



BLUFFDALE PLANNING COMMISSION
Wednesday, November 4, 2026

Notice is hereby given that the Bluffdale City Planning Commission will hold a public meeting on **Wednesday, November 4, 2026, at 6:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as possible** at the Bluffdale City Hall, 2222 West 14400 South, Bluffdale, Utah. This meeting will also be broadcast live to the public on the City's website www.bluffdale.gov. Notice is further given that access to this meeting by Commission members may be via electronic means via telephone conference call. The public may comment at the meeting or by emailing comments to planningmeetingcomment@bluffdale.gov by **4:00PM** the day of the meeting. Emailed comments will be submitted to the Planning Commission but will not be read at the meeting.

In the event the meeting is disrupted in any way that the City in its sole discretion deems inappropriate, the City reserves the right to immediately remove the individual(s) from the meeting and, if needed, end virtual access to the meeting. Reasons for removing an individual or ending virtual access to the meeting include but are not limited to the posting of offensive pictures, remarks or making offensive statements, disrespectful statements or actions, and any other action deemed inappropriate.

PLANNING COMMISSION BUSINESS MEETING 6:00 PM

1. Roll Call.
2. Invocation/Thought/Reading and Pledge of Allegiance.
3. Approval of minutes from the September 16, 2026 and October 7, 2026 Planning Commission meetings.
4. Planning Commission disclosures.
5. Public Comment: Any person who wishes to comment on items not scheduled on the agenda for a public hearing may address the Planning Commission and comments will be limited to not more than three (3) minutes.

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

6. **CONSIDERATION AND VOTE** on an amended Site Plan for 30 dwelling units in the R-SL Senior Living Zone and a new access to 2700 West located at 2535 West Remi Lane (Application 2026-14). Howland Partners, Inc., Applicant, represented by Gary Howland and Tina Franco. Caitlyn Tubbs, Staff Presenter.
7. **CONSIDERATION AND VOTE** on an amended subdivision plat for 30 dwelling units and a new access to 2700 West in the Reagan Cove Subdivision Plat (Application 2026-15). Howland Partners, Inc., Applicant, represented by Gary Howland and Tina Franco. Caitlyn Tubbs, Staff Presenter.

LEGISLATIVE ITEMS

8. **PUBLIC HEARING, CONSIDERATION, AND RECOMMENDATION** on a proposed Text Amendment to reduce the minimum required distance from residential property lines for indoor Kennels from 350 feet to 250 feet (Application 2026-33). Full House Dog Training, Inc., represented by Tracie Kay, Applicant. Caitlyn Tubbs, Staff Presenter.
9. **PUBLIC HEARING, CONSIDERATION, AND RECOMMENDATION** on a proposed Development Agreement for the Chapel Row project, including 20 single family residential lots and an agricultural preservation parcel with seasonal produce stand on 15.72 acres at 3515 West 13800 South (Application 2026-26). Brett Lovell and Garrett Schmidt, Applicants. Caitlyn Tubbs, Staff Presenter.
10. **PUBLIC HEARING, CONSIDERATION, AND RECOMMENDATION** on a proposed Development Agreement for a retail boutique within an existing historic structure located at 14402 South 1690 West (Application 2026-20). Art and Robin Thraen, Applicants. Ellen Oakman, Staff Presenter
11. **PUBLIC HEARING, CONSIDERATION, AND RECOMMENDATION** on a proposed Zone Map Amendment from R4 to Neighborhood Commercial (NC) for 0.24 acres located at 14402 South 1690 West (Application 2026-20). Art and Robin Thraen, Applicants. Ellen Oakman, Staff Presenter.
12. **PUBLIC HEARING, CONSIDERATION, AND RECOMMENDATION** on a proposed Text Amendment to allow Short-Term Rental of Accessory Dwelling Units (Application 2026-35). City of Bluffdale, Applicant. Ellen Oakman, Staff Presenter.
13. **PUBLIC HEARING, CONSIDERATION, AND RECOMMENDATION** on a proposed amendment to the Water Conservation Element of the General Plan (Application 2026-34). City of Bluffdale, Applicant. Daniel Tracer, Staff Presenter.

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

14. Planning Commission Business (planning session for upcoming items, follow up, etc.).
15. Adjournment.

Dated: October 30, 2026



**Grant Crowell, AICP
Community and Economic Development
Director**

In compliance with the American Disabilities Act, individuals needing assistance or other services or accommodation for this meeting should contact Bluffdale City at least 24 hours in advance of this meeting at (801)254-2200. TTY 7-1-1.



MINUTES

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES**

Wednesday, September 16, 2026

Present:

**Members: Erik Swanson, Vice-Chair
Kory Luker
Joel Woodruff**

**Staff: Grant Crowell, Community and Economic Development Director
Caitlyn Tubbs, Planning Manager
Pauline Matagi, Community Development Coordinator
Addison Mitton, Assistant City Engineer
Courtney Armstrong, Accounting Technician**

Others: Steve Austin, City Council Member

PLANNING COMMISSION BUSINESS MEETING

1. Roll Call.

Vice-Chair Erik Swanson called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.

2. Invocation/Thought/Reading and Pledge of Allegiance.

Mark Hales offered the invocation and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Approval of Minutes from August 19, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting.

It was noted that Commissioner Swanson's name was duplicated on page 1, lines 30 through 31.

Commissioner Woodruff moved to APPROVE the Minutes of the August 19, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting, as amended. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Luker. Vote on motion: Kory Luker-Yes, Joel Woodruff-Yes, Erik Swanson-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Planning Commission Disclosures.

There were no disclosures.

5. Public Comment.

There was no public comment.

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES**

Wednesday, September 16, 2026

6. Development Agreement Training – Grant Crowell and Fred Donaldson, Staff Presenters.

Community and Economic Development Director, Grant Crowell reported that the City had received multiple recent inquiries about Development Agreements, including for commercial flex space developments.

A Development Agreement:

- Is a contract between the City and property owner or developer that regulates the use and development of a specific piece of land.
- Is specifically enabled by State code and can be used as the City sees fit.
- Creates vesting in mutual commitments by exchanging infrastructure, contributions, certainty or design standards outside normal zoning in exchange for higher density, smaller lot sizes, or different project attributes.
- Must be fair to both parties.
- Must follow legislative land use hearing requirements in most cases.
- Can be used to supplement underling zoning or in lieu of zoning and General Plan changes.
- Because it is a contract between the developer and City Council, Council involvement may be required early in the process via work sessions, presentations, etc.

City Attorney, Fred Donaldson explained that Development Agreements are recorded on the property and run with the land, so they create restrictive covenants that bind successor owners and the City.

The traditional legislative zoning process for land use changes includes:

- Zone Map amendments
 - traditional zones
 - special districts
 - infill overlays
 - other zoning tools previously used in Bluffdale
- Zoning Text Amendments

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES**

Wednesday, September 16, 2026

- Zone Map Amendments combined with General Plan Amendments (map or text)
- State code considers zoning changes and Development Agreements as similar types of land use regulation.

When a Development Agreement is not appropriate:

- The developer agrees to comply with the standards, requirements, and restrictions in the underlying zone.
- The City does not want or need special consideration.
- The development is uncomplicated.

