



Minutes of the City of West Jordan
Planning Commission
Tuesday, October 06, 2026 – 6:00 PM
8000 S Redwood Road, 3rd Floor
West Jordan, UT 84088

Call to Order

Commissioners Present: Chair Jay Thomas, Vice Chair Ammon Allen, Commissioner Cheryl Acker, Commissioner Tom Hollingsworth, Commissioner John Roberts

Staff Present: Senior Assistant City Attorney Duncan Murray, Associate Planner Mark Forsythe, City Planner Larry Gardner, Division Chief/Fire Marshal Mike Jensen, Senior Planner Tayler Jensen, Community Development Director Scott Langford, City Engineer Nate Nelson, Community Development Administrative Assistant Kerryn Talbot

Absent: Commissioners Jimmy Anderson and Emily Gonzalez

1. Pledge of Allegiance

Commissioner Hollingsworth led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. Consent Calendar

a. Approve Meeting Minutes

September 15, 2026 – Planning Commission Work Session
September 15, 2026 – Planning Commission Regular Meeting

Motion: Commissioner Allen made a motion to approve the minutes of the September 15, 2026 meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Acker and passed 4–0 in favor.

Commissioner Roberts was in a sidebar discussion and was not present for this vote.

3. Public Hearings (with final action by the Planning Commission)

a. Sugar Factory on the Creek Townhomes; 1790 West Sugar Factory Road; Preliminary Site Plan and Preliminary Major Subdivision; CC-R Zone; Proposal by the Applicant; [Mark Forsythe/Nate Nelson/Angelica Haro/Mike Jensen #35708, #35709; parcels 21-34-181-005, 21-34-181-001, 21-34-180-001]

Brandon Wixom, representing the applicant, presented the item. He explained that the proposal would create a community where 23 families could own homes and enjoy a variety of amenities. Bingham Creek would be incorporated as part of the development. He noted that significant effort had been made to create an attractive and functional project. The site plan includes a pedestrian bridge, and a portion of the property has been donated to the City to improve walkability to the TRAX line. The applicant stated that careful attention was given to circulation and public access. They have also listened to neighbor's concerns and made

adjustments accordingly. The building elevations reflect a farmhouse style to be consistent with the character of West Jordan. On the opposite side of the creek, the County requested an easement.

Associate Planner Mark Forsythe reviewed the Preliminary Site Plan and Preliminary Major Subdivision. He explained that the property is in the CC-R (City Center Residential) Zone and was recently rezoned by the City Council with a transit overlay. After review, staff found that the proposal meets the intent of the applicable zoning. He also noted that a preliminary development plan was presented during the rezone process; the current review focuses on site-specific details.

Mark highlighted updates made since the earlier version of the plan, including adjustments to parking. The development plan includes provisions requiring “guest only” parking signage. Additional CC&R provisions address parking and access requirements. The applicant will dedicate a portion of the property to the City for the future TRAX line. Regarding fencing, a masonry wall will run along the east side, and its height will be kept low enough for neighboring residents to see oncoming traffic as vehicles exit the site. Staff recommended approval.

Commissioner Allen asked about public access and whether Mark was referring to the entrance or the private lane. Mark clarified that those details will be worked out during final review, but the intention is to include a public access easement. Assistant City Attorney Duncan Murray provided background on private roads and the City's ability to provide ongoing services.

Public Hearing Opened. No comments or questions. Public Hearing Closed.

Motion: Commissioner Allen made a motion to approve the Preliminary Site Plan. Commissioner Acker seconded the motion, and it passed 5–0.

Motion: Commissioner Allen made a motion to approve the Preliminary Major Subdivision. Commissioner Acker seconded the motion, and it passed 5–0.

Requirements of Approval

Preliminary Site Plan

1. The development shall be consistent with all ordinances, provisions and standards of the West Jordan City Code and the adopted Sugar Factory on the Creek Townhomes Development Plan/Development Agreement.
2. All applicable West Jordan City departmental requirements must be met prior to Final Site Plan approval.
3. Apply for, and obtain approval of, all applicable permits from Salt Lake County Flood Control and the City of West Jordan.

