

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR PLEASANT VIEW CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD
JANUARY 4, 2023**

[Planning Commission Meeting \(youtube.com\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ryl2ODm66p0&ab_channel=PleasantViewCity) Part 1

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ryl2ODm66p0&ab_channel=PleasantViewCity Part 2

MEMBERS PRESENT

Andy Nef
Dean Stokes
Jeff Bolingbroke
Julie Farr
Manya Stolrow
Chad Kotter
Sean Wilkinson

VISITORS

Steven Mansfield
Kai Tohinaka
Susie Becker

EXCUSED

David Gossner

MINUTES PREPARED BY:

Brooke Smith, MMC
1/7/2024

STAFF PRESENT

Amy Mabey, City Administrator
Brandon Bell, Planning and Zoning Administrator

MINUTES APPROVED:

March 7, 2024

Commission Chair, Andy Nef, called the meeting to order at 6 pm

1. CALL TO ORDER

- a. Pledge of Allegiance and Opening Prayer, Reading or Expression of Thought.
(Commissioner Jeff Bolingbroke)**
- b. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest.**

The Pleasant View Planning Commission meeting was called to order at 6 pm on January 4, 2024, by Commissioner Nef, who welcomed all those in attendance. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, followed by a prayer led by Commission member Bolingbroke expressing gratitude for the opportunity to serve the city and make it better.

Commissioner Nef noted there were no declarations of conflict of interest.

City Manager, Amy Maybe requested to change the order of agenda items 4A and 4B, the transportation Master Plan and impact fee facilities plan presentations by consultants, to occur before her Subdivision presentation in item 3A in order to honor the consultants' time. The Commissioner Nef approved this change to the agenda order with no objections from other commission members.

2. MEETING MINUTES APPROVAL

Consideration for approval of meeting minutes for the July 7, 2022, May 4, 2023, September 7, 2023, and October 5, 2023 meetings.

Commissioner Nef asked for a motion to approve the meeting minutes from July 7, 2022, May 4, 2023, September 7, 2023, and October 5, 2023.

Some clarifications were needed, as highlighted sections asked which commissioner declared a conflict of interest, made a motion to approve minutes, and other specifics. Brandon Bell noted the minutes would be updated to "Commissioner" in places where the specific person was unclear.

Motion and Vote

A motion to approve the meeting minutes from the four listed dates, with amendments discussed, was made by Commissioner Jeff Bolingbroke. A second was provided, with no further discussion. A vote was held with all commissioners voting in favor by stating "aye." The minutes were approved with amendments to be adjusted by the Planning Director.

3. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

- a. Consideration of a conditional use permit and site plan for Kerner Residence at 4860 North Pole Patch Drive / 755 Burnham Drive (Weber County Parcel # 160120047). Staff Presentation (Planning & Zoning Administrator, Brandon Bell)**
 - i. Public Hearing**

Staff Presentation

The Planning Commission heard a request for a conditional use permit and site plan review for an accessory structure proposed at 4860 North Pole Patch Drive / 755 Burnham Drive, the Kerner Residence. Planning & Zoning Administrator Brandon Bell provided background that the request is for a structure that does not meet accessory building setback requirements for the 5-acre lot A5 zone. The property has a sensitive land overlay with additional restrictions as well.

Brandon Bell summarized that a 2023 ordinance established separate standards for accessory buildings, including being located at least 100 feet from a public street, 25 feet from side/rear lot lines, and behind the rear wall of the primary dwelling. The proposed structure, connected to the home via a covered breezeway, was considered by staff to be a detached accessory building rather than an attached addition that shares structural connections or footings. The location does not meet the code for accessory structures as it is not behind the rear wall of the home. Staff recommended relocation or application for a variance.

Public Hearing

Commissioner Nef opened a public hearing.

Steven Mansfield, an architect commented that other cities interpret attached structures differently, but there was no further public input.

The hearing was closed.

Commission Discussion

Debate amongst Planning Commissioners centered on whether connecting the structure's foundation to the home could allow it to be considered an attached addition versus a separate accessory building. A need for clarity and consistency in the application of the code was discussed.

Motion

A Commissioner made a motion to recommend approval of the conditional use permit without requiring a letter stating the structure won't be used as living quarters, but with all other staff recommendations.

After discussion on clarity of standards and process, the motion was withdrawn.

Amended Motion and Vote

Another Commissioner made a motion to recommend denial to the City Council, on the condition that the applicant, staff, and building inspector meet before the Council meeting to determine if the structure can be attached. If resolved, the Council could then consider approval. The Motion was seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Clarification

The intent is for further clarification to be provided on whether the proposed accessory structure can be considered an attached addition to the primary home by connecting foundations. Consistency in the application of codes/standards was emphasized.

