



BLUFFDALE PLANNING COMMISSION
Wednesday, February 18, 2026

Notice is hereby given that the Bluffdale City Planning Commission and Bluffdale City Council will hold a public meeting on **Wednesday, February 18, 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. **Minutes:** Approval of the minutes from the February 4, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting.
4. **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

5. **CONSIDERATION AND VOTE** on a proposed Site Plan for a new Office/Warehouse building on 2.43 acres located at 950 West 14730 South (Application 2025-39). LightLink Communications, Applicant, represented by Adam Orme. Ellen Oakman, Staff Presenter.

LEGISLATIVE ITEMS

6. **PUBLIC HEARING, CONSIDERATION, AND RECOMMENDATION** on a Text Amendment to multiple sections of the Bluffdale City Code as follows:
 - Consolidate Chapters 11.80.010 (R-1-43 Residential Zone) and 11.80.020 (R-1-10 Residential Zone) into a new Chapter 11.80.010 ("Single-Family Residential Zones"), outlining lot and building requirements for all existing single-family zones and creating the R2 ("half-acre") and R3 ("third-acre") zones;
 - Relocating and Chapter 11.80.040 (R-1-87 Residential Zone) into Chapter 11.70 (Agricultural Zone) and renaming that zone to A-2;

- Amend Chapter 11.350.030 of the Bluffdale City Code to incorporate new R2 and R3 Zones and their respective uses and large animal rights;
- Modifying the lot standards (width, frontage, setbacks, and coverage) in the R-1-10 (Renamed as R4) Zone;
- Amend assorted sections of the Bluffdale City Code to update code titles and related references; and
- Updating the legend and zone labels on the Official Zoning Map to reflect those same changes.

City of Bluffdale, Applicant. Caitlyn Tubbs, Staff Presenter. (Application 2025-07)

7. **PUBLIC HEARING, CONSIDERATION, AND RECOMMENDATION** on a Text Amendment to enact Section 11.160.320 *Placement and Usage of Accessory Storage Containers* to allow for placement and use of storage containers (e.g. shipping containers, Conex containers, enclosed truck trailers, freight containers, etc.) within the City of Bluffdale and limiting the number and locations of such within residential and non-residential zones. City of Bluffdale, Applicant. Caitlyn Tubbs, Staff Presenter. (Application 2025-23)

DISCUSSION ITEMS:

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

Dated: February 13, 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.

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, February 18, 2026**

Present:

Members: **Debbie Cragun, Chair**
 Ulises Flynn
 Tina Griffis
 Kory Luker
 Erik Swanson
 Joel Woodruff (arrived at 6:21 p.m.)

Staff: **Grant Crowell, Community and Economic Development Director**
 Caitlyn Tubbs, Planning Manager
 Ellen Oakman, Associate City Planner
 Pauline Matagi, Community Development Coordinator

PLANNING COMMISSION BUSINESS MEETING

1. Roll Call.

Chair Debbie Cragun called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

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

Scerinda Johnson offered the invocation and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. Minutes: Approval of the Minutes from the February 4, 2026, Planning Commission Meeting.

Commissioner Griffis moved to TABLE the Minutes of the February 4, 2026, Planning Commission Meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Flynn. Vote on motion: Ulises Flynn-Yes, Erik Swanson-Yes, Tina Griffis-Yes, Kori Luker-Yes, Chair Cragun-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

4. Public Comment.

There was no public comment.

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, February 18, 2026**

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

5. CONSIDERATION AND VOTE on a proposed Site Plan for a new Office/Warehouse building on 2.43 acres located at 950 West 14730 South (Application 2025-39), LightLink Communications, Applicant, represented by Adam Orme. Ellen Oakman, Staff Presenter.

Associate City Planner, Ellen Oakman, presented the Staff Report and indicated that two parcels would be combined for the 21,556-square-foot LightLink office/warehouse building at 950 West 14730 South in the Heavy Commercial Zone. The primary building will be on the south site. The existing buildings on the north parcel will be demolished, and that area will be used for gravel storage. A total of 31 parking stalls are required, and the applicant proposed 41 stalls.

The Zoning Map, Site Plan, Landscaping Plan, and architectural renderings were displayed. Landscaping will be primarily along the 14600 South corridor. The main building will face 14730 South and be constructed of split-faced/honed concrete masonry unit (“CMU”) and architectural metal panels.

The applicant requested the following deviations:

- 8% glazing on the east façade (10% is required)
 - This was requested due to lack of visibility and operational layout limitations. The facade is a non-street-facing elevation and is set back 10 feet from the property line.
- No façade articulation or roofline variation.
 - High bay storage and loading areas require uninterrupted wall planes to accommodate operations. Other reasons include fire access, circulation, and racking system height. Increased glazing, variation and materials, and stepped massing were used on publicly visible elevation.
- Exclude the gravel area on north lot from landscaping calculations. If excluded, 17% of the overall parcel will be landscaped (15% is required).
 - The gravel portion is fenced and not visible from the right-of-way. Landscaping will be concentrated in the 14600 South corridor.

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, February 18, 2026**

Proposed Conditions of Approval include:

- Planning Commission approval of deviations.
- Updated fire approval memo is required.
- That all requirements of the City Codes and Engineering Standards are met.
- The applicant must complete a Lot Line Adjustment to combine the two existing parcels into one to allow for the storage use.

Staff recommended that the Planning Commission approve the Site Plan Application based on the findings presented in the Staff Report.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Flynn, Community and Economic Development Director, Grant Crowell, confirmed that a small portion of the property will be acquired by the City for the long-term project to widen 14600 South from Interstate 15 to Redwood Road.

In response to a question from Commissioner Swanson, Ms. Oakman reported that a Fire Department approval memo had not been received but would be required prior to Site Plan approval.

Commissioner Flynn asked if water-wise landscaping would be installed. Ms. Oakman reported that no sod was proposed. Landscaping will be primarily shrubs and trees.

Commissioner Swanson asked if the gravel storage would cause any issues with dust. Ms. Oakman stated that the primary activity will be on the 14730 South property, which will be accessed from that road. The gravel is stored on the northern property. Mr. Crowell added that gravel storage is not permitted as a standalone use, so the parcels must be combined.

The applicant, Adam Orme, stated that LightLink currently occupies a small building on the north property and has grown to 100 employees. They have owned the south property for the past seven years and are now ready to build on it. They will be demolishing the existing structures and selling a portion of the north parcel to the City.

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, February 18, 2026**

Regarding the deviations, the new building will include a two-story office building, storage, and a warehouse. The façade deviation was requested for the warehouse portion, which will be behind a privacy fence. There will be a six-foot masonry fence along the eastern façade, and the glazing deviation is to remove the area hidden by the fence from the calculation. The street-facing façade will meet all City design requirements. They also requested that the gravel storage area not be included in the landscaping calculations.

