

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR PLEASANT VIEW CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD
November 7th, 2024 at 6:00 P.M.**

[Planning Commission \(youtube.com\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7333333333)

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

Excused
Dean Stokes

STAFF PRESENT

Amy Mabey, City Administrator
Tammy Eveson, Planner I
Janitza Osuna, Planner Tech

MINUTES PREPARED BY:

Janitza Osuna (with AI Assistance)

MINUTES APPROVED:

July 10th, 2025

VISITORS

Trent Williams – Petitioner
Matt Montano
Paul Pitcher
Adam Crowther

1. CALL TO ORDER

a. Pledge of Allegiance and Opening Prayer, Reading or Expression of Thought. (Vice Chair Julie Farr)

b. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest. *NONE*

NOTE: It was noted by City Administrator Amy Mabey there were a couple of other General Plan Amendment items that were originally noticed prior to the current meeting. However, due to a noticing error, the item it was pulled and will be rescheduled and included on next months agenda.

2. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

a. Minor Subdivision – Consideration of a proposed Minor Subdivision For 11.31 acres of land located at approximately 2690 N 600 W

The Planning Commission reviewed an application for a minor subdivision located at 2690 N 600 W. The applicant is proposing to subdivide the existing parcel into three separate lots for the future development of medical office buildings. The property, which is currently occupied by the Pleasant View Emergency Center at the corner of 600 West and 2700 North, is located in the C-2 General Commercial Zone. This zoning permits office uses, including medical and dental offices, and the proposed subdivision is consistent with the city's zoning and land use regulations. A subdivision plat was prepared and has been reviewed by the Development Review Committee, with comments and conditions provided by staff and the city engineer. The applicant has addressed the identified issues, and documentation has been submitted confirming that the necessary corrections have been made. A draft cross-access agreement

has also been received to ensure continued road connectivity from the adjacent Rush Complex to the west. Staff has determined that the application meets all requirements for a minor subdivision and recommended approval, pending final review by the city engineer.

Petitioner was asked to come up to the Podium. Petitioner is Trent Williams, Professional land surveyor and project manager. He did not have anything to add to the project description from staff.

A concern was raised regarding the existing helipad located at the back corner of the property. The question was whether its continued use might present an issue, given that the site will be surrounded by new office developments and a relatively narrow roadway. While specific regulatory requirements for the helipad were not known at the time, the concern centered on potential operational impacts, such as road closures or restricted access during use.

It was clarified that the helipad shown on the subdivision plat is included for record purposes and to provide notice of its existence. Staff confirmed that the required setbacks and distances from property lines, as requested by the hospital, have been reviewed and met. While there were initial concerns about the helipad's proximity to surrounding office developments and roads, staff noted that similar configurations exist at other hospital sites, such as IHC facilities, where helipads are located adjacent to roads and developed areas. No formal conflicts or restrictions were identified, and it was stated that helipad operations are managed as part of the hospital's procedural and regulatory requirements. The Planning Commission requested that staff conduct a final check to ensure the helipad meets all applicable requirements before moving forward. Staff agreed and noted that this would be addressed through the Development Review Committee (DRC) process.

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION

MOTION

- A motion to **APPROVE** was made by **VICE CHAIR FARR**
- The motion was seconded by Commissioner **GOSSNER**
- Vote was **UNANIMOUS**

NOTE: Motion to approve was made with the condition that it meets the final approval of the DRC.

PUBLIC HEARINGS – LEGISLATIVE ITEMS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CITY COUNCIL.

a. Zone Text Amendment - Consideration of a text amendment for Manufacturing and Commercial Parking Requirements.

The Planning Commission considered a city-initiated text amendment regarding parking requirements within all commercial and manufacturing zones, including both planned and community/neighborhood commercial districts. The proposed amendment aims to introduce flexibility into parking standards based on the specific use and operational needs of a development, rather than applying fixed parking ratios solely based on zoning designations. The amendment would allow petitioners to submit supporting data—such as reports from traffic engineers or other qualified professionals—demonstrating the actual parking demand for their project. The Planning Commission would then have the discretion to consider this information and, where appropriate, approve an alternative number of

required parking stalls. The proposed language does not eliminate existing parking standards but rather supplements them with a discretionary tool for more tailored decision-making. The amendment would standardize this flexibility across all applicable zones and clarify existing language within the C-2 zone.

