

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR PLEASANT VIEW CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD
January 9th, 2025 at 6:00 P.M.**

[Planning Commission \(youtube.com\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=733333333333)

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

STAFF PRESENT

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

VISITORS

Kennedy - YCC

MINUTES PREPARED BY:

Janitza Osuna(with AI Assistance)

MINUTES APPROVED:

September 4th, 2025

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- a. **Review and consideration of the Planning Commission meeting minutes prepared for August 1, 2024.**

MOTION

- *A motion to **APPROVE** was made by Commissioner **KOTTER***
- *The motion was seconded by Commissioner **STOLROW***
- *Vote was **UNANIMOUS***

3. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

- a. **Public Hearing: Willow Brook Subdivision Amendment. Consideration of an amended subdivision plat for the Willow Brook Subdivision, located at approximately 2243 N (Lynne St.) Highway 89. (Presenter: Tammy Eveson)**

A petition was presented before the Planning Commission requesting approval of a subdivision plat amendment and lot line adjustment to combine three existing lots—Lots 3, 4, and 5—into a single lot, which will be identified as Lot 11. The proposed lot consolidation is intended to facilitate the development of an assisted living facility. The applicant has obtained the necessary utility easement agreements for sanitary sewer installation and will install underground utilities, including storm drains and sewer lines, as outlined in the submitted easement documents. Public utility easements shown on

the current dedication plat were previously vacated by the Pleasant View City Council in November 2022, and those locations will be removed from the new plat to be recorded with Weber County. City staff noted that the proposal complies with applicable city ordinances, particularly because no new lots are being created and the properties involved are under the same ownership. Furthermore, as no city streets are being vacated or altered, approval authority lies solely with the Planning Commission. Staff recommended approval of the subdivision plat amendment, subject to conditions outlined in the staff packet, including coordination with the Weber County Surveyor's Office for any required plat adjustments, and submission of a detailed description of the differences between the existing and amended plats, along with compliance with comments from the city engineer. No public comments were received regarding the proposal, which was properly noticed on the property, as well as posted on the state and city websites.

PETITIONER – ANDREW NEWBOLD

The petitioner mentioned that he had been working with City staff over the last 3-4 years and is very appreciative. He mentioned that they encountered some significant challenges early on, particularly with stormwater issues. There was an existing runoff from neighboring properties that was accumulating on their site and not properly draining. They worked closely with the city and eventually reached an agreement with the developer to the west, that allowed them to address the issue.

The petitioner said that as part of the solution, they're implementing a stormwater management system that will handle both their own runoff and also help mitigate the impact from adjacent properties. He also mentioned that they have partnered with Rocky Mountain Care, an assisted living operator, and they have a building designed and ready for development.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING COMMISSIONER BOLINGBROKE
SECONDED BY VICE CHAIR FARR

NO PUBLIC COMMENTS

CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING VICE CHAIR FARR
SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER STOLROW

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION

question was raised by Chair Nef regarding the next steps in the development process for the proposed Assisted Living project. Clarification was requested on whether the applicant would still need to return for plat approval and to address site-specific requirements such as building height, parking, and related issues.

City staff responded that the applicant had previously submitted a comprehensive application, including modifications to the Assisted Living facility and adjustments to the citywide footprint based on utilization metrics. The next steps include adjusting lot lines, followed by a formal subdivision application. After that, the process will continue with site plan review and ultimately the building permit phase.

MOTION

- A motion to recommend **APPROVAL** was made by Commissioner **BOLINGBROKE**
- The motion was seconded by Commissioner **WILKINSON**
- Vote was **Unanimous**

4. LEGISLATIVE ITEMS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CITY COUNCIL

a. Public Hearing: Commercial Planned Unit Development (CPUD) Zoning Overlay. Consideration to apply the CPUD overlay zone to the C-2 and CP-2 Zones. (Presenter: Tammy Eveson)

This was a consideration of a proposal for the city administration to apply the adopted Commercial Plan Unit Development (CPUD) overlay zone to the C2 and CP2 zones. The proposal was intended to help meet the desires and intents of the General Plan by supporting the creation of a functioning commercial corridor.

It was noted that commercial development often requires varied approaches, and that these approaches need to be applied to ensure the installation of all necessary and appropriate infrastructure. Applying the CPUD overlay to the C2 and CP2 zones was presented as a way to create flexibility to accomplish the community's vision and character for Pleasant View's business and commercial areas. At the same time, it was intended to ensure that the necessary development standards were considered, and that any exceptions to these standards would be properly vetted and reviewed prior to approval. Staff recommended approval of the proposed application of the CPUD overlay to the existing C2 and CP2 zones.