Mr. Donaldson reported that some cities had required Development Agreements for all rezones. In response, the Legislature changed code to indicate that if the developer is willing to abide by existing requirements and the City does not need additional consideration, a Development Agreement cannot be required. Mr. Crowell added that the Planning Commission had recently recommended approval of a rezoning request with the condition that a Development Agreement be required, but the City Council decided that the zoning was sufficient and certainty was not required.

When a Development is appropriate:

- When special consideration is given in exchange for something else.
 - Density, setbacks, right-of-way, parks, additional contributions, design, certainty, phasing, etc.
 - State law prohibits certain design and landscaping regulations on single-family homes without a Development Agreement.
- To fill gaps that need clarity or address complicated issues
- The City Council can require a Development Agreement in conjunction with a rezone or deny a rezone without one if they deem it necessary and reasonable. However, that is typically not necessary unless there is consideration on either side.

Mr. Donaldson explained that both rezoning and Development Agreements are legislative decisions, and both would be afforded deference on appeal.

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, September 16, 2026**

General observations on Development Agreements:

- They can either stand alone or supplement underlying zoning, but the Zone Map is essentially changed regardless.
- They are a negotiation that provides the City with leverage to achieve its goals.
- They can alter any provision of the land use code, map, or General Plan.
 - A project can be deemed consistent with the General Plan without amending it.
- They expire, with a term set during negotiations.
- Contract litigation and enforcement is different than land use enforcement.
- They are recorded on the property and run with the land, and as such they bind future development on the property.
 - Provisions regarding default and time to cure violations are included in each Development Agreement. If a party defaults, the agreement is enforced as a contract claim through the civil litigation process. Code violations are typically enforced administratively through the Code Enforcement process.
- The Planning Commission conducts hearings and makes recommendations on all land use regulations, including Development Agreements.
- Early feedback from the City Council may be warranted.
- They must be signed prior to being placed on a City Council meeting agenda and should not be redrafted during the Council meeting.

Mr. Crowell reported that other resources were available from the Utah Property Rights Ombudsman, and a Utah League of Cities and Towns ("ULCT") training video was also available.

Mr. Donaldson indicated that recent Development Agreements for Bringhurst Station and a micro-flex development requested changes to design standards, parking requirements, etc., and in return the City was able to request additional right-of-way and other considerations. Development Agreements create certainty for the City and are often mutually beneficial.

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES**

Wednesday, September 16, 2026

1 In response to a question raised by Commissioner Woodruff, Mr. Donaldson confirmed that
2 Development Agreements can create a path to approval for developments that do not meet zoning
3 standard, and disputes are handled differently from zoning issues. They allow developers to contract
4 for certain exceptions to zoning requirements in exchange for considerations such as additional open
5 space or other improvements.

6
7 Regarding future changes, Development Agreements outline what are considered major or minor
8 amendments. Minor amendments can be administratively approved, but major amendments require
9 City Council approval. Land use changes would also come before the Planning Commission.

10
11 Mr. Crowell reported that early in his career, Development Agreements were typically used for larger
12 master-planned communities, but they were now being tailored for smaller parcels as well.
13 Mr. Donaldson added that State law has added more flexibility related to the agreements over the past
14 10 years. They are enabled by State Code to create more flexibility for property owners to use their
15 land as they see fit and bind how the land can be developed. However, when the agreement expires,
16 its obligations and entitlements also lapse.

17
18 In response to a question from Vice-Chair Swanson, Mr. Donaldson reported that Development
19 Agreements are drafted on a case-by-case basis based on the City's and developer's goals. For
20 example, if a developer wanted to allow a use not included in the zone's Table of Uses, the City could
21 require that other uses be removed as consideration.

22
23 **LEGISLATIVE ITEMS**

- 24
25 7. **PUBLIC HEARING, CONSIDERATION, AND RECOMMENDATION on a Proposed**
26 **General Plan Map Amendment for approximately 2.09 acres located at 14553 South**
27 **3400 West from Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) to Low Density Residential**
28 **(LDR) and Zone Map Amendment for the same property from R1 Residential to R2**
29 **Residential (Application 2026-25), Austin Day, Applicant. Caitlyn Tubbs, Staff**
30 **Presenter.**

31
32 Planning Manager, Caitlyn Tubbs, presented the Staff Report and indicated that the 2.09-acre subject
33 property is located at the southern end of 3400 West. The Applicant intended to subdivide the
34 property into two 1.25-acre and .825-acre lots. Ms. Tubbs noted that a Concept Plan was not required,

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, September 16, 2026**

1 but one had been provided for illustrative purposes only. The plan was not binding; if rezoning was
2 approved, all standards of the R2 zone must be met.

3
4 The Very Low-Density Residential land use designation contemplates less than one dwelling unit per
5 acre and is intended to accommodate large-lot residential and agricultural development. As the
6 planned subdivision would have two lots on 2.09 acres for a total of 0.957 dwelling units per acre,
7 Staff determined that it was consistent with the current designation. However, the Applicant had
8 applied to amend the General Plan Map to Low Density Residential, as was their right.

9
10 The R2 Zone limits properties between two and five acres in size to a total of 1.5 dwelling units per
11 acre. If rezoning was approved, the property could potentially qualify for three lots if all other
12 standards were met. If the City desired additional guarantees that the property would only be
13 developed with two lots, a Development Agreement could be considered.

14
15 As there were only three Commissioners present, Ms. Tubbs reminded them that any vote must be
16 unanimous in order for action to be taken.

17
18 Commissioner Luker asked why the model motions were combined. Ms. Tubbs clarified that the
19 item could be divided into two separate motions as it included two applications.

20
21 Vice-Chair Swanson indicated that the property was close to the edge of the City, and the Falls at
22 Boulden Ridge was much denser than surrounding properties. Mr. Crowell noted that it was a Planned
23 Residential Development (“PRD”) with an average density of approximately one dwelling unit per
24 acre. In response to Vice-Chair Swanson’s question, Ms. Tubbs reported that the R3 Zone must be
25 60 feet from the border of the City and have a minimum of five acres. The subject property would
26 not qualify for that zoning. A nearby 25-acre parcel was the only parcel in the area that would qualify,
27 but the property owner had not inquired about potential development.

28
29 Commissioner Woodruff remarked that the Salt Lake County parcel map listed the parcel as 1.98
30 acres and asked about the discrepancy. Ms. Tubbs reported that the Applicant recently completed a
31 boundary line adjustment to bring the property to 2.09 acres. In response to his follow-up question,

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, September 16, 2026**

Ms. Tubbs explained that dwelling units per acre is calculated as an average per parcel. If the property was rezoned to R2 and subdivided into two lots, neither lot would qualify for further subdivision under the existing ordinance. Mr. Crowell clarified that only a plat amendment would be required if all zone requirements were met. Otherwise, the property must be rezoned to allow for additional lots.

The Applicant, Austin Day, stated that his family would live on the property and maintain both lots. They intended to live in the new home, and either their in-laws or children would live in the existing house. They originally requested R3 zoning but were denied. In response to a question from Vice-Chair Swanson, he stated that the boundary line adjustment added .09 acres on the western property line to allow for the private lane, which was completed and would be used to access the second parcel.