A question was raised regarding how changes in site conditions—such as an increase in the number of employees or a change in operations—would be addressed in the future, potentially five or ten years after initial approval. Staff responded that typically, if the site plan remains unchanged and only the building ownership changes, there would be no additional review or input required. However, there are provisions in some existing code sections that address changes in use or intensity. It was acknowledged that applying a flexible standard introduces some uncertainty, but the goal is to provide a more tailored and practical approach to parking requirements at the time of initial site plan approval.

A question was raised regarding the proposed text amendment's use of the term "appropriate source" when referencing who may submit data to justify a reduction or adjustment in parking requirements. The concern centered on the vagueness of the term and whether applicants themselves could be considered an "appropriate source," potentially leading to subjective or unsupported claims. Staff acknowledged that the language was intentionally broad to allow some flexibility, as not all cases may involve a traffic engineer. It was suggested that listing a few example sources—such as a traffic engineer, civil engineer, or site planner—could help clarify the intent without being overly restrictive.

MOTION TO **OPEN** PUBLIC HEARING BY COMMISSIONER KOTTER
SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER WILKINSON

PUBLIC HEARING

Sara Urry

- A concern was raised that "*may*" implies discretion rather than obligation, which could lead to ambiguity. The preference would be for clearer language, such as "*must*" or "*shall*," if the intent is to establish a requirement. However, it was acknowledged that in this context, the use of "*may*" indicates that the parties have the option to submit but are not obligated to do so.
- She agreed that professional services should be defined

MOTION TO **CLOSE** PUBLIC HEARING BY COMMISSIONER WILKINSON
SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KOTTER

A commissioner inquired about cleaning up some items in the zone text amendments. Staff responded that if there are specific areas to be included, they should be identified in a motion. It was noted that zoning text amendments do not typically specify the intended outcomes in the notice itself. However, to maintain clarity and meet legal requirements, the notice must list all affected zones, and the specific changes proposed.

MOTION

- A motion to **recommend approval** was made by **Commissioner GOSSNER**
- The motion was seconded by **Commissioner MORRIS**
- **Vote was UNANIMOUS**

NOTE: recommended approval of the proposed language, with a revision to change the phrase “other appropriate source” to “civil engineer or engineering professional.” Additionally, staff recommended taking the opportunity to update the Grammatic formatting and to review the numerical standards referenced in several listed items. It was also recommended that future item storage conditions be reviewed for each of the other items.

b. General Plan Amendment - Consideration of a proposed amendment to the Community Character table of the General Plan to provide distinction for Rural Residential Land Use classifications corresponding with the language and specifications in the Future Land Use Map.

Staff presented a proposed clarification related to the General Plan table, noting that the current language lacks clarity regarding the application of the A2 zone. The issue was identified during a broader evaluation of the General Plan.

Specifically, the table currently references “Rural Residential” with a density of 0 to 1 dwelling units per acre, which does not align with the intended use. The General Plan specifies that “Rural Residential” is meant to reflect 1 unit per 5 acres, aligning with the A5 zoning district.

To address this, staff recommended splitting the current category into two clear designations:

- Rural Residential 1: 0 to 1 dwelling units per 5 acres (implementing zoning district: A5)
- Rural Residential 2: 0 to 1 dwelling units per 2 acres (implementing zoning district: A2)

Staff emphasized that grouping the two under a single category is inconsistent with general planning principles, as they represent distinct land use intensities. The proposed changes would improve clarity and better reflect the intended implementation of zoning districts within the General Plan.

A question was raised regarding whether any state regulations or pending legislative changes might influence or necessitate revisions to the language currently under review. Staff responded that while changes beyond those noticed for public hearing cannot be made at this time, there are no specific state mandates currently affecting the exact number of zones or their designated densities.

However, the State does require that municipalities support moderate income housing, and the emphasis is on ensuring a variety of housing types and densities are available.

MOTION TO OPEN PUBLIC HEARING BY COMMISSIONER WILKINSON

SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KOTTER

NO PUBLIC COMMENTS

MOTION TO CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING BY COMMISSIONER KOTTER

SECONDED BY VICE CHAIR FARR

MOTION

- **A motion to recommend approval was made by Commissioner BOLINGBROKE**
- **The motion was SECONDED by Commissioner WILKINSON**

- **Vote was UNANIMOUS**

c. General Plan Amendment - Consideration of a proposed amendment to the General Plan for 30.6 acres of land located at approximately 540 West 4300 North, from Rural Residential 5 to Rural Residential 2.

Staff presented a proposal addressing conflicting provisions in the General Plan, specifically relating to the Rural Residential 5 (A5) and Rural Residential 2 (A2) designations. The item was placed after the previous agenda item to maintain continuity, as both relate to clarifying the application of these zoning classifications.

