

**RIVERTON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
July 9, 2026**

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

Planning Commission Members:

Chair Darren Park
Gary Cannon
Evan Matheson
Shelly Cluff
Monique Beck
Joe Marzo

Staff:

Matt Cassel, City Engineer
Tim Prestwich, City Planner
Lisa Halversen, Planner
Ryan Carter, City Attorney

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

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

2. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. "OQUIRRH ESTATES, LOT 13 AMENDED," PLZ-26-1002, AN APPLICATION FOR A TWO-LOT SUBDIVISION OF ABOUT 0.57 ACRES LOCATED AT 12666 SOUTH GILBERT CIRCLE. APPLICANT – BLAINE BRADY.

City Planner Tim Prestwich presented the Staff Report and indicated that the Planning Commission had approved an application for a private lane on the subject property in April 2026. Zoning and Aerial Maps were reviewed. The property is located near the intersection of 2700 West and 12600 South. It is surrounded by commercial properties to the east, west, and north, and accessed by a cul-de-sac and similar R-4 Zoning to the south.

The proposed Subdivision Plat was reviewed. The private lane will be 20 feet wide, extend north from the east property line, and end in a Fire turnaround. The new lot will be located behind the existing house. Both lots will meet City standards for setbacks and lot size. All City Departments have reviewed and approved the plans pending correction of minor redlines that would not affect the design. The applicant will be allowed to retain the vinyl fence adjacent to compatible zoning. Masonry fencing has already been installed along most property lines bordering commercial zoning, and a new eight-foot masonry fence will be installed on the east property line. As proposed, fencing will meet all requirements.

Mr. Prestwich reported that one written comment was received in response to the public notice and entered in the record. The comment spoke to whether the City should allow private lanes off of cul-de-sacs, which was a legislative choice that had already been made and could not be reconsidered.

Commissioner Cannon asked if it would be difficult to match the existing masonry wall and if the proposal met the City's flag lot requirements. Mr. Prestwich stated that individual property owners installed the existing masonry walls, and it was in the developer's interest to match the materials if possible. The ordinance allows either a flag lot or easement, and the private lane was on an easement. The parcel would not meet the size requirements for a flag lot.

Chair Park asked about the sizes of adjacent residential lots. Mr. Prestwich reported that nearby lots were approximately 0.25 acres. Lot 13 was initially much larger.

The Applicant, Blaine Brady, stated that it would be a straightforward two-lot subdivision. The existing home will remain, and a new home will be constructed on the rear lot. It was not a request to rezone to commercial or multi-family. The property would remain in the R-4 single-family residential zone, consistent with the neighborhood. He had worked with his civil engineer on the plat, private lane, utilities, stormwater, fire access, etc. The boundaries would be improved by the new eight-foot masonry fence. The masonry on the north and southwest was the same type of gray, and the new fence would be consistent with those boundaries. The red masonry wall to the west was a different material. Mr. Brady accepted all Conditions of Approval and asked that the Planning Commission approve the application.

Commissioner Cluff noted that there would be no parking on the private lane and asked if sufficient parking would be available. Mr. Brady stated that there would be a driveway and garage for parking on the rear lot.

Chair Park opened the public hearing.

Terry Segan stated that he lives adjacent to the subject property and had emailed a comment on the item. If the subdivision was approved, he would be left with the aftermath. He saw it as something that would deteriorate the quality of life on Gilbert Circle. No one regulates the private lane except the residents. If the front lot is sold, they become the owner of the private lane, which creates the possibility of more problems. Even though the proposal met City requirements, he did not believe it was the right thing to do because it would not do anything good for residents. He did not believe a lot on a cul-de-sac had ever been approved for subdivision in Riverton and asked that the ordinance be changed to prohibit them.

Ethan Imlay stated that he lives near the proposed subdivision. He understood that the private lane was already approved but believed it still mattered because the proposed rear lot would depend on the shared access. His concern was not whether a second home could physically be placed on the property but whether it would create two practical, sustainable lots when conditions such as lot size, shape, frontage, access, parking, drainage, utilities, buildable area, and emergency service needs were considered. Riverton subdivision standards state that subdivisions could create lots that are developable and capable of being upon and should not create lots where improvement becomes impractical because of size, shape, driveway grades, sewage, or other physical conditions. He believed that standard was especially important because it is an irregularly shaped lot in a cul-de-sac, and the

proposed rear lot appeared to be dependent on a narrow, shared access configuration. The City not managing the private lane could open it to potential issues. He asked the City to make clear findings on the record that both lots independently meet all applicable subdivision and zoning standards, that any private lane or shared access area was not counted toward requirements, and that the City clearly address whether the proposed access arrangement was adequate for long-term use. His sister and brother-in-law have a similar setup in Herriman, and the emergency turnaround is always blocked.

