CITY OF SOUTH JORDAN
PLANNING COMISSION MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS

April 12, 2016

Present: Commissioner Sean D. Morrissey, Commissioner Mark Woolley, Commissioner T. Earl Jolley, Commissioner Julie Holbrook, Commissioner Brady Quinn, City Planner Greg Schindler, Staff Attorney Steven Schaefermeyer, Planner David Mann, Planner Jake Warner, Deputy Director Engineering Shane Greenwood, Deputy Recorder Cindy Valdez

Absent: Commissioner Craig Hall

Others: See Attachment A

6:30 P.M.
REGULAR MEETING

I. GENERAL BUSINESS

A. Welcome and Roll Call

Vice Chairman Earl Jolley welcomed everyone and noted that all Commissioners are present except Commissioner Hall and Commissioner Morrissey, and they may be late to tonight's meeting.

Vice Chairman Jolley said he would like to welcome our newest Commissioner Brady Quinn. He was sworn in before the meeting started and we happy to have you on the Commission.

Vice Chairman Jolley said we need to nominate a new Chairman and a Vice Chairman for this year, so I will entertain a nomination for the Chairman.

Commissioner Holbrook motioned for Commissioner Woolley to be the Chairman for the Planning Commission. Commissioner Jolley seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was unanimous in favor; Commissioner Hall and Commissioner Morrissey were absent from vote.

Vice Chairman Jolley said we now need to nominate a Vice Chairman for the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Woolley motioned for Commissioner Holbrook to be the Vice Chairman for the Planning Commission. Commissioner Quinn seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was unanimous in favor; Commissioner Hall and Commissioner Morrissey were absent from vote.

Vice Chairman Jolley said we now need to nominate a representative for the Architectural Review Committee.

Commissioner Holbrook motioned to re-appoint Commissioner Jolley to be the representative for the Architectural Review Committee. Commissioner Woolley seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was unanimous in favor; Commissioner Hall and Commissioner Morrissey were absent from the vote.

Commissioner Morrissey arrived at the meeting.

Commissioner Woolley will take over as the Chairman for the rest of the meeting.

B. Motion to Approve Agenda

Commissioner Holbrook made a motion to approve the April 12, 2016 Planning Commission Meeting Agenda. Commissioner Woolley seconded the motion. Vote was unanimous 5-0 in favor; Commissioner Hall was absent from vote.

C. Approval of the Minutes from the Meeting held on March 29, 2016

Commissioner Jolley made a motion to approve the March 29, 2016 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes as printed. Commissioner Quinn seconded the motion. Vote was unanimous in 5-0 favor; Commissioner Hall was absent from vote.

II. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS AND OTHER BUSINESS

A. Staff Business

None

B. Comments from Planning Commission Members

Commissioner Holbrook said I would like to see Commissioner Jolley bring back some of the information from ARC Meetings that he attends. It would be nice to know about some of the discussions and decisions that are made to the items we will be reviewing.

Commissioner Jolley said I could take some notes at the ARC Meeting and give you a brief over view of what we have looked at and what was approved.

III. CITIZEN COMMENT

None

IV. SUMMARY ACTION

None

V. ACTION

None

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND POTENTIAL **ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION ITEMS

**Administrative Action = Less Discretion, Substantial Evidence (Objective Standard)

A.1 Issue: **DAYBREAK VILLAGE 5 PLAT 7 PRELIMINARY PLAT**

Address: Approximately 10775 South 5060 West
File No: SUB-2016.11
Applicant: Kennecott Land

City Planner Greg Schindler reviewed the background information on this item.

Commissioner Holbrook said do we know the size of these townhomes?

City Planner Schindler said I do not, but the applicant is here tonight and may have that information.

Chairman Woolley opened the Public Hearing to comments. There were none. He closed the Public Hearing.

A.2 Potential Action Item – (See VI.A.1)

Commissioner Jolley motioned to approve File No.SUB-2016.11 with the (1) requirement by staff. Commissioner Morrissey seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor; Commissioner Hall was absent from the vote.

B.1 Issue: DAYBREAK UNIVERSITY MEDICAL #2 PRELIMINARY PLAT

Address: Approximately 5220 West Daybreak Parkway
File No: SUB-2016.08
Applicant: Kennecott Land

City Planner Greg Schindler reviewed the background information on this item.

Chairman Woolley opened the Public Hearing to comments. There were none. He closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Holbrook said are there parking garages allowed in this area?

City Planner Schindler said yes they are.

B.2 Potential Action Item – (See VI.B.1)

Commissioner Holbrook motioned to approve File No.SUB-2016.08 with the (1) requirement by staff. Commissioner Morrissey seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor; Commissioner Hall was absent from the vote.

C.1 Issue: DAYBREAK VILLAGE 10 NORTH PLAT 2 PRELIMINARY PLAT

Address: Approximately 10600 South 5450 West
File No: SUB-2016.12
Applicant: Kennecott Land

City Planner Greg Schindler reviewed background information on this item.

Tyler White, West Jordan, Utah – said there is a Charter School in the purple area, but traditionally the "M" area has been townhomes in the past, and that is what is tentatively planned for these lots in the future. The only other plan that I have seen that is slightly different is the UTA Park and Ride that is by the TRAX area.

Chairman Woolley opened the Public Hearing to comments. There were none. He closed the Public Hearing.

C.2 Potential Action Item – (See VI.C.1)

Commissioner Jolley motioned to approve File NO.SUB-2016.12 with the (1) requirement by staff. Commissioner Holbrook seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor; Commissioner Hall was absent from vote.

D.1 Issue: DETACHED GARAGE CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT

Address: 1169 West Koradine Drive
File No: CUP-2016.02
Applicant: Alex Winder

Planner David Mann reviewed background information on this item.

Commissioner Holbrook said are you saying that this new structure will be the same height as the one on the other side of the fence?

Planner Mann said I am not aware of the height of the other fence, but I would say it's about the same.

Commissioner Holbrook said what is the height of this fence?

Planner Man said it is 25 feet.

Commissioner Quinn said what is the square footage of this structure?

Planner Mann said it is 3,360 square feet, and the building next to it is approximately 3,400 square feet.

Commissioner Morrissey said what is the reason for the building?

Planner Mann said it is a garage and guest house.

Alex Winder, 1169 W. Koradine Drive South Jordan, Utah 84095 – said I have spoken with 3 of my neighbors that surround me and it will affect the most and they did not have any concerns, and are ok with me building this structure.

Commissioner Holbrook said do you plan on running a business out of this building?

Mr. Winder said no, it is just to store my stuff.

Commissioner Woolley said are you going to be using the guest house right away?

Mr. Winder said we will use it right away, and eventually we will add on to our home, or tear the existing house down and build a new home. I didn't want to build a home and not have the garage as big as I wanted it and regret it down the road. The guest house will be for my adult children if they choose to come back and live at home.

Commissioner Holbrook said is this going to be a rental unit, or is it just for family?

Mr. Winder said it is for family and friends. I wouldn't let anyone I don't know live on my property with my children.

Chairman Woolley opened the Public Hearing to comments. There were none. He closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Jolley said this is an acre lot so I am not worried about the height it is only a foot higher.