Staff Recommendations

The building meets the required distance from an earthquake fault, as no known fault is located on the property, per Map 3 listed in this report. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the application with the following conditions, in order to meet the requirements of City Code:

- Prior to proceeding to the City Council, the lines showing the setback need to be adjusted to show the distance from the closest point of the building, (in it's proposed location) to the closest point of the each of the property lines, to verify that the above standards are met, and so that the building inspector will know where the building will be located in relation to the property line. This information should be provided for the building in it's updated location if it needs to be moved to meet other requirements.
- The property owner be required to provide a signed letter indicating that the building will not be used for living quarters, as a part of their building permit application.
- The applicant needs to provide a grading plan for review by the City Engineer, prior to being considered by the City Council. The applicant should demonstrate on that grading plan, that the grade of the soil in the final grading plan has an angle equal to or less than the angle of repose.
- The applicant has provided a slope map, and just needs to verify that the garage will only be constructed on lands that are 25% slope or less, or move the location of the building to an area that it will be on such lands, in the final design, within the constraints of City ordinances and as necessary to meet the applicable City Code provisions listed in this report.
- The recommended conditions above need to be provided prior to consideration of the Conditional Use Permit by the City Council.
- Conditions of the Engineer's Review Memo.
- The lot is also subject to a maximum irrigated area via the water service agreement that the City has with Pole Patch Water System.
- The requirement for spark arrestors to be installed and maintained in every fireplace or other vented combustion apparatus constructed indoors or outdoors needs to be met by including those in the building plans for the building permit, and as a condition for the issuance of such.

Screen openings in such arrestors shall not be in excess of one quarter inch in diameter. This should be included or added as part of the building plans, prior to and as a condition of building permit approval.

- The Public Works Department verify at their discretion, that the location of any proposed utility lines is acceptable. Any new utility line locations may need to be modified, per Public Works Department input.
- A closed sewer system shall be required within a sensitive area zone, per City Code. Septic systems are not permitted; the applicant needs to connect to the sewer line in the area.
- Staff recommends that minor modifications may be permitted to final design of the building, building location, concrete and similar surfaces as part of building permit approval, if needed, within the constraints of the applicable City ordinances listed in this Staff Report, as necessary to meet any conditions of approval.
- Details relating to the application & application form be finalized.

b. Consideration of a site plan for Stone Meats at 1485 W Stone Field Way (Building Addition) at 2703 North Parkland Boulevard (Weber County Parcel #192110001). Staff Presentation (Planning & Zoning Administrator, Brandon Bell)

Staff Presentation

Planning & Zoning Administrator Brandon Bell stated this is a request to amend an existing site plan to allow for a building addition at the Stone Meats facility located in a Manufacturing and commercial Mixed (MCM) zone. Accessory uses like this addition are permitted whether the main use is conditional or permitted per code. The proposed addition is for office space, comprising a small percentage of the overall building area. Brandon Bell noted enforceability only applies to ordinances directly related to the addition, not the whole existing site.

The required front setback is a minimum of 20 feet. The setback increases by 1 foot for every foot of building height over 20 feet - the building height is 23 feet. The exact distance to the new addition was not provided but Brandon Bell stated staff would request dimensioned drawings for permitting.

The applicant proposes adding 52 parking stalls which meets code requirements by staff's assessment. However, 3 proposed stalls would encroach on the required 20 ft parking setback from the street property line. Staff recommends the removal of the 3 stalls to meet setbacks, enabled by flexibility in code on required stall numbers. This would bring the total to 49 stalls but still meet requirements.

Additional Conditions

Brandon Bell summarized 5 recommended conditions of approval needing applicant action prior to proceeding:

- 1) Provide dimensioned drawings showing the distance to property lines
- 2) Locate any new parking stalls outside the 20 ft setbacks
- 3) Remove 3 stalls near the south property line to meet the setback
- 4) Obtain Fire Marshal and City Engineer approval
- 5) Allow minor modifications to building or setbacks to meet requirements

Petitioner

Architect Steven Mansfield, representing the applicant, clarified they will have full civil engineering drawings as they proceed. He noted frustration with losing the 3 stalls after removing a driveway access per City request but stated they would comply by removing those stalls.

Motions

A Commissioner made a motion to approve the site plan with all staff recommendations. The Motion was seconded, which passed unanimously with all Commissioners voting in favor.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

City staff recommends approval of the proposed site plan in accordance with the city’s zoning code, with the following recommended conditions of approval:

- 1) The applicant needs to provide the full dimension from the property line to the front (east side) and side (north side) of the building addition; this will assist with the building permit and construction process, to have this information on the approved site plan.
- 2) Any new parking stalls and/ or area used as parking lot area should only be located in an area outside a 20’ setback from the both property lines. At least some of the proposed parking stalls in this area may need to be eliminated to meet this standard.
- 3) Requirements of the City Engineer’s Review Memo and approval of civil engineering issues, such as stormwater at the discretion of Staff, after Planning Commission approval of the site plan, with any minor adjustments to the site plan, that may be necessary to execute the stormwater retention requirements without violating other requirements and conditions of approval.
- 4) Requirements of the Fire Marshall.
- 5) Allowing minor variation of building footprint and or height within setback/while still meeting setback and height requirements, and not affecting the amount of parking due to those minor adjustments.

c. Adoption of 2024 Meeting Schedule

Staff and Commission reviewed proposed meeting dates for upcoming months. It was noted the typical July meeting date of July 4 would be changed. Commissioners agreed to move the July meeting to July 11. The April meeting was also moved from April 4 to April 18 due to it falling during spring break. Staff will send calendar invitations for all dates to commissioners as a reminder.