In response to a question raised by Chair Cragun, Mr. Orme reported that there will be a concrete pad and privacy gate at the entrance, and it will be right-in/right-out only. LightLink is a fiber optic company, and semitrucks will enter and exit the property frequently.

Commissioner Flynn stated that he understood the reasons for the deviation requests and was not opposed to granting them. Chair Cragun remarked that other builders have been granted deviations. A lot of work was put into the new design standards, but each property and use is different. The Planning Commission has the ability to grant deviations when they make sense, and she had no issues with granting them in this case. The Commission agreed.

Commissioner Flynn moved to APPROVE the Light Link Office Warehouse Site Plan Application 2025-39 subject to the Conditions and based on the Findings presented in the Staff Report dated February 13, 2026. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Swanson. Vote on motion: Ulises Flynn-Yes, Erik Swanson-Yes, Tina Griffis-Yes, Kori Luker-Yes, Chair Cragun-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

LEGISLATIVE ITEMS

6. PUBLIC HEARING, CONSIDERATION, AND RECOMMENDATION on a Text Amendment to multiple sections of the Bluffdale City Code as follows:

- **Consolidate Chapters 11.80.010 (R-1-43 Residential Zone) and 11.80.020 (R-1-10 Residential Zone) into a new Chapter 11.80.010 (“Single-Family Residential Zones”), outlining lot and building requirements for all existing single-family zones and creating the R2 (“half-acre”) and R3 (“third-acre”) zones;**
- **Relocating and Chapter 11.80.040 (R-1-87 Residential Zone) into Chapter 11.70 (Agricultural Zone) and renaming that zone to A-2;**

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, February 18, 2026**

- **Amend Chapter 11.350.030 of the Bluffdale City Code to incorporate new R2 and R3 Zones and their respective uses and large animal rights;**
- **Modifying the lot standards (width, frontage, setbacks, and coverage) in the R-1-10 (Renamed as R4) Zone;**
- **Amend assorted sections of the Bluffdale City Code to update code titles and related references; and**
- **Updating the legend and zone labels on the Official Zoning Map to reflect those same changes.**

City of Bluffdale, Applicant. Caitlyn Tubbs, Staff Presenter. (Application 2025-07)

City Planner, Caitlyn Tubbs presented the amendments, which were created at the direction of the City Council following multiple Work Sessions and visioning meetings on potentially creating additional zoning tools.

The General Plan is the City’s guiding document for development and identifies three top housing goals:

1. Retain the character of established neighborhoods.
2. Provide a variety of high-quality housing choices that incorporate a range of types, tenancies, and densities.
3. Ensure new housing stock addresses all income levels and life stages.

Additionally, the State requires each municipality to include a Moderate-Income Housing Element in its General Plan. The City must choose three menu items designed to facilitate construction of moderate-income within Utah. The menu item most applicable to the proposed text amendment is:

- F. Zone or rezone for higher density or moderate-income residential development in commercial or mixed-use zones near major transit investment corridors, commercial centers, or employment centers.

Zoning is a toolbox for the City’s use. Existing tools are underlying zones like R-1-43, R-1-10, Heavy Commercial, Light Industrial, etc. Overlay zones can be applied to allow for infill

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, February 18, 2026**

development or to accommodate natural features or other site constraints. Development Agreements can also be entered into, as necessary.

Ms. Tubbs reported that the proposed Text Amendments would add two tools to the toolbox. Current zoning designations would not be changed, and additional density or development rights would not be automatically granted in those areas. If the amendments were adopted and included in the toolbox, anyone interested in utilizing them would still need to submit a rezoning application that would go through the established noticing, review, and public hearing process with the Planning Commission and City Council.

The proposal would consolidate all single-family residential zones into one chapter of Bluffdale City Code. They were currently spread across multiple chapters, and both property owners and developers have indicated that it can be difficult to locate all requirements. Several other communities consolidate all standards and requirements into one centralized table, and Staff proposed implementing that pattern in Bluffdale ordinances. Existing R-1-43 and R-1-10 Zones would be renamed R1 and R4, respectively. The Text Amendment also contemplated adding R2 (0.50-acre minimum lot size) and R3 (0.33-acre minimum lot size) Zones. The current R-1-87 Zone would be redesignated A-2 Agricultural (two acre minimum). The existing A-5 Zone would remain.

Ms. Tubbs reviewed the proposed Development Standards table. No changes to lot widths, setbacks, etc. were proposed for the new R1 and R3 Zones. At the City Council's direction, the minimum lot sizes for the R2 and R3 zones were rounded down to 20,000 and 13,000 square feet, respectively. The tools are not intended to split existing one-acre lots. At the most recent joint Planning Commission/City Council Work Session, members of both bodies stressed that the new zones would not be considered for parcels under two acres in size.

The minimum area for each zone is:

- R1: one acre
- R2 and R3: two contiguous acres

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, February 18, 2026**

- R4: 10,000 square feet

In response to a question raised by Chair Cragun, Ms. Tubbs reported that “contiguous” was chosen to indicate that more than one parcel can be included in the rezoning request as long as they are adjacent to one another. At the Planning Commission’s director, Staff could consult with City Attorney, Fred Donaldson on alternate wording.

Commissioner Swanson asked if the proposed requirements would mean that only three homes could be built on two acres in the R2 Zone. Ms. Tubbs reported that shared driveway options are available, but whether a fourth home could be built would depend on geography and other factors. Commissioner Swanson stated that he would be interested in seeing how many homes could be realistically built with the proposed minimums. Mr. Crowell remarked that it would depend on the parcel size. For example, a public cul-de-sac requires a lot of land area but has minimal effect on a 20-acre subdivision. Commissioner Swanson stated that the minimum acreage may need to be increased for the R2, R3, and R4 Zones.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Woodruff, Ms. Tubbs reported that variances are extremely uncommon and a lot of frontage variance had not been granted in over 10 years. Commissioner Woodruff asked if Staff had studied whether the proposed zones could realistically be applied to a two-acre parcel in Bluffdale. Mr. Crowell stated that it had not been studied. Lots are all shaped differently, and that is usually addressed in pre-application meetings. He believes the zoning could be applied to some two-acre parcels but not others. Commissioner Woodruff stated that the frontage is the limiting factor. It would be easy to fit four houses on two acres, but the frontage requirements make it very difficult. Ms. Tubbs reported that Staff will gather information on whether the proposed lot frontage and width would be limiting factors for future development.

Changes were also proposed to R-1-10 (proposed R4) zoning standards. Over the past 20 years, all applicants who applied for R-1-10 zoning also applied for an infill overlay. The most popular use is to request a setback reduction. Instead of the current setbacks (30 feet front, 20 feet side, and 30 feet rear), on average the City has approved 22-foot front, nine-foot side, and 21-foot rear

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, February 18, 2026**

setbacks. In one instance the applicant requested a lot width reduction from 100 feet to 75 feet, and in another instance the development required a minimum lot size of 12,000 square feet. Staff used the above averages to adjust standards for the proposed R4 Zone.