Vice-Chair Swanson asked why the Applicant had requested a General Plan Map Amendment when the existing land use would fit the development. Mr. Crowell explained that the Applicant was informed that he must file the application when he requested to rezone the property to R3. However, if they were no longer considering three lots, that amendment was not necessary. Mr. Day expressed disappointment that he could not create three lots and indicated that he hoped to position the houses to allow for another lot if City requirements changed in the future.

Vice-Chair Swanson opened the public hearing and reported that one email comment had been received and reviewed by the Planning Commission. There were no further comments. The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Luker was in favor of rezoning the property but would recommend denial of the Land Use Map Amendment.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Woodruff, Ms. Tubbs reported that development rights are bestowed with zoning. If the Planning Commission desired confirmation that the property would only be subdivided into two lots, a Development Agreement would be necessary. Commissioner Woodruff was in favor of upholding the current General Plan designation. Vice-Chair Swanson agreed that the General Plan should be upheld until there was a broader discussion on appropriate changes for that area of Bluffdale.

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, September 16, 2026**

In response to a question from Commissioner Luker, Mr. Donaldson confirmed that there should be two separate motions.

General Plan Map Amendment:

Commissioner Luker moved to forward a **NEGATIVE** recommendation to the City Council for the proposed General Plan Map Amendment from VLDR to LDR for the property at 14553 South 3400 West, based on the findings presented in the Staff Report dated September 11, 2026. Commissioner Woodruff seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Kory Luker-Yes, Joel Woodruff-Yes, Erik Swanson-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

Vice-Chair Swanson had the same concerns for the Zone Map Amendment, as there was an incongruity between the R2 Zone and General Plan designation for the area. He preferred that the density concern be addressed through a Development Agreement.

Commissioner Luker stated that he did not feel a Development Agreement was necessary. A similar recommendation was recently made to the City Council and they felt an agreement was not necessary. However, he appreciated Vice-Chair Swanson's concern.

In response to a question from Commissioner Woodruff, Vice-Chair Swanson stated that an additional mechanism was necessary to ensure that the subdivision conformed with the General Plan designation requiring an average of one dwelling unit per acre. Commissioner Woodruff pointed out that the same issue would arise every time the new zoning was requested. Vice-Chair Swanson agreed that it would occur unless the Planning Commission was given new tools or the current tools were modified.

The previous City Council decision was discussed. Mr. Crowell explained that applications are considered on a case-by-case basis, and all findings and decisions should be based on the item's specific attributes. The subject property had considerably different attributes from the previous application, as that property had more barriers to approval.

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES**

Wednesday, September 16, 2026

Commissioner Woodruff referred to Mr. Day's desire for a third dwelling unit and indicated that delaying the item could provide him with more time to pursue that option. Otherwise, they could recommended a Development Agreement to ensure compliance with the General Plan.

Zone Map Amendment:

Commissioner Luker moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the City Council for the proposed Zone Map Amendment from R1 to R2 for the property at 14553 South 3400 West, based on the findings presented in the Staff Report dated September 11, 2026. There was no second. The motion failed.

Commissioner Woodruff recommended that the full Planning Commission discuss how to address similar applications in the future, so they did not continue having the same discussion. Vice-Chair Swanson stated that he was grateful for the new zones. However, there was friction between the General Plan designation and R2 Zone. He would like to discuss the matter with the City Council and ask them to address the issue.

Mr. Donaldson explained that a Development Agreement may be required, as the General Plan designation may not be sufficient to prevent further subdivision.

Commissioner Luker moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the City Council for the proposed Zone Map Amendment from R1 to R2 for the property at 14553 South 3400 West, based on the findings presented in the Staff Report dated September 11, 2026 and including the following additional finding:

1. The City Council should enter into a Development Agreement with the Applicant to ensure that development aligns with the General Plan requirement of less than one dwelling unit per acre.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Woodruff. Vote on motion: Kory Luker-Yes, Joel Woodruff-Yes, Erik Swanson-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, September 16, 2026**

Mr. Crowell reported that the item would be on the September 23, 2026 City Council meeting agenda.

8. PUBLIC HEARING, CONSIDERATION, AND RECOMMENDATION on a Proposed Update to the Transportation Master Plan, a Component of the City's General Plan, City of Bluffdale, Applicant. Addison Mitton, Staff Presenter.

Assistant City Engineer, Addison Mitton, presented the proposed Transportation Master Plan update and reported that the plan was last updated in February 2020.

Changes included:

- The project list was updated and completed projects were removed.
- Population projections were updated to replace references to Equivalent Residential Connections (“ERC”) with actual population numbers.
- Household and employment density maps were updated to reflect higher density in Independence, near The Point, and at the Gravel Pit.
- The functional classification map was updated to indicate that the only City-owned arterial roadways in the City are Porter Rockwell Boulevard, Redwood Road, and 14600 South.
- Sections related to active transportation were removed as the City now had an Active Transportation Master Plan.
- Traveling demand modeling and associated maps were updated and summarized.
 - Prior to its closure for construction, 14600 South had an average of 11,000 vehicles per day. Porter Rockwell Boulevard, Redwood Road, and Pony Express Road also carried heavier volumes.
 - Only 14600 South failed in level of service (“LOS”). By 2035, its volume was expected to increase to 15,000 vehicles per day and LOS F, which is the worst category. Porter Rockwell Boulevard was also expected to be an F but was identified for widening in the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) long-term plan. By 2050, volume on 14600 South was expected to increase to approximately 20,000 vehicles per day.
 - Wasatch Front Regional Council (“WFRC”) planning proposed an additional access to I-215 from Noell Nelson Drive.

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, September 16, 2026**

- Information was added about the proposed FrontRunner station.

Vice-Chair Swanson asked about UDOT’s plans for Porter Rockwell Boulevard. Mr. Mitton reported that it currently has a three-lane cross-section in many areas, with a five-lane cross-section closer to Redwood Road. They planned to add a lane in each direction for a total of seven. The City had requested a timeline several times, but one had not been provided.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Woodruff, Jeremy Searle of METHODS Consulting reported that the bulk of population growth in the City was expected to be in eastern Bluffdale, especially the Gravel Pit area, but there would be some infill development elsewhere.

Commissioner Woodruff asked if the project list included all of 14600 South. Mr. Mitton confirmed that the full City-controlled length of 14600 South was included, not just the undercrossing that was currently under construction. The planned end state was two lanes in each direction.

Vice-Chair Swanson opened the public hearing.

Robin Thraen gave her address as 14570 South 1690 West and spoke against a proposed roundabout on 14600 South. The only reason the road connected to Redwood Road was that her family sold the land to the City based on the promise that it would be temporary until Porter Rockwell Boulevard was constructed. Her house is on the northwest side of 1690 South, which was supposed to be a residential street. Instead, there was loud traffic in both directions. The City later decided that it needed a left-hand turn lane, so her driveway and part of her yard were taken away. She was now being told that there would be a roundabout there, and her preference was for anything but a roundabout due to the amount of land that would be taken from the three adjacent property owners. She asked why it needed to be a thoroughfare and why the center section of the roundabout needed to be so large. The City is big on homeowners doing what they would like to do with their property, but she just wants to keep her land. A traffic signal would be less of an intrusion. The money paid for the house that used to be on the property was a wash because all the money they received from the City was used to pay interest on the loan.