This ordinance, which had recently been approved by the City Council following a recommendation from the Planning Commission, was discussed in relation to its actual application. The discussion revisited points previously addressed at length, referencing examples such as the Peak View development and the area near Jimmy John's. In the latter case, it was noted that while the development is functional, it involved coordinating different site plans that were not very cohesive.

A question was raised by Chair Nef regarding whether the purpose of applying an overlay was primarily to ensure better coordination among developments or to serve another function. Staff explained that under the CPUD ordinance, the underlying zone remains the dominant zone. If a developer wishes to make any modifications or alterations to support more cohesive development, they must bring those proposals forward for review. The overlay allows for such proposals to be considered. While it does not guarantee that modifications will be approved or exercised, it provides an additional option for consideration during the planning and approval process.

Commissioners wanted more clarification on the benefits of this proposal. Staff noted that current development regulations require frontage on a city street and do not allow for a Planned Unit Development (PUD) option. The Funplex development was cited as an example where shared drive aisles and access points necessitated more flexibility than the current ordinance allows. It was stated that, to date, the city has not had a tool or ordinance to effectively evaluate or enforce such integrated site designs. The creation of the CPUD is intended to address this gap, allowing for more cohesive commercial development rather than piecemeal projects placed side by side without consideration of the broader context.

The goal of the CPUD is to support planning at a larger scale, factoring in area-wide traffic flow and infrastructure needs. For large undeveloped tracts, this tool could provide flexibility by not strictly requiring street frontage, provided there is adequate shared access. Any deviation from base zoning requirements would still require approval by the Planning Commission and City Council. The ordinance is designed to offer flexibility while maintaining oversight, particularly regarding setbacks, frontage, and similar zoning standards.

Staff clarified that the city does not have the authority to mandate the use of a CPUD in cases where developers prefer to proceed independently rather than as a cohesive development. State laws present certain challenges that prevent the city from requiring developers to "play together." It was noted that implementing a CPUD generally involves a development agreement, which must be entered into voluntarily. While the city cannot force collaboration, it can encourage and facilitate it through planning and coordination efforts.

An example was cited near the Dutch Bros and Jimmy John's area, where development is coming together, albeit with some difficulty. Staff noted that projects involving shared parking and access agreements are inherently more complex, and having the ability to evaluate the broader development context is essential as those areas evolve.

*OPEN PUBLIC HEARING COMMISSIONER **KOTTER**
SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER **STOKES***

NO PUBLIC COMMENTS

*CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING BY COMMISSIONER **BOLINGBROKE**
SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER **STOKES***

MOTION

- A motion to Recommend **APPROVAL** was made by Commissioner **BOLINGBROKE**
- The motion was **seconded** by Commissioner **STOKES**
- Vote was **UNANIMOUS**

b. Public Hearing: Zoning Ordinance. Consideration of an ordinance establishing a Small Lot Single-Family Residential (SLSR) Zone. (Presenter: Amy Mabey)

The Planning Commission reviewed a proposed Low Scale Single-Family Residential (LSSF) zoning ordinance. Staff explained that the ordinance would allow single-family lots with a maximum density of six units per acre, smaller lot sizes, and housing types such as patio homes. Duplexes, twin homes, and townhomes would not be permitted. The ordinance was created at the direction of the City Council after a previous R-5 zoning proposal and General Plan amendment were tabled. The Housing Committee,

made up of city leadership and staff, worked with legal counsel and conducted site visits to develop the draft.

Commissioners asked if the LSSF zone could be applied citywide. Staff stated there is no specific geographic limitation written into the ordinance, but any request would still go through the city's three-step review process: General Plan amendment (if needed), zoning map change, and project approval. One commissioner asked why there was no minimum acreage requirement. Staff explained that including a strict acreage limit would reduce flexibility, and the city's review process is designed to prevent misuse.

A commissioner expressed concern about the phrase "deemed appropriate" in staff materials, noting it could be interpreted differently by future planning commissions or councils. Staff clarified that this phrase was in the staff memo and not part of the ordinance language that would be adopted. Commissioners suggested the City Council could adopt clearer factors or criteria to guide determinations of appropriateness.

