Minutes of the
Millcreek Planning Commission
June 17, 2026
5:00 p.m.
Regular Meeting

The Planning Commission of Millcreek, Utah, met in a regular public meeting on Wednesday, June 17, 2026, at City Hall, located at 1330 E. Chambers Avenue, Millcreek, Utah 84106. The meeting was conducted electronically and live streamed via the City's website with an option for online public comment.

PRESENT:

Commissioners
Shawn LaMar, Chair
Christian Larsen, Vice Chair
Steven Anderson (arrived at 5:11 pm)
Jenny Burgess
Nils Per Lofgren (excused)
Jacob Richardson
Victoria Reid
Diane Soule
Ian Wright

City Staff
Elyse Sullivan, City Recorder
Francis Lilly, Planning Director (electronic)
Brad Sanderson, Current Planning Manager
Jake Green, Dev. Review Specialist
Ryan Bagshaw, Dev. Review Coordinator
Sean Murray, Planner

Attendees: Brad Reynolds, Ryan Reynolds, Mike Matheson, Thomas Moffat, Abdul-Qoyum Mohmand, Brent Halliday, Sheryl Martin, Tracy Thomas, Lincoln Clark, Travis Clark, Vicky DiGregorio, Lee Dial, Tanya Andrew, Bob Tueller

REGULAR MEETING – 5:00 p.m.
TIME COMMENCED – 5:03 p.m.

Chair LaMar called the meeting to order and briefly explained the duties of the planning commission.

1. **Public Hearings**

1.1 Consideration of ZM-26-012, Rezone Request from R-1-10 Zone to R-1-8 Zone Location: 3757 S 2300 E Applicant: Thomas Moffat Planner: Brad Sanderson

Brad Sanderson presented a request to rezone property at 3757 S 2300 East from R-1-10 to R-1-8 to facilitate a two-lot subdivision while retaining the existing home. He explained that the proposed rezone is consistent with the Future Land Use Map designation of Neighborhood 1 and represents only a modest reduction in minimum lot size, from 10,000 to 8,000 square feet, with minimal changes to frontage and setback requirements. The applicant could subdivide under the current zoning, but the smaller lot standard would allow a more practical lot configuration while preserving the existing residence. Sanderson noted that an existing awning and detached accessory structure would be removed to meet setback requirements, and a new detached garage would be constructed to provide the required covered parking for the existing home, while the proposed new home would include an attached two-car garage.

Sanderson reported that the proposal was presented at both an open house and a neighborhood meeting, which had limited attendance, and that the community council ultimately issued a favorable recommendation for the rezone despite raising questions regarding the orientation and layout of the future subdivision. During commission discussion, Chair LaMar sought clarification regarding compliance with parking, setback, and other development standards. Sanderson explained that the subdivision process would include a transition period to bring the existing home into compliance before the final plat is recorded and confirmed that no additional fence or buffering requirements would be triggered because the surrounding properties are similarly zoned. He added that the applicant had expressed a willingness to replace the existing fence in coordination with the neighboring property owner. Based on the findings and conclusions in the staff report, Sanderson recommended approval of the rezoning request.

Thomas Moffat, applicant, explained that the property already meets the minimum acreage requirements for subdivision under the existing zoning but requested the rezoning to create a cleaner, more practical lot configuration. Moffat stated that the intent was to avoid an irregular property line perpendicular to the right-of-way and instead establish lot lines that are more consistent with the surrounding neighborhood. He also expressed a commitment to working with Sanderson throughout the subdivision process to ensure the existing property is brought into compliance before the final plat is recorded, preventing any nonconforming conditions.

Chair LaMar opened the public hearing.

There were no comments. Sanderson noted some people attended the neighborhood meeting and open house with questions but were all supportive of the project.

Chair LaMar closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Richardson, based on the findings and conclusions listed within the staff report, moved that the Planning Commission recommend approval of file number ZM-26-012, as presented. Commissioner Larsen seconded.

Commissioner Anderson arrived during the motion and noted that an irrigation line runs along the south property line and expressed concern that it has not been adequately maintained, resulting in periodic flooding. He emphasized the importance of preserving a safe outlet for the irrigation system as part of any future development and suggested the issue be addressed during the subdivision process. Brad Sanderson explained that while the subdivision would not return to the Planning Commission for further review, the city's standard process requires detailed civil plans prepared by a licensed engineer or surveyor. He added that when irrigation facilities are present, the irrigation company must review the plans, approve the proposed improvements, and sign the final plat to ensure the irrigation system is properly accommodated and maintained.

