

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR PLEASANT VIEW CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD
August 1st, 2024, 2024 at 6:00 P.M.
[Planning Commission \(youtube.com\)](#)**

MEMBERS PRESENT

Andy Nef
Julie Farr
Chad Kotter
Jeff Bolingbroke
Sean Wilkinson
David Gossner

STAFF PRESENT

Amy Mabey, City Administrator
Tammy Eveson, Planner I

VISITORS

Jordan Watson - Developer

MINUTES PREPARED BY:

Janitza Osuna, Planner Tech

MINUTES APPROVED:

January 9th, 2025

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

Call to Order

Commissioner Nef called the meeting to order at 6:01 pm

Pledge of Allegiance and Opening Prayer, Reading or Expression of Thought

Commissioner Nef led the attendees in reciting the Pledge of Allegiance, followed by prayer.

Declaration of Conflicts of Interest

No declarations of conflicts of interest were made during the meeting.

2. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

Public Utility Easement. Consideration to vacate a public utility easement for the property located within 304 West 3275 North and 310 West 3275 North.

- *Planner, Tammy Eveson, introduced the agenda item, which involves an application to vacate a public utility easement located at the addresses: 304 West and 310 West at 3275 North.*
- *The easement in question runs between two properties, and there is uncertainty about its use. City administrator, Amy Mabey, points out that the easement seems awkward and doesn't connect directly to other areas, making it unclear why it was established. The properties in question appear to have some old structures, like a barn and possibly a chicken coop, that may have been linked to the property's previous use. The affected easement cuts diagonally across the corners of the two adjoining properties. The applicant is requesting the vacation of this easement.*
- *The Planner explained that the applicant has completed extensive work, including contacting and obtaining letters of release from all relevant utility providers, including the city, confirming that no utilities are currently using the easement.*

- *The Planner stated that after reviewing all available information, there is no evidence that any utilities are currently using the easement. Therefore, staff is recommending approval of the vacation of the easement.*

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION

- *Commissioner Julie Farr questioned why there was an easement there in the first place.*
- *Staff conducted a review of the easement and could not identify any valid reason for the existence of the easement at this location.*
- *The petitioner is not present at the meeting because there is some confusion about whether the matter went through the appropriate channels (such as the Planning Commission or City Council).*
- *Commissioner Andy Neff points out the importance of the petitioner to be present in case any questions arise.*
- *Because the petitioner is absent, there is a suggestion to either table the issue for further discussion or make a decision without their input. There is also a mention of the legal requirements for a municipal utility easement to go to City Council, and the need for public utility easement issues to be reviewed by the Planning Commission.*

MOTION

- *Motion to open a public hearing by Commissioner Farr with a second by Commissioner Wilkinson. There were no comments from the public.*
- *Motion to close the public hearing by Commissioner Wilkinson with a second by Commissioner Bolingbroke.*
- *Despite the absence of the petitioner, a motion is made by Commissioner Gossner, to approve the abandonment of the easement, based on staff recommendations. Commissioner Wilkinson seconds the motion. The process moves forward with the approval of the motion, with a brief opportunity for public input before the final vote.*
- *The motion to approve the easement abandonment is passed unanimously.*

3. LEGISLATIVE ITEMS

General Plan Amendment: Consideration of General Plan Amendment to modify the future land use map and the future designation of approximately 9 acres of land, on the west side of the US highway 89 and near 3900 north, from low density Residential to High Density Residential.

Key Points Discussed:

- **Land Use Change:**
The proposal aims to change the land use designation from low-density residential to high-density residential, mainly to comply with state housing mandates. This would facilitate the construction of multi-family housing to help meet state requirements for affordable housing.
- **State Housing Requirements and Penalties:**
State law mandates that cities implement at least three strategies for moderate-income

housing. If the city fails to meet these housing goals, there could be significant financial consequences, such as:

- Loss of road funding: up to \$520,000.
- Fines: Around \$992,000 annually for not meeting state housing goals. These penalties highlight the urgency of complying with the state's housing requirements.

- **Road Master Plan and Connectivity:**

The development must align with the city's road master plan, which is essential for ensuring proper road connectivity. The property in question has significant infrastructure in place, with a major road (Capstone Drive) being central to future development.

- **Challenges with Manufacturing Zoning:**

The area was previously considered for manufacturing development, but due to the road layout and the impact of the road master plan, this option became less viable. Instead, the city is looking at shifting the land use to high-density residential, which is a better fit for the area, especially given its proximity to a daycare facility.