Side setbacks were discussed, with one commissioner recommending an increase from eight feet to ten feet to reduce building proximity. Staff said the proposed setbacks had been reviewed by the Fire Marshal and Building Inspector with no concerns. Commissioners also asked whether developments using LSSF would require HOAs. Staff responded that HOAs are not required, but a single legal entity or management structure would be necessary in some cases to maintain common elements.

Questions were raised about lot widths and building envelopes, with commissioners noting that a 65-foot-wide lot with ten-foot side setbacks would leave only 45 feet for the building width. Staff confirmed this would limit building size but maintained it was still workable.

A commissioner asked if internal accessory dwelling units (ADUs) would still be allowed. Staff confirmed that ADUs are permitted under state law and would be allowed in this zone. Another commissioner asked whether LSSF zoning could be applied to individual parcels rather than large subdivisions. Staff said this is possible but would still require compliance with all development and infrastructure standards. A concern was raised about potential "spot zoning" if small parcels across the city were rezoned to LSSF. Staff and commissioners agreed that the existing review process, which involves public hearings and council action, would provide adequate safeguards.

Commissioners also questioned how infrastructure standards, such as road widths and turnarounds, would be addressed. Staff explained that these are regulated citywide by Public Works standards and are not specific to zoning ordinances.

Staff explained that the language was provided by legal staff and clarified that the intent was not for this zone to be applied throughout the entire city. Instead, it would only apply to specific areas deemed appropriate, since it allows for greater density

than is typical in most of the community. Staff noted that it is difficult to categorize it with existing zones, but emphasized it is not meant to be the predominant zoning designation.

A commissioner asked what limits the use of this zone. Staff responded that there is not a specific mechanism in the zoning ordinance to limit it, and typically there is not. While the R-5 zone does include limiting language, staff acknowledged that has presented some problems. Staff explained that the true limiting factors are the process itself and community review, including the city's general plan, zoning, and the approvals of the Planning Commission and City Council.

*OPEN PUBLIC HEARING VICE CHAIR FARR
SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER STOLROW*

Ann Arrington (Council member) - stated a conflict of interest as they also serve on the housing committee and have been active in the initiative. Arrington explained that many residents have expressed interest in smaller, patio-style homes rather than large homes, and that this proposal has been driven by community need. Arrington reported that committee members conducted field visits to nearby communities to review examples that could be incorporated into the proposed zone, with the goal of designing it to achieve the desired look rather than reacting to outside proposals.

Arrington stated that they do not support placing an acreage limit, such as six or ten acres, on the zone. They noted that Pleasant View has small parcels of land, including narrow strips, that are unsuitable for large homes but could work well under this zoning.

Arrington further explained that appropriateness should be determined on a case-by-case basis, considering factors such as water, sewer, and infrastructure capacity. They concluded by expressing support for the approval of the proposal, noting that concerns raised could be addressed individually as projects come forward.

A commissioner asked whether there should be a minimum acreage requirement. They provided the example of a half-acre lot being split into smaller sections and questioned whether such small parcels would qualify for the zone. They suggested requiring at least one acre as a minimum.

The commissioner also asked about street requirements, noting that as written, streets would need to meet city standards unless an HOA was created to manage private streets, snow removal, and related responsibilities. They emphasized that an HOA approach would lead to a different outcome and process.

Staff responded that each application would come before the Planning Commission for review and approval, including lot line adjustments. They noted this is an area the city has not yet fully addressed and will require careful consideration moving forward.

Sara Urry (Council Member) - stated agreement with Councilmember Arrington's comments and added that she had previously suggested placing a cap on the size of developments under this zone. She explained that the intent was not to allow large-scale patio home developments throughout the city, particularly across the hillside. Sarah noted that both the City Council and Planning Commission must determine where this zoning is appropriate. Even if an application is submitted before the general plan is amended, the Commission has the ability to determine whether the location is suitable. She emphasized that there is no requirement for either the Planning Commission or City Council to approve an application if the site is not appropriate.

She further stated that if the development is not part of an HOA, it will still be required to meet all city standards, including road widths and infrastructure requirements. She emphasized that the city should not amend its standards for individual projects, as they are intended to reflect best practices for the community.

Sarah concluded by reiterating that the next step is for the Commission and Council to identify specific areas where this zoning may be appropriate. She stated that the intent was never to allow massive developments but rather to target certain areas where the zoning would fit.