Requirements of Approval

Preliminary Subdivision

1. Register the Homeowners Association with the Utah Department of Commerce prior to recording the approved Final Subdivision Plat.

2. Submit the Covenants, Codes and Restrictions to the City for review with the Final Condominium Plat. The approved CC&R's must be recorded with the final approved subdivision plat.

4. Public Hearings (with Recommendation to City Council for Final Action)

a. Barber Estates; 7401 South 5490 West: Rezone RR-1D (Rural Residential 1 Acre Lots) to R-1-12 (Residential Single-Family 12,000 Square Foot Minimum Lot Size) Zone; Anderson Development (Applicant)[Tayler Jensen/Nate Nelson/Angelica Haro #34633 Parcel #20-25-325-015-0000]

Adam Anderson, the applicant, presented the item. He explained that the request is for a rezone to the R-1-12 zone and noted that a concept plan with nine lots had been submitted. He stated that the project will still need to go through the engineering process, including road access requirements. For context, he discussed national and state trends in lot redevelopment and the relationship between home size and land area, noting that homes built on appropriately sized lots tend to remain long-term community assets. The applicant stated that they have met with neighbors and staff to address site-related concerns and reiterated that the request before the Commission is solely for the rezone. He requested approval.

Senior Planner Tayler Jensen clarified that the concept plan is informational only. The Commission is not voting on a concept but rather making a recommendation—positive or negative—on the rezone request. He explained the subsequent steps in the development process, including preliminary subdivision review, Planning Commission final subdivision review, and staff-level building permit approval.

Commissioner Allen asked about the entrance from 5490 West shown on the map. Tayler explained that a deferral agreement exists to ensure the road is completed, whether by Anderson Development, Peterson, or a combination of both parties. When Commissioner Allen asked whether sufficient right-of-way exists, Tayler clarified that it will be the developer's responsibility to ensure adequate right-of-way is provided.

Public Hearing Opened

A resident, Melissa Wood, who lives north of the subject property, expressed concern that all properties to the north and east have animal rights, with parcels ranging from 1-acre lots to 5-acre and 10-acre lots. She questioned why the proposed rezone would reduce lot sizes from ½-acre to 12,000 square feet and asked for clarification regarding ¼-acre lots. She noted that many homeowners had not been invited to community meetings regarding the proposal. Additional concerns included traffic impacts and the lack of an exit onto 5600 West. The resident asked that the Commission not approve the rezone and consider what would be most appropriate for existing property owners.

Resident Ben Southworth spoke in opposition to the rezone. He stated that while the R-1-12 zone itself is generally acceptable, the proposed amendment does not align with the Future Land Use Map (FLUM), which designates the area as Low Density—not Very Low Density. He referenced the first finding of fact, noting that land-use decisions should be guided by the General Plan to protect existing neighborhoods and minimize impacts. In his view, the

proposed transition is not appropriate. He explained that the surrounding RR-½ properties support uses such as horses, cows, and sheep, which are characteristic of Rural Residential areas, and that these uses are not compatible with higher-density development. Mr. Southworth also noted that previous references indicated 8,000-square-foot lots, which added to his concern that the proposed rezone does not meet the intent of the General Plan.

Resident Steve Schiele, who lives in Jacob Hill Circle, spoke in opposition to the rezone. He stated that he and his neighbors built and purchased their properties approximately 25 years ago because the area was zoned for low-density development and accommodated large lots, horses, and cattle. He expressed frustration with requests for increased density based on development economics, noting that he continues to receive inquiries from parties interested in purchasing his property. Mr. Schiele cited the Council's prior approval of 55 rental homes across the street and raised concerns about existing and future traffic congestion, access to 7800 South, and emergency-vehicle access. He questioned why the property owner wished to develop smaller lots while retaining a half-acre or full-acre parcel and asked that the original intended use of the property be considered. After reviewing the plat, he also questioned the absence of a buffer between the proposed development and adjoining properties. He described unresolved code-enforcement concerns involving Conex containers along his property boundary and warned that placing homes near existing horse properties could create conflicts over odors and flies. Mr. Schiele asked the Commission to reconsider the proposed density and stated that residents would be willing to discuss larger lots. He emphasized that his property is a legacy for his family and that he intends for it to remain horse property.