Chair LaMar called for the vote. Chair LaMar voted yes, Commissioner Anderson voted yes, Commissioner Burgess voted yes, Commissioner Larsen voted yes, Commissioner Reid

voted yes, Commissioner Richardson voted yes, Commissioner Soule voted yes, and Commissioner Wright voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

1.2 Consideration of ZM-26-013, Rezone Request from R-1-8 Zone to R-2-8 Zone Location: 3507 S 1300 E Applicant: Ryan Reynolds Planner: Brad Sanderson
Brad Sanderson presented a request to rezone approximately 1.25 acres on the eastern portion of a larger parcel from R-1 to R-2-6.5, creating consistent zoning across the property. He explained that the Future Land Use Map designates the entire area as Neighborhood 1 (low density residential) and noted that the existing zoning split was established during the city's comprehensive rezoning process rather than following property boundaries. Sanderson stated that the proposed rezone would align the eastern portion of the parcel with the existing R-2-6.5 zoning on the western portion.

Sanderson reviewed several development concepts that had been considered, including single-family lots, a through street connecting 1300 East to Melvina Street, and the ultimately preferred layout featuring four duplex buildings served by a cul-de-sac. He explained that the cul-de-sac design would reduce the potential for cut-through traffic while providing a development pattern that fits the site more effectively than a five-lot single-family subdivision. The proposal would result in eight residential units in four residential-style duplex buildings designed with pitched roofs, setbacks, heights, and building footprints comparable to surrounding single-family homes. He noted that the applicant, Brad Reynolds Construction, has completed similar residential duplex developments throughout Millcreek and the Salt Lake Valley.

Sanderson reported that the proposal was presented at both a neighborhood meeting and a subsequent open house. The earlier neighborhood meeting drew a larger audience due in part to notifications for another nearby project, resulting in a range of opinions regarding single-family versus duplex development. Attendance at the open house was smaller, and he observed that neighboring residents generally responded favorably to the proposed cul-de-sac, building design, setbacks, and overall site layout. While several written comments expressing opposition were received, Sanderson stated that the residents living closest to the property generally expressed support for the proposal. He concluded by inviting questions from the Commission and noting that the applicant was present to address any additional concerns.

Commissioner Burgess asked how traffic would be addressed. Sanderson explained that a traffic study had not been conducted because the proposal did not meet the threshold for a development that would typically require one. He noted that the property could potentially accommodate five single-family homes under the existing zoning, while the proposed development would consist of eight residential units, representing a net increase of three units over the currently permitted density. Sanderson acknowledged that the development would generate additional traffic on Melvina Street and Luck Lane compared to the property's current undeveloped condition but stated that the city had not completed a study to quantify the anticipated traffic impacts.

Commissioner Soule shared observations from a site visit, noting that the property is accessed from Luck Spring Lane near a church, where existing traffic is already concentrated. She stated that the proposed cul-de-sac appeared to be an appropriate design solution, as it would distribute neighborhood traffic more effectively than routing all access through 1300 East.

Commissioner Soule expressed support for the proposal, commenting that the site is well suited for residential development. She also remarked that, had the city's proposed small-lot zoning standards already been adopted, the property could have been an ideal location for a cottage-style housing development.

Ryan Reynolds, applicant, expressed appreciation for the opportunity to continue developing projects in Millcreek, noting that this would be the company's third project in the city within the past six years. He stated that the proposed rezone would unify the property's split zoning designation, creating a more cohesive development that better aligns with the surrounding neighborhood. Reynolds explained that the proposed duplex development is consistent with existing housing in the area, noting that several twin homes already exist nearby on Luck Spring Lane and Melvina Street. He described the homes as high-quality residences featuring durable exterior materials and upgraded finishes, similar to the company's other Millcreek developments. Reynolds also emphasized that the duplex configuration would provide a more attainable price point than a single-family subdivision, while avoiding an impractical lot layout under the existing zoning. He concluded by stating that the project would offer quality housing opportunities in a neighborhood he believes is an excellent place to live and raise a family.