The following minimums were proposed:

- Lot size: 10,000 square feet
- Lot width: 60 feet
- Lot frontage: 60 feet
- Front setback: 20 feet
- Side setback: 10 feet
- Rear setback: 20 feet

A massing study was reviewed. Current R-1-10 standards result in a square lot, whereas the infill overlays and proposed R4 Zone provide the opportunity for deeper, narrower lots with more backyard space.

During the joint Work Sessions, the Planning Commission and City Council discussed the importance of protecting large animal rights in the City. Existing requirements allow two cows, two horses, five sheep, five goats, or two pigs per 0.50 acre. As the proposed R2 Zone has a slightly smaller minimum lot size of 20,000 square feet, that minimum was carried over to the large animal rights requirements.

Most of the proposed Text Amendments were housekeeping changes to update references and renumber chapters. If all single-family zones are relocating into one chapter, all other zoning chapters will need to be renumbered. All references to old zoning designations were also updated throughout all City ordinances, as well as in the Zoning Map legend.

Ms. Tubbs reported that the item was noticed for a public hearing. Staff requested that the Planning Commission open the public hearing and gather public comment prior to making a recommendation to the City Council or continuing the item. A joint Planning Commission/City Council Work Session was scheduled for March 18, 2026, to discuss the item further.

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, February 18, 2026**

Staff recommended that the Planning Commission consider potential fiscal impacts of the proposed R2 and R3 Zones, as well as potential impacts to infrastructure and utilities. The Commission should also consider whether it would be appropriate to require applicants to apply for a General Plan Map Amendment concurrent with any rezoning requests or to instead apply a Text Amendment to reflect the changes in the body of the General Plan.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Swanson, Ms. Tubbs confirmed that no changes were currently being proposed to the General Plan. The General Plan Map was reviewed, and Ms. Tubbs indicated areas designated Low Density Residential that would be suitable for R2 and R3 development. Those zones could not be applied in the Very Low-Density Residential areas as Bluffdale requires the Zoning Map to follow the General Plan.

Chair Cragun reported that emailed comments had been received on the item, and those comments would be included in the record. Some comments were received about the Sage Estates development, and she clarified that the discussion did not pertain to that development. It is in the R-1-43 Zone, and the only change proposed to that zone was renaming it to R1. Comments on that development should be held until a public hearing is held on that specific item.

Chair Cragun opened the public hearing.

Teresa Johnson gave her address as 3342 West 14400 South and asked if the presentation could be made available on the website. In response to her question, Chair Cragun stated that the item would likely be tabled, and there would be other opportunities for public comment. Ms. Johnson asked when the City decided to stop maintaining one-acre lots and instead allow 0.33-acre lots. Chair Cragun stated that the City Council directed Staff to create the proposed amendments.

Laurie Maxfield gave her address as 14480 South 3200 West and asked Staff to explain why the proposed zoning would decrease the minimum lot size for 0.50-acre parcels from 21,000 to 20,000 square feet. Ms. Tubbs reported that the change was made based on feedback received from the City Council. Ms. Maxfield stated that too many animals are allowed on 0.50-acre parcels, and she did not believe the minimum lot size should be reduced without also reducing the number of

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, February 18, 2026**

animals allowed. She lives on three acres, and the City would allow her to have 24 large animals on her property.

Tim Petru gave his address as 2527 West Statehood Drive. He asked where higher density would be allowed in the City without affecting existing one-acre lots. Ms. Tubbs reported that during the joint City Council/Planning Commission Work Session, members decided that the City should not consider allowing R2 or R3 zoning on properties less than two acres in size. Two contiguous acres are required to apply for either zone, so a single one-acre lot would not be eligible for those zones. However, two adjacent one-acre lots would qualify. Mr. Petru agreed with Commissioner Swanson that the minimum should be more than two acres. Commissioner Swanson stated that a General Plan amendment would also be required. For example, Ms. Maxfield could not simply subdivide her three-acre lot in the new R1 Zone because that would not comply with the General Plan designation of Very Low Density.

Derick Moser gave his address as 14486 South 3400 West and stated that he likes having one-acre lots, but he understands that reality no longer supports that density. He supported the City's effort to allow higher density in appropriate areas as that might prevent half of Bluffdale from being annexed into Riverton or Herriman.

Chair Cragun stated that the public hearing would be left open during Planning Commission discussion.

Commissioner Luker commended Staff on their excellent work in incorporating comments made in the last Work Session into a concise document. Chair Cragun agreed. Text Amendments can be very difficult to interpret, and in this case, it was even more difficult because zones were also being renamed and extensive Code updates were required. Putting these extensive changes into a readable, understandable format took a lot of Staff time and effort.

Commissioner Swanson reiterated his request for examples of how the proposed new zones could be applied and if the minimum parcel size needed to be increased to allow for viable development.

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, February 18, 2026**

Commissioner Woodruff remarked that there could be 50 applications in the first year or only one, and those extremes require vastly different Staff, Planning Commission, and City Council resources. The concept can assist in natural growth, but only if it is feasible based on current conditions in Bluffdale. He asked Staff to research potential long-term fiscal, utility, infrastructure impacts of allowing the zone, as it is important to thoroughly assess the true impact of the proposed changes over time and ensure that the City can absorb them. Chair Swanson remarked that different areas of the City would have different development-related traffic, sewer, and water concerns.

Chair Cragun stated that when the item was first discussed in 2025, the Planning Commission talked about it being similar to spot zoning. In that meeting, they discussed identifying areas where 0.50- and 0.33-acre lots would be appropriate and building that into the General Plan so developers know where the zoning is allowed rather than the City holding separate public hearings for individual developer's requests and deciding on one parcel at a time. She believes the General Plan should be updated first. Citizens who are opposed to the new zones may be reacting to the unknown, and identifying where they could be applied on the General Plan Map would be a more appropriate first step. She recommended tabling the item until after the March 18 Work Session so more questions can be answered. For example, are there 15-acre or larger parcels that can be developed in the City?

Commissioner Griffis agreed with Chair Cragun. She would like the areas to be identified and documented. More data is also needed on how the proposed zones would impact Bluffdale's existing population.

Commissioner Swanson stated that it would not be advisable to amend the General Plan Map prior to creating the R2 and R3 zones because in the interim the R-1-10/new R4 Zone is the only higher-density zone that can be applied. He believes the changes need to be made in tandem.