D.2 Potential Action Item – (See VI.D.1)

Commissioner Morrissey motioned to approve File No. CUP-2016.02 for a detached garage located at 1169 W. Koradine Drive with the (1) requirement by staff. Commissioner Jolley seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor; Commissioner Hall was absent from vote.

E.1 Issue: ACCESSORY LIVING UNIT – GUEST HOUSE

Address: 1169 West Koradine Drive
File No: ALU-2016.04
Applicant: Alex Winder

Planner David Mann reviewed background information on this item.

Commissioner Morrissey said could you go over where the deficiencies are to meet ordinances?

Planner Mann said the square footage of the home is 2167 square feet and the proposed accessory building unit is 1584 square feet, so it is 50 percent of the footage of the home which is well over the 35 percent allowable.

Alex Winder, 1169 West Koradine Drive South Jordan, Utah 84095- said I don't have anything to add to the review, but I can answer any questions you may have for me.

Commissioner Jolley said is it your intention for your family to live in this unit?

Mr. Winder said no my wife and I will not be living in this unit.

Commissioner Holbrook said my concern would be that if you decide not to build the house and you sell the property we would have this non-conforming living unit there, and if someone purchased your home they could rent it to anybody and then you would have a rental unit in the neighborhood.

Mr. Winder said I have lived in South Jordan my entire life and I really like this neighborhood. This garage is going to cost probably $200 thousand dollars so I don't think that I will ever move.

City Planner Schindler said by our code if this gets approved tonight and down the road he decides to sell the home, the next owner does not automatically get an accessory permit, they will have to come back to the Planning Commission and go through the process.

Chairman Woolley opened the Public Hearing to comments.

Erril Balfour, 1184 W. Koradine Dr. South Jordan, Utah 84095 - said I live across the street and 2 houses to the west from this property. I really don't see an issue with this building, especially when the

guest house is going to be encompassed by the approved garage. It is not like they are building a garage and then building something additional. I have no issue with this. I like the way that it is designed because you can't even tell there is a guest house above the garage.

Gavin Sullivan, 1222 W. 10610 S. Koradine Dr. South Jordan, Utah 84095 – said my main issue with having a property like this is the parking for the additional cars, but it was shown on the plans that there is more than adequate space for the additional cars. That is all that I wanted to say regarding this.

Chairman Woolley closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Jolley said I might be persuaded otherwise if he had some residents in the neighborhood that were against this, but it sounds like they do not have an issue with it. The structure that is proposed is just going to increase the value of his home, as well as the surrounding homes in the neighborhood. I do like the idea of limiting the renters that he can have to family to eliminate the transient renters that maybe the neighborhood would not appreciate.

Chairman Woolley said could you address the idea of limiting the renters to family.

Mr. Winder said I don't think I would like it to be limited to family, because I do real estate and sometimes I have a client that is building a house or something and they will need a place to live for 6 months, so I would like the flexibility. My family will be living in front of that property and I don't think I am going to allow anyone I don't trust or know to be there with my kids.

Commissioner Morrissey said will you be charging rent to live there?

Mr. Winder said yes I will, that will allow me to recoup some of the money it cost to build it.

E.2 Potential Action Item – (See VI.E.1

Commissioner Quinn motioned to approve File No. ALU-2016.04 for a guest house located at 1169 W. Koradine Drive with the requirement by staff. Commissioner Jolley seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 4-1 in favor. Commissioner Morrissey voted No; Commissioner Hall was absent from the vote.

F.1 Issue: SPECIALTY RETAIL GROCERY SITE PLAN

Address: 10622 South Redwood Road
File No: SP-2016.02
Applicant: Monet Ragsdale, Leadership Circle LLC

City Planner Schindler reviewed background information on this item.

Monet Ragsdale, 1521 Oxbo Drive Montrose, Colorado – said I would like to say that we worked really hard with staff to come up with a design that goes above and beyond the code so that we have something beautiful in the heart of the City. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have for me except who the tenant is, because I can't tell you at this time.

Chairman Woolley opened the Public Hearing to comments.

Greg Weaver, 10671 Winter Haven Court South Jordan, Utah 84095 – said I built my house in 2010 knowing that most likely this property would have commercial, so in general I have no objection at all. There was a concern that I had and I spoke with the developer about that concern in November, and it was about the privacy and safety aspect. If you look at the Les Schwab store that is directly north of this project they have an 8 foot sound wall which has been a great barrier between commercial and residential. If you look at the wall just east of my property you can see that it is a 6 foot wall, and there is a really big difference in impacts in the neighborhood between a 6 and 8 foot wall. I would like to request of the Commission that if you approve this tonight that you would stipulate an 8 foot wall to help mitigate some of the impact to the neighborhood. I appreciate the landscaping I think it is terrific, but I have young children and safety is an issue. I also have a concern with the lighting. I know that lighting can be designed so that it is not impactful, but if it is facing the bedrooms it could be. I would like to bring up something that is confusing to me. There are a couple of signs on the property that are advertising this hearing, but they list the date as 19th of April, not the 12th of April. I am not sure what happened there, but I am a little concerned that all of the neighbors that wanted to attend thought it was next week and were not correctly notified.

Chairman Woolley closed the Public Hearing.

Chairman Woolley said do we need to address the date that was posted for the Public Hearing?

City Planner Schindler said I do not have the file with me at this point I will need to go upstairs and verify the correct dates. We don't normally do a posting for the site plan review, what was posted on site was for the rezone application, but I will need the file to verify that.

Staff Attorney Schaefermeyer said I would recommend that you do not make any decisions on this until the notice issue is cleared up.

Ryan Humphries, 6208 W. Indian Pony Way South Jordan, Utah 84095 – said I wanted to speak for this grocery store, we are actually partnering with some other people across the street from them behind the bank. We think this will be a great addition, and we will be building a hobby shop and 5 other units as well. We did get a notice in the mail regarding this meeting tonight, but the sign on the property does say April 19, 2016.

Chairman Woolley closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Quinn said I think it would be beneficial to take a 5 minute break while City Planner Schindler clears up the date issue.

Commissioner Holbrook motioned to adjourn for a 5 minute break. Commissioner Quinn seconded the motion.

Chairman Woolley adjourned for a short break.

Chairman Woolley said the meeting is back in motion. We have had staff review the official notices and the sign on the property was actually for the rezone, and the date for the Planning Commission was incorrect, but it has already taken place so that sign should have come down. Tonight's meeting would have only been noticed by mail and we have copies that indicate the correct date. I am going to ask our Legal Staffs opinion on moving forward.

Staff Attorney Steven Schaefermeyer said the rezone went to City Council on April 5, 2016. The notice was incorrect for the rezone, but eventually that is subject to appeal. My concern is that this site plan is subject to the actual rezone, and we do have a signed development agreement, so then it gets even more complicated, but since this meeting was noticed correctly I would condition your approval until after the appeal time, which is May 3, 2016.

Commissioner Morrissey said I think we should just proceed with that condition.

Commissioner Holbrook said I think the applicant has gone forward in good faith and there is no one objecting to this project, so I think we should move forward. We really do appreciate the public being aware of the notices, and bringing it to our attention.

Commissioner Quinn said would it be possible to hear from the applicant about their thoughts on raising the fence to 8 feet.