Commissioner Richardson asked about price points. Reynolds said the units are intended as for-sale homes, not rentals, and estimated they would likely be priced in the $600–700k range, noting comparable single-family homes on the same land would likely exceed $1 million, so the duplex format improves affordability. Chair LaMar asked about a cluster of mature trees in the northeast corner of the site and whether they could be preserved. Reynolds said tree retention had been a major topic at neighborhood meetings and that they intend to keep as many large, mature trees as possible for privacy and overall project quality. Chair LaMar also asked about perimeter fencing, and Reynolds explained it would likely be a combination of precast and vinyl fencing, with final decisions still to be made. Commissioner Burgess thanked the applicant for committing to preserve the trees.

Chair LaMar opened the public hearing.

Mike Matheson, whose residence is located directly southeast of the subject parcel, expressed support for the proposed rezoning. He stated that he and his wife had met with Brad Sanderson and Ryan Reynolds several times and appreciated the thoughtful design of the project. He commented that the proposed layout, including the cul-de-sac configuration, would help maintain slow traffic speeds and preserve the character of the existing neighborhood. He also noted that the previously discussed single-family concept did not appear to fit the site as well and expressed confidence in the applicant's work based on other nearby developments. He concluded by encouraging the Planning Commission to approve the rezoning request.

Abdul Mohmand, Lorraine Drive, asked for clarification regarding an earlier version of the proposal, noting that the subject property had previously been considered in conjunction with the parcel at the corner of Lorraine Drive and 1300 East. He recalled discussion of parking spaces proposed near the corner to serve the single-family homes and asked how that element related to the current proposal, specifically whether it remained part of the project or if the developments had since been separated.

Tanya Andrew, Melvina Street, expressed enthusiasm for a new street name.

Ryan Reynolds clarified that the parking discussion referred to a separate development proposal located on the west side of 1300 East. He explained that the western property remains under review and that site plans are still being refined in coordination with city staff. Chair LaMar confirmed that the current rezoning request pertains only to the eastern portion of the property and is being considered independently of the separate project.

Chair LaMar closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Soule thanked residents for coming to the meeting to give positive feedback. Commissioner Larsen stated that his primary hesitation with the proposal stemmed from the property's Future Land Use designation as Neighborhood 1. However, he acknowledged that the parcel is already split between two zoning districts and expressed the view that the property owner should have the ability to utilize either existing zoning designation. He noted his appreciation for the proposed residential product and specifically commended the cul-de-sac design for helping to mitigate traffic impacts associated with the increased density. Considering the existing split zoning and the request to extend the zoning already in place on the western portion of the property, Commissioner Larsen indicated his support for the rezoning request.

The commission focused on whether to tie the proposed rezoning to a development agreement that would lock in the building quality and design being presented. Sanderson cautioned that while the elevations and materials look good, the city has no code mechanism to force that exact product without a development agreement; if ownership changed, someone could still build a "boxier" but code-compliant building. Chair LaMar and Commissioner Larsen both said they liked the project, especially since four duplex buildings could be less visually dense than six single-family homes that could be built under current R-1-8 zoning, and they felt the concept fit the neighborhood despite the "Neighborhood 1" land-use designation. Sanderson explained that staff had not proposed a development agreement only because the project already meets all other code standards but acknowledged an agreement could be used purely to ensure this specific design and material quality. Commissioners debated whether that extra control was necessary. Chair LaMar liked the idea of conditioning approval on the depicted project, while Commissioner Anderson felt a development agreement was unnecessary, arguing that the builder's reputation and financial interest in selling attractive homes already incentivize them to build something high quality, and that the city should also show some trust.

Commissioner Soule, based on the findings and conclusions listed within the staff report, moved that the Planning Commission recommend approval of file ZM-26-013 as presented. Commissioner Anderson seconded. Chair LaMar called for the vote. Chair LaMar voted no, Commissioner Anderson voted yes, Commissioner Burgess voted yes, Commissioner Larsen voted yes, Commissioner Reid voted yes, Commissioner Richardson voted yes, Commissioner Soule voted yes, and Commissioner Wright voted yes. The motion passed.

Chair LaMar voted no because he felt a development agreement would be prudent.