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

Commissioner Cannon asked if an accessory dwelling unit (“ADU”) could be built on any 0.25-acre lot in Riverton that had adequate space. Mr. Prestwich reported that all single-family residential lots have the ability to build an ADU, but the ordinance would limit size and location. City Attorney, Ryan Carter, added that ADUs are subject to administrative review, not a public hearing.

Commissioner Cluff explained that the Staff review process includes utilities, sewer, drainage, emergency access, etc. Departmental review is a standard part of the approval. Mr. Prestwich clarified that the sewer review was separate from the City, but they reviewed the same plans as City departments.

Commissioner Cluff asked about the possibility of vehicles blocking emergency access. Mr. Carter reported that private lanes cannot be obstructed, and the residents who benefit from and use the private lane are expected to maintain access. When violations occur, they are enforced privately. Chair Park added that if law enforcement was not already on scene, the Fire Department would request their presence to manage the issue. He had personally dealt with similar situations in the past.

Chair Park pointed out that the private lane would be governed by an HOA consisting of the two lots and asked who would bear the responsibility of maintaining in the event one lot was sold. He also asked Staff to address the possibility of the road falling into disrepair or emergency access being repeatedly blocked. Mr. Carter reported that the City requires Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (“CC&Rs”) to be recorded if there is a shared facility to ensure that maintenance costs are shared. However, he did not know if the private road was shared because it provided egress across the front lot, but that lot had an existing driveway. When CC&Rs are recorded, they run with the land and stay in place permanently. The road would not be maintained by the City. If fire access was not maintained, the home could conceivably lose its Certificate of Occupancy.

Commissioner Cluff reiterated that when the Planning Commission approves a Subdivision Plat, its decision is based on existing legislation and is a balancing act between the rights of the owner of the subject property and surrounding property owners. If something meets the rules outlined in the legislation, it must be approved. The Planning Commission’s responsibility is to ensure that it meets the rules.

Mr. Carter confirmed that the Applicant is entitled to development approval if the application meets the standards found in Ordinances. There were no special standards in Riverton City Code ("RCC") that would create a different standard for cul-de-sacs. Points raised by Commissioner Cannon regarding the difference between a subdivision and ADU were well-taken in the sense that multiple families would be allowed on the lot even if it was not first subdivided. The Utah Legislature had made it clear that they expect cities to allow for subdivisions whenever possible because of the housing crisis. The procedure for getting a subdivision like the one proposed is found in Title 10, Chapter 20 of Utah Code, and nothing in City Code conflicted with that title. Anything preventing subdivision of the lot would have been found in the base zoning for the lot sizes of the property, and the property was large enough to accommodate two 0.25-acre lots given the prevailing zoning for the area. A subdivision met the Ordinance, and the Applicant was entitled to development approval. No policy debate could change that outcome.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Cluff, Mr. Carter reported that if the City Council were to entertain different standards for cul-de-sacs, they would have to adopt an ordinance to that effect, but it would not apply to the subject property because the project was vested when the complete application was accepted by the City.

Chair Park stated that the subdivision process is much more restrictive than ADU approval, and the City had much more control over the outcome. Mr. Prestwich confirmed that the ADU process is administrative and not reviewed by the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Matheson stated that he lives on a cul-de-sac and has to be careful backing out of his driveway. The proposed subdivision included internal turnarounds for each house, so cars will face the road when exiting the property. He would be in favor of the application even if the Planning Commission had the option to deny it.