Ms. Ragsdale said we did have a neighborhood meeting back in December and they did express their desire to have and 8 foot fence. The problem with that is the wall is not on our property and we don't have the ability to extend that wall. The other choice is to build another wall a couple of feet inside our property that is 8 feet high, but it will give you a "no man's land." We have done this in the past and it is my firm belief that it makes it less safe. We have listened to the neighbors and we disagree slightly with what the solution is that is why we went with really extensive landscaping that is above and beyond what is required. We feel that we have gone above and beyond to address what is safe for everyone.

Commissioner Quinn said I would like to thank the applicant for her input.

Staff Attorney Schaefermeyer said I need to make a correction to the date I stated earlier of May 3, 2016, that needs to be stated in your motion for the appeal process as May 5, 2016. I apologize for the incorrect information earlier.

Commissioner Jolley said I think we are doing the right thing by maintaining the 6 foot fence, I think it would be a huge mistake to build one inside the property line. I don't think there will be any light penetration so there should not be any issues there either.

Chairman Woolley re-opened the Public Hearing.

Greg Weaver, 10671 Winter Haven Court South Jordan, Utah 84095 – said I am confused about the fence line, so I would like to know who's property it is?

City Planner Schindler said it would be your property because it was put up by the developer in your subdivision.

Mr. Weaver said can we give permission to have it replaced?

City Planner Schindler said you can have it replaced, but you would have to pay for it yourself, you couldn't require them replace it.

Mr. Weaver said if the decision of the Commission is to retain the 6 foot wall, do I as the land owner have the ability to put up an 8 foot wall?

City Planner Schindler said to put up an 8 foot wall you would have to go through the Board of Adjustment Hearing Officer, and you would need to go through the variance process.

Chairman Woolley closed the Public Hearing.

F.2 Potential Action Item – (See VI.F.1

Commissioner Holbrook motioned to approve the Site Plan for the Specialty Retail Grocery, subject to the following:

The Applicant shall submit and obtain a lot line adjustment or final subdivision approval prior to obtaining a building permit.

All additional right-of-way, along the north property line abutting 10610 South (approximately 275 linear feet) and along the entire east property line abutting Redwood Road (approximately 420 linear feet), shall be dedicated to the City by warranty deed or recordation of a subdivision plat prior to constructing property improvements.

Prior to constructing property improvements, the Developer shall obtain written approval from the Utah's Department of Transportation in order to access Redwood Road.

This would be conditional to the May 5, 2016 pending appeal noticing.

Commissioner Jolley seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor; Commissioner Hall was absent from the vote.

VII. PUBLIC HEARINGS AND POTENTIAL *LEGISLATIVE ACTION ITEMS

*Legislative Action = More Discretion, Reasonably Debatable (Subjective Standard)

G.1 Issue: HEAGREN PROPERTY
FUTURE LAND USE AMENDMENT AND REZONE

Address: 10604 South 2700 West
File No: LUA-2016.02 & REZ-2016.06
Applicant: Don Matthews, RDM Land & Development

City Planner Greg Schindler reviewed back ground information on this item.

Don Matthews, 5459 W. Arora Vista Herriman, Utah – said we have had a lot of good discussions with the Planning and Engineering staff in relationship to this, and I really don't have any comments pertaining to the zone change and the land use amendment, so I am here to answer any questions that you may have for me.

Chairman Woolley opened the Public Hearing to comments.

Travis Solcle, 10684 S. Bison Trail Cove South Jordan, Utah 84095- said on Bison Ridge Subdivision we greatly oppose the interconnection, mainly due to the bridge and what is required from the Utah Lake Canal. In my background I specialize in risk management, I also serve on the Board for the Utah Chapter for Risk and Management Society, and everything that is risk related is really coming out in this interconnection piece. I built my home in 2010 and I knew that the Utah Lake Canal was there, and that it was a great secondary water resource and we really appreciate it, but at the same time we look at the risk factors as you go down to

the bottom of Bison Ridge Road you have concrete barriers, a vinyl fence, you have everything from a risk standpoint that say "stay away" To my knowledge there have not been any incidents within Utah Lake Canal, or surrounding areas either. The reason we are opposed to bridges from a risk standpoint is that a large portion of these incidents are the leading causes of unintentional injuries and deaths. When we report claims to the CDC and other State agencies we look at the age groups that are affected by this. Utah is ranked 19th on risk factor for the populous of injury per deaths when it comes to unintentional injuries by deaths, Idaho is ranked number 2, and now Idaho and Oregon taking away canals. They are taking away canals and they are piping them now, because of the risk factors, law suits, and the issue of parents. I know you all serve on the Planning Commission, but being on my side of the table having dealt with a death claim of a child it is something we always look back on with a risk mitigation plan to see what could have been done differently. When you allow a bridge from a risk standpoint, you are allowing a diving board into a nice big swimming pool.

Jeff McMullin, 2726 Cousins Lane, South Jordan Utah, 84095 – said I am here on a two-fold assignment. I am the President for the Utah Lake Distributing Canal that this proposed bridge would cross. I sent a letter to the Planning Commission last week and I am not sure if you received that or not, but if you do not have a copy of it the developers does. As a canal company we oppose any crossing of our canal for the same reasons that Mr. Solcle has stated. It is private property, and anytime you cross the canal you are going to have people discarding of garbage in the canal. We have had several instances along there over the past 40 years of people doing that same thing. We cannot see any advantage of crossing in that area. To the south we have a crossing of our canal on the McKee Farm, and we understand that crossing happened because the City asked for an emergency access between 3200 W, and 2700 W. We went along with approving that bridge at that time. I can't see an advantage of having a bridge connecting Bison Ridge with this proposed subdivision. I would think that any emergency equipment would go down 2700 west to get to this proposed subdivision, not across the canal. I am a resident of the subdivision that is going to surround my house, and with a bridge and traffic going across there, I am not in favor of a subdivision if that is going to happen. I don't have a problem with the subdivision being there as it is proposed I just don't want the canal.

Courtney Orton, 10633 S. Bison Ridge Cove South Jordan, Utah 84095 –said I am a resident of Bison Ridge Estates and I live on Bison Ridge Road. I am here representing our neighborhood, as well as other moms that are worried that if this access point is approved and the road is extended from 3200 W to 2700 W that we would have major safety concern for our children that play on this road. Obviously we cannot predict the future and we don't know how this road will be used if it was extended, but we imagine that it would become a short cut from 3200 W to 2700 W. We think that is a reasonable hypothesis because there is an elementary school on 2700 W that many of our kids go to, so we are just worried about this road being extended and traffic being increased. It is a long strait narrow road downhill from where we live, and it is hard for residents in our own neighborhood to maintain safe speeds, let alone people who don't live in our neighborhood and are not aware of how many children live and play in our neighborhood. I would urge you to consider the risks when you are looking at this rezoning.