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, September 16, 2026**

1 In response to a question from Vice-Chair Swanson, Mr. Mitton confirmed that Ms. Thraen's
2 comment was relevant to Item 10 on the agenda. Mr. Crowell noted that the Transportation Master
3 Plan indicated a signal or other treatment at the intersection.

4
5 Ms. Thraen indicated that she did not receive notice of the Planning Commission meeting.
6 Mr. Crowell clarified that mail notices are not required for General Plan amendments.

7
8 *Van Bills* gave his address as 14565 South 1690 West and stated that he was also speaking on behalf
9 of his mother, who lives at 1660 West 14600 South. In 2019, the City purchased her road frontage
10 for a project that had not yet been completed. He asked why they had not done what was already
11 planned. He was also opposed to a roundabout; it would affect both him and his mother, as the City
12 would need to take land from them both.

13
14 *Mark Hales* stated that he voted no on the original plan in 2017 because promises were made that the
15 trestle would not be built and the road would not be expanded. The intention was to downgrade the
16 road, and the change in plans was frustrating. When the City takes the land, he expected that all
17 parties would be appropriately compensated.

18
19 There were no further comments. The public hearing was closed.
20

21 Commissioner Woodruff stated that the projects identified in the Transportation Master Plan were
22 tentative and would require later approval. Mr. Crowell explained that it is a multifaceted process.
23 Freeway access was identified as a necessity in the plan. Studies have already been conducted, but
24 budgeting constraints can sometimes delay a project by five to 10 years. Bluffdale had requested help
25 from the State for 14600 South and received some funding. Property acquisitions were occurring
26 yearly, and the entire project could not begin until that was completed. There were also jurisdictional
27 issues. The City acknowledged that the project would be very impactful to residents.

28
29 Vice-Chair Swanson asked if the projections considered the fact that some northwestern traffic would
30 travel down Porter Rockwell Boulevard to 600 West rather than trying to access Redwood Road from
31 14600 South. Mr. Mitton reported that the regional component was considered in travel demand
32 modeling. It was expected that once 600 West was opened all the way through The Point, it would

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, September 16, 2026**

1 afford some relief. However, it would also spur development. One impetus for the 14600 South
2 project was that The Point was imminent, and the City needed to ensure that its transportation system
3 could handle the additional volume.

4
5 In response to a question from Commissioner Woodruff, Mr. Mitton stated that the 14600 South
6 closure had caused additional strain on Porter Rockwell Boulevard and Bangerter Highway, which
7 further drove the need for another connection. It is never ideal to only have two or three isolated east-
8 west connection points, but that was prevalent across the Salt Lake Valley. More connectivity is
9 always better. Commissioner Woodruff stated that Bluffdale's design created less of an east-west
10 necessity and questioned the need to create a new arterial connection. Mr. Mitton clarified that
11 Redwood Road was the next main driver.

12
13 Vice-Chair Swanson asked how traffic on Redwood Road had changed with the opening of additional
14 segments of the Mountain View Corridor. Mr. Mitton reported that it initially decreased because
15 everyone was excited to use the new road. However, they now realized the pinch points in getting on
16 and off of Mountain View. Many vehicles were trying to get onto I-15 from the south, and there were
17 limited connections to do so.

18
19 **Commissioner Luker moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the City Council for**
20 **the proposed update to the Transportation Master Plan. There was no second. The motion**
21 **failed.**

22
23 Commissioner Woodruff was uncomfortable with approving the ability to expand prior to
24 understanding Item 10 and other projects.

25
26 **Commissioner Woodruff moved to TABLE Item 8 until all discussion items were completed.**
27 **Commissioner Luker seconded the motion. Vote on motion: Kory Luker-Yes, Joel Woodruff-**
28 **Yes, Erik Swanson-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.**
29

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, September 16, 2026**

9. PUBLIC HEARING, CONSIDERATION, AND RECOMMENDATION on Proposed Revisions to the Right-of-Way Cross Section Standards to incorporate active transportation elements. City of Bluffdale, Applicant. Addison Mitton, Staff Presenter.

Mr. Mitton reviewed the proposal to add three street cross-sections to the City's standard cross-sections, which currently consist of travel lanes, medians, park strips, sidewalks, and a bicycle lane or shoulder on the side. Staff hoped to add these new approaches so the City could implement elements of the 2025 Active Transportation Master Plan such as bicycle lanes and shared use paths.

Mr. Mitton then explained the three new options.

1. A Cycle Track is a concept that moves bicyclists off the road and behind the curb rather than next to vehicles as in existing bicycle lanes. Mr. Mitton explained that the cross-section differed from the sample photograph in that the track would be next to the curb, with landscaping between the cycle track and sidewalk. This option was safer as the cycle track is closer to the roadway, providing more visibility for vehicles turning into driveways.
2. A Shared-Use Path is shared by bicyclists and pedestrians and was already in use in areas of the City like Harmon Day Drive.
3. A Protected Bike Lane places a curb between the bicycle and vehicle lanes to protect bicyclists from traffic.

The new cross-sections were reviewed. Mr. Mitton reported that the standard cross-section for minor collector roads like 3600 West and areas of 14400 South reduced travel lanes to an 11-foot minimum width, as reducing width had been shown to decrease speeds. There would be a two-foot shoulder for vehicles, curb and gutter, and a five-foot park strip. Minimum widths were 10 feet for shared use paths, five feet for cycle tracks, and six feet for protected bike lanes as that would allow room for sweeper trucks and certain snow plows.

In response to a question raised by Vice-Chair Swanson, Mr. Mitton confirmed that the cross-section included in the meeting packet incorrectly showed a 12-foot minimum width. No changes were made

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES**

Wednesday, September 16, 2026

1 to the main cross-section for major collector roads like 2700 West near Bangerter Highway and some
2 areas of 14400 South.

3
4 Vice-Chair Swanson opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was
5 closed.

6
7 **Commissioner Luker moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the City Council for**
8 **the proposed revisions to the Right-of-Way Cross Section Standards to incorporate active**
9 **transportation elements. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Woodruff. Vote on**
10 **motion: Vote on motion: Kory Luker-Yes, Joel Woodruff-Yes, Erik Swanson-Yes. The motion**
11 **passed unanimously. The motion passed unanimously.**

12
13 Mr. Crowell reported that the item would be on the next City Council meeting agenda.

14
15 **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

16
17 **10. Discussion of Future Improvements Along 14600 South from Redwood Road to 1000**
18 **West. Addison Mitton, Staff Presenter.**

19
20 Mr. Mitton introduced Jeremy Searle from Method Consulting, who presented the 14600 South
21 Environmental Feasibility Study encompassing 14600 South from Redwood Road to Spring View
22 Parkway.

23
24 Mr. Searle stated that plans for the roadway needed to be considered in a regional context, as the
25 travel demand model is a regional model that encompasses cities from Ogden to Santaquin. For both
26 the Transportation Master Plan and the current study, they conducted an in-depth review of
27 socioeconomic data for Bluffdale and surrounding areas that considered future population, job
28 growth, etc.