Ryan – inaudible speech

Jeff Lee (Land Owner/Resident)- stated that the proposed language provides flexibility for the Planning Commission and City Council to determine whether future applications are appropriate, allowing for changes over time without being overly restrictive. They noted that while some may prefer rigid requirements, they support language that gives decision-makers discretion.

They addressed questions that had been raised about what is allowed under the proposal, explaining that developers will be required to submit a proposal defining the construction of all units and establishing either CC&Rs or a master development plan. Approval will not move forward until those requirements are met, which provides the commission with the necessary information for decision-making. Jeff also clarified language regarding interior accessory dwelling units, stating that the allowance is specific to interior spaces and not exterior. They emphasized that this prevents multiple external buildings, as everything must be part of a continuous unit and approved within the CC&Rs.

They concluded by stating that the concerns raised have been addressed in the proposal, that the language is sound, and recommended that the commission forward the proposal with a recommendation of approval.

A commissioner asked Jeff, the property owner of 475 West, to share his perspective on why the site is appropriate for the proposed zoning.

Jeff explained that the property is located adjacent to the golf course, where there are already similar housing units. He noted that multiple residents have approached

him while golfing to ask about development plans and many expressed support for patio-style homes on the site.

Jeff described the property as a small, back-of-the-way development that would not conflict with surrounding uses. He emphasized his belief that there is increasing demand for smaller lots and patio homes, citing his 20 years of experience in real estate. He noted that while he personally prefers larger lots, he has been surprised at how many buyers prefer smaller properties.

He added that housing prices and land costs in Utah have doubled in the last six years, placing the state among the ten least affordable places to live in the nation. He stated that attitudes are shifting and that requiring all homes to be on half-acre or larger lots is becoming outdated and unsustainable.

Jeff concluded that the proposed development would not decrease neighboring property values, pointing out that the homes planned would be consistent in footprint with existing homes nearby. He noted that the adjacent subdivision does not contain homes with a main floor larger than 2,000 square feet, which aligns with what buyers are currently seeking.

Stephen Collier (Resident) - felt the presentation was missing a major component of information. They described the proposal as seeming more like the creation of a tool for a project rather than a fully developed plan. He expressed concerns regarding infrastructure and capacity, noting that road capacity is not addressed in the proposal. The speaker stated they did not want to sound overly critical but wanted to ensure that questions about impacts and limitations were fully considered.

Carson Jones (Developer) - commented that his favorite part of city planning is creating thoughtful developments. Carson stated his opinion, that eliminating the master planned community zone had been a mistake, as it allowed flexibility for a variety of lot sizes and well-designed neighborhoods.

They explained that many residents no longer want five-acre lots. Carson expressed strong support for the proposed zoning, calling it a valuable tool for the city.

He cautioned that it should not be applied universally but rather in appropriate areas, considering utilities and infrastructure. He suggested adjusting the front yard setback requirement, explaining that with lot coverage limits, homeowners may want larger single-level homes, and reducing setback depth could allow more functional use of the lot. He added that shorter driveways would also allow more water infiltration into the ground.

The speaker concluded that the zoning proposal is a positive idea and should be considered as a useful option for the city.

Paul Pitcher (Resident and Member of Fox Meadows HOA) - spoke in support of the proposal. He explained that lots in his neighborhood range from approximately 6,700

to 7,800 square feet, with homes ranging from about 1,650 square feet up to 4,000 square feet if owners add a second floor or extend the home.

He stated that the HOA contracts for snow removal and maintains its own private streets, which makes the neighborhood more manageable for residents. Pitcher commented that a development like the one proposed would be a positive addition, as it provides options for people who want to remain in the community while downsizing to something more practical.

Pitcher shared that his previous home was on a half-acre lot, which became burdensome to maintain. Downsizing into a more manageable and livable home has been beneficial for him and his family. He urged the commission to consider the needs of residents who want to stay in Pleasant View but require smaller, lower-maintenance housing options.

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

In final discussion, A commissioner stated they would prefer to see these types of developments integrated into larger master planned communities. They acknowledged, however, that this zoning alone would not allow for a full master development because of lot requirements, which would still be limiting.

Staff responded that while master planned communities are addressed at the general plan level with density considerations, a new ordinance may eventually be needed to effectively accommodate clustering in future developments. Staff noted that the city currently lacks a strong clustering ordinance to support such mechanisms.