Commissioner Cluff moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE Application PLZ-26-1002, Oquirrh Estates, Lot 13 Amended Subdivision, subject to the following:

Conditions:

- 1. Subdivision lots and private lane layout shall be consistent with the plans presented to the Planning Commission except where otherwise noted.**
- 2. Applicant must apply for a Final Plan approval.**
- 3. Final Plan and Plat to be reviewed and approved by City Staff.**
- 4. Final Plat must be recorded with Salt Lake County.**
- 5. Applicant must fix any outstanding Riverton City Staff redline comments on the plat and plans.**

6. **The Applicant must obtain any necessary approvals or permits from applicable outside agencies or jurisdictions.**
7. **Include a temporary turnaround on the property to meet City and Fire Department requirements.**
8. **Storm drainage systems and accommodations comply with the Riverton City Standards and Ordinances, and with the recommendations of the Riverton City Engineering Division.**
9. **The Applicant must create and agree to follow a Long-Term Storm Water Management Plan according to Riverton City Standards and Ordinances.**
10. **A Land Disturbance Permit must be issued by the City prior to any construction grading on the site.**
11. **The site and structures shall comply with all applicable Riverton City Standards and Ordinances, including the International Building and Fire Codes.**
12. **The private lane and utilities in the private lane are to be owned and maintained by the property owners. No City maintenance will take place on private infrastructure.**

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

- B. "TOWNS AT 11800 SOUTH," PLZ-26-8015 AN APPLICATION FOR A MULTI-FAMILY SITE PLAN FOR TOWNHOMES ON APPROXIMATELY 5.17 ACRES LOCATED ON THE NORTHWEST CORNER OF THE INTERSECTION OF 11800 SOUTH AND REDWOOD ROAD – SCOTT YERMISH OF PRIORITY BUILDERS.**

Mr. Prestwich reported that the Planning Commission had previously approved two rezoning applications for the subject property located on Redwood Road near 11800 South. Aerial and Zoning Maps were reviewed, and Mr. Prestwich indicated that the development would solve many problems on a challenging property. Midas Creek runs through the property, and it is surrounded by private lanes for the RM-8 development to the north as well as multiple older houses along 11800 South. The developer had approached the remaining private owners and Utah Department of Transportation ("UDOT") regarding purchasing adjacent parcels but had been unable to reach an agreement. However, the development was laid out to expand into those properties should they become available in the future.

The Site Plan was reviewed. Twelve units will be accessed from Redwood Road, and 29 units will be accessed from 11800 South. If the adjacent parcels were acquired, a second access from 11800 South could be added. RM-8 allows eight units per acre, but the actual

density is lower. There will be 41 guest parking stalls as required by Ordinance in addition to two parking stalls per unit, for a total of 117 parking stalls. Some units will be rear-loaded with front porches facing the shared road. Units along the creek will face it and a walking path.

There will be a total of 62% landscaping, including both manicured usable space and natural landscape in the creek area. All interior roads, open space, and the stormwater system will be privately maintained. Because Midas Creek is a County facility, the HOA will have day-to-day maintenance responsibilities, but the County requires emergency access in the event of an emergency or major maintenance.

Conceptual renderings were displayed. The units will have two stories above ground and full basements, with a balcony off the second-floor master bedroom. Unlike single-family homes, the townhome design is subject to RCC § 18.50.110(2). No vinyl or aluminum siding is allowed, and a certain percentage of brick or stone is required. Staff will ensure that all requirements are met when the Building Permit applications are received.

Mr. Prestwich reviewed the proposed Landscaping Plan. Per waterwise landscaping requirements, green space will be usable space with a limited amount of grass. The subdivision will include a tot lot, pavilion, and dog park, as well as green space along road frontages. The areas along Midas Creek and the detention basin will include trees and native vegetation. All tree requirements were met.

Staff had a concern regarding the lack of pedestrian access across the creek. A resident of the Redwood Road portion would have to exit the subdivision, walk down Redwood Road, and reenter the development to access the dog park and tot lot. They discussed this issue with the developer and recommended that a crossing be added for better access to shared amenities. However, the developer indicated that it would add considerable cost to the project for access that is already available via another route.

Existing masonry fencing will remain, and new masonry fencing will be installed along Redwood Road and adjacent incompatible uses. A three-rail vinyl fence was proposed along 11800 South, which met Ordinance and was supported by Staff.

Mr. Prestwich reviewed the recommended Conditions of Approval and indicated that most were standard for multi-family developments. Condition 14 would require landscaping around buildings to be installed prior to occupancy and that no more than 80% of building permits could be issued before community landscaping and amenities are installed. The Development Services Director may adjust this requirement due to adverse weather. He recommended that Condition 15 be modified to state that all amenities will be maintained by the HOA. Condition 16 should also be added to require that the CC&Rs be reviewed by the City Attorney prior to plat recordation.