Chair Cragun stated that it may be possible to delay any rezoning requests for R2 and R3 until after the General Plan is updated. Many people who are opposed to the new zones may not

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, February 18, 2026**

understand that someone could currently apply for 0.25-acre zoning in the west side of Bluffdale, and it may be better to allow 0.50- and 0.33-acre lots to be built there instead.

Marlin Jones gave his address as 14726 South Ten Sleep Circle. He asked if the Text Amendments were in response to a developer's request. Mr. Crowell stated that there were no applications pending. Staff was given an assignment to work on the code. Commissioner Flynn stated that it would help the Planning Commission make zoning decisions.

Commissioner Swanson added that there is a large hole in Bluffdale's zoning code as there were currently no zones for parcels between 0.25 and one acre in size, but higher density is allowed. Issues have arisen recently. For example, there are parcels in Springview Farms that were not included in the original development, and the developer now wants to build on 0.25-acre lots surrounded by 0.33-acre lots. The City does not have an 0.33-acre zone, so it cannot require that lot size. Mr. Jones stated that he believes it is spot zoning, and the General Plan should be addressed first.

Commissioner Woodruff stated that there are State mandates for higher density, which Bluffdale struggles with. Constituents have spoken with City Council members about the issue. There are also several nonconforming lots in the City that the new zones could address. It is important to ensure that it is done correctly, but the issue was being addressed proactively to determine how Bluffdale should grow.

Brad Llewellyn gave his address as 3547 West 13800 South and asked if there was a map of nonconforming lots. Commissioner Woodruff stated that he has several neighbors with nonconforming lots. Mr. Llewellyn agreed that there should be additional zones but believes it is important to consider what is already nonconforming.

Commissioner Flynn remarked that the reasons behind the changes should be made known. The Text Amendments include a lot of different changes that may need to be split into two applications, although he understands why they were presented together. Commissioner Luker asked if it would be possible to separate the nomenclature change and code updates from the proposed new R2 and

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, February 18, 2026**

R3 Zones. Mr. Crowell stated that the ordinances could be drafted that way if Staff was directed to do so.

In response to a question from Ms. Johnson, Chair Cragun stated that the General Plan designates areas of the City where specific zones are appropriate, and it would need to be updated if the new zones were approved. Commissioner Flynn added that the General Plan projects into the future and provides of vision of how the City would like to grow.

Chair Cragun stated that the meeting minutes would be published on the City website and Staff would address the Planning Commission's questions at the March 18 joint meeting, which would provide more clarity for both the Commission and residents. Comments can be emailed to the Planning Commission, but its members do not engage with the public outside of meetings. Other questions could be directed to the City's elected officials.

Commissioner Griffis moved to CONTINUE the Proposed Ordinance Amending Chapter 9.10.020 Related to the Adoption of the Wildland Urban Interface Building Standards until after the March 18, 2026, Work Session and direct Staff to provide additional information regarding the Planning Commission's questions. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Flynn. Vote on motion: Ulises Flynn-Yes, Erik Swanson-Yes, Tina Griffis-Yes, Kori Luker-Yes, Chair Cragun-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Crowell reported that the March 18, 2026, joint Work Session will be an open meeting, but there will not be a public hearing. The public Planning Commission meeting was still open, and it will likely be continued to April 15, 2026.

7. **PUBLIC HEARING, CONSIDERATION, AND RECOMMENDATION on a Text Amendment to enact Section 11.160.320 Placement and Usage of Accessory Storage Containers to allow for placement and use of storage containers (e.g., shipping containers, Conex containers, enclosed truck trailers, freight containers, etc.) within the City of Bluffdale and limiting the number and locations of such within residential and non-residential zones. City of Bluffdale, Applicant. Caitlyn Tubbs, Staff Presenter. (Application 2025-23)**

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, February 18, 2026**

Ms. Tubbs presented the Staff Report and indicated that the Text Amendment was created at the direction of the City Council. Staff conducted research on how other municipalities regulate cargo containers in residential zones and determined that the majority of cities along the Wasatch Front prohibit cargo containers in residential areas. Only Salt Lake City and West Valley City allow cargo containers, and property owners are required to provide additional architectural treatments to make them look more like a shed and less like a shipping container. In other cities, they are only allowed in non-residential areas. When they are allowed in residential zones, it is for temporary use not to exceed one year and must be placed on a hard surface.

Bluffdale is a unique city with larger lots, and many residents purchased a large lot for storage or to run a home-based business. As such, the City wants to allow cargo containers while ensuring that they are kept in safe and serviceable condition and City aesthetics are maintained. The proposed definition for cargo containers is as follows:

Cargo Container: A standardized, reusable vessel fabricated to transport freight or goods on a truck, railroad, or ship, in accordance with international standards for overseas shipping, including cargo containers, shipping containers, or other portable storage units that are placed on private property and used for storage of items, including, but not limited to: clothing, equipment, goods, household or office fixtures or furnishings, materials and merchandise.

Proposed general requirements:

- Accessory use only in residential and non-residential areas.
- Vertical stacking is prohibited.
- No roofs or lean-tos unless fully integrated into an accessory building (for example, as an accessory dwelling unit (“ADU”)).
- Unless approved as an ADU, the cargo container cannot be used as dwellings.
- Must be in good repair and secured.
- Cannot be placed in required parking areas.

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, February 18, 2026**

Ms. Tubbs reported that the draft language also includes a requirement to store the cargo container on a concrete or asphalt surface. However, the Planning Commission could choose to remove that requirement and allow them to be placed on gravel or dirt as well.

In response to a question raised by Chair Cragun, Ms. Tubbs reported that the definition of “roof” would be pulled from Building Code. If integrated into an ADU, it would have to comply with all code requirements for those structures.

Ms. Tubbs reported that cargo containers would be permitted in the Heavy Commercial and Light Industrial Zones where open storage is an allowed accessory use, which are primarily in the eastern side of the City near the railroad tracks and above 14600 South. One container up to 40 feet in length would be allowed for each 10,000 square feet of lot size in those zones, not to exceed five total containers. In residential zones, cargo containers would be prohibited in front and corner side yards. They could only be placed in easements or utility corridors if the easement holder or corridor owner provides written consent.

The maximum number of containers allowed would be determined by lot size:

- 20,000 square feet or less: No containers allowed.
- 20,000 square feet to one acre: One container per 20,000 square feet.
- One acre or larger: One container per 20,000 square feet, not to exceed 4 containers.

Containers must be 40 feet in length or smaller. Standard cargo containers are approximately eight feet wide by nine feet tall and 10, 20 or 40 feet in length. Commissioner Flynn recommended that the specific container sizes be included in the text.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Woodruff, Ms. Tubbs clarified that the maximum number of containers applies regardless of the length.