They clarified that the proposed zoning is specific to six units per acre, and clustering does not necessarily fit the intent, which is to allow smaller lots and smaller units. Staff emphasized that while a developer could theoretically request a hillside of this zoning, such a proposal would be contrary to the general plan and staff would not recommend it.

There was concern from one of the commissioners about smaller lots and HOA's "popping up all over the city" .

A commissioner asked whether a property owner with a large side yard, such as an acre along a major road, could develop it without constructing a new road. They questioned if such a situation would be allowed or considered appropriate.

Staff responded that such a proposal could be considered, noting that any property owner has the ability to bring forward a rezoning request. They emphasized that the process includes mechanisms for review and public input, which would determine whether the proposal is ultimately approved.

A commissioner reported that two housing bills are currently before the Utah State Legislature and will be presented in the coming weeks. HB90 would make a detached single-family dwelling on a lot of at least 4,000 square feet a permitted use in all residential zones within first- and second-class cities, and would also make housing a permitted use in all commercial zones. HB37, titled Utah Housing Amendments, would create a housing overlay zone allowing for a minimum density of approximately 12 units per acre. Staff emphasized that if passed, these bills would require municipalities to comply regardless of existing zoning ordinances. Commissioners discussed that while residents often express frustration with changes to zoning or land use maps at the city level, many requirements are set by state law and are outside the city's direct control.

The consensus was that proposals should be evaluated on an individual basis rather than imposing arbitrary limits, since potential applications could range from a single 8,000-square-foot lot to several acres. Commissioners agreed it would be more effective to see proposals come forward, then refine the ordinance as needed. There was also discussion about concerns with "spot zoning" if smaller lots were split off in established neighborhoods. Staff noted that any such proposal would still go through the required process of a general plan amendment, rezoning, and development review, providing opportunities to determine whether it is an appropriate fit.

Commissioners discussed the side yard setback requirements, specifically whether the minimum should be 8 feet or 10 feet. It was noted that increasing the setback to 10 feet would result in a total of 4 additional feet between homes—2 feet on each side. On a 65-foot-wide lot, this would limit the maximum house width to about 45 feet. Commissioners questioned whether this reduction meaningfully impacts the types of homes that could be built and whether it would hurt the housing product or simply provide greater separation between neighbors. Some expressed a preference for increased distance between homes, though acknowledged that 2 feet may or may not make a significant difference. Staff also noted that many existing homes in Ogden do not meet current side yard requirements but are grandfathered in under prior standards.

MOTION

- A motion to recommend **APPROVAL** was made by Commissioner **STOKES**
- The motion was **SECONDED** by Commissioner **WILKINSON**
- Vote was **UNANIMOUS**

c. Public Hearing: Secondary Water Ordinance Amendments. Consideration of ordinance amendments for secondary water requirements. (Presenter: Amy Mabey)

Staff presented a proposal from the City Administration concerning the secondary water ordinance. It was noted that current code prohibits development without a connection to a secondary water source. The Mayor and Administration had been presented with concerns regarding development in areas where secondary water connections are not possible or where no future systems are planned. In response, an ordinance amendment was prepared for consideration that would allow for exemptions in such cases.

Staff provided background, explaining that the ordinance was last updated in 1992. The current ordinance requires mandatory connections for all residential and agricultural properties with access to secondary water for irrigation purposes, with the intent of protecting the culinary water supply. The code prohibits cross-connections between secondary and culinary systems to prevent contamination. Additionally, use of culinary water for irrigation is prohibited where secondary water is available. Some properties developed prior to 1982, or those with prior agreements with the City, are grandfathered. New building permits are only issued when secondary water is available, with exceptions for prior agreements.

The proposal presented would retain all existing language, with only minor stylistic clarifications, but would add a substantive new provision. A special consideration section would allow exemptions from the secondary water requirement through a development agreement. Exemptions could be granted for properties with adequate private water rights to sustain landscaping or for those implementing natural or xeriscape landscaping that requires no outdoor watering. To qualify, property owners would need to submit a detailed landscaping plan and obtain City Council approval. Failure to comply with an approved plan could nullify the agreement, and violations could result in a Class B misdemeanor.

Staff presented both the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed ordinance. Advantages include allowing for the development of land without secondary water access, where costs are currently prohibitive. The use of natural scape or xeriscape reduces infrastructure impacts, promotes water conservation through less outdoor water use, and relieves additional demand and pressure on the secondary water system. It also acknowledges the finite nature of secondary water as a resource.