Commissioner Cannon stated that he was thankful Midas Creek would be maintained by the HOA but asked if mitigation was necessary to prevent potential flooding in the basements of

homes along the creek. He also asked if it was possible to increase the lot depth for units 201, 202, and 203 to provide adequate space for residents to back out of their driveways.

In response to a question from Commissioner Matheson, Mr. Prestwich confirmed that units would have an approximately five-foot driveway area in front of the garage. In response to his follow-up question, Mr. Carter reported that the Midas Creek stream channel cannot be altered in a way that would cause it to redirect. The HOA can beautify the area and will be responsible for keeping it clear of debris, but they cannot change it. Installation of rock, for example, would require a permit from the United States Army Corps of Engineers.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency ("FEMA") Floodplain Map for Salt Lake County was updated approximately six years previously. He did not recall its predictions for Midas Creek in the event of a 100-year flood, but regardless, that would not require additional mitigation measures. Properties within a FEMA Flood Plain Map Zone must purchase flood insurance against that possibility. If groundwater was discovered during excavation, additional mitigation may be required prior to continuing construction. The best way to prevent flooding is to keep the creek clear of debris, which will be the responsibility of the HOA.

Commissioner Beck asked if a bridge over the creek would be allowed. Mr. Prestwich stated that a permit would need to be obtained from the Salt Lake County Flood Control. No grading is allowed in the floodway, but it is allowed in the floodplain.

Chair Park asked City Engineer Matt Cassel to explain the process that would be required if the Planning Commission determined that a crossing was needed. Mr. Cassel reported a Salt Lake County permit would be required, and the County's role was to ensure that Midas Creek could still maintain the flows it is designed for. A hydrology analysis would be required to confirm that the bridge would not restrict Midas Creek. If all County, State, and Army Corps of Engineers requirements were met, a bridge could be installed. The permitting process would take approximately three months as the Army Corps of Engineers only has 90 days to review an application.

Chair Park asked about the stub road near the dog park potentially extending to 11800 South. Mr. Prestwich stated that if additional property was acquired for development, a second access would be necessary as no more than 30 units are allowed on a single access point. Chair Park asked if the potential access would meet minimum distance requirements from the intersection of Redwood Road and 11800 South. He was also concerned about removing green space. Mr. Prestwich clarified that the subdivision would have over 60% green space and only 20% was required, so losing that area would not bring it out of compliance. The City Engineer would review any requests to connect to 11800 South.

Commissioner Cluff asked if a walking path could be installed to connect the subdivision to the sister development. Mr. Prestwich reported that the developer tried to work with that HOA for shared access, but an agreement could not be reached.

The Applicant, Scott Yermish, stated that he lives in Riverton, and it was important that the development reflect the lifestyle he enjoyed as a resident. A permit had been issued to build up and reinforce the areas of Midas Creek that had not been maintained. When he purchased the land, there were tires and trash cans in the creek, so its maintenance was not previously an issue for the City. Midas Creek will be the center of the development, with lighted walking paths and pavilions. There will be tot lots and pavilions on both the north and south sides.

When the plans were first reviewed by the Design Review Committee, it was indicated that the gated access from Redwood Road would be sufficient. Prior to that, he spent a year and a half working with the neighboring HOA on a shared access but was unable to reach an agreement.

In addition to building up and reinforcing the creek, they will ensure that both City and County have access to the north and south culverts. The 100-year-storm issue had been addressed. Additionally, the previous flood was caused by Herriman not closing its gates, and there were now additional retention ponds across the street.

They had tried to purchase the adjacent properties. However, UDOT had a rule that they would not sell property if the intention of purchase was to gain access.

Josh Gera of Ensign Engineering stated that FEMA recently updated their mapping, and the red hatched area on the Site Plan was the main conveyance of a 100-year flood event. No grading would be done to alter the main conveyance. The banks had eroded in one area at the southeast corner of Lot T201. They worked with Salt Lake County Flood Control on the issue and will reinforce the banks with riprap. Most major blockages that occur with creeks like Midas Creek are at upstream and downstream ends of culverts. They will provide access points for the County so they can quickly access these in the event of an emergency.