29
30 Western Bluffdale is not very dense, but east-west travel demand is an issue all along the Wasatch
31 Front, especially in Salt Lake County. There were high-volume north-south corridors like Bacchus
32 Highway, Mountain View Corridor, Bangerter Highway, I-15, and I-215, but east-west corridors were
33 lacking. 9000 South, 12300 South, and 14600 South are slower roads that suffer from more

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, September 16, 2026**

1 congestion. Utah County was constructing the 2100 North freeway in Lehi to try to address the
2 regional east-west demand. Porter Rockwell Boulevard filled some of that need, as did 14600 South
3 between I-215 and Redwood Road.

4
5 The Transportation Master Plan identifies future needs like the demand on 14600 South but does not
6 specify what must be done. As the projects get closer, the City begins to take steps like the
7 Environmental Feasibility Study. Additional environmental studies may need to be conducted based
8 on funding sources. Projects must also be designed. Each step helps clarify the project, and this study
9 was the first step in that process.

10
11 Project goals included:

- 12
- 13 • Accommodate future demand and improve safety.
- 14 • Enhance active transportation, mobility, and safety.
- 15 • 1690 West intersection improvements.
- 16 • Minimize impacts to residents and the existing bridge, river, and canal.

17
18 Current demand on 14600 South was almost at a LOS of F, and volume would continue to increase
19 with growth across the Wasatch Front. If the improvements were completed, it would operate well
20 to at least 2050. If they were not completed, the result would be severe congestion.

21
22 Mr. Searle reviewed a typical proposed cross-section showing two lanes in each direction. A standard
23 center turn lane was removed for most of the corridor to minimize negative impacts to residents, and
24 left turn pockets were added at key intersections like 1690 West. The proposed roadway included a
25 cycle track behind the curb and gutter in addition to the sidewalk.

26
27 Mr. Mitton indicated that other roadside improvements could be considered. For example, a shared
28 use path could be installed instead of both a cycle track and sidewalk. Mr. Searle added that the study
29 evaluated whether solutions were feasible and what their impacts may be.

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, September 16, 2026**

The traffic study determined the following:

- Without improvements, the following intersections were anticipated to operate at poor LOS:
 - Redwood Road
 - 1690 West
 - 1300 West
- Installing a roundabout or signal at 1690 West would result in the best peak-hour operation.
 - Roundabouts have fewer delays and result in safer operation. Studies show that roundabouts have fewer and less severe accidents than signals.
 - A roundabout would facilitate U-turns for vehicles traveling to or from King Quail Way and Elora Circle. With a signal, a raised median would be required and left turns from those streets would be prohibited.

Mr. Searle reviewed an aerial map indicating intersections that would have poor LOS if nothing was done to address the issue by 2050. Intersections at Redwood Road, 1690 West, and 1300 West would all have a LOS of D or F. A second map showing LOS with improvements indicated that those roadways would then be rated A or B. 1690 West would have a LOS of B with a signal or A with a roundabout.

Concept plans for both a roundabout and signal at 1690 West were reviewed next, and Mr. Searle indicated that a roundabout would need a lot additional right-of-way and be very impactful to residents. It would also cost more than a signal. Potential benefits included fewer overall delays, safety, and better U-turn accommodation. Benefits of a signal would be fewer right-of-way impacts, lower costs, and similar operation to a roundabout. Disadvantages included difficulty in making U-turns and a potential increase in the number of accidents. The study did not identify either as a preferred alternative.

A diagram comparing traffic flow at roundabouts and signals was displayed. It was noted that signals have multiple conflict points, whereas roundabouts have far fewer areas where collisions can occur and any collisions are at far lower speeds.

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, September 16, 2026**

Several alternatives were analyzed, including widening on either the north or south side. It was determined that a best-fit alignment would minimize impacts by widening on either side based on what would have the fewest negative impacts in a specific area. Intersections on the west side near Redwood Road would require a raised median and be restricted to right-in/right-out movement.

The Jordan River Trail crossing was also considered. Rather than requiring people to continue crossing the road at grade, it was recommended that the trail run along the hillside on the south side of 14600 South with a bridge to tie into the trail. In response to a question from Commissioner Woodruff, Mr. Searle reported that it could not be run under the road due to water table issues, and the grade was such that placing it above the road made the most sense.

The study also analyzed environmental impacts. Resource evaluations included:

- Cultural resources
 - Eligible historic properties were identified and included a historic canal.
- Biological resources
- Water resources
 - The river, canals, and wetland areas were documented and identified.
- Noise analysis
 - An increase of 10 decibels or less was anticipated, which would not be so significant as to require mitigation.
 - This analysis was conducted prior to the 14600 South road closure and considered the forecasted number and types of vehicles, speed limit, location of travel lanes, and queue lengths at intersections.
- Known hazardous material sites

The project schedule was reviewed next. The Environmental Feasibility Study was completed in 2026, and funding acquisition would take place through 2030. The study may need to be updated between 2030 and 2032, followed by final design. Construction was expected to begin between 2035 and 2040.

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, September 16, 2026**

Cost estimates were as follows:

- Entire corridor including 1690 West pavement and right-of-way acquisition: \$19 million;
- 1690 West signal only: \$350,000;;
- 1690 West roundabout only, including additional right-of-way purchases: \$2 million; and
- Pedestrian bridge including tie-in and trail realignment: \$3 million.

Vice-Chair Swanson asked what would drive the final decision regarding the signal or roundabout, as well as opportunities for public input. Mr. Mitton reported that the process would begin when the environmental study was updated prior to final design. Vice-Chair Swanson stated that impacts of The Point will be apparent by that time.

In response to a question raised by Mr. Crowell, Mr. Searle explained that whether the study needed to be updated would depend on the timing and type of funding. Multiple changes were anticipated for the area, so it would be beneficial to update the concepts to ensure that they were still the best solution. Unless funding was obtained immediately, an update would be prudent. Mr. Mitton added that regardless of the funding source, the project was impactful enough to warrant additional study prior to completing the final design.

Vice-Chair Swanson asked how the project would connect to the underpass project. Mr. Searle reported that the project would end at Spring View Parkway, and intersections are a natural place for transitions. If the cycle track option was chosen, that would be an easy transition at any point, but a shared use path would be easier because the underpass project included a 10-foot trail on either side.

Commissioner Woodruff asked what was driving the need for a roundabout or signal. Mr. Searle reported that it was primarily driven by traffic from the north. Commissioner Woodruff remarked that he saw the points of conflict but did not know that a roundabout at 1690 West would address all of them. There is also a sizeable difference in the amount of land required for a roundabout versus a signal. He understood the benefits of a roundabout but questioned whether one was feasible in that

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, September 16, 2026**

1 location. Mr. Searle explained that one reason studies are conducted is to understand whether a
2 solution is feasible, and the answer is sometimes no due to the impacts.

3
4 Regarding the proposed size of the roundabout, Mr. Searle pointed out that 14600 South is an arterial
5 roadway, so the roundabout was designed to accommodate trucks and vehicles with trailers. In
6 response to a question from Vice-Chair Swanson, he reported that the new underpass will
7 accommodate any vehicle that can travel on I-15.