2. New Item

2.1 Consideration of SD-26-004, Request for a Subdivision Location: 3210 S Highland Drive Applicant: Millcreek Planner: Brad Sanderson

Brad Sanderson presented a condominium plat application for the mixed-use hotel development located at the corner of Chambers Avenue and Highland Drive. He reminded the commission that the project had previously received approvals for a minor subdivision, street vacation, easements, and related property adjustments through the Planning Commission and City Council. He explained that the current application seeks to further subdivide the property into vertical condominium units to establish separate ownership interests within the mixed-use building.

Sanderson described the proposed condominium plat as dividing the structure by volume and floor level. The ground floor facing the Common would contain retail space, with the city retaining ownership of most of that level except for the Fine Arts Center portion. The city would also retain ownership of the central parking structure, while the hotel would occupy the portions of the building along Highland Drive and Chambers Avenue, and residential condominium units would be located above the retail space. He noted that the roof areas would also be divided according to ownership. Sanderson explained that condominium plats for mixed-use buildings require the creation of ownership boundaries by level rather than by traditional lot lines.

Sanderson stated that the application complies with all criteria required for condominium plat approval, including health, safety, access, and zoning requirements. He reported that the proposal was presented at an open house, where only one representative from the East Mill Creek Community Council attended. The community council subsequently reviewed the application and issued a favorable recommendation. Based on the applicable approval criteria and the findings contained in the staff report, Sanderson recommended approval of the condominium plat application.

In response to Commissioner Wright's question regarding similar ownership arrangements, Sanderson explained that this type of vertical condominium ownership is common in office buildings and mixed-use developments. He noted that establishing condominium units creates the legal descriptions necessary for individual ownership should portions of the building be sold, functioning similarly to a residential condominium plat. Sanderson also advised the commission that a future application would return for review to further subdivide the residential portion of the building into 25 individual condominium units, creating separate ownership for each residential unit.

Chair LaMar asked for public comment. There was none.

Commissioner Reid, based on the findings and conclusions listed within the staff report, moved that the Planning Commission approve file number SD-26-004 as presented. Commissioner Burgess seconded. Chair LaMar called for the vote. Chair LaMar voted yes, Commissioner Anderson voted yes, Commissioner Burgess voted yes, Commissioner Larsen voted yes, Commissioner Reid voted yes, Commissioner Richardson voted yes, Commissioner Soule voted yes, and Commissioner Wright voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Continuing Business

3.1 Consideration of ZM-26-011, Request for a Development Agreement Through an Olympus Hills West Village Center Special District (OHW-VCSD) Zone Rezone Application Location: 3962 S Wasatch Boulevard Applicant: Lee Dial of Cowboy Partners Planner: Brad Sanderson

Brad Sanderson introduced the continued consideration of the proposed development agreement for the Olympus Hills West Village Center Special District, noting that the item had been continued from the previous month's meeting to allow additional information to be gathered. He reminded the Planning Commission that the prior discussion focused on several outstanding issues, including traffic circulation to and from Highland Drive, the reduction in proposed commercial space, potential freeway noise impacts and reflections, and building-related design concerns. Rather than repeating the full presentation from the previous meeting, Sanderson proposed focusing on those specific topics that had prompted the continuation. He explained that the applicant had prepared a presentation addressing each of the commission's concerns and noted that staff had also received an updated traffic study from Hales Engineering earlier that day. Sanderson stated that the applicant would review the requested information before the commission resumed its discussion, adding that reopening the previously closed public hearing would be at the commission's discretion.

Lee Dial, representing Cowboy Partners, presented updates to the proposed Olympus Hills West Village Center development in response to issues raised by the Planning Commission at the previous meeting. He explained that the project includes two buildings over below-grade parking, with the north building dedicated to residential units and the south building containing residential units above commercial space, including retail, restaurant, and office uses. In response to concerns about the amount of commercial space, Dial stated that the proposal had been revised to increase commercial square footage from approximately 3,000 to 4,000 square feet by eliminating a previously proposed food truck concept. He noted that the development team intends to attract a restaurant tenant and has already begun discussions with prospective operators, while requesting flexibility to allow other retail uses if a restaurant cannot be secured after a good-faith effort.