- **School Impact and Coordination:**

In follow up to questions raised regarding future school needs, Weber School District evaluates the needs based on evaluations and studies in assessing capacity and transportation needs to determine school boundaries and bussing routes. City plans are utilized and factored into their studies.

- **Limited Suitable Areas for Multifamily Housing:**

The city has limited suitable areas for multifamily housing, and this proposal is seen as a strong candidate to meet the housing goals due to its alignment with infrastructure and surrounding developments.

- **Developer and Property Owner Support:**

Both the property owner and developer are committed to moving forward with this proposal. This is crucial because the state requires that the city present feasible and realistic development plans to meet housing mandates.

- **Proactive Planning and Future Housing Needs:**

The city is taking a proactive approach in identifying locations for future housing development to meet state requirements. The aim is to update the general plan now to avoid more pressure later.

- **Future Housing Considerations:**

- **UTA Station Area Plan:** The city plans to create a station area plan once transit service resumes at the UTA Frontrunner station. This plan would focus on mixed-use development, including high-density housing.

- **Uncertainty of State Requirements:** While the city has worked hard to meet current housing goals, there is frustration about the state's ever-changing expectations. The speaker wonders when the city will reach a point where the state's housing requirements are stable enough to stop requiring constant revisions to the general plan.
- **Commissioner Concerns:**
 - Some commissioners expressed concerns about the lack of clear definitions for "moderate" income housing.
 - There were differing opinions on whether high-density housing is appropriate, with one commissioner preferring larger single-family lots (20,000 sq. ft.) rather than town homes. According to the General Plan, high density is considered to be 8 to 14 dwelling units per acre. Low density is 2 dwelling units per acre.
 - There was a question about whether the general plan amendment is premature without having established zoning laws that define the number of units per acre. It was suggested that the City wait until a full update of the General Plan is completed.

MOTION

- *Motion to open a public hearing*

Public Comments:

- **Jordan Watson** (Developer, Tri Land Development):

Jordan Watson explained that the proposal originated during the due diligence process. Initially, the plan was for a commercial flex development, but the Transportation Master Plan interfered, prompting a reconsideration. The developer sees the change as an opportunity to develop a townhome project that would help meet affordable housing needs, offering homes priced under \$450,000 and help get the road access that is on the road master plan. The project is seen as beneficial for both the city and future residents.
- **Steve Callier** (Resident):

Steve Callier opposed the general plan amendment, urging the city to gather input from residents before making such changes. He expressed concern that the city is simply adapting to state pressures without properly considering what the community needs.
- **Chelsea Rich** (Resident, Business Owner):

Chelsea Rich expressed frustration over the limited availability of land for manufacturing and the shift towards high-density housing. She believes that this trend will limit opportunities for businesses and could force them to relocate or shut down, affecting long-established businesses.

- **Motion to Close Public Hearing:**

A motion was made to close the public hearing was made by Commissioner Bolingbroke, and a second motion followed by Commissioner Wilkinson.

- **City Administrator Amy's Response:**

Amy clarified that a new zone would indeed be required if the general plan amendment is passed. While the general plan provides a guideline for future land use, zoning changes are necessary to implement the development. The general plan itself is advisory, and the city retains flexibility in modifying zoning as needed. She also discussed the city's five-year implementation plan and acknowledged the challenges of meeting the state's housing requirements, especially given that the state can change those requirements at any time.

- **Open Discussion:**

- After extensive discussion, the commissioners seem to lean towards recommending denial of the general plan amendment to the city council. They're concerned that this zoning change might lead to unwanted consequences, and they believe more public input and review of the general plan are necessary.

MOTIONS

- Motion to deny approval of the General Plan Amendment was made by Commissioner Bolingbroke with a second from Commissioner Kotter. Motion died with a 2 to 3 vote in favor of denial, Commissioner Farr abstained.
- Motion was made by Commissioner Gossner to table the item with a 2nd from Commissioner Farr. There was a 4 to 1 vote against tabling the item.
- A motion was made to recommend approval by Commissioner Wilkinson with a 2nd by Commissioner Nef. The motion received a vote of 4 to 2 against the motion.
- A motion was made by Commissioner Wilkinson to recommend denial of the General Plan Amendment to the City Council with a 2nd by Commissioner Kotter. Motion passed with a unanimous vote.
- One commissioner states that while they don't agree this is the best location for the change, the property is already zoned residential, and the state's housing mandates may leave them with little choice but to approve similar changes elsewhere. They believe the council should have the final say, but they recommend denial as a precaution.

4. ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn was made, which was seconded and approved unanimously.