8
9 Commissioner Luker asked if this project would be affected by the updated Transportation Master
10 Plan. Mr. Mitton explained that the plan contemplated the following for 14600 South:

- 11 • Widen to three lanes between Redwood Road and Heritage Crest Way (UDOT).
- 12 • Add the grade-separated railroad crossing that was currently under construction.
- 13 • Widen to five lanes between Heritage Crest Way and Porter Rockwell Boulevard (UDOT).
- 14 • Widen to seven lanes between Porter Rockwell Boulevard and I-215 (UDOT).

15
16
17 In response to a follow-up question, Mr. Mitton reported that widening to three lanes was a near-term
18 project to be completed by 2032, and widening to seven lanes was a long-term project to be completed
19 by 2042. Dates listed in the report were for anticipated completion, and the project list was
20 coordinated with the WFRC's long-term plan. Mr. Crowell indicated that timelines were subject to
21 change based on funding availability and project priorities.

22
23 Vice-Chair Swanson reopened the public hearing for item 8.

24
25 *Dan Garner* gave his address as 1680 West 14600 South, at the corner of the potential roundabout.
26 He asked for clarification on the blue and red lines indicated on the conceptual rendering. Mr. Searle
27 explained that the lines represented active transportation elements, and the blue line was the outer
28 edge of the improvements. Mr. Garner asked how much of his property would be purchased for right-
29 of-way and stated that the final choice should be made based on what would have the most minimal
30 impact on residents as possible. He grew up in Bluffdale and did not want to have to move.

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, September 16, 2026**

1 *Laura Garner* stated that she lives on 14000 South near Redwood Road and could not access
2 Redwood Road during rush hour if there was a roundabout at the intersection instead of a signal. Mr.
3 Garner's property is on a hill. A roundabout would require a large retaining wall, and the construction
4 would ruin his property. She recommended a traffic signal because it would be less intrusive and
5 cheaper. There were very few houses to the south, so the road would not be used by many people
6 traveling north-south, and she did not believe the road should be considered an east-west corridor
7 because it ends at Redwood Road. She hoped the City would consider installing a signal instead of a
8 roundabout because the four people who live on the corners love their homes.

9
10 *Natalie Garner* stated that she and her husband live in the blue house on the corner, and she could not
11 stress enough the impact a roundabout would have on her family. She did not believe a study could
12 determine impacts. Bluffdale is about community. Although it was only a planning item, she believed
13 notice should be required to inform residents who would be impacted. They have chickens and a
14 garden that would be lost, which was not fair or respectful just to convenience other people. It is a
15 residential neighborhood, and a roundabout is not a reason to make them lose more of their property.
16 It was the first stage of discussion, but she did not believe it should be discussed further.

17
18 *Robin Thraen* asked if the entire The Point property was owned by Draper. Mr. Crowell reported that
19 it was owned and being developed by the State but within Draper City boundaries. Bluffdale would
20 receive a small proportional share of sales tax revenue. Ms. Thraen stated that Bluffdale should not
21 bend over backward to accommodate it while receiving no benefit.

22
23 There were no further comments. The public hearing was closed.

24
25 Vice-Chair Swanson asked Staff to address the public comments. Mr. Mitton stated that the goal of
26 the Transportation Master Plan was to look at regional needs. The City was not accommodating The
27 Point by building out its roads but rather ensuring that its road operate at an acceptable level of service
28 despite The Point.

29
30 Vice-Chair Swanson stated that prior to moving forward with any project, funding would need to be
31 secured, and a new environmental assessment would likely be required. He asked about other

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, September 16, 2026**

opportunities for public input during that process. Mr. Crowell reported that typically with a project of this significance, there is a public information element with the selected consultant. However, the timeline for public outreach was difficult to determine at that stage. The Transportation Master Plan identified the necessity for intersection improvements but did not design or select a preferred improvement. Mr. Mitton added that a public open house would be part of the design process.

Vice-Chair Swanson stated that they had received valuable input on early planning for the intersection and how it should be approached. He thanked those present for their comments as it helped the City better understand potential impacts.

Commissioner Luker moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the City Council for the proposed update to the Transportation Master Plan. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Woodruff. Vote on motion: Kory Luker-Yes, Joel Woodruff-Yes, Erik Swanson-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Crowell reported that the item would be considered by the City Council at its next meeting.

11. Planning Commission Business (planning session for upcoming items, follow up, etc.

Mr. Crowell reported that the next Planning Commission meeting would be held on October 7, 2026.

In response to a question raised by Vice-Chair Swanson, Mr. Crowell reported that Staff was available to help the Planning Commission with any remaining required training. There were several video trainings available, including a one-hour training on Development Agreements from the ULCT and other trainings from the Utah Property Rights Ombudsman's office. Ms. Tubbs added that the Land Use Academy of Utah is a great resource, and its database of training videos can be accessed at <https://luau.utah.gov>. Commissioners could also attend conferences for more detailed training.

Mr. Crowell reported that Kjersti Jarman had resigned as she had accepted a position with the Chamber of Commerce. He was unsure whether she would continue working with the Youth Council.

The City Council will be holding work sessions through the end of the year, including one on a proposed Development Agreement in northwest Bluffdale and another on short-term rentals.

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES**

Wednesday, September 16, 2026

1
2 **12. Adjournment.**

3
4 The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.
5

6
7
8
9 _____
10 Pauline Matagi, Community Development Coordinator

11 Approved: _____

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
PUBLIC COMMENT EMAIL ADDENDUM
Wednesday, September 16, 2026**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

09-13-2026
Day Rezone

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed zoning change from R1 to R2 for the neighboring property in Bluffdale.

This change will have a direct and negative impact on my home and quality of life. Our backyard faces this development, and we already deal with traffic, headlights shining into our home, and increased use of a dusty, undeveloped road. Increasing density will only intensify these issues—bringing more congestion, noise, and disruption into an area that was never designed for it.

Equally important, this proposal undermines the standards that Bluffdale has worked to establish and maintain. Homeowners in this area made significant investments based on the expectation of R1 zoning—larger lots, lower density, and a consistent neighborhood standard. Changing the rules now introduces uncertainty and sets a precedent that those standards can be lowered over time.

Higher-density zoning often brings increased transient activity, more strain on infrastructure, and a measurable decline in neighborhood stability. With that comes impacts to safety, property values, and overall community pride. Simply put, this is a trade-off that current residents should not be forced to accept.

My family chose Bluffdale four years ago because it stood apart from surrounding areas that failed to maintain these standards. Approving this change moves Bluffdale in the same direction many of us intentionally left behind.

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
PUBLIC COMMENT EMAIL ADDENDUM
Wednesday, September 16, 2026**

1

2 I urge you to uphold the city’s established vision, protect existing homeowners, and deny this
3 zoning change. Once these standards are lowered, they are very difficult to restore.

4

5 Sincerely,

6 David M. VanCott

7



MINUTES

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, October 7, 2026**

Present:

Members: Debbie Cragun, Chair
Erik Swanson, Vice-Chair
Kory Luker
Ulises Flynn (joined meeting at 6:59 p.m.)

Staff: Grant Crowell, Community and Economic Development Director
Caitlyn Tubbs, Planning Manager
Pauline Matagi, Community Development Coordinator
Ellen Oakman, Associate Planner
Courtney Armstrong, Accounting Technician

Others: Steve Austin, City Council Member
Alan Lord, City Council Member

PLANNING COMMISSION BUSINESS MEETING

1. Roll Call.

Chair Debbie Cragun called the meeting to order at 6:07 p.m.