Dial also described revisions to the landscaping plan, agreeing to install a uniform street tree pattern in response to commission feedback. To address concerns about signage, he proposed using halo-lit building signs with lower-intensity lighting to reduce visual impacts while still providing sufficient visibility for commercial tenants from Interstate 215. He reviewed proposed exterior materials, emphasizing a palette centered on brick and wood-look fiber cement siding, with stone limited to accent features, and explained that the architectural design had been refined to ensure a high-quality appearance consistent with the developer's long-term ownership of the property.

Addressing concerns regarding privacy and noise, Dial explained that rooftop amenity areas have been designed with setbacks and landscape planters to limit views toward neighboring homes west of Interstate 215. He further stated that, based on input from the project's acoustical consultant, sound generated by the development would reflect upward rather than toward adjacent residential properties due to the orientation of the buildings and the surrounding topography. He also noted that restaurant activity would be located on the east side of the development, with the buildings themselves serving as a buffer from nearby residences.

Dial discussed updates to the project's traffic circulation, explaining that the secondary northern access would function as a right-in/right-out entrance only, primarily serving service vehicles and reducing conflicts with traffic near the freeway interchange. He noted that an updated traffic study had been completed and submitted to the city earlier that day for staff and commission review and invited staff to summarize its findings for the commission.

The commission's discussion then centered on traffic impacts and access design for the mixed-use project. Dial reiterates that the northern driveway is intended as a secondary access point—mainly for garbage trucks and supplemental circulation—not the primary entrance, which will be shared with the Porsche dealership on the south. He said the developers are comfortable with the traffic engineer's recommendation to make that north access right-in/right-out only, enforced with a raised median on Wasatch, to prevent left turns that would conflict with queuing for the freeway. City staff, Jake Green, then summarized the updated traffic study, explaining that the new proposal generates only 186 more daily trips than the 2023 concept—"negligible" for a project this size—and that the analysis still shows a warranted traffic signal at the Wasatch intersection by about 2030, after project build-out. Millcreek, not UDOT, will decide whether to install that light (UDOT will only advise due to the proximity to freeway ramps). The commission briefly explores whether a roundabout could work there, but Green says the expected traffic volumes and queuing issues make a roundabout problematic at that location. Commissioner Anderson noted a raised median would also improve safety and turning behavior at the opposing Einstein Bagels access, and he and Green clarify how the median's length and placement will restrict unsafe left turns.

Commissioner Soule asked about the name, "Liberty Cove." Dial noted all of Cowboy Partners' projects use the name Liberty, and they added Cove because of Olympus Cove. The commission then focused on the first-floor commercial space: several members say they strongly prefer that it be built and marketed as a restaurant, not generic commercial, to avoid a permanently vacant or weakly activated corner. Sanderson explains how other agreements have handled this—by requiring the space to be fully "restaurant-ready" (grease traps, venting, etc.) and giving the developer a fixed window (e.g., a few years) to make a good-faith effort to land a restaurant tenant before allowing a switch to other retail. Commissioners weigh how long that window should be and how to define "good-faith effort," while also discussing how prescriptive they should be about exterior materials (e.g., percentage of brick) so the built project matches the quality shown in the renderings without over-locking the design or making the project financially infeasible. Dial said full plans have not been established yet. Sanderson noted the material elevation in the presentation showed 47% brick. Commissioner Soule asked about prohibiting neon lighting due to resident complaints at the last commission meeting.

Chair LaMar asked for public comment.

Vicky DeGregorio, Aura Circle in Holladay, reiterated concerns regarding the proposed illuminated building signage, stating that the lighting plan had not been meaningfully revised since the previous meeting. She argued that the Village Center Special District was specifically created to accommodate neighborhood-scale commercial uses that remain compatible with the surrounding residential character, and that examples of illuminated signage presented by the applicant were not comparable because they were located in traditional commercial areas far from residential homes. She emphasized that the proposed signs would be approximately 300 feet from nearby residences and directly visible from second- and third-story bedroom windows, making them significantly more intrusive than the examples provided. DeGregorio also questioned the advertising value of freeway-facing illuminated signs, noting that motorists would only have a brief opportunity to see them before passing the site, while nearby residents would experience their visual impact every night. She urged the commission to require either non-illuminated signage, a nighttime curfew for illuminated signs, or other restrictions through the development agreement before approval, explaining that once the project is built, future mitigation would be difficult or impossible. She further expressed concern that the city's existing lighting standards measure illumination only as an average at the property line and would not adequately protect upper-story homes from direct light. In closing, she suggested additional design measures, including darker exterior colors and enhanced landscaping along the west side of the project, but emphasized that eliminating or significantly limiting illuminated signage would provide the greatest benefit to the surrounding neighborhood.