Bart Forsyth, 2978 W. Bison Ridge Road South Jordan City, Utah 84095 – said I am here tonight in opposition to this road extension. It was back in October when our subdivision residents noticed a sign that was going up at the end of our road indicating that the road would be continued in the future, so after we seen this we got together and prepared a letter a few weeks later and sent it to South Jordan City with 78 signatures on it, so you have a copy of that before you. It has a lot of good reasons why the road extension is not necessary. We were surprised to see the sign because this subdivision has been in place for 10 years, and there has never been any discussion about extending the road in the past. In addition to that we were surprised because our recorded subdivision plat does not show the extension. As we have looked at this road and evaluated it we asked ourselves 3 questions:

1. Does it benefit Bison Ridge Estate Subdivision

2. Does it benefit the new proposed subdivision
3. Does it benefit the City, City residents, and Emergency Services

As we looked at this, in every case the answer was no, there are more disadvantages to this than there are benefits. On Bison Ridge there are already 3 access points, which we have good circulation, and on 3210 W. there is a crash gate for Emergency Services into Bison Ridge. If you look at the concept plan there are 2 access points and good circulation, we just don't see a need for this new extension. The only benefit that occurs for motorists is that if they wish to avoid 10400 S they can use our subdivision as a cut through, and as I have read the general plan it prohibits a cut through. There is no doubt that as we open this up there is going to be a lot of speeding on our road. There are several citations that I can read from your general plan that are in direct conflict with this proposal. We have concluded that this is not a good idea. We understand the City resources that would need to be spent to build this bridge and connect, and we do not think it is a good use of City funds. We would also like to advocate that the road be eliminated from this subdivision proposal.

Cheri Gonzales, 10683 Bison Trail Cove South Jordan, Utah 84095 – said I have been a resident of South Jordan City since 1992, and I am one of the original residents of Bison Ridge. I am just going to give some history that I have learned from the original developers as we are trying to figure out this situation. Originally when we purchased our lot in 2007, the sellers of the subdivision indicated to us that there would not be a bridge that would go over that canal. They said that South Jordan City had a moratorium on bridge development at that particular point in time. In addition to that South Jordan City indicated to the developers at that time that the bridge was cost prohibitive and that the cost would not out-weigh the benefits of the bridge, so as a result of that the bond monies that the developers put forth to the City for the bridge went back to the developers, and the bridge was deemed unnecessary. When the sign that was put up in 2015 we came together as a neighborhood and you have the letter in front of you listing all of the reasons why we are as a neighborhood not in favor of this particular bridge, so the neighborhood, developer, and canal company all deem this as unnecessary development. We are wondering why the funds couldn't be used in a more productive way for South Jordan City, we have a great City and you are awesome to do all of this work for us and we really appreciate it.

Alex Winder 1169 W. Koradine Drive South Jordan, Utah 84095- said I used to live 10550 S. and we have same problem, people are cutting through there all of the time. I actually moved from there because cars would just fly up that street. I now live on Koradine Drive and they put up the same sign, so I guess I will be at that meeting also because I do not want that to go through. I like the concept, but I think the bridge is pointless, I just don't see the need for it. I do like the R.25 zoning, because I think we need more of that because the house prices are so expensive, and it would be nice to have a little cheaper price point in South Jordan.

Valerie Gukeisen, 2748 W 10755 S South Jordan, Utah 84095 – said property is through the backway property to our house and I have lived there since 1988. The owners of the property have had it for a long time and they have done what they needed to do to take care of it and they should be able to sell it. I agree that the bridge is not a good idea at this time, but there should not be any reservation about changing this zoning to R-2.5.

Chairman Woolley closed the Public Hearing.

Don Matthews, 5459 W. Arora Vista Circle – said as Jeff McMullin stated as President of the Utah Lake Distribution Company he submitted a letter to the Planning Commission, I would like to know if all of the Commissioners received that letter? If it is appropriate I made copies for everyone.

City Planner Greg Schindler said I just received the letter today so none of the Planning Commissioners have received it, so you can give the copies you have to them and the recorder as well. I also received 2 other letter today from property owners in the Bison Ridge Subdivision who are in favor of the bridge crossing. I wasn't prepared to bring them tonight, but I can make copies and provide those letters as well and get them to you.

Mr. Matthews said as a developer in light of all the great feedback from the residents it may behoove me as a developer to remove that access, and the bridge, and increase some of the lot sizes. That is all I wanted to add.

Chairman Woolley re-opened the Public Hearing.

Heather Riding, 10687 S. Bison View Cove South Jordan, Utah 84095 – said it sounds like the City would like this to go through for fire access, however, I as well as the neighbors do not see a huge need for that considering there are other accesses that the emergency vehicles could use. I believe that the funds could be used in a better way; it just really does not make sense to me.

Chairman Woolley closed the meeting.

Commission Jolley said we have heard a lot of comment tonight that is not related to our issue, with the exception to the comment pertaining to the zoning, which I have no issue with rezoning this and I don't think the rest of the residents have an issue with the zoning, it is the bridge crossing that is the issue. I am under the assumption that the developer knows that he would incur all of costs for the bridge crossing if it were to be approved by a preliminary subdivision which will be in the future, I don't think it would be the Cities cost.

City Planner Schindler said that is half correct, one of the residents brought up that the bond was returned to the developer of Bison Ridge, so I think the City would share in the cost.

Commissioner Quinn said just as a point of observation, there didn't seem to be any opposition to the rezoning and that is what here for tonight.

Chairman Woolley said we have had some great citizen comments tonight and we do appreciate that. We can take what has been expressed tonight under advisement as we move forward with the developer and staff, but let's move forward with what is before us tonight and that is the rezoning.

G.2 Potential Action Item – (See VII.G.1

Commissioner Quinn motioned to recommend that the City Council adopt:

- **Resolution R2016-21 approving the Future Land Use amendment, and**
- **Ordinance No. 2016-07-Z approving the zone change.**

Commissioner Jolley seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 5-0 unanimous in favor; Commissioner Hall was absent from the vote.

H.1 Issue: ZONE TEXT AMENDMENT – REPEALING SECTIONS 17.30.030 (PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT), 17.60.030 (PERFORMANCE DEVELOPMENT); AND 17.90.030 (PERFORMANCE DEVELOPMENT); AMENDING CHAPTERS 17.40 (RESIDENTIAL ZONES), 17.54 (REDWOOD ROAD MIXED USE (MU) ZONES), AND 17.74 (MIXED USE (MU) ZONES); AMENDING SECTIONS 16.04.19 (PARKS, PARK STRIPS, WALKWAYS, TRAILS, AND OPEN SPACE), 17.70.030 (CONDITIONAL USES), 17.70.170 (OTHER REQUIREMENTS), 17.130.010 (DEFINITION AND

PURPOSE); AND ADDING SECTION 17.130.050 TO THE SOUTH JORDAN CITY MUNICIPAL CODE.

File No: ZTA-2016.02
Applicant: City of South Jordan

City Planner Jake Warner reviewed background information on this item.

Chairman Woolley opened the Public Hearing to comments. There were none. He closed the Public Hearing.

Commissioner Holbrook said this is the first time we have seen this completed, yet we are expecting the public to know about it, understand it, after it has never been discussed anywhere. My personal opinion is that it seems out of sequence. In my mind it seems like it should be discussed, changed, sent back and then given the final completed report, and then have the Public Hearing.