Disadvantages noted were significant as well. Enforcement of city ordinances and protection of the culinary water supply would be challenging under this proposal. Long-term application and maintenance of natural scape landscaping may present difficulties, including code enforcement concerns. Additionally, if secondary water connections are not extended to adjacent properties, the availability of infrastructure becomes more limited, potentially resulting in higher costs or requiring city investment to extend service in the future. The long-term provision of dedicated secondary connections for non-potable landscaping water would also be complicated by enforcement challenges.

A commissioner asked if state law would soon require all properties to connect to secondary water, potentially conflicting with the proposal. Staff replied they were not aware of such a law, noting only requirements for sanitary sewer connections. They

added that while statewide efforts focus on water conservation and metering secondary water, they had not found a mandate for secondary water connections.

A commissioner asked about the origin of the proposal and whether it was tied only to Hillside properties or if there were other examples. Staff responded that while Hillside was one example, there had been other situations where access to secondary water created challenges. As an illustration, staff noted that Wildcat Storage had access to canal company water for irrigation, but that access did not extend to the adjacent Sunpro site. Sunpro therefore had to make a significant financial investment in order to connect to the secondary water system and develop the property.

*OPEN PUBLIC HEARING VICE CHAIR **FARR**
SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER **STOKES***

- Someone from the audience came up to the podium but it was too inaudible for minutes
- A resident asked about exceptions and whether the proposal included any geographic definition. Staff clarified that the ordinance does not identify specific geographic areas but applies in situations where access to secondary water is not available.
- Sara Urry (Council Member)- expressed concern that ordinances should be established in the best interest of the entire city rather than adjusted for the benefit of individual property owners who knowingly purchased land without secondary water access. The councilmember noted that while the situation may be difficult for some property owners, it is not the city's role to change ordinances in order to reduce individual costs when such changes could burden the broader community. The councilmember emphasized that significant resources have already been invested to ensure the city's limited water supply is protected, citing past moratoriums and the purchase of additional water in 2016 that cannot yet be utilized due to the expense of necessary infrastructure. The councilmember concluded that while property owners have the right to request exceptions, the council must consider the needs of the city's 12,000 residents rather than a single property owner.
- Another councilmember suggested that a possible solution could involve requiring property owners seeking an exemption to form a homeowners association (HOA). The HOA could then manage the properties and prohibit the use of culinary water for landscape maintenance, helping ensure compliance. The councilmember also noted the possibility of creating a compromise through a special building fee.

*CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING BY COMMISSIONER **STOLROW**
SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER **KOTTER***

During clarification, a councilmember asked whether the current ordinance would prohibit a one-lot subdivision from using a private well and purchased water from Weber Basin for secondary purposes if the property owner did not intend to connect to the city's culinary system. Staff confirmed that, under the ordinance as written, such use would be prohibited for residential development. Staff further explained that while agricultural uses are not restricted in the same way, any residential development requires connection to the secondary water system rather than relying on a private well, even if Weber Basin permits the water use.

MOTION

- A motion to Recommend **DENIAL** was made by Vice Chair **FARR**
- The motion was **SECONDED** by Commissioner **STOKES**
- Vote was **UNANIMOUS**

5. PLANNING COMMISSION TRAINING

- a. Open and Public Meetings Training. Completion of annual training required for open and public meetings.**

The council participated in a scheduled training session. An informational video was presented, and a group test was administered and completed following the video.

- b. Conflict of Interests Form. Present form for completion in accordance with State requirements.**

- c. Planning Commission Policies and Procedures. Discuss the Planning Commission's currently established Policies and Procedures and further review of the Planning Commission to identify any desired modifications.**

6. APPOINTMENT OF LEADERSHIP - Planning Commission nomination and consideration of the Chair and Vice Chair leadership appointments for the 2025 calendar year.

The Commission discussed the annual appointment of leadership for 2025, including the nomination and consideration of Chair and Vice Chair positions. It was noted that this process occurs each year and is determined by the Commission as a body. Nominations and discussion among members were opened regarding the appointments for the upcoming year.

MOTION

- A motion **TO RE-APPOINT ANDY NEF AS CHAIR AND JULIE FARR AS VICE CHAIR BY Commissioner WILKINSON**
- The motion was **SECONDED** by Commissioner **STOKES**
- Vote was **UNANIMOUS**

7. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned with no further items discussed.