Brent Halliday, Aura Drive in Holladay, expressed support for thoughtful development while emphasizing concerns related to traffic circulation and safety in the area surrounding the proposed project. Speaking from the perspective of both a resident and bicyclist, he described existing traffic challenges along Wasatch Boulevard, including the difficulty of making left turns into and out of the Olympus Hills Shopping Center due to heavy traffic. He stated that a future traffic signal at the shopping center entrance would improve safety and traffic flow and noted additional conflicts created by vehicles attempting to turn into the Einstein Bagels driveway, creating hazardous conditions for motorists and cyclists. Halliday suggested that a raised median could help reduce unsafe turning movements by restricting left turns and directing vehicles to make safer right-turn movements from the proposed development. While acknowledging neighboring residents' concerns regarding lighting, he indicated that traffic safety was his primary concern, adding that although limited freeway lighting exists near the interchange, the area generally retains dark nighttime views of the mountains that residents value.

Bob Tueller, Aura Circle in Holladay, stated that his primary concern remained the proposed lighting, particularly the west-facing sign. Drawing on his marketing and advertising experience, he stated that the west-facing sign would not meaningfully attract customers or determine the success of the businesses, while north- and south-facing signage would be more visible to approaching traffic. He expressed support for progress and neighborhood improvements but urged the commission to protect residents' nighttime views of Mount Olympus by limiting or eliminating unnecessary illuminated signage.

Chair LaMar stated that the public comments and additional information provided by the applicant highlighted the need for greater specificity regarding signage and building materials before final approval. While he appreciated the expanded sign exhibits and supporting information, he did not believe it was appropriate to rely solely on the city's standard sign code for a project within the Village Center Special District. He suggested incorporating language into the development agreement requiring the applicant to return with a more detailed signage plan as part of the conditional use process, allowing the Planning Commission to review sign placement, size, illumination levels, and other design details after further refinement. He also recommended including provisions related to exterior building materials in the development agreement, providing additional flexibility to ensure the project's final design remains compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

Commissioner Wright felt there could be unlit signs or that lighting could be kept to ground level. The commission worked through the details of how to lock key expectations into the development agreement. They converge on requiring that the ground-floor commercial space be truly restaurant-ready (including grease traps and vent shafts) and that the developer have a fixed window—generally coalescing around two years from the issuance of the certificate of occupancy—to secure a restaurant tenant before being allowed to switch to other retail. Commissioners stressed they want the space activated quickly and not left vacant for years. They also return to the idea that the sign package is not yet detailed enough to simply defer to the generic sign code, especially given the sensitivity of the site; several members say they would like the full signage package (locations, sizes, lighting) to come back to the Planning Commission, though Sanderson notes that, legally, their role is to recommend and the City Council ultimately decides whether to require that. Finally, they clarify that because this zone treats mixed-use as a development-agreement use rather than a conditional use, there will not be a later conditional-use review—making it all the more important to get specifics on materials, brick percentage, and signage into this development agreement now.

Dial explained the proposed timeline for securing a restaurant tenant within the project's commercial space, noting that detailed architectural work and active tenant recruitment would begin after approval of the development agreement and issuance of a building permit. He stated that his goal is to secure a restaurant tenant early in the approximately 20-month construction period so that lease negotiations and tenant improvements can be completed before the building receives a certificate of occupancy. He explained that restaurant build-outs can require six to nine months, making early recruitment essential to having the business open when the project is completed. Dial emphasized that a restaurant remains his primary objective, as he believes it will be the most valuable amenity for future residents and the overall success of the development. While acknowledging the need for flexibility during the leasing process, he stated that he does not intend for the commercial space to remain vacant and has already begun preliminary discussions with potential restaurant operators. He affirmed that if they had no intention of doing a restaurant, the developers would not pay for grease traps or ventilation hoods.