Ms. Tubbs encouraged the Planning Commission to consider whether containers should be allowed on other surfaces such as road base, gravel, or raw ground, or if asphalt and concrete would be more appropriate. They should also consider whether the proposed maximum number of

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, February 18, 2026**

containers was appropriate, as well as the maximum container length. Residents and business owners use storage containers, and it was the City's intent to allow their continued use while ensuring that community aesthetics and cleanliness are maintained.

In response to Chair Cragun's question about the definition of "roof", Mr. Crowell reported that Building Code address the roof assembly, wind load, snow load, etc. The simplest definition would be something that is placed on top of the shipping container. Once it placed there, the container becomes a structure and must meet Building Code.

Commissioner Luker asked how the ordinance would apply to agricultural spaces. Ms. Tubbs reported that as written, agricultural uses would be governed by residential requirements. A five-acre agricultural property could have four total containers. That could be revisited if the Planning Commission believed more containers should be allowed. Commissioner Griffis remarked that some agricultural property owners may use containers for animals and install a lean-to.

Commissioner Flynn inquired about engineering concerns with allowing containers to be placed on gravel or bare dirt versus a hard surface. Ms. Tubbs reported that other cities have indicated that when cargo containers are placed on a hard surface, the bottom does not rust out as easily. They can also be moved more easily. However, there are no safety or engineering concerns with placing them on a softer surface.

Commissioner Woodruff asked if there was any correlation between sheds and shipping containers. Mr. Crowell reported that a building permit is required for structures over 200 square feet in size or if the structure meets other requirements.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Swanson, Ms. Tubbs reported that information on the number of shipping containers in the City was not available. The lot size requirements were drafted based on what Staff believed would be a suitable number. Mr. Crowell added that Code Enforcement handles a lot of open storage cases, and imposing a limit would give some residents the opportunity to understand their options for all the open storage they have accumulated. If the

BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, February 18, 2026

ordinance was not adopted, a resident could have an unlimited number of cargo containers on their property.

Chair Cragun asked how compliance would be addressed if the ordinance passed. Mr. Crowell stated that it could be addressed in a number of ways. A date could be identified for compliance or it could be amortized. They would need to determine how widespread the nonconformities are and how that could be addressed.

Chair Cragun opened the public hearing.

Marlin Jones stated that Bluffdale is not like Salt Lake City and asked if the City was compared to Nephi, Scipio, or Fillmore, which have similar lot sizes. His cargo container is on road base under the power line easement, where a permanent structure cannot be built. He does not know why the City cares if the floor of his shipping container rusts out. He believes it is an overstep into his property rights. He has had a shipping container on his lot for 10 years, and it would be unreasonable to apply restrictions to it now.

Taylor Maxfield gave his address as 14412 South Vantage Circle. Two months ago, Code Enforcement cited him for having a roof between two containers. They indicated that he would be fined \$100 per day until it is removed. A building permit and Site Plan review to keep the roof would cost \$2,100. He ultimately removed the roof, which had been fully engineered for wind and snow load. His recommendation was that property owners be left alone to do what they want with their properties. Requiring asphalt or concrete would affect most people who already have containers and cost thousands of dollars. Grandfathering worries him because he has been having issues with Bluffdale Code Enforcement. As written, Code Enforcement can determine if the container is in good condition, and people can only be pushed so far. He believes the City will require a permit next.

Curtis Nelson gave his address as 14694 South Ten Sleep Circle and stated that he agrees with the aesthetic requirements but does not believe a hard surface should be required. Changes will be costly, so residents should be given at least three years to comply with any new requirements. Shipping containers can be beautiful.

BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, February 18, 2026

Camille Schramm gave her address as 14744 South Ten Sleep Circle. She believes the hard surface requirement was only for aesthetics, because cargo containers can be placed on soft surfaces. If it is in her backyard, the City should not care about its aesthetics. They are structurally sound on bare ground. She asked if the word “secure” indicated that the container must be locked or that it must be secured to the ground. If it was the former, she did not believe the City should mandate that her container be locked. She also asked why more restrictions are being considered when current laws are not enforced. She moved to a one-acre lot in Bluffdale 16 years ago and now lives next to what feels like an apartment complex because it has two tenants. Bluffdale City Code states that there can only be one renter in a home and if someone rents out their basement, the property owner must also live on the property. She has copies of the advertisements indicating that they are separate units and neither resident is related to the other or the property owner, who does not live on the property. She had met with Code Enforcement and the City Manager, but nothing has been done. She believes other laws should be enforced before the City overreaches into property rights. They moved there for a specific reason, and it is being violated.

James Wright gave his address as 14418 South 2700 West and stated that shipping containers are built to be at sea and are rust resistant. If containers are limited to 40 feet, people will have to store items in their garages. A typical garage is approximately 700 square feet, but only one storage container would be allowed on many lots. The containers are heavy and do not need to be secured to the ground. He asked why limits must be placed on residents’ ability to think outside the box. A shipping container can be used as a horse stall, tack room, chicken coop, or many other things. If aesthetics was the main focus, they could simply require that the containers be clean. They are not hurting anyone and should be left as-is.

Russ Buhler gave his address as 3462 West Buhler Lane and stated that there should be a limit on how many cargo containers are allowed. Residents moved to Bluffdale to do what they want with their property. People who want to be heavily governed can live in homeowners associations. He does not choose to live in one for that reason, and he would hate to see Bluffdale become an HOA city. He agrees that there should be a standard of upkeep because it brings down everyone’s property values when one property is not taken care of. Hard surfaces are often required to stop

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, February 18, 2026**

things like oil from seeping into the ground water. If that is required for cargo containers, it should also apply to sheds. Conex has storage containers up to 53 feet in length, and he believes that it needed to be addressed in the ordinance. It is the public's right to repeat themselves. Bluffdale is more like Nephi than South Jordan, and he does not believe it should be compared to other cities.

Randall Law gave his address as 14296 South 3600 West and stated that people do not spend \$10,000 on temporary containers. Asphalt would be very permanent because it would have to be jackhammered out. He built a base of river rock and gravel for his container, which was very expensive. He has had it for four years and uses it all the time. He wants to retain the right to have and use storage containers.

Derick Moser stated that over 20 years ago, he bought five acres in Bluffdale and developed it. Bluffdale reminded him of his home in Idaho. His home was on the outskirts of the City where he could have animals and run his home building business. Twenty years later, things have changed. A new subdivision went in behind him, and people put in landscaping, ornate pools, and other amenities. He is not like that. He runs his company from his home, and he has stuff. Now Bluffdale says he can no longer openly store his stuff on his lot. On November 14, 2025, he received his first notice from Bluffdale City for a property that has looked the same for 20 years. He was told that he had to clean up his property and remove openly stored construction materials. It is his lot, not the City's or the people from California who seem to have a problem with everyone. He has been paying taxes and supporting the City for 20 years, and now outsiders are making them change everything. He believes Bluffdale is overreaching and acting like an HOA. They should get out of property owners' business. Government should have little to do what he does on his lot, and if he wants to store his construction stuff in Conex containers that is what he will do.