In its natural state, sites north and south of the property sheet flow into Midas Creek. The County required any new development to restrict stormwater discharge into the creek to 0.02 cubic feet per second, which was downsized from the previous requirement of 0.20. As much as possible, all stormwater on the site would be routed to underground detention areas and released into the creek at the restricted rate.

Mr. Gera reported that there was potential to install a tot lot west of the existing pavilion on the south side. Mr. Yermish added that a pedestrian bridge over Midas Creek would cost well over \$100,000, and some duplicate amenities would need to be removed to cover that cost.

In response to a question raised by Chair Park, Mr. Yermish stated that removal of amenities would only offset approximately \$30,000 of the bridge cost. Chair Park stated that the Planning Commission was pleased Midas Creek would be beautified and maintained. It would be a vast improvement and benefit to the community. However, as currently divided, it was two separate developments with no continuity between them. Residents of the

northern section would not have reasonable access to the southern portion. An updated Site Plan was displayed showing amenities in the northern section.

Drawings, sample photographs, and a draft Site Plan showing the potential bridge were reviewed. Mr. Yermish stated that if not for the cost, he would prefer to have a bridge. They had extensive meetings with Salt Lake County about Midas Creek, and he was dedicated to its maintenance. Chair Park remarked that the bridge would further beautify the development and make it more appealing to potential homeowners. Mr. Yermish agreed but reiterated that there were financial constraints.

Mr. Yermish stated that the townhomes would have stone and Hardie Board facades, 10-foot main floor ceilings, nine-foot basement and second-floor ceilings, and over 2,200 square feet of space. His concept was similar to brownstones in Chevy Chase, Maryland. If a bridge was required, they would figure out how to build it. The CC&Rs had already been submitted to the City but could be amended to include the bridge, and they could begin work on infrastructure while waiting for the permit.

Commissioner Matheson stated that he loved the concept of the bridge but did not believe it was a major issue as people would only need to walk an extra 20 yards without it. Chair Park stated that the bridge would address safety and continuity concerns.

Commissioner Cannon agreed that bringing both sides together would create continuity, but he did not know that the bridge would be a greater amenity than those already proposed. Bridges can also be a challenge with canals. He was unsure if the bridge was worth losing other critical amenities.

Mr. Yermish stated that the County must have full access to the culverts, so bridge placement options would be limited. He preferred to have duplicate amenities on each side.

Commissioner Cluff stated that as a mother of small children, they love bridges, and she would feel safer walking with them on a bridge than along Redwood Road. If the community was targeted toward families that enjoy tot lots, a bridge would be a nice addition. If they made friends with children on the other side, she did not want them to have to walk on Redwood Road to get to their friend's house. However, she understood that a bridge would be expensive, and it was the developer's decision.

Mr. Yermish stated that he had spoken with the remaining property owners, but UDOT and the owner of the corner property would not sell. Any future development would come back before the Planning Commission, and they were ready to proceed with the current plan.

Chair Park remarked that there was significantly less open space on the north side. Mr. Yermish stated that some of the detention pond space could be utilized for a dog run and play area. Chair Park pointed out that the submitted landscape plan did not show the area as greenspace suitable for children to play. Mr. Gera stated that some sod could potentially be introduced in the triangular area near Midas Creek, but he was unsure of the

amount of space available there. Mr. Yermish indicated potential green space areas on a physical copy of the plans.

Chair Park opened the public hearing.

Virginia Baird stated that she currently owned the subject property. She believed Mr. Yermish had done a tremendous amount of work and the development would be beautiful. She was not in favor of the bridge due to its cost. Also, she did not believe people in complexes like the one proposed typically know their neighbors, and they can walk slightly longer to get to the dog park.

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

Chair Park stated that the item was for approval of the submitted Site Plan, but a secondary plan had been presented by the Applicant. He asked if the new plan must be resubmitted for review. Mr. Carter deferred to the Planning Department on the matter but indicated that the Planning Commission could also continue the item for further review. Mr. Prestwich stated that the bridge was a separate issue, but the additional amenities shown on the new Site Plan could be handled administratively. He recommended a Condition of Approval be added to indicate that the amenities were required.

Commissioner Cluff asked if the developments would meet all standards if considered separately. Mr. Prestwich stated that they would meet open space requirements, but the submitted Site Plan would not meet standards because a tot lot is specifically required.