The commission refined the specific conditions they want in the development agreement. They agree the restaurant requirement should run for 24 months from issuance of the certificate of occupancy, giving the developer time to recruit a tenant but avoiding long-term vacant space. For building materials, they settle on requiring approximately 47% brick on the exterior, plus or minus 5%, effectively turning the applicant's own illustrative percentages into a standard, and confirming there will be no stucco (consistent with the submitted elevations). They then refined a lighting rule: no illuminated signage above 15 feet measured from the elevation of Wasatch Drive on any façade, leaving only low-level, street-oriented lighting subject to the normal sign code. Commissioners debate but ultimately do not add an outright ban on "neon," worrying that language could accidentally prohibit small LED "neon-style" window signs inside a future restaurant.

Chair LaMar allowed additional public comment.

Todd Larsen asked about code enforcement on the Porsche dealership's lighting. Staff noted that code enforcement was already looking into whether Porsche is dimming its lights at 9 p.m.

Commissioner Larsen, based on the findings and conclusions of the staff report, moved that the Planning Commission recommend approval of ZM-26-011 adding a Development Agreement including the Terms and Exhibits of Finding 9 of the staff report, additional terms based on the traffic study received June 17, 2026, and additional conditions:

1) requiring brick as 47% +/- 5% of exterior material;

2) prohibit illuminated signage above 15 ft of the elevation of Wasatch Drive on all facades;

3) require a good faith effort to acquire only a restaurant tenant to occupy the commercial space in 24 months of certificate of occupancy; and

4) build the commercial space to properly accommodate a restaurant use including grease traps, vents, etc.

To the already existing Olympus Hills West Village Center Special District Zone specifically pertaining to property approximately located at 3962 S Wasatch Blvd.

[Finding 9 from staff report - Staff is suggesting the following item or 'terms and exhibits' be considered and recommended to the City Council as part of a Development Agreement:

1. Uses shall include the following:

a. Restaurant - Minimum 4,000 sqft. sit-down restaurant(s),

b. Office - Between 5,000-8,000sqft of Professional Office Space,

c. Open Space - Minimum 10,000sqft of contiguous landscaped usable area,

d. Residential - Between 65 to 70 residential units,

e. Parking - Minimum of 220 Parking Spaces.

2. Exhibit A - Site Plan Layout

3. Exhibit B - Building Mass, Orientation, Elevations including materials and colors

4. Exhibit C - Landscape Plan

5. Exhibit D - Lighting Plan

6. Exhibit E - Signage Plan

7. Exhibit F - Amenities Plan

8. Exhibit G - Frontage Improvements]

Commissioner Wright seconded. Chair LaMar called for the vote. Chair LaMar voted yes, Commissioner Anderson voted yes, Commissioner Burgess voted yes, Commissioner Larsen voted yes, Commissioner Reid voted yes, Commissioner Richardson voted yes, Commissioner Soule voted yes, and Commissioner Wright voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Commission Business

4.1 Approval of May 20, 2026 Regular Meeting Minutes

Chair LaMar moved to approve the minutes as presented in the packet. Commissioner Richardson seconded. Chair LaMar called for the vote. Chair LaMar voted yes, Commissioner Anderson voted yes, Commissioner Burgess voted yes, Commissioner Larsen voted yes, Commissioner Reid voted yes, Commissioner Richardson voted yes, Commissioner Soule voted yes, and Commissioner Wright voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

4.2 Housing Subcommittee Report
Commissioner Richardson did not have a report.

4.3 Updates from the Planning Director
Sanderson noted Chambers Avenue construction was starting to provide access to the city hall parking garage and construction for Millcreek Common Phase II was coming along.

5. Calendar of Upcoming Meetings
- City Council Mtg. 6/22/26, 7:00 p.m.
- Historic Preservation Commission Mtg. 7/9/26, 6:00 p.m.
- City Council Mtg. 7/13/26, 7:00 p.m.
- Planning Commission Mtg. 7/15/26, 5:00 p.m.

ADJOURNED: Commissioner Burgess moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:22 p.m. Commissioner Soule seconded. Chair LaMar called for the vote. Chair LaMar voted yes, Commissioner Anderson voted yes, Commissioner Burgess voted yes, Commissioner Larsen voted yes, Commissioner Reid voted yes, Commissioner Richardson voted yes, Commissioner Soule voted yes, and Commissioner Wright voted yes. The motion passed unanimously.

APPROVED: Shawn LaMar **Date** 7/15/26
Shawn LaMar, Chair

Attest: **Elyse Sullivan, Recorder**