Bobbie Posey gave her address as 14662 Ten Sleep Circle and stated that more containers should be allowed. She could easily fit 20 storage containers in her backyard, and hers are on railroad ties.

Keith Schramm gave his address as 14744 South Ten Sleep Circle and stated that he moved to Bluffdale 16 years ago because the city they lived in kept overreaching. Developers began building

BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, February 18, 2026

on smaller lots and the city started placing limits on animals and overreaching in other ways. Bluffdale respected animal and property rights. He believes there are already laws about things like weeds and property maintenance. Those laws can be enforced rather than targeting shipping containers. He does not have a shipping container but has thought about getting one because it would be a great way to store things. Regarding problems with aesthetics, people buy containers to store things so it probably helps the community's aesthetics. He was concerned about ordinance language like "secured" and "good repair" because those terms are open to interpretation. He can leave his front door unlocked or garage door open and that is not a violation, so a shipping container should not have to be secured. His neighbor to the rear built a large steel building that shades his backyard and garden. He could have 40 shipping containers in the space the building occupies, so only allowing two containers on an acre seems ridiculous.

Teresa Johnson stated that when she moved to Bluffdale almost 30 years ago, she needed extra storage. She had a Tuffshed garage installed that now looks terrible with peeling paint and rotting wood. She purchased a Conex storage container 20 years ago. It is not a pretty color, but it has held up much better than the building. Containers are built differently and standard building codes should not apply to them. The container will not blow away, but she would be okay with adding tie-downs if necessary. She cannot afford to build a new garage or move the container to install a cement base.

Brian Douglas gave his address as 15017 South 3200 West and stated that cargo containers are elevated on a rail and do not have issue with rusting at the bottom. It would cost approximately \$300 to have someone move it to pour concrete, then another \$300 to put it back. He believes the solid surface requirement should be removed.

Steve Krahenbuhl gave his address as 3489 west 14400 South and stated that many people were present in support of cargo containers but no one was there to complain about them. He asked if the ordinance was being proposed just because someone thought it was a good idea. He does not have a storage container on his property, but whether he wants one or five should be his business and not the City's.

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, February 18, 2026**

Teresa Johnson stated that she purchased 25 Conex storage containers ranging in size from 20 to 40 feet in length that were sent to various areas of the state. Some were placed on asphalt and others on dirt. The State did not put any rules on the containers.

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

Commissioner Flynn stated that valid concerns were expressed in the public hearing about the proposed terminology. The City wants to have strong Code Enforcement but does not really have the money to go after everyone. He asked what problem the ordinance would solve. The solid surface requirement should be removed and the maximums reconsidered. The City does not want homes to become storage yards, but he was not in favor of the current ordinance language.

Chair Cragun asked Commissioner Flynn to clarify his questions for Staff. Commissioner Flynn stated that he would like to understand the City Council's intent with the ordinance and whether it came about due to litigation or complaints, as well as how many residents it would impact.

Commissioner Griffis agreed that the Planning Commission needed to better understand the problem the ordinance would solve prior to voting in favor of it. She recommended that the item be discussed during the joint Work Session.

Mr. Crowell stated that an upper limit may need to be set, but that number could be higher than proposed. Commissioner Griffis stated that if someone had 200 containers, for example, that would be a fire hazard. It would be a better approach to first define the problem and then solve it based on that information.

Chair Cragun stated that the item should be discussed during the Work Session because the ordinance was not ready for a vote. She did not understand the difference between a shed and container and was concerned that the ordinance could be inconsistent with what is allowed for sheds. A shed under 200 square feet does not need a building permit but has a roof, and she did not understand why container regulations would not also be based on square footage. In response to her question, it was clarified that "secured" means locked. Chair Cragun stated that she did not

BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, February 18, 2026

know why the City would mandate locking a storage container. She also did not support requiring a hard surface base.

Commissioner Luker stated that new ordinances are created when Staff is given the assignment to do so. They then contact other municipalities to see how their regulations are written, pull ideas that seem reasonable to them, and draft the ordinance. It then goes to the Planning Commission, which discusses and listens to public feedback on the item and may determine that, for example, a shipping container does not need a concrete base. The draft language is not personal. Staff simply developed an ordinance based on known information, and they are not experts in shipping containers. Public comment is an important part of the process.

Commissioner Luker agreed that all residents have property rights. Many citizens spoke about their right to do what they want with their lots, but they may not feel that way if someone wanted to subdivide their lot. He personally did not know if the ordinance was necessary, but he would not want to see shipping containers in people's front yards, so there may need to be some boundaries.

Commissioner Woodruff stated that he would like to know whether the ordinance was intended to address safety or aesthetics. If it did not address either, it should not be considered. He encouraged the City Council to not give Staff such intensive assignments without first understanding why it was necessary.

Commissioner Swanson agreed with his Commission colleagues. They need to understand the key issues prior to discussing potential limitations. There may be a reason to consider requiring a hard surface or limiting the number of containers, but there also may not be a valid reason to adopt the ordinance at all.

Commissioner Griffis moved to TABLE the Proposed Ordinance Amending Chapter 9.10.020 Related to the Adoption of the Wildland Urban Interface Building Standards. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Flynn. Vote on motion: Ulises Flynn-Yes, Erik

**BLUFFDALE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, February 18, 2026**

Swanson-Yes, Tina Griffis-Yes, Kori Luker-Yes, Chair Cragun-Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Cragun remarked that the meeting had the highest attendance in her nine years on the Planning Commission. She thanked members of the public for participating in City processes. Commissioner Flynn encouraged citizens to speak with their City Council representatives because the decision will ultimately be theirs.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

8. Planning Commission Business (Planning Session for Upcoming Items, Follow Up, Etc.)

Mr. Crowell reported that the Mo' Bettas ribbon cutting was scheduled for February 19 at 4:30 p.m. The Snelgrove Ice Cream ribbon cutting will be held on February 24 at 3:30 p.m. Mil's Café opened that week. O'Reilly Auto Parts will open on February 28, but they will not hold a ribbon cutting until May. Applications had been received for multi-tenant buildings on north Redwood Road and a carwash.

The joint City Council/Planning Commission Work Session was tentatively scheduled for March 18 and will take the place of the regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting. There would likely be a March 4 meeting, but the topics were to be determined.

Chair Cragun stated that residents keep asking about a Chick-fil-A due to the billboard advertising the one in Draper. Mr. Crowell stated that one is not planned for Bluffdale.

9. Adjournment.

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 8:37 p.m.