Staff Attorney Steven Schaefermeyer said I am actually working on an "Appeals and Special Acceptation Amendments" that some on the Council has talked about for a while now that needs to get done. In talking with City Attorney Ryan Loose we have discussed what we think that sequence would look like. I think Planner Warner appreciates your input on these Zone Text Amendments. I think the City Council does too, because they have limited time and if they have a good relationship with you they won't have to be spending as much time as they have been these Zone Text Amendments. I am personally up to any suggestions on how you think these should go forward, and maybe Planner Schindler has some suggestions as to what he prefers also.

Commissioner Holbrook said it just seems like the sequence is out of sequence in general.

Commissioner Jolley said how often has would this tool have been used in the past if it were in place over a year?

City Planner Schindler said it would depend because in the past we had other zones, and there were different things allowed in those zones. It might get requested, but I don't know how often it will get implemented, it will depend on what they are asking to do. If it is for density it will probably not get approved unless it is in an area that the Council feels is appropriate. I doesn't always have to be for density, it could be for mixed uses in the zone, and not necessarily residential. It could be adding a retail use in an office zone.

Commissioner Jolley said there might be pieces of property throughout the City that this may open the possibility of developing small pieces of property that don't conform.

City Planner Schindler said I don't see it as an infill issue. I see it as a broader area that might be a tool to be used to bring in some commercial for more tax base if that is what the City wants, but in order to do that they will need to introduce some density in the residential on part of the property, so it wasn't all commercial.

Staff Attorney Steven Schaefermeyer said I have heard the City Manager say that it might be helpful in regards to infill, but not what City Planner Schindler is talking about in regards to higher density and different uses, but unique oddly shaped properties where you might want to change some of the very specific requirements that right now we are not allowed to do.

Chairman Woolley said the good news in my opinion is that it gives staff, Planning Commission and specifically the City Council the ability to look at these odd shaped parcels and gives legislative ability to say "this makes sense in this part of our community." I think it is good to have some flexibility, but you don't want to open up the flood gates to something that is not acceptable.

Commissioner Holbrook said I wanted to ask the other Commissioners if they thought this would be positive on the Open Space Zone, or should we recommend that it not apply to that?

Chairman Woolley said the only prohibitions under section "C" is that sexually oriented businesses should not be allowed, or would be otherwise prohibited by the basin, and then the PC Zone, and the Single Family Residential.

Commissioner Quinn said I think I agree, don't you think one of the prohibitions should be the Open Space?

Planner Warner said I am not sure if the Commission is aware that the City Council has essentially put on hold the revisions for the Open Space, in fact we are bringing forward the Office Zone separately. One thought that I have had is that the recreation center cannot be built in an Open Space Zone the way it is written now, and even as it has been revised. This was seen as a tool that could allow the recreation center to be built in the Park as is. It will be interesting to see how this tool will be used, and it will totally be up to the Council. We as staff need to get a feel for where the Council is at with the applications that come in, and then we can act as better gate keepers.

Chairman Woolley said will the revisions come back to the Planning Commission?

Planner Warner said this has tentatively been scheduled for City Council on Tuesday May 3, 2016. When we do that it is always with the understanding that the Planning Commission could table it and reschedule, but the normal process would be that once the Commission make a recommendation it will go to the City Council and you have had your say, they can the play with it and make revisions and it is in their hands at that point.

City Planner Schindler said are you talking about the revisions tonight, or to the Open Space?

Chairman Woolley said I am talking about the Open Space and the Office.

Planner Warner said I am sorry I misunderstood what you were saying.

Chairman Woolley said in my mind we made recommendations based on a document that at that point had gone back and forth between staff and Council in work sessions, and now it has changed. In my opinion as the Land Use Authority if there are minor revisions they can move on, but if there are substantial changes I think it needs to come back to the Planning Commission for our review and recommendation. I don't think there needs to be another Public Hearing, but when we take something we have recommended based on a certain criteria, and that changes substantially, I would think that it is best practice to come back to this Commission and review the recommendations and forward any thoughts and recommendations to the Council.

Planner Warner said there has been some discussion among staff, and I would say the same concept applies. The changes that have been made were discussed in a joint session between the Council and the Commission in a work session, so the changes are consistent with that discussion. I think what staff has determined is that the Planning Commission has their say and then it is in the Councils hands.

Staff Attorney Schaefermeyer said according to the Office and Open Space, I believe we that we have discussed that since those are separating you basically saw that what the City Council is adopting, and we had talked about re-noticing and bringing it back as a Public Hearing on the Open Space Zone.

Planner Warner said since the joint work session we made the changes that were discussed and we took that package to the City Council again for their decision, they tabled it, and it was determined to separate them. There is some concern about some things that are in the works and how it may affect the Open Space Zone, so the Council wants to let some things play out before we bring the Open Space Zone back to them. It was determined that if it comes forward at this point it will come forward with a different ordinance.

Commissioner Holbrook said one suggestion that I have is that we had talked about meeting quarterly with the Council, and maybe at those meetings if the Council is wanting to revise so many of these zones and different things, we could do it at those work sessions together.

Chairman Woolley said I like that, and I think that was the intent.

Commissioner Quinn said I feel a little lost on this particular discussion because I was not involved with the combined work session that took place, so I would like to recuse myself from the vote.

Commissioner Morrissey said I think this could be a very helpful tool moving forward for the Planning Commission. It allows us to monitor and make decisions based on the present and not on the past. I think it was discussed extensively at the work session. I also think the combined work session was a success, and I think it should be heavily favored by the City Council and the Planning Commission to have quarterly meeting to have joint discussions.

Commissioner Jolley said there is a lot of content here, we could spend days reviewing this, so that is why we rely on staff to recommend these things, along with City Council. I am alright with moving forward on this. I can see the necessity for it. I think it can be very helpful moving forward.

H.2 Potential Action Item – (See VII.H.1

Commissioner Jolley motioned to make a recommendation to City Council to approve Ordinance No. 2016-05. Commissioner Morrissey seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote was 3-0 in favor; Commissioner Holbrook voted No, and Commissioner Quinn recused himself from the vote; Commissioner Hall was absent from vote.

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

Chairman Woolley said on the record I would like to welcome our new Commissioner Brady Quinn, it is good to have you here. What I would like to put forth formally is that as I watched and worked with Planning Commissions around the State, many times an alternate member is almost relegated to the cheap seats and not even invited up on the Dias unless they are there to vote. I don't feel that way, and I hope my fellow Commissioners feel the same way I do. We are thrilled to have you on board, and I would hope that you would be up here with us and fully engage, debate, and share. When you are not able to vote at least you are a part of the entire process.

Chairman Woolley said again for the record, can we recommend to the City Council loud and clear that we appreciated the joint work session. We felt that is was beneficial for us, as well as them, and in order

to do the business of the City, and to do it well, we would recommend that it be formally adopted on a quarterly basis at them time and place of their choosing.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Holbrook made a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Quinn seconded the motion. Vote was unanimous in favor.

The April 12, 2016 Planning Commission meeting adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

Meeting minutes were prepared by Deputy Cindy Valdez.

This is a true and correct copy of the March 12, 2016 Planning Commission meeting minutes, which were approved on April 26, 2016.

Anna M. West

South Jordan City Recorder

Attachment A.