Hadley Warnick, a sophomore at Copper Hills High School whose home is directly behind the proposed development, spoke in opposition to the rezone. She stated that her property and neighboring farms have cows, horses, and other farm animals. She expressed concern that placing homes between active agricultural properties, including a meat farm and horse properties, could create compatibility, cleanliness, and construction challenges. Ms. Warnick described the area as one of West Jordan's last remaining agricultural areas and said the proposed development could contribute to the long-term loss of agriculture.

Kody Brown, who lives on the private road at the opposite end of the proposed development, spoke in opposition to the proposed lot sizes. He stated that the nearby dark-green parcels shown on the map are part of an active working farm and that he and his family moved to the area because of its large lots, farms, and animals. He noted that his family has kept cows and chickens and currently has goats and household pets. Mr. Brown also questioned how the zoning and street-completion requirements would affect the existing private road. He asked that smaller lots not be placed next to large horse and agricultural properties.

Brittni Allen, who lives one house outside the required notification area, spoke in opposition to the rezone. She stated that she moved to the neighborhood approximately one year ago and confirmed that flies and other impacts associated with nearby animal uses can be significant. Ms. Allen also expressed concern about existing traffic conditions and said the recently resurfaced and restriped roads are not equipped to accommodate additional higher-density housing. She stated that she purchased her property to provide privacy and outdoor space for her children and was concerned that the proposed development would allow additional homes to overlook her yard. She noted that higher-density housing options already exist nearby and

asked that the remaining low-density, rural character of the area be preserved.

Shane Bowler, who lives at and operates the farm adjacent to the proposed development, stated that the farm has operated at that location for many years and that he intends for it to remain. He acknowledged the comments regarding flies and odors associated with the farm. Mr. Bowler said his primary concern was that the proposed subdivision does not currently have the required access. He reported that he had met with the developers that day and had begun discussing possible solutions, but expressed concern about approving the rezone before required access to the subdivision is secured.

Isidora Drury, whose property touches the northeast corner of the proposed development, spoke in opposition to the rezone. She expressed concern about the trend toward smaller lots and cited traffic and safety issues near the car wash and Home Depot, including the effects of nearby higher-density development. Ms. Drury stated that she has had a positive experience living on Teco Drive, where she feels safe and knows neighboring property owners. She supported development of the subject property but asked that it be designed with lot sizes and uses more compatible with the surrounding area. She also raised concerns about traffic, crime, neighborhood stability, and incidents involving mailboxes, and asked the Commission to consider the comments made in opposition to the proposal.

Ben Homer, who lives in the subdivision directly south of the proposed development, spoke in opposition to the rezone as proposed. He stated that although the two nearby subdivisions are zoned R-1-12, their lots exceed the 12,000-square-foot minimum, generally ranging from approximately 13,000 to 20,000 square feet. He said that he and his wife chose their larger lot as a long-term home where they could raise their children. Mr. Homer disputed the characterization of 12,000-square-foot lots as standard for the neighborhood, noting that the two most recently developed nearby subdivisions contain larger lots. He expressed willingness to consider a revised proposal with larger lots but asked the Commission to vote against the current proposal.

Tiffany Ostrander, who lives directly east of the proposed development, stated that she keeps horses, goats, and turkeys on her 1½-acre property and acknowledged that these animals contribute to flies in the area. She expressed concern about how her property would be buffered from the proposed 12,000-square-foot lots. Ms. Ostrander said she had discussed fencing and buffering with the developer but was concerned that those measures were not included in the plans or as requirements of approval. She asked whether taller fencing or other protections would be required to provide an adequate buffer between the properties.