Amy Maybe thanked all for good attendance recently and noted meetings being reduced to once per month has been beneficial. Meetings have been efficient while still having good participation. She apologized for the recent long nights. Brandon Bell added that additional meetings can be scheduled as needed per commission requests.

4. LEGISLATIVE ITEMS

- a) **Proposed zoning and subdivision ordinance amendment (land use ordinance amendment(s)) to Pleasant View Municipal Code Titles 18 and 17**
 - i. **Staff Presentation (City Administrator, Amy Mabey)**
 - ii. **Public Hearing**

Staff Presentation

City Administrator, Amy Mabey presented proposed updates to the subdivision ordinances to comply with recent changes to state code, improve clarity, and simplify processes. Updates include:

- A voluntary concept plan review to provide early guidance is required for non-residential
- Preliminary and final subdivision application review processes updated per SB 174
- Minor subdivisions are eligible for streamlined DRC approval if meeting specific criteria
- Noticing standardized Utah Code requirements
- Removal of public hearing requirement and subdivision application checklists from code

Amy Mabey outlined the various review authorities and approvals in the updated ordinance language. The Development Review Committee (DRC) would gain authority over final approval for residential developments meeting SB 174 criteria and all minor subdivisions under the proposal.

Public Hearing

Chair Nef opened the public hearing. Hearing no public comments, he closed it.

Motion and Vote

A Commissioner made a motion to recommend approval of the proposed amendments to Titles 18 and 17, with further clarification on approval authorities added to the final subdivision section. The Motion was seconded, which passed unanimously.

b) Proposed General Plan Amendment including the Transportation Master Plan (includes Active Transportation Plan) (TMP), Impact Fee Facilities Plan (IFFP), and Impact Fee Analysis (IFA). Staff Presentation (City Administrator, Amy Mabey)

i. Public Hearing

ii. Consider a recommendation to the City Council to amend the General Plan

Staff Presentation

City Administrator Amy Mabey introduced Kai Tohinaka with Parametrix, a consultants who assisted with developing the Transportation Master Plan (TMP), and Susie Becker with Zions Bank who helped analyze transportation impact fees. The TMP included significant public engagement and incorporated a focus on active transportation based on a UDOT grant received.

Kai Tohinaka, Parametrix Presentation

Kai provided an overview of their process and key components of the TMP. This included stakeholder interviews, a public event, and a community survey. They analyzed existing conditions related to demographics, facilities inventory, traffic patterns, and safety data, and modeled future travel demand.

Recommendations were developed such as future vehicle and active transportation networks and associated projects, which were used to create a capital facilities plan. Cost estimates were prepared. The last step was developing an impact fee facilities plan identifying eligible projects for impact fees over a 10-year timeframe.

Susie Becker, Zions Bank Presentation

Susie explained transportation impact fees allow cities to charge new development a one-time fee to cover the cost of added capacity needs driven by growth. An Impact Fee Facilities Plan (engineering-

focused) and Impact Fee Analysis (financial-focused) are required. Kai's work identified \$534,000 of existing road capacity that could be bought into by new development and \$1.2 million of new facilities needed, which Susie used to calculate a cost per vehicle trip estimate. This was translated into impact fees for various land uses based on standard trip generation rates.

Public Hearing

Chair Nef opened the public hearing. Hearing no comments, he closed the public hearing.

Motion and Vote

A Commissioner made a motion recommending approval of the proposed general plan amendment. The Motion was seconded, which passed unanimously.

REMARKS FROM COMMISSIONER AND/OR STAFF

Previous Meeting Follow-Up (3A)

Brandon Bell asked for clarification on the recommendation for item 3A during the Administrative Section. The commission clarified that the recommendation for denial would go away if the related issue was resolved. The recommendation would then become one for approval. Alternatively, the matter could be forwarded to the City Council for a decision.

Commission Follow Up

Commission reminded that follow-up communication over the next month would be helpful related to any recent questionable cases that may need additional clarification before going to Council. Amy Maybe noted there has not been any Council action since the last discussion on this.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Jeff Bolingbroke made a motion to close the meeting, and Commissioner Julie Farr seconded. The meeting was adjourned.