 /S/ Pauline Matagi
Pauline Matagi, Community Development Coordinator

Approved: 03-04-2026

Public Comment Addendum
Received by Email for 02-18-2026 Planning Commission

02-14-2026

Anna Marie McCurdy- Residential Text Amendment

Dear Bluffdale Planning Commission,

My name is Anna McCurdy and I live in the Sage Estates development on Salmon Caddis Dr. I am writing to you to share my thoughts about rezoning the land just north of my street, by decreasing the lot sizes and changing the set backs. I have thought a lot about this and I hope that my email clearly expresses my concerns.

As a resident who would be directly impacted by these proposals I have the following concerns: Public safety and pedestrian hazards. As you know Loumis Parkway is the only street in and out of our neighborhood and it runs directly by Vintage Park. Increasing the density of the area in question would drastically increase vehicle trips on a road where children frequently cross to access the park. This creates an unacceptable safety risk for our neighborhoods' most vulnerable residents. I am also concerned about problems that could arise during winter time and with our city slow plows. If lot sizes are smaller, this causes problems with parking if people or guests or multi vehicles. This could cause a permanent line of cars onto the street, obstructing visibility for drivers and creating obstacles for snow plows and emergency response vehicles. Making these lot size changes would also change the neighborhood character. The proposed setback reductions will create a "walled-in" density that is entirely inconsistent with the existing homes.

I ask that this Planning Commission maintain our current zoning standards to protect the safety and character of this neighborhood.

Thank you for your time and service to Bluffdale.

Sincerely,
Anna McCurdy

02-14-2026

Creed Anderson- Residential Text Amendment

Dear Planning Commission Members,

I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed residential text amendments that would allow increased density through the creation of R2 and R3 zones.

Many of us purchased our homes with a clear understanding of how the surrounding land was zoned and what that meant for the future character of our community. Zoning is not just a technical classification — it directly influences financial decisions, long-term planning, and expectations about neighborhood stability. When residents invest in property based on established zoning, there is a reasonable expectation that those standards will not be continually reduced over time.

Our neighborhood already experienced a prior rezoning that reduced lot sizes below what was originally anticipated. That change was deeply unpopular, and many residents felt blindsided. Most homes in this area sit on approximately .3 to .5 acres, and the surrounding larger-lot zoning was a key component in preserving balance, space, and compatibility. Further reducing adjacent properties to allow one-third-acre lots would continue a pattern of incremental density increases that undermine the original vision for this area.

Each new development seems to come with assurances that the impact will be minimal or that it is necessary to meet broader goals. However, over time, these cumulative changes significantly alter the character of established neighborhoods. At some point, the City must stand by its long-term planning commitments and protect the expectations of current residents.

This area was never intended to evolve into high-density residential by gradual amendment. Increasing density yet again will affect traffic, infrastructure strain, stormwater management, and overall neighborhood cohesion. More importantly, it erodes trust in the planning process.

I respectfully urge the Commission to reject this amendment and preserve compatibility with existing lot sizes and neighborhood character. Stability and predictability in zoning decisions are critical to maintaining community confidence and protecting property investments.

Sincerely,
Creed Anderson
Bluffdale Resident

02-14-2026

Amy Harding- Proposed Container Regulations

Dear Bluffdale Planning Commission,

I am writing to express my concern regarding the proposed regulations on shipping/storage containers within residential properties. I currently have four shipping containers on my property. They are used responsibly and maintained in a way that does not negatively impact my neighbors or the community. They are also not visible from the city streets. I am strongly opposed to additional regulations that dictate how homeowners use their private backyards, particularly requirements that could force expensive modifications such as installing concrete or asphalt pads.

Requiring containers to be placed on concrete or asphalt would create a significant and unnecessary financial burden on property owners. Many residents use containers as a cost-effective storage solution, and imposing thousands of dollars in additional site requirements defeats that purpose. Regulations that result in excessive fees or daily fines for otherwise reasonable property use feel punitive rather than protective.

I fully support reasonable standards that address legitimate safety concerns. However, regulating backyard storage in a way that imposes high costs and strict placement requirements is an overreach and unfairly impacts responsible homeowners, especially when the shipping containers are not visible from the street.

One of the main reasons my husband and I was attracted to move to Bluffdale is that we would have the space for our younger kids at the time to have private space to play and also have space for our family to enjoy our hobbies of power-sports and mechanics. We also appreciated that the only HOA we had regulated water and nothing else. We chose a place that did not have an HOA as we didn't want people dictating how we use our land.

I respectfully ask the Commission to reconsider these proposed requirements and seek solutions that balance community standards with property rights and affordability.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Amy Harding

02-17-2026

John Mayfield- Residential Text Amendment

Dear Members of the City Council and Planning Commission-

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed zoning amendment that would allow higher-density lots to be integrated within our established larger-lot neighborhoods.

Our city has been intentional and disciplined in its development pattern. Larger, more spacious lots are not incidental; they are a defining feature of Bluffdale's identity. They shape not only the physical landscape, but also traffic patterns, infrastructure demands, neighborhood cohesion, and long-term property values. That consistency has been part of what makes this city distinctive and desirable.

The current proposal introduces a structural change that cuts against that design logic. Higher-density housing is not inherently problematic. In fact, our city has already demonstrated foresight by designating specific areas where higher-density development is appropriate and planned. That is smart growth: concentrating density where infrastructure, roads, and services are designed to support it.

What is being proposed now is different. It inserts higher-density lots into neighborhoods that were designed, purchased, and invested in under a lower-density framework. That shift alters:

1. Neighborhood Character – Established spacing, sightlines, landscaping, and architectural scale would be disrupted. These are not cosmetic details; they are the core of the neighborhood's identity.
2. Property Value Stability – Homeowners made long-term financial decisions based on the existing zoning framework. Changing that framework midstream introduces uncertainty and potential value erosion for those who relied on the city's prior commitments.
3. Infrastructure Alignment – Roads, traffic flow, utilities, and parking capacity were designed for low-density patterns. Incremental densification without holistic infrastructure planning often creates downstream costs borne by existing residents.
4. Precedent Risk – Once the principle of mixing fundamentally different density patterns is established, it becomes difficult to defend against future incremental increases. Over time, this can fundamentally transform the community without a clear, voter-supported mandate.

Cities lose their uniqueness gradually. It does not happen in one dramatic vote, but through a series of well-intentioned decisions that dilute the original vision.

If the goal is to increase housing supply, the appropriate path is to:

- Continue concentrating higher density in the areas already designated for it;
- Conduct a comprehensive infrastructure and traffic impact analysis before altering established zones;
- Engage in a broader long-term master planning process rather than piecemeal changes.

The strength of this city has been disciplined planning and respect for the expectations set with its residents. I encourage you to preserve that consistency. Growth is inevitable. But not all growth patterns are equal. Thoughtful, concentrated density in planned areas protects both housing goals and neighborhood integrity. Blurring those lines risks undermining what has made this community special in the first place. I respectfully urge you to reject the proposed zoning change.

