a 50% cul-de-sac. It would only benefit existing residents of 11900 South. Under typical land use standards, the City pays for solutions to existing problems, not the developer. In this case, the developer was being asked to both dedicate the land to the city and pay for the improvements. If the City was adamant about the 50% cul-de-sac, the applicant requested Impact Fee credits to offset the cost of land and improvements.

Commissioner Fowler stated that the 50% cul-de-sac was being requested for emergency and City vehicle access. Mr. Maxfield clarified that it would allow anyone on the dead-end street to turn around at a cul-de-sac rather than a private driveway. For example, if someone takes a wrong turn, it will allow them to turn around without the liability of backing up or using a private driveway. It will also allow garbage trucks and snow plows to turn around. The location was identified on the map.

Commissioner Fowler asked why the developer would be responsible for installing the cul-de-sac if it was a matter of public access. Mr. Maxfield agreed with Mr. Guymon that it is an existing deficiency. However, the city was requesting a 50% cul-de-sac in exchange for reducing the public right-of-way on Kimballs Lane by two feet. Guests and delivery vehicles may also try to access the development from 11900 South. Chair Adams clarified that the Planning Commission could not negotiate the cul-de-sac issue.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Squire, Mr. Maxfield stated that curb, gutter, sidewalk, and park strips are required on all public road frontages, including the dead-end area of 11900 South.

Regarding the reduced alleyway width, Mr. Guymon stated that the developer needed the reduction to meet the approved density and deliver a project with workforce housing and a certain number of price-restricted units. The alleys will be 20 feet wide so two cars can pass one another, and there is no need for street parking because each townhome will have both a garage and a driveway. Some of the sidewalks were removed because they were able to connect all pedestrian walkways throughout the project.

In response to a question raised by Chair Adams, Mr. Guymon reported that Kimballs Station will be their first four-story condominium and highest-density project to date. They have built back-to-back townhomes and three-story condominiums in many locations. Chair Adams stated that Mountain Ridge has similar buildings, and the development is very tight. Residents backing out of their driveways bump up against the curb on the other side of the street. He asked if the density was in response to the Station Area Plan or land and construction costs. Mr. Guymon indicated that it was due to both. Edge Homes has similar products at Mountain Ridge and Mount Ranier in Herriman. The condominiums are all three-bedroom generational units, and the clubhouse will have a new, enhanced design. The driveways will be 18 feet deep, and the garages will be at least 20 feet deep. The alleys will be 20 feet wide, and private lanes will be 27 feet wide.

Chair Adams asked about the proposed workforce housing. Ms. Jastremsky reported that there will be 30 workforce housing units through a public-private partnership between Edge Homes and Draper City. Specific standards regarding buydowns were included in the original Development Agreement. Chair Adams indicated that a salesman had told him some units would be sold at cost. Mr. Guymon clarified that the City subsidy will be approximately \$60,000 for each unit, and there will be no resale restrictions.

In response to a question from Commissioner Squire, Mr. Guymon stated that private owners may rent out their units, but no units will be sold to institutional investors. Edge Homes will not retain any units for rental use. Ms. Jastremsky stated that the development will be governed by an HOA, which can add rental restrictions.

Commissioner Fowler asked about the request to remove the landscape buffer at Juan Diego. Mr. Guymon stated that they replaced the buffer with parking stalls to avoid under-parking. They worked directly with Mr. Colosimo and obtained his approval to remove the buffer. There will be a

fence, and the school is not concerned about what happens on the other side of it. Their only concern was the building setbacks.

In response to a question, Mr. Guymon stated that the trail will be clearly shown on the site plan upon submission for approval.

Chair Adams opened the public hearing.

Denise Smith stated that she lives across the street from the subject property. She was concerned about the amount of traffic the development would generate. She believes the solution is to have fewer units.

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

Commissioner Fowler stated they had talked about 15-foot driveways earlier in the meeting, but the proposed driveways are 18-foot. It was noted that a standard parking stall is 9 by 18 feet, so one vehicle will fit. Regarding traffic, the zoning and density were already approved. Mr. Maxfield clarified that a traffic impact study was required, and any negative impacts from the project must be mitigated. That analysis would be considered with the Site Plan.

Motion: Commissioner Nixon moved to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for APPROVAL of the Development Agreement Amendment, as requested by Mike Winters, representing Edge Homes for Kimballs Junction Development Agreement Amendment, Application 2025-0293-DA, based on the Findings for Approval and subject to the recommendations listed in the staff report, including the staff recommended changes from the report, dated February 27, 2026, and as modified by the following additional or modified recommendations:

1. Add language to the body of the development agreement stating that the East Jordan Canal Trail shall be installed and dedicated to the city.

Second: Commissioner Fowler seconded the motion.

Vote on Motion: 5-to-0 in favor.

Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstained	Not Participating	Absent
Chair Adams				X	
Fowler	X				
Squire	X				
Nixon	X				
Shirey					X
Ogden					X
Fidler, Alternate	X				
Green, Alternate	X				

E. Public Hearing: City-Initiated Alpine-Draper Boundary Adjustment Land Use Map and Zoning Map Amendment Requests (Legislative Items)

On the request of Draper City for Land Use Map and Zoning Map Amendments to remove approximately 0.45 acres of property from the Draper City Land Use and Zoning Maps. The property is located at approximately 16001 South 3500 East and is the subject of a municipal boundary line adjustment with Alpine City. Known as Applications 2026-0046-MA & 2026-0047-MA. Staff contact: Todd Draper, 801-576-6335, todd.draper@draperutah.gov.

Mr. Draper presented the staff report. The Vicinity, Aerial, Land Use, and Zoning Maps were reviewed. The subject property is designated Residential Hillside Low Density and zoned RR-22. The amendment would remove the area from the City's Zoning and Land Use Maps.

Chair Adams opened the public hearing.

David Witbeck stated that 19 months ago, his family purchased a lot in Alpine City. After the purchase, they discovered that the County Recorder had made an error that removed approximately 20 feet from their property. The boundary line adjustment corrects that error.

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

Motion: Commissioner Fowler moved to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for APPROVAL of the proposed Land Use Map and Zoning Map Amendments, as requested by Draper City, Applications 2026-0046-MA and 2026-0047-MA, based on the following Findings and the Criteria for Approval listed in the staff report dated February 25, 2026:

Findings for Approval:

- 1. The proposed amendments are consistent with goals, objectives and policies of the city's General Plan.**
- 2. The proposed amendments are harmonious with the overall character of existing development in the vicinity of the subject property.**
- 3. The proposed amendments will not affect the standards of any applicable overlay zone.**
- 4. The proposed amendments will not adversely affect adjacent property.**
- 5. There will be adequate facilities and services to serve the subject property within Alpine City.**
- 6. The proposed Land Use Map amendments comply with DCMC Section 9-2-020(F).**

Second: Commissioner Squire seconded the motion.

Vote on Motion: 5-to-0 in favor.

Commissioner	Yes	No	Abstained	Not Participating	Absent
Chair Adams				X	
Fowler	X				
Squire	X				
Nixon	X				
Shirey					X
Ogden					X
Fidler, Alternate	X				
Green, Alternate	X				

2. Other Business.

Coordination between City Staff and the Planning Commission (as needed).

None.

3. Adjournment.

Motion: Commissioner Squire moved to ADJOURN.

The meeting adjourned at 10:03 PM.