The proposal recommends a density adjustment from Rural Residential 5 to Rural Residential 2 in certain areas to accommodate the City's Master Street Plan, which includes a planned 66-foot right-of-way. This adjustment would allow for the appropriate placement of roadways and City utility lines across developable land adjacent to those roadways.

Currently, the five-acre designation under the General Plan poses challenges related to exactions and the feasibility of requiring the full 66-foot roadway within proposed developments. Staff advised that this could exceed what can be reasonably required from a developer.

In one proposed development scenario, clustering five-acre parcels did not accommodate the full right-of-way or utility line placement, creating practical concerns. While such constraints could potentially be addressed, the General Plan appears to pull in two directions—preserving large-lot rural density versus meeting infrastructure needs.

The Planning Commission was asked to consider whether to prioritize retention of the planned roadway alignment (as recommended by Public Works and Engineering staff) or to maintain the existing five-acre density standard.

The group discussed the development approval process, beginning with the General Plan and potentially proceeding to a zoning change and subdivision review. If the City Council approves the proposal—regardless of whether a density change is involved—the applicant would submit a subdivision application, which would then go through the city's formal process. If a rezone is required based on the land use determination made by the Council, it would be reviewed by both the Planning Commission and City Council. Staff noted that public interest often increases at the rezoning and platting stages.

Using a 30-acre example, it was clarified that not all acreage would be developable, as portions must be dedicated to roads and infrastructure, reducing the number of allowable lots. A question was raised about the City's ability to require land to be set aside for environmental uses, such as water recharge areas, and whether that would allow for or require clustered development. Staff confirmed that environmental factors—including slopes and water recharge—are always addressed during the subdivision stage. The core issue under consideration is whether the existing designated density is appropriate or whether maintaining the road alignment serves a more significant city interest.

MOTION TO OPEN PUBLIC HEARING BY VICE CHAIR FARR
SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER BOLINGBROKE

SARA URRY –

- **General Plan Requirements:**
a guideline, but it still carries significant weight in decision-making.
- **Flexibility and Public Input:**
The general plan can evolve. It reflects the changing needs, values, and desires of the community. Therefore, public hearings are required whenever changes are proposed, even if a specific development doesn't strictly require one.
- **Master Roads Plan Limitations:**
Changing the Master Roads Plan is not simple. It's tied to The Capital Facilities Plan. Any change—such as reducing road width—requires supporting studies, which are expensive. These studies must prove the new design meets the necessary criteria.
- The city often relies on developers to build infrastructure like roads.
- If the city makes changes that cause a developer to lose money, it could become a legal and ethical issue. The city can't force developers to absorb losses, nor can it pay the difference if it's not in the adopted plan.
- Infrastructure changes must be pre-approved in the plan with data and justification. Otherwise, they're not permitted.
- City staff care deeply because they understand the budget limitations and the legal framework. They cannot support decisions that would create financial burdens the city can't meet or violate planning requirements.

AUDIENCE MEMBER

- If a road was not needed anymore, would that also require a study, like it would if they were adding or change a road?
- The speaker noted that the property in question is adjacent to an A2-zoned parcel on one side and an R20-zoned parcel on the other. They expressed the opinion that it would make logical sense for the zoning to transition from R20 and A2 to 900, and then to A5, in order to create a more consistent and streamlined zoning pattern.

Answers from Staff

- *Removing a road from the Transportation Master Plan does not necessarily require a formal study (unlike adding or significantly altering one). However, removal has secondary impacts, and those must be considered carefully. For example; If density is kept the same, but the road is removed, that mismatch needs to be addressed through plan updates. The Transportation Master Plan and General Plan must stay aligned.*
- *When reviewing subdivision changes or development proposals, staff evaluates road connectivity to ensure properties are not landlocked and avoid creating flag lots or other access issues. This ensures future development maintains logical and fair access patterns for all property owners, and may, in some cases, create opportunities for adjacent landowners by improving access.*
- *It was noted that if the city wishes to preserve both the road plan and the existing zoning, the responsibility lies with the city to determine how to achieve that goal, especially in cases where legal constraints prevent the application of certain exactions to developers. Staff referenced earlier versions of development proposals for the area, which included a connection through*

4400 North. While some level of connectivity may still occur in future proposals, it may follow a different alignment, potentially reducing overall connectivity. This reduction could impact the efficiency of utility systems, such as sewer infrastructure, which would need to be upgraded to support any resulting development changes.