Milton Schow, who lives directly east of the proposed development, spoke in opposition to the proposed lot sizes. He stated that he and his family moved to the property approximately 20 years ago because of the area's rural character, including larger lots and greater distance between neighboring homes. Mr. Schow acknowledged that the proposal had increased the minimum lot size from 9,000 to 12,000 square feet but said the proposed lots would still be too small and incompatible with the surrounding area.

Public Hearing Closed

Chair Thomas thanked the youth who spoke during the public hearing and stated that the

Commission values their participation. He clarified that the matter before the Commission was limited to the rezone request and that the Commission could only make a recommendation to the City Council; additional development details would be considered at a future hearing. Chair Thomas noted that under City Code, the proposed R-1-12 zoning, at approximately three lots per acre, is classified as very low-density residential and is less dense than many proposals reviewed by the Commission. He also shared that he lives next to agricultural property and understands that livestock and chickens can generate flies, which he viewed as an expected impact of living near agricultural uses.

The Commission then asked staff to address questions raised during the public hearing. Senior Planner Tayler Jensen stated that 5490 West has been included in the City's Master Transportation Plan since 2010 and would be dedicated as part of the development process. Staff also addressed traffic and emergency-response considerations.

Senior Assistant City Attorney Duncan Murray suggested allowing the applicant and staff to respond to additional questions. Staff explained that the R-1-12 zone does not require a buffer from the adjoining rural-residential lots and that existing animal rights on those properties would remain. A buyer disclosure could advise future residents of nearby farms, livestock, odors, and other agricultural impacts.

Community Development Director Scott Langford noted that Mr. Bowler's negotiations with the developer regarding access across his property were private. Mr. Langford explained that the ordinance to be drafted by Senior Assistant City Attorney Duncan Murray would include a three-year reversionary clause. If the developer did not obtain the required right-of-way and construct the road in accordance with City Code and the condition of approval within three years, the property's zoning would revert to its current designation.

Senior Planner Tayler Jensen added that the subdivision could not be approved before the road was developed.

Vice Chair Ammon Allen acknowledged the difficulty of balancing the area's changing character with the property owner's right to develop under City Code. He cautioned that denying a code-compliant use could create legal risk and an undesirable precedent. In response to concerns about buffering, he explained that the proposed R-1-12 zoning would provide a transition from larger agricultural lots to smaller residential lots rather than directly to substantially higher-density development. He noted that homes could be located approximately 25 feet from the rear property line and could be up to 35 feet high. Vice Chair Allen stated that he appreciated the applicant's effort to select lot sizes that would be compatible with the community while reducing the likelihood of future subdivision and additional congestion. He concluded that the City had done what it could within its regulations.

Commissioner Acker emphasized that the proposed rezone would include a three-year reversionary clause, under which the property would return to its current zoning if the required road access were not secured and completed within that period. She stated that the matter before the Commission was limited to the rezone recommendation and that details such as fencing would be addressed later during subdivision plat review.

Commissioner Hollingsworth asked whether traffic studies would be conducted as part of the later road review. Staff confirmed that a traffic study would be required if determined necessary by the Engineering Department as the road proceeds through acquisition and approval.

Chair Thomas requested that the motion expressly include the following reversionary provision: If, within three years, the developer does not obtain the required right-of-way and construct the road in accordance with City Code and the condition of approval, the property's zoning will revert to its current designation.

Motion: Commissioner Hollingsworth moved that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the West Jordan City Council for the Barber Estates rezone of approximately 8.3 acres from Rural Residential, 1-Acre Lots (RR-1D) to Single-Family Residential, 12,000-Square-Foot Minimum Lot Size (R-1-12), subject to all conditions of approval, including the condition that if, within three years, the developer does not obtain the required right-of-way and construct the road in accordance with City Code and the condition of approval, the property's zoning will revert to its current designation. Commissioner Allen seconded the motion, and it passed 5–0.