SOUTH JORDAN
UTAH

APRIL 12, 2016

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING SIGN IN SHEET

PRINT NAME	ADDRESS
Mike Haagren	10332 So. Dinkyville Way Copperton Ut
Cheri Gonzales	10683 Bison Trail Cove So Jordan Ut
Martin Gonzales	10683 Bison Trail cv. So. Jordan UT
Kyle Jukes	10887 S Redwood
Tamera Rasmussen	3048 W. Bison Ridge Rd
Tony Rasmussen	3048 W Bison Ridge Rd.
Joel Marquez	10671 S. Bison View Cove
Natalie Marquez	↑ ↑
Ronnie Cooper	10641 S. Bison Creek Cove
Kelly Cooper	10641 S. Bison Creek Cove
Derek Smith	11487 S 2950 W
Albert Fjeldsted	10653 S. Bison View Cove
[illegible]	10653 S. Bison View Cove

SOUTH JORDAN
UTAH

APRIL 12, 2016

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING SIGN IN SHEET

PRINT NAME	ADDRESS
Travis Sokol	10684 S. Bison Trail CV 84095
Kent & Colette Butterfield	2717 W. Cousins Lane 84095
Jamara + Ken Lloyd	1222 W. 10875 So. So. Jordan
DON A. MATHEWS	5459 W. AURORA VISTA DR.
Koreen & Harold Stewart	3072 W. Bison Ridge Rd. 84095
Brandon + Jillian Brady	10657 S. Bison Creek Cove, South Jordan
Jeff McMullin	2726 Cousins Ln
Darwin Gukeisen + Valerie Gukeisen	2748 W. 10755 So. S.J. 84095
Tyler White	9067 S. 1300 W., Ste 304 84088
Lorie Benson	10531 S. Alexander Park Ln.
Mya Bennett	10692 S. Bison Ranch Cv.
Greg Weaver	10671 Winterhaven Ct
Heather Riding	10687 So. Bison View Cove.
Alex Windsor	1169 W Katadine Dr.

SOUTH JORDAN
UTAH

APRIL 12, 2016

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING SIGN IN SHEET

PRINT NAME	ADDRESS
Bart Forsyth	2978 W Bison Ridge Rd.
Erica Balfour	#184 W Koradine Dr.
Steven Roberts	1113 W. Koradine DR
Joann Spencer	10106 S Bison Trail Cove

VII.G.1 Item. G.1 Attachment B

November 12, 2015

Mr. Brad Klavano
Director of Development Services/City Engineer
South Jordan City
1600 W. Towne Center Drive
South Jordan, UT 84095

Subject: Bison Ridge Road Extension

Dear Mr. Klavano:

This letter is being written by and on behalf of the homeowners of Bison Ridge Estates subdivision (Bison Ridge) to express opposition to a future extension of Bison Ridge Road. Recently, a sign was placed by South Jordan City at the east end of Bison Ridge Road indicating that the "road will continue in the future". We understand that a recent inquiry was made to the city regarding future development of the vacant land to the east of Bison Ridge which, as a matter of policy, prompted the city to post this sign.

The undersigned homeowners of Bison Ridge are opposed to any future extension of Bison Ridge Road. This opposition is based primarily on several safety issues that would be caused by a road extension, but we also see very little or no benefit being provided by extending the road. Below you will find a list of reasons for our opposition which we believe outweigh any benefit associated with a future road extension:

1. Safety (traffic): The additional traffic caused by a road extension is a significant safety concern to the residents of Bison Ridge, including the many children residing in the neighborhood. This concern is exacerbated by the straight and steep nature of the Bison Ridge Road extending from 3200 West Street. These conditions will invite speeding by folks residing outside of Bison Ridge wishing to use Bison Ridge Road for access purposes. This poses an unacceptable and unwarranted safety risk to the residents of Bison Ridge.

2. Safety (Canal): Open canals in Utah have a long history of drownings. Currently, Bison Ridge is physically separated and kept safe from the Utah Lake Distribution Canal (Canal) by fencing and other barriers. A road extension would provide direct access to the open Canal and subject Bison Ridge residents (including the many young children) to dangerous conditions that do not currently exist. Once again, this would pose an unacceptable and unnecessary safety risk.

3. Crime: A road extension would invite additional crime to Bison Ridge by making it an easier target through increased access. This is a serious concern to the neighborhood. We have no interest in providing additional access to criminals.

4. Road Extension Logistics: As indicated above, we see very little, if any, benefit of extending Bison Ridge Road for a number of reasons as follows:

First, we don't see a need for access between 2700 West and 3200 West which is so close to 10400 South. If this type of access is important to South Jordan City, we suggest that an interconnection be sought further south in a location more central to 10400 South and 11400 South.

Second, because of its close proximity to 10400 South, a Bison Ridge Road extension would then be used as a "short cut" by folks wishing to avoid traffic and congestion on 10400 South, or for other access purposes. As expressed above, the nature of Bison Ridge Road lends itself to unsafe conditions due to speeding. Because of this and other reasons, we are strongly opposed to the use of Bison Ridge as a cut-through subdivision.

Third, we see no benefit of a road extension for emergency services access. Very good access, which is more appropriate for emergency services vehicles, is already provided to either side of the Canal by three major thoroughfares; 2700 West, 3200 West and 10400 South. Furthermore, because of the close proximity of 10400 South, we see no emergency services timing issues associated with access to either side of the Canal.

Fourth, if more than one point of access is required for subdivision development directly east of Bison Ridge, we suggest that it be gained from 2700 West or 10400 South Streets.

Finally, many of the homeowners in Bison Ridge built their homes or moved to Bison Ridge with the understanding that the road would never be extended across the canal. A road extension would forever change the complexion of Bison Ridge and make it a much less desirable place to live. Many of the homeowners would not have moved to Bison Ridge if they knew a future road extension would take place.

We are requesting that South Jordan City remove Bison Ridge Road extension from its future plans. Your response to this letter can be made to:

Bart Forsyth
2978 West Bison Ridge Road
South Jordan City, UT 84095

Sincerely:

Merrill Rasmussen — Laura Lee Rasmussen

Harold H. Stewart — Koreen S. Stewart

Kara Jenkins — [illegible]

[illegible] — [illegible]

Bartan G. Forsyth — Shannie Forsyth

[illegible]	Jeremy Robison
Kelly Cooper	Jimmy Robin
Stanley Nielsen	James Rasmussen
Stephanie Nielsen	Tony Rasmussen
Ronald Dean	Myrna Fjelstad
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	Cheri Gonzales
Catherine B. Singer	John H. Singer
Lisa S. Bagley	[illegible]
Michelle C. Dye	Myrna Weller
[illegible]	[illegible]
Michelle Romero	Jan Lassig
[illegible]	Sean Bennett
Justin Lassig	Mya Bennett
[illegible]	

[illegible]	Krista [illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	Kindsay Black
Natalie Morquoy	Terri Sirrine
[illegible]	[illegible]
Tara-Lee Milar	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
Angela Liddiard	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	Courtney Orton
R Bangert	Heather Riding
[illegible]	Brock Riding
[illegible]	[illegible]
Randy K Hoora	[illegible]

Jon Frank	Laura Frank
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	Jennifer Nelson
[illegible]	Jill Brady
Caryn Hardy	[illegible]
Julie Hardy	

Item G.1 Attachment C.