Commissioner Cluff asked if the option for a bridge could be left open through the approval. Mr. Prestwich reported that the application could be approved without the bridge, and the amended Site Plan would then come back before the Planning Commission if it was added. A bridge could also be discussed if the additional lots were acquired.

Chair Park agreed with Ms. Baird that adults have difficulty getting to know their neighbors, even in townhomes, but noted that children know each other. If there are families on both sides of the creek, the children will want to play with their friends. He was not comfortable with requiring younger children to walk along a superhighway. Although somewhat offset from the development, the intersection of Redwood Road and 11800 South had been a problem. A bridge would be a safer solution.

Mr. Prestwich stated that a footpath may be possible as water is rarely present in the creek. Chair Park indicated that a formal path would be better and asked if an improved path through the creek bed would be allowed. Mr. Cassel reported that it may or may not require County approval, depending on the materials used. Mr. Yermish stated that they had considered the option, and he believed it was a good solution to keep costs lower and retain amenities on both sides. Chair Park stated that it would improve continuity and allow both children and adults to access the other side of their community without leaving it.

Commissioner Marzo agreed that a path is necessary to tie the community together. He has small children, and they would find a way to reach the children on the other side of the development. It was important to tie the community together via either a footpath or bridge. He would not want his children walking or riding their bikes along Redwood Road if he was not with them. Chair Park remarked that using a formal path would also discourage children from creating their own.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Marzo, Mr. Carter pointed out that the developer's goal was to avoid the cost of the bridge. If the Planning Commission was willing to allow a footpath, that should be the focus of the motion.

Commissioner Cluff stated that it would be difficult to get a stroller or bicycle across pavers, but that may not be an issue if there is a tot lot on both sides. She was comfortable approving the application with a conditional walking path.

Recommended language for the stipulation was discussed. Mr. Carter indicated that Salt Lake County may be unwilling to accept the risks associated with the proposed walking path. In response to a question from Commissioner Marzo, he stated that a gate would not likely not be permitted. Mr. Cassel added that if a permit is required, the impacts and safety of any proposed crossing would be addressed.

Commissioner Cluff moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE Application PLZ-26-1002, "Oquirrh Estates, Lot 13 Amended," subject to the following:

Conditions:

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

7. **The Applicant must create and agree to follow a Long-Term Storm Water Management Plan according to Riverton City Standards and Ordinances.**
8. **A Land Disturbance Permit must be issued prior to any construction grading on the site.**
9. **Developer shall coordinate with downstream users for the continuation and relocation of existing irrigation turnouts and supply ditches.**
10. **The site and structures shall comply with all applicable Riverton City Standards and Ordinances, including the International Building and Fire Codes.**
11. **The applicant must obtain any necessary approvals or permits from applicable outside agencies or jurisdictions.**
12. **Any necessary easements or agreements on the property must be recorded with the Salt Lake County Recorder.**
13. **Site work may commence while the perimeter fencing is not installed, but no building permit shall be issued until perimeter fencing is complete.**
14. **Landscaping surrounding a building must be installed before the building may be occupied. No more than 80% of the building permits may be issued until the required community landscaping and community amenities are installed. The Development Services Director may adjust this requirement for adverse weather or construction feasibility.**
15. **The HOA shall be responsible for maintaining the private roads, utilities, common spaces, and open-space parcels within the subdivision, including maintaining Midas Creek Channel.**
16. **The City Attorney must approve the CC&Rs for the development prior to the plat recording.**
17. **The developer must apply for a walking pathway across Midas Creek. If approved, the walking path shall be constructed. If denied, additional sod space will be provided on the north side.**
18. **Landscaping shall include a tot lot on the north side of the creek.**

Commissioner Beck seconded the motion. Vote on Motion: Commissioner Matheson-Aye, Commissioner Beck-Aye, Chair Park-Aye, Commissioner Cluff-Aye, Commissioner Marzo-Aye, Commissioner Cannon-Abstain. The motion passed unanimously.

3. MINUTES

**A. PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES FROM THE JUNE 25, 2026,
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING.**

Commissioner Matheson moved that the Planning Commission **APPROVE** the minutes from the Planning Commission meeting on June 25, 2026, as reported. Commissioner Beck seconded the motion. The motion passed with unanimous consent of the Commission.

4. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:27 PM.