2. Invocation/Thought/Reading and Pledge of Allegiance.

Council Member Alan Lord offered the invocation and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Approval of Minutes from the September 16, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting.

Chair Cragun moved to TABLE the Minutes of the September 16, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Luker. Vote on motion: Erik Swanson-Yes, Kory Luker-Yes, Erik Swanson-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Planning Commission Disclosures.

There were no disclosures.

5. Public Comment.

There was no public comment.

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, October 7, 2026**

6. PUBLIC HEARING, CONSIDERATION, AND RECOMMENDATION on a proposed General Plan Map Amendment for approximately 1.03 acres at 14595 South 1515 West from Very Low-Density Residential (VLDR) to Low Density Residential (LDR). Nathan Andersen, Applicant. Ellen Oakman, Staff Presenter. (Application 2026-21).

Items 6 and 7 were presented in conjunction.

Associate Planner, Ellen Oakman, presented the Staff Report and indicated that the items were for a General Plan Map and Zone Map Amendment. The approximately 1.03-acre subject property is located near 14600 South and 1515 West. The request would rezone the property from R1 to R4 with the Infill Overlay (“IO”) and change the General Plan designation from Very Low Density Residential to Low Density Residential. The Applicant intended to subdivide the property into two residential lots. The IO modification would allow for a 60-foot minimum lot width, a deviation from the 75-foot standard width for the R4 zone. Access to the property would be from 1515 West. Aerial and Zoning Maps were reviewed. Nearby properties were zoned R1, R4, and R4 IO.

The Concept Plan indicated the following:

- A two-lot residential configuration.
- Proposed lot width of 60 feet.
- Lot 1 with the existing home would be approximately 0.76 acres and Lot 2 would be 0.27 acres, for an average of approximately 11,700 square feet per lot.
- Proposed density of approximately 1.94 dwelling units per acre.
- Driveway will be outside of the City right-of-way.

The General Plan Map Amendment would change the land use designation from Very Low Density Residential of less than one dwelling unit per acre to Low Density Residential of one to four dwelling units per acre. The surrounding area included Low Density Residential, Cluster Residential, and historic small lots.

The R4 Zone requires the following:

- Minimum lot size: 10,000 square feet
- Lot width: 75 feet

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, October 7, 2026**

1 • Front setback: 20 feet

2 • Side setback: 10 feet

3 • Rear setback: 20 feet

4 • Lot coverage: 50%

5 • Applicant requested the IO to accommodate a lot width of 60 feet, but the lots would meet all
6 other zone requirements. The reduced width was necessary to accommodate topography and
7 lot configuration.

8
9 In response to a question raised by Chair Cragun, Ms. Oakman confirmed that the right-of-way shown
10 on the Concept Plan would not be affected by the widening of 14600 South.

11
12 The Applicant, Nathan Andersen and his father, Thayne Andersen were present to answer questions.
13 Nathan Andersen indicated that there were other small lots in the area of the subject property. Some
14 land will be taken for the widening of the road, and he hoped that some power could be given back
15 to those who would be affected by it.

16
17 Chair Cragun asked the Applicant to explain the topographical challenges. Nathan Andersen reported
18 that the existing home's sprinkler system would be impacted if they had to increase the width of the
19 second lot.

20
21 Chair Cragun opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was closed.

22
23 Commissioner Swanson asked for more information on other lots in the area that were less than one
24 acre in size. Community and Economic Development Director, Grant Crowell, reported that 14600
25 South is one of the oldest parts of Bluffdale. Many of the smaller lots in that area were inherited
26 when the City incorporated, including a fourplex that was approved by the County in the 1960s or
27 earlier. The developed subdivisions with smaller lots are located northwest of the subject property.
28 There are also smaller historic lots on 1690 West and along Redwood Road.

29
30 Chair Cragun reported that she drives by the property whenever she leaves her house, and there are a
31 lot of different sized properties in the area. It was different from properties to the west of Redwood

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, October 7, 2026**

1 Road that were primarily one acre or larger. She did not believe the proposal was out of place for the
2 area. Commissioner Luker agreed and indicated that although he was initially concerned with
3 creating an island, it did fit with the area.

4
5 Commissioner Luker asked if Staff had any concerns about the proximity of the driveway to the
6 intersection. Ms. Oakman reported that the location indicated on the Concept Plan was approximate,
7 and Staff would confirm the location when final plans were submitted. Mr. Crowell added that the
8 intent of the illustration was to demonstrate the impact of widening the road. The Engineering
9 Department would have final approval authority. In response to a follow-up question from
10 Commissioner Luker, he confirmed that the property could not be designated from 14600 South as it
11 would be too close to the 1515 West intersection.

12
13 Nathan Andersen stated that he spoke with nearby property owners, 30 to 40 of whom signed a
14 petition in favor of the application. Two were uncomfortable signing the petition but were not
15 opposed to the proposal. He would ideally like to pull directly out into the road but was told that it
16 was not possible. They had discussed accessing the property from the east, and that neighbor was not
17 opposed to the idea as long as it did not impact his green belt.

18
19 **Commissioner Luker moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the City Council for**
20 **the Proposed General Plan Map Amendment for approximately 1.03 acres at 14595 South 1515**
21 **West from Very Low Density Residential (VLDR) to Low Density Residential (LDR), based on**
22 **the findings presented in the Staff Report dated October 2, 2026. The motion was seconded by**
23 **Commissioner Swanson. Vote on motion: Erik Swanson-Yes, Kory Luker-Yes, Erik Swanson-**
24 **Yes. The motion passed unanimously.**

25
26 7. **PUBLIC HEARING, CONSIDERATION, AND RECOMMENDATION on a proposed**
27 **Zone Map Amendment for approximately 1.03 acres at 14595 South 1515 West from R-**
28 **1 Residential to R-4 Residential with an Infill Overlay. Nathan Andersen, Applicant.**
29 **Ellen Oakman, Staff Presenter. (Application 2026-21)**
30

31 **Commissioner Luker moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the City Council for**
32 **the Proposed Zone Map Amendment for approximately 1.03 acres at 14595 South 1515 West**

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, October 7, 2026**

from R1 to R4 Infill Overlay (IO) per the IO Zone Requirements in Section 11.110.030.050, based on the findings presented in the Staff Report dated October 2, 2026. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Swanson. Vote on motion: Erik Swanson-Yes, Kory Luker-Yes, Erik Swanson-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Oakman reported that the items were tentatively scheduled for the November 18, 2026 City Council meeting and would be re-noticed.

- 8.
- PUBLIC HEARING, CONSIDERATION, AND RECOMMENDATION on a proposed Text Amendment to:**
- a. **Amend Chapter 11.20 of the Bluffdale City Code to enact a new definition of “Energetic Materials Operations”;**
 - b. **Enact Section 11.160.330 of the Bluffdale City Code to outline requirements for Energetic Materials Operations businesses; and**
 - c. **Amend Section 11.350.020 of the Bluffdale City Code to allow Energetic Materials Operations as a permitted use in the Light Industrial (I-1) Zone.**
- Vector, represented by Zach Williams, Applicant. Caitlyn Tubbs, Staff Presenter. (Application 2026-27)**

Planning Manager, Caitlyn Tubbs reported that the Applicant currently operated a drone assembly business in the Light Industrial (“I-1”) Zone and hoped to expand the business to include assembly and installation of energetic materials, which were currently not defined in code. The Text Amendment would define Energetic Materials Operations, outline requirements, and identify approved locations.