Utah Lake Distributing Company
1156 South State Street, Suite 201
Orem, Utah 84097
801-225-6746

April 7, 2016

South Jordan City
Planning Commission
1600 West Towne Center Dr.
South Jordan, UT 84095

Gentlemen,

The directors of the Utah Lake Distributing Company strongly oppose the proposed bridge crossing our canal at about 10600 South. The city required a bridge at about 10800 South connecting the two McKee farm subdivision parcels. We opposed this bridge also, however the City came to us and the developer and said they needed a road connecting 2700 West with 3200 West for emergency access. This is when we agreed to go ahead and allow the developer to build a bridge at that location. On the McKee Farm bridge crossing we required a minimum six foot height inside the box culvert that required the developer to raise the road on each side of the bridge. The reason for this higher culvert was to enable the cleaning of silt build up under the bridge with machines rather than cleaning the silt buildup by hand. I don't think this higher bridge will work for the 10600 south project. When bridges cross our canal it enables more people to use our canal road. Especially for people to throw their garbage in our canal. This canal road and the canal are private property. We have signs that state this because the canal company will not be liable for any damage or loss of life. We have let citizens use our canal road for their walking path but do not encourage that use. We feel that the east-west connectivity between 2700 West and 3200 West at 10800 South and 10400 South should be adequate for any emergency access.

Sincerely,

Jeff McMullin
President

Joe McKee
Director

Clifford N Nelson
Cliff Nielsen
Director

Item G.1
Attachment D

Bison Ridge Road Extension – Support

Resident Alexander Park Lane

April 7, 2016

Mayor - David L. Alvord
City Planner - Greg Schindler, AICP & Planning & Zoning Board
Councilman - Christopher J. Rogers
1600 W. Towne Center Dr. (10610 S.)
South Jordan, Utah 84095

Dear City Leaders,

I am writing in reference to the Bison Ridge Road being extended through to 2700 West. However, I have a few very passionate neighbors, who I want to remain friends with, who are adamantly opposed to this notion. For this reason, I am writing anonymously. In my opinion, this road needs to go through as the city has intended. There are a number of reasons for this. Please consider the following as benefits to the road extension and for continuing forward with the plan.

1. Child Safety
    a. Our children need a safe neighborhood path to get to the local schools. Currently, if our children want to get to Monte Vista Elementary School or South Jordan Middle School, they must walk down to 106th South and then up to 2700 West. I believe we can agree in most part that 106th South is not the most kid friendly walking path, especially for elementary age children. Our kids deserve and would benefit from the more direct, neighborhood friendly path that the Bison Ridge Road extension would allow them to travel on.
    b. Extending the road through to 2700 West would take a fair and helpful portion of the Bison Ridge traffic off of Bison Ridge 3200 West exit and the Alexander Park Lane 106th exit. For many of the same reasons and/or risks that those that are opposed to extending the Bison Ridge Road going through, we also give as reasons and/or risks to extend the road and fairly shift the burden to multiple roads. These include but are not limited to, speed and the number of vehicles traveling through the neighborhood.
    c. The canal is definitely a concern, but other neighborhoods within South Jordan also have the canal running through them, and as long as the city holds the developer accountable

to a safe passage over the canal, we should not be held to a different standard than those other neighborhoods.

2. Community
    a. Roads tie a community together. The extension of this road will allow for a more community driven, friendly neighborhood. These 17 homes would instantly be welcomed in to the Bison Ridge and Alexander Park Place communities, because that is what good neighborhoods do and we are a good neighborhood. Extending Bison ridge advocates for neighbor involvement. I would recommend that the connection not be officially opened until the majority of building be complete to keep construction vehicles out of the existing neighborhoods.
    b. To increase this sense of community the city should really consider tearing down the 3010 breakaway. There is no need to exempt those neighbors from our neighborhood. Having that road closed off, closes off a sense of community. It is amazing how a simple road can tie neighborhood communities together or a fence can afford reasons for a divide.
3. Fairness
    a. The Bison Ridge and Alexander Park communities are asking for something that our neighbors just to the south in McKee Ridge and Palomino Cove just fought for and lost. They, too, didn't want their roads extended for safety and community disruption fears. This should play into the decision with the Bison Ridge Road extension as well. We should all be treated equally.
4. Developer
    a. The developer is having one off meetings with the neighbors of the community who are against extending the road through. The developer would definitely win out here, but at the expense of the long term vision of neighborhood communities. The developer could bypass a hefty cost in this situation and at the same time add another home to increase their pocket book. I don't think it is fair that the developer and those that oppose the road going through come prepared to team up against the long term good of the city.

South Jordan has an awesome planning and zoning board that has spent many years getting ready for changes in the community to be made over time. I believe our Mayor and our City Council also have long term visions into what are the best interests for our communities. I believe our city leaders should honor those plans. One of those plans is the extension of the Bison Ridge Road to 2700 West. By standing by this planned extension, we will be creating a safer environment for our children, building a stronger sense of community among neighbors, and maintaining a sense of fair and equitable decisions amongst all South Jordan neighborhoods.

Bison Ridge Road Extension – Supporter

Item 6.1 Attachment .E.

Mayor Alvord, Councilman Rogers and Mr. Schindler, 4/7/16

Hello Gentleman. This letter is concerning the road extension at the bottom of Bison Ridge Road. I currently live in the Bison Ridge Neighborhood. Our neighborhood is very passionate about not continuing Bison Ridge Road through to the new development to the east of our neighborhood. I must admit that I, at one time, was opposed to the road extension as well. I even signed a letter that was addressed to each of you, a few months ago. Now that more facts are available, I am now in favor of having this road put through the neighborhood with access to 2700 West. Unfortunately, the majority of my neighborhood is not. We've had several neighborhood meetings and I've learned that when you are politely trying to add feedback that goes against the majority, your voice is not heard. This is the reason for this letter.

After months of talking about this road, one of my neighbors decided to contact the developer of the neighborhood that is being built to the east of us. The developer presented his plan to our neighborhood representative, who then added it to our online neighborhood group page. There are 17 homes in the development on sizeable lots. That is not a large neighborhood. The developer, of course, is on board with not extending the road because as he explained, it will save him thousands of dollars and allow him to possibly put one more home on the street. Our neighborhood will be meeting with this developer tonight to come up with a game plan for the city council meeting. I will attend the meeting for the information, but will probably keep my thoughts to myself. I love this neighborhood. My kids have amazing friends, we have become extremely involved in the neighborhood functions and it really is a great place to live. I don't want to cause problems between my family and the rest of the neighborhood. There is a lot of emotion and passion tied to this road extension. I can see each of their points as to why they don't want the road put through, but that doesn't mean that I have to agree with them. For these reasons, I have chosen to write this letter anonymously. I know that there are a few other neighbors who share my opinions, but are afraid to speak up. I have encouraged each of them to write a letter as well. I know that my next door neighbor did today and I'm hoping that more do so.