Sincerely,
John Mayfield

02-18-2026

Darrin Glines- Residential Text Amendment

Dear Planning Commission,

In consideration of the residential zoning changes proposed by the Planning Commission I would like to make the following comments:

I want to be clear at the outset — this is not an argument against growth. Growth is inevitable, and in many ways it can be positive. My concern is about *how* we grow, and whether this proposed shift aligns with the long-term vision and infrastructure realities of our city.

Moving from one-acre lots to .5 and .33 acre lots is not a minor adjustment. It represents a fundamental change in development pattern — effectively transitioning from semi-rural to suburban density. That shift affects traffic volumes, stormwater runoff, neighborhood character, school enrollment, emergency services and long-term infrastructure obligations.

Many residents purchased property here with the understanding — based on zoning and planning documents — that this community would maintain a semi-rural character. A large increase in potential density materially changes that expectation. If the city intends to make that shift, it should come through a comprehensive planning update with full public engagement, not simply as a response to development pressure.

I would respectfully ask a few practical questions:

- Has a full traffic impact analysis been conducted based on build-out at .5 and .33-acre density?
- Has the city completed a long-term fiscal impact analysis to determine whether the increased tax base will truly cover lifecycle maintenance of roads, stormwater systems, and other infrastructure?
- Has coordination occurred with the school district regarding projected enrollment at full build-out?

Higher density can increase short-term revenue. But if long-term maintenance costs exceed that revenue, the burden ultimately falls on existing residents. If the goal is to provide flexibility, perhaps there are more measured alternatives worth considering — such as targeted higher-density zones near major corridors, transitional zoning as a step-down approach, or clustered development that preserves open space while accommodating growth. Those types of approaches allow growth without abruptly redefining the character of the entire community.

Again, this is not about resisting change. It's about ensuring that change is deliberate, data-driven, and aligned with the adopted master plan. A shift of this magnitude deserves careful analysis and broad community consensus.

Thank you for considering these points,

Darrin Glines
Bluffdale, UT 84065

02-18-2026

Mark Shaffer- Residential Text Amendment

Planning Department,

In regarding to the proposed new Chapter 11.80.010:

- Please consider retaining the same acres size for R2 and R3 as in the existing Chapter
- New Zone 4 R-1-10 **not** to modify or change the existing code for the lot standards (width, frontage setbacks, and coverage)
- Our family moved to Bluffdale 12 years ago to live in and community with open space. Homes have open space in the neighborhoods and are presently not high density. We feel that by modifying the lot standards will change our community and open higher density in new subdivisions in Bluffdale City.

Thank you

Mark Shaffer
Bluffdale Utah 84065

02-18-2026

Brenda Petru- Container and 1 acre lots

Many residents with 1 acre lots rely on shipping containers for low cost storage or animal shelter.

What is the purpose of this proposed rule change? It seems very targeted to small business owners and large animal owners, and as people who live on one acre lots with neighbors who use containers, I don't understand the problem. We moved out here for the country feel. This and the proposal to break up the one acre lots feels really sad for our culture here in Bluffdale.

Brenda Petru

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

Notice is hereby given that a public meeting will be held before the Bluffdale City Planning Commission on Wednesday, February 18, 2026, at Bluffdale City Hall, 2222 W 14400 S, which will begin at 6:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as possible for the purpose of receiving public comment on proposed Text Amendments as follows:

1. Enacting Section 11.160.320 *Placement and Usage of Accessory Storage Containers* to allow for placement and use of storage containers (e.g. shipping containers, Conex containers, enclosed truck trailers, freight containers, etc.) within the City of Bluffdale and limiting the number and locations of such within residential and non-residential zones.

City of Bluffdale, Applicant. Caitlyn Tubbs, Staff Contact. (Application 2025-23)

In addition to attendance at the Planning Commission, if you have any comments or concerns, there are several additional ways to participate:

1. **View** meeting on the City's website at **www.bluffdale.gov**.
2. **Email** your comments to **planningmeetingcomment@bluffdale.gov** for the Planning Commission and include "Residential Text Amendment" in the subject line of the email.
3. **Mailed** written comments will also be accepted. Please mail to the following:

City of Bluffdale Planning Department
c/o Caitlyn Tubbs, Planning Manager
2222 West 14400 South
Bluffdale, UT 84065

For further information, please contact Caitlyn Tubbs at ctubbs@bluffdale.gov or 801-849-9466.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing assistance or other services for this meeting should contact Bluffdale City Hall at least 24 hours in advance of such meeting at 801-254-2200. TTY 7-1-1. The City website is located at www.bluffdale.gov.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

Notice is hereby given that a public meeting will be held before the Bluffdale City Planning Commission on Wednesday, February 18, 2026, at Bluffdale City Hall, 2222 W 14400 S, which will begin at 6:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as possible for the purpose of receiving public comment on proposed Text Amendments as follows:

1. Consolidate Chapters 11.80.010 (R-1-43 Residential Zone) and 11.80.020 (R-1-10 Residential Zone) into a new Chapter 11.80.010 (“Single-Family Residential Zones”), outlining lot and building requirements for all existing single-family zones and creating the R2 (“half-acre”) and R3 (“third-acre”) zones;
2. Relocating and Chapter 11.80.040 (R-1-87 Residential Zone) into Chapter 11.70 (Agricultural Zone) and renaming that zone to A-2;
3. Amend Chapter 11.350.030 of the Bluffdale City Code to incorporate new R2 and R3 Zones and their respective uses and large animal rights;
4. Modifying the lot standards (width, frontage, setbacks, and coverage) in the R-1-10 (Renamed as R4) Zone;
5. Amend assorted sections of the Bluffdale City Code to update code titles and related references; and
6. Updating the legend and zone labels on the Official Zoning Map to reflect those same changes.

City of Bluffdale, Applicant. Caitlyn Tubbs, Staff Contact. (Application 2025-07)

In addition to attendance at the Planning Commission, if you have any comments or concerns, there are several additional ways to participate:

1. **View** meeting on the City’s website at **www.bluffdale.gov**.
2. **Email** your comments to **planningmeetingcomment@bluffdale.gov** for the Planning Commission and include “Residential Text Amendment” in the subject line of the email.
3. **Mailed** written comments will also be accepted. Please mail to the following:

City of Bluffdale Planning Department
c/o Caitlyn Tubbs, Planning Manager
2222 West 14400 South
Bluffdale, UT 84065

For further information, please contact Caitlyn Tubbs at ctubbs@bluffdale.gov or 801-849-9466.

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing assistance or other services for this meeting should contact Bluffdale City Hall at least 24 hours in advance of such meeting at 801-254-2200. TTY 7-1-1. The City website is located at www.bluffdale.gov.