The following definition was proposed:

Energetic Operations: Facilities engaged in manufacturing, fabricating, assembling, repairing or refurbishing, packaging, and distributing explosive or energetic devices or materials. Facilities may also include research and development, quality assurance, disposal where authorized, or other lawful activities involving explosive or energetic devices or materials regulated under applicable federal or state law.

Chair Cragun stated that the definition did not give a clear indication of what Energetic Operations are. Ms. Tubbs reported that included operations were outlined in a separate section of code, but the

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, October 7, 2026**

1 definition could be edited if necessary. Chair Cragun stated that wording needed to be added to
2 explain what the term means.

3
4 Ms. Tubbs reported that the following operations would be included under the new use:

- 5
- 6 • Explosive articles: Detonators, Initiators, Propellants, Inflators
- 7 • Blasting materials, agents, and caps
- 8 • Low Energy Exploding Foil Initiators (“LEEFIs”)
- 9 • Energetic and Pyrotechnic materials, including ignition systems, gas generators, and
- 10 • rocket motors.
- 11 • Aerospace, commercial, or defense energetic devices
- 12 • Other items could be included, but Staff wanted to provide the above list of broad operations
- 13 to avoid the Applicant having to re-apply as technology evolves.

14
15 Chair Cragun stated that the list of included operations explained the term better than the definition
16 and asked that it be incorporated into the definition.

17
18 Ms. Tubbs reported that applicants for Energetic Materials Operations would be required to provide
19 information necessary for the City to confirm compliance with applicable laws and site-specific safety
20 considerations as part of the business license application. The City may impose reasonable conditions
21 to address safety or emergency response needs or other site-specific concerns and can conduct
22 inspections to verify compliance.

23
24 The Land Use Table for nonresidential zones would be also amended to include Energetic Operations
25 as an approved accessory use in the I-1 Zone. The use must be secondary to an existing primary use.

26
27 The Applicant, Zach Williams stated that he is in charge of facilities and inventory in the Vector
28 warehouse. They currently employ 90 people at the Bluffdale location. Mayor Hall and Governor
29 Cox had toured the facility, and they were working toward Governor Cox’s vision of making Utah a
30 defense industrial base. The company was founded to provide war fighters with cutting edge
31 technology at speed and scale, and they meet that goal by producing drones. They would like to

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, October 7, 2026**

1 incorporate LEEFIs on their drones, which follow stringent Department of Defense standards and
2 safety regulations. They produce low energy but are set off at high voltage to propel munitions
3 installed by the end user. A LEEFI is approximately one-quarter inch in height, smaller in diameter
4 than a dime, and similar in operation to the mechanism that deploys air bags in cars. Vector will be
5 required to follow Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (“ATF”) regulations for
6 storage, inspections, background checks, etc.

7
8 In response to a question from Commissioner Luker, Mr. Williams reported that a partner company
9 will manufacture the LEEFIs for Vector. They are initiated at 1,000 volts, but he did not have
10 information on the amperage.

11
12 In response to a question raised by Commissioner Swanson, Mr. Williams confirmed that the City
13 would be relying on the stringency of federal regulations regarding safety, storage and inspection.
14 Bluffdale currently had no applicable regulations, and Utah followed ATF regulations. The facility
15 would be subject to both City and federal inspections, and both the facility and their processes would
16 be inspected as part of the ATF application process.

17
18 Chair Cragun opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was closed.

19
20 Commissioner Swanson stated that he would be more concerned about the location if it were a larger
21 operation. In response to his question, Ms. Tubbs confirmed that a business must be operating under
22 a primary use to be eligible for approval of the accessory use. Commissioner Swanson stated that the
23 City must rely on federal regulations regarding storage in order to protect other businesses.

24
25 Chair Cragun asked about next steps if the Text Amendment was approved by the City Council. Ms.
26 Tubbs reported that the Applicant had an existing business license for General Manufacturing.
27 Information regarding safety standards and practices would be reviewed and a site inspection
28 performed prior to approval of the accessory use. Mr. Crowell added that inspections are based on
29 fire code, not building code, and the Fire Marshall would likely require a special midyear inspection.

30
31 In response to a question raised by Commissioner Swanson, Ms. Tubbs reported that Fire Chief, Matt
32 Evans, was present when the application was reviewed by the Development Review Committee

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, October 7, 2026**

1 (“DRC”) and expressed no concerns at that time. The facility would be inspected when the request
2 for approval of the use was received.

3
4 Chair Cragun stated that the Planning Commission was making a recommendation on the Text
5 Amendment only. The Applicant’s facility would still be subject to City and federal inspection.

6
7 Mr. Williams reported that the Fire Marshall performs routine inspections of the facility, and he would
8 be happy to coordinate with the City so they could be present at the ATF inspection.

9
10 **Chair Cragun moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the City Council for the**
11 **proposed Text Amendment for Energetic Materials Operations based on the findings presented**
12 **in the Staff Report, and with the following additional finding:**

- 13
14 **1. Language should be added to the definition to better define Energetic Materials.**

15
16 **The motion was seconded by Commissioner Swanson. Vote on motion: Erik Swanson-Yes,**
17 **Kory Luker-Yes, Erik Swanson-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.**

18
19 Ms. Tubbs reported that the item was tentatively scheduled for the November 18, 2026 City Council
20 meeting, and an additional public hearing notice would be mailed prior to the public hearing

21
22 **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

- 23
24 **9. Planning Commission Business (Planning Session for Upcoming Items, Follow Up, etc.).**

25
26 Mr. Crowell reported that the City Council was holding study sessions to discuss land use matters.
27 There was a Development Agreement in process for a 0.33-acre-lot subdivision at the southeast
28 intersection of 13800 South and 3600 West that would come before the Planning Commission soon.
29 He believed the Commission would see more Development Agreements being used in lieu of Zone
30 and Land Use Map Amendments, including one for 6,000-square-foot lots off of Redwood Road. An
31 upcoming historic project may also require a Development Agreement. The Council also discussed
32 short-term rentals, and they would likely be added to the accessory dwelling unit (“ADU”) ordinance.

DRAFT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, October 7, 2026**

1 Kjersti Jarman had resigned and was now working with the South Valley Chamber of Commerce,
2 and the City Building Official had also tendered his resignation.

3
4 The City Council adopted the Transportation Master Plan at its last meeting. Austin Day's application
5 was tabled pending a Development Agreement restricting the subdivision to two lots.

6
7 Ms. Tubbs reported that the November 4, 2026 Planning Commission meeting had a very full agenda.
8

9 **10. Adjournment.**

10
11 The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 7:02 p.m.
12
13
14

15
16 _____
17 Pauline Matagi, Community Development Coordinator

18 Approved: _____

Item 6 & 7

Item 8

Item 9

Item 10

Item 11

Item 12

Item 13