Note: During this portion of the meeting, an audience member made comments from their seat. These comments were not part of the official record. As such, they are not included in the minutes.

MOTION TO CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING BY COMMISSIONER BOLINGBROKE
SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KOTTER

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION

Vice Chair Farr noted that the property has a long history of rezoning requests, often met with public opposition. They referenced the 2016 Sensitive Lands Study, which identified the area as a key groundwater recharge zone due to its sand base and natural springs.

They expressed concern that most commissioners had not reviewed the study and cautioned against increasing impervious surfaces through higher-density development. After consulting with Public Works, it was suggested relocating an aging utility pipe to the east or west side of the property to preserve A-5 zoning and enable better lot and road layouts.

They opposed amending the General Plan without a full citywide update and public input, warning against piecemeal changes. They also raised concerns about road connectivity to a private road. She would recommend to deny the amendment and explore alternatives that preserve sensitive land and align with existing zoning and infrastructure needs.

Commissioner Farr added that the property is adjacent to a designated wetland area near the Wadman park. She expressed concern that rezoning to allow higher-density housing—with basements, swimming pools, and other impervious features—would significantly disrupt groundwater recharge.

Staff explained that the issue originated after discussions with the City Engineer and Public Works Director. A developer submitted a concept plan showing road connectivity from 4400 North to the north. Upon review, staff noted that a road is identified in the City's Road Master Plan in this area.

They clarified that while road alignments are not fixed and could potentially shift, the City cannot require full road construction as an exaction from a low-density development due to the scale and cost. Adjusting the alignment remains possible, and the City could pursue utility easements as part of the plan. However, constructing the full road would require monetary investment from the City.

Staff noted that the current zoning map designates the property as A2, while the Future Land Use Map identifies it as A5. They acknowledged uncertainty about the history or rationale behind this discrepancy.

A commissioner commented on the earlier suggestion to relocate utilities to the east or west side of the property, noting that doing so could conflict with residential development, as a home cannot front two roads. Staff clarified that a large existing water main currently runs through the center of the property, which is why the proposed road is aligned as shown on the concept plan.

Public Works has acknowledged this is aging infrastructure, and staff noted it could be updated and incorporated into the City's Capital Facilities Plan. Although a utility easement could be realigned (e.g., along the west edge), it would still pose design challenges for five-acre lots, as any development would have to work around this major line, whether or not a road is built on top of it.

Staff emphasized that the question remains whether the City wants the full road alignment, part of it, or to prioritize utility access over road development. Additional comments noted that extending a road north of 4400 North may not be feasible due to setback restrictions and the proximity of existing homes, especially on the east side.

It was noted that the road location will not be determined at this stage, regardless of the land use designation. The road alignment could shift west or east depending on future planning. If the commission is open to an A2 designation, it would then be up to the developer to submit a site plan that accounts for sensitive lands and other constraints.

The final lot sizes may vary depending on what best fits the land's characteristics and complies with regulations.

Staff clarified that, legally, the City can recommend prioritizing either the road alignment or the density, but likely not both, depending on what is justifiable based on the development's impact.

A commissioner expressed concern that if the City does not take proactive action on zoning, the State Legislature may soon mandate higher densities. They referenced a legislative proposal that would have allowed 5,000 sq ft lots in any zone statewide, which reportedly had significant support. The commissioner stated their belief that a similar bill is likely to return with even more traction, given the ongoing housing crisis in Utah. Their concern is that if the City does not act now to shape its own development, the State may impose less desirable zoning outcomes in the near future.

A commissioner asked whether the 2016 Sensitive Lands Study specifically recommended that the area in question remain zoned A5. In response, another commissioner clarified that while the study does not directly address zoning density, it comprehensively evaluates the city's hillside and includes analysis of soils, water bodies, recharge zones, and flood potential. The study does reference the existing general plan and offers recommendations consistent with its direction, which at the time designated the area as A5.

FINAL MOTION

- A motion to **TABLE** was made by **VICE CHAIR FARR**
- The motion was **SECONDED** by Commissioner **GOSSNER**

NOTE: Two motions were made. The first motion, to recommend denial of the amendment, ended in a 3–3 tie and failed. The second motion was to table the item and request all commissioners review the 2016 Sensitive Lands Study before reconsidering the matter. This motion passed 4–0. Staff committed to ensuring the study is distributed and accessible prior to the next meeting.

3. ADJOURNMENT

The commission briefly discussed the upcoming November event, confirming it would be held on the evening of the 21st in the same meeting room and that spouses or partners are invited to attend.

The meeting was adjourned with no further items discussed.