Conditions of Approval:

1. The developer shall complete 5490 West from Highlands Loop Lane to the northern boundary of Barber Estates before a certificate of occupancy is issued.

Planning Commission added Condition

2. If, within three years, the developer does not obtain the required right-of-way and construct the road in accordance with City Code and the condition of approval, the property's zoning will revert to its current designation.

6. Adjourn

Motion: Ammon Allen made a motion to Adjourn. There were no objections. The meeting adjourned at 7:01 PM.

I hereby certify that the foregoing minutes represent an accurate summary of what occurred at the meeting held on October 6, 2026. This document constitutes the official minutes for the West Jordan City Planning Commission meeting.

/s/ Kerryn Talbot, Administrative Assistant
Community Development

Approved this 20th day of October 2026

Fw: Public Hearing for the Proposed "Old Bingham Byre Subdivision" Rezone (R-1-8C)

From WJPlanning <wjplanning@westjordan.utah.gov>
Date Thu 8/13/2026 3:27 PM
To Mark Forsythe <Mark.Forsythe@westjordan.utah.gov>
Cc Kerry Talbot <kerry.talbot@westjordan.utah.gov>

FYI

Larry D. Gardner
City Planner/Zoning Administrator
West Jordan City
801-569-5067
Larry.gardner@westjordan.utah.gov

From: Ray and Denise Thurman <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Wednesday, August 12, 2026 7:59 PM
To: WJPlanning <wjplanning@westjordan.utah.gov>
Subject: Public Hearing for the Proposed "Old Bingham Byre Subdivision" Rezone (R-1-8C)

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To the Members of the Planning Commission,

Our names are Ray & Denise Thurman, and we own the residential property at 8142 South Pheasant Run Circle and the 1/4-acre parcel that directly butts up against the proposed 1.46-acre "Old Bingham Byre" subdivision project.

I spoke with city staff today and understand that the application files and subdivision plats are currently undergoing legal review by the city attorneys.

As an immediate adjacent neighbor, I want to formally place a clear boundary notice into the official file before those legal documents are approved or finalized for the August 18th public hearing:

I request that the city mandate the following strict conditions on this development:

1. **Zero Encroachment or Easements on My Property:** I want to state clearly for the record that I do not, and will not, consent to any construction easements, utility easements, drainage easements, or access rights running through or onto my property. The developer's project, private lane, utility tie-ins, and grading must be contained **100% within his own 1.46-acre parcel.**
2. **Continuous Masonry/Brick Boundary Wall:** Because the new 5-lot layout creates a high-density footprint that directly butts up against our established borders, we ask that the developer be required to install a continuous, 6-foot-tall decorative precast concrete, masonry, or brick privacy wall along the entire shared property line. This wall must be fully funded and built by the developer prior to final plat recording, providing critical safety, sound insulation, and privacy.

3. **Strict Adherence to Rear Setbacks:** We request that any new primary structures built on the lots directly behind us strictly maintain the standard 25-foot rear yard setback, with zero structural exceptions or variances granted under the "C" (Conditional) suffix designation.
4. **Accessory Structure Enforcement:** Should future lot owners utilize detached modular units (such as Modal units) as Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs), we ask that the city strictly enforce a minimum 5-to-10-foot boundary setback from our shared property line to prevent overcrowding and roof-shed drainage onto our land.
5. **Stormwater Mitigation:** We request that city engineers thoroughly review the grading plans to ensure all modern roof and private lane stormwater runoff from the new subdivision is retained entirely on-site and directed away from our existing homes and foundations.

Thank you for your time, your consideration of these neighborhood impacts, and your dedication to protecting existing West Jordan residents. I look forward to speaking on this matter at the public hearing on August 18th.

Sincerely,

Ray & Denise Thurman