Here are my thoughts on why the road should go through…

1. It is my understanding that because of the road that is being put through from McKee Ridge to Mckee Farms, our neighborhood will no longer be eligible for school buses to Monte Vista Elementary. My husband and I both work. Most of the time, I will be home to take my kids to school. However, there are times that my elementary age children will have to walk to school now that we don't have buses. I am really concerned about my kids walking along 3200 West to McKee Ridge to follow the new road to 2700 W. It's also crazy for them to have to walk west through the Bison Ridge neighborhood to access 3200 W, walk south on 3200W, just to walk east down through the McKee Ridge neighborhood to get to school. I understand that this is within the one mile bus guideline, but it is still a long walk and will require my kids to walk along 3200 West to access McKee Ridge. I am much more comfortable with the idea of my children walking through our neighborhood to 2700 West. Currently, even with buses, there are days that I do drive my kids to school for one reason or another. We don't see a lot of kids walking until we reach approximately 10600 S on 2700 W. At this point there are always several kids walking to school along 2700 West. I feel that there is safety in numbers and having that road go through will allow my kids to have a safe walking route to school.
2. One of the concerns of my neighbors is that having this road will compromise the safety of our kids. This one makes me laugh a bit. I don't think that my neighbors realize that they are the biggest contributors to this. I can tell you that the stretch of road from 3200 W to the roundabout on Bison Ridge Road is a race track. The average speed of the cars driving up and down this road, is about 35-40 mph. The only exception to this rule happens to be right after the bus drops off the kids in the afternoon. Everyone slows down because there are kids crossing without watching and parents waiting for their kids that are monitoring the traffic. A good friend of mine lives on Alexander Park Lane. We usually get together every week to let our kids play. I am amazed at how fast the cars go along this road. It is a long, straight road

with no reason to stop. Some of those that are the most outspoken about the road extension, are the fastest drivers when it comes to Alexander Park Lane and Bison Ridge Road. There was one day that our kids were out riding bikes and playing four square in the drive way. The ball went out in the street. Luckily, our kids didn't chase it, but our neighbor who was driving very excessive speeds, hit and popped the ball without even slowing down. I was shocked at how fast she was driving! The fact that she didn't even slow down when the ball went into the street, surprised me. My friend said that the only time anyone drives the speed limit is when South Jordan City puts out the monitoring cables. Everyone seems to be on their best behavior until the cables disappear. I can't speak for all of the homeowners on Alexander Park Lane, but my friend said that the majority of them would like to see the Bison Ridge Road extension happen. They feel that it might ease the traffic on their road a bit. I encouraged her to write a letter, but they are not actually part of Bison Ridge and feel that it's not their place.

3. Another reason that my neighbors are concerned about the road extension, is the canal. To me, this isn't even an issue and I have young kids as well. When I attended the city council meetings for the road extension in McKee Ridge, the council explained to the residents that there would be a fence to keep the kids away from the canal. I'm assuming that our canal crossing would be fenced as well. Currently, there is a fence keeping the kids away from the canal. How is this different? Can accidents happen? Yes. Could they happen as things are now? Yes.
4. Another neighbor expressed concern for the fact that we have a girl with down syndrome in our neighborhood and that the reason they bought here was because it was a quiet neighborhood that she could wander. This girl is 16, I believe. She is so sweet and I enjoy seeing her every now and then, but that's just it. She is never outside and when she is, it's with either her parents or her brother. We have lived here for several years. I have yet to see her out wandering by herself. When they moved in, it was obvious that the breakaway fence would eventually be taken down and the road would go through. We knew it and we still built here.
5. Another point that they are arguing is that crime will go up. I am not sure how having a street extended would add to crime. I don't think our neighbors realize the amount of people that come into our neighborhood to look at the animals on Alexander Park Lane. There was a day that I was visiting my friend and two scary looking men came and sat down on my friend's front lawn to eat their lunch and watch the elk and bison. I don't mean to stereotype, but my kids were playing and I realized quickly that these two men were not the type I'd want around my kids. When my friend politely asked them to leave, they started using language that I didn't appreciate, laughing at her and throwing food scraps and wrappers all over her lawn. They finally left and she went out and cleaned it up. She said that this is not uncommon. She has people sitting in her parking strip all of the time to watch the animals. Some seem harmless, others not so much. She said that typically the weekends are the worst. Our neighbors don't realize that a road extension is not going to bring in crime. We already have visitors from all over the valley and every demographic in our neighborhood constantly looking at the elk and the bison. However, as my friend says… the animals were here first and we knew that when we bought our lot. When the talk of the road extension started last fall, several of the neighbors mentioned that instead of fighting the road extension, we should petition to privatize the neighborhood. If crime is what they are concerned about, we should be looking at privatization rather than fighting a street that will add 17 nice homes!
6. Another point that I don't agree with is that our neighborhood would be used as a "cut through". I'm not sure who would use it as a "cut through". One of my neighbors argued that those that are in the Jones Farm neighborhood would use our neighborhood to get their kids to Monte Vista Elementary or South Jordan Middle School rather than use 10400 S and 2700 W. What I couldn't get them to understand is that all of the neighborhoods west of 3200 W between 10400 S and 11400 S do not go to Monte Vista or SOJO Middle. They are in the boundaries of Elk Meadows and Elk Ridge with the exception of a few permits, and those permits are very few. The areas that are in high demand are the Costco/Walmart shopping centers and Bingham High and the Redwood Road area. Those that live east of 2700 W will not use our street as a cut through to get to Wal Mart because they will still need to make a left hand turn at 3200 W.

Why would they not just make that left hand turn at 2700 W? Those that live east of 3200 W are not going to use it as a cut through to get to Bingham High and the Redwood Road area because there is no reason to. With the road going through at McKee Ridge, there is no need for the neighbors in the McKee Ridge neighborhood or the 10755 S neighborhood to use Bison Ridge Road as a "cut through". This isn't an issue at all!

7. Many of us are close to the neighbors in the McKee Ridge neighborhood. Because of church boundaries, we are all in the same Ward. The conversation that has come up several times, is… why do those in Bison Ridge feel that they're more special than those in McKee Ridge? Why would the City Council side with you when they wouldn't side with us? It's true. If we were granted the request of not extending Bison Ridge Road, what we are saying is that we are an elite neighborhood that can get what we want. I know that the majority of those in Bison Ridge do not feel this way. I can honestly say that so many of my neighbors are good, genuine people who would give you the shirt off their back. They do not view themselves as "elite". However, for us to ask for our road not to go through, and be granted this, sends the wrong message to those in the McKee Ridge neighborhood and the Palomino Cove neighborhood for that matter. I don't feel that this would be fair.
8. I feel that having Bison Ridge Road extended would actually relieve the traffic burden on the west side of Bison Ridge Road and Alexander Park Lane. If I had my way, 3010 W would be open as well. Since there is a break away fence there, I'm hoping that this will be sooner than later. It would be nice for those on the lower two circles to have 3010 W to access 10400 S rather than using Alexander Park. When there are more options, the traffic spreads out and there isn't a traffic burden to any one street in the neighborhood. To me, that seems safer!

Thank you so much for taking the time to read this letter! I hope that you will take these thoughts into consideration when making this huge decision. I know that your job is not easy, but having information from those on both sides of the argument, will hopefully help in making the correct decision.

Thanks again!