

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR PLEASANT VIEW CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD
December 5th, 2024, 2024 at 6:00 P.M.
[Planning Commission \(youtube.com\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=...)**

MEMBERS PRESENT

Andy Nef
Julie Farr
Chad Kotter
Dean Stokes
Sean Wilkinson
David Gossner
John Morris

Excused
Manya Stolrow
Jeff Bolingbroke

STAFF PRESENT

Amy Mabey, City Administrator
Tammy Eveson, Planner I

VISITORS

PETITIONER -Jeff Harrison
APPLICANT - Cecil Satterthwaite

Phillip Swanson
Steve Collier
J Chugg
Jill Nicholson
McKell Jensen
Taylee Jensen
Jeremy Jensen
Jill Mitton

MINUTES PREPARED BY:

Janitza Osuna(with AI Assistance)

MINUTES APPROVED:

October 2nd, 2025

1. CALL TO ORDER

a. Pledge of Allegiance and Opening Prayer, Reading or Expression of Thought. (Commissioner John Morris)

b. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest. *NONE DECLARED*

2. LEGISLATIVE ITEMS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CITY COUNCIL

a. Rezone. Consideration of a rezone for 18.44 acres of land located on the corner of 2700 North and U.S. Highway 89 from Planned Commercial (C-2) to MixedUse West (MUW).

The meeting opened with the first item on the agenda, which included three legislative items for recommendation to the city council. All items would be open to public comment during the hearing.

Item 2A was introduced as a rezone consideration for property located at 2700 North US Highway 89. The request was to change zoning from Planned Commercial (C2) to Mixed Use (MUW).

Staff presented a City proposed amendment for consideration to modify the current zoning designation of approximately 28 acres of land located on the west corner of 2700 North and US HWY 89. The request was to rezone from Planned Commercial (C2) to Mixed Use West. This change was described as a coordinated effort between the city and property owners, aligning with recent changes to the general plan approved by the city council on August 13, 2024. The proposal is intended as a proactive effort to provide a variety of housing options by allowing increased density through zoning

modifications. The effort supports Utah Code 10-9a-403 addressing moderate income housing requirements.

Staff explained that the C2 General Commercial Zone is intended to consolidate commercial uses into two classifications based on activity types and compatibility. While C2 allows for a full range of office, retail, service, and entertainment needs, the impacts often require substantial integration and may not be compatible with nearby single-family homes. In contrast, the Mixed Use West Zone allows both residential and non-residential components. The ordinance requires that commercial use remain a significant element of the site, with housing components allowed once commercial development is in place. A minimum of 50 percent of any development in the Mixed Use West Zone must be non-residential, determined by overall square footage. Any new mixed-use developments will also require approval and adoption of a specific area plan.

Staff recommended approval of the proposed zoning change, noting that it aligns with the general plan, the future land use map, and state requirements for moderate income housing.

A commissioner asked if a developer could complete the entire project at once or develop only a portion of the property. The question was whether a developer could build on four acres, for example, and if so, whether at least two acres of that would need to be commercial before adding two acres of residential. The commissioner also asked for clarification on whether the 50 percent non-residential requirement applied to the entire development or if it could be subdivided.

Staff responded that any land would need to be subdivided and platted before development. Based on discussions with groups that have looked at the property, staff noted there has been interest in holistic development rather than small portions, largely due to costs and access challenges along two major roads. Staff also explained that the CPUD ordinance could be utilized, offering flexibility for future proposals.

A commissioner asked for clarification on the acreage amount. It seems there was a discrepancy between the agenda and the staff report. It was confirmed that the correct number they were looking at was 18.44 acres.

*MOTION TO OPEN PUBLIC HEARING COMMISSIONER **STOKES***

*SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER **WILKINSON***

NO PUBLIC COMMENTS

*MOTION TO CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING COMMISSIOER **STOKES***

*SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER **BOLINGBROKE***

MOTION

- A motion to **APPROVE** was made by commissioner **STOKES**
- The motion was **seconded** by **VICE CHAIR FARR**
- Vote was *Unanimous*

b. General Plan Amendment. Consideration of a petition for a General Plan amendment for 169 acres of land from Rural Residential (Current Applicable Zone A-5) to Very Low Density Residential (Current Applicable Zone RE-20) at approximately 4300 North 1100 West.

The next item was a consideration brought forward by a development group for Hillside Villages East. The applicant was Jeffrey Harrison along with listed property owners.. The proposal was to change the general plan designation from Rural Residential, which allows one dwelling unit per five acres under the A5 Zone, to Very Low Density Residential, which allows one to two dwelling units per acre under the RE20 Zone. This change would effectively shift the property from five-acre lots to half-acre lots.

Staff explained that the developer’s proposal described a master-planned community incorporating open space and trail systems, with an emphasis on clustering density in a way that maintains the rural character of the area. Infrastructure considerations, including elements of the master plan for 4300 North and related road projects, were also noted.

The development group held a public open house on July 16 to gather feedback from residents and stakeholders regarding the project and its objectives. Staff clarified that the proposed community is located north of 4300 North, which contrasts with the general plan’s current designation for Very Low Density Residential in that area. The very low density residential designation extends from the Ogden-Brigham Canal to 4300 North and from approximately 500 West to the eastern city limits, continuing northward to 4575.

Staff noted that as with other similar proposals, any future development would need to protect view corridors, slopes, water areas, and sensitive lands. Trail systems would be incorporated into the design. It was emphasized that these considerations are preliminary and general in nature, as specific subdivision proposals and designs would require further review at later stages. This item before the commission was for general plan consideration only.

Staff noted that the proposal includes a portion of land within the city’s annexation plan. Portions of the annexation plan are already incorporated into the city’s general plan, which staff described as thoughtful long-term planning that anticipates future growth and development within city boundaries. Although the land is not currently inside city limits, it is addressed in the general plan.

The proposal was also described as consistent with elements of the road master plan. Staff reported that no public comments had been received via email or telephone prior to the meeting.

A commissioner asked about 1100 North, noting that the proposed concept plan did not appear to show the road continuing straight through the development. The commissioner questioned whether the change in alignment was consistent with sound planning, since 1100 North currently runs straight for several miles before reaching the project area.

Staff responded that the concept plan is preliminary and has not been fully vetted with the road master plan. The main consideration from the city's perspective is ensuring interconnectivity between points, even if lines are shown as straight on maps. Staff emphasized that the primary issue before the Planning Commission at this stage is the question of density, as detailed road alignments would be addressed in future reviews.

APPLICANT PRESENTATION – JEFF

- Jeff wanted it to be known that it's the first time that there has been one owner for the whole property
- He would like a master planned community
- They have met with city and tried to come up with the best zoning and use for the property could be
- Jeff mentioned that he has taken feedback from the community and most agree that they are wanting housing for children or parents, open space and trails.
- Current issues are 2700 North traffic as well as 4300 North not being complete.
- His goals are to meet the needs of future Pleasant View Growth
- Preserve the good things from the community and provide housing options for family members.
- He will try to ensure utilities are adequate
- Finish skyline drive
- Access to the foothills
- No known geological issues or soil issues
- Preserve Water Source, water source protection zones
- Conservation easement on open space
- Types of homes: Single Family Homes, Estate Lots, Step up homes, Patio Homes
- As it is right now (A5) there could be 33 estate lots.

A commissioner raised a question about culinary water service, asking how water would be supplied at the higher elevations of the proposed development. The commissioner expressed concern about whether adequate pressure could be achieved in that area given the significant elevation change.

The petitioner responded that the issue had been discussed in a prior work meeting with the city's public works representative, Tyson, who noted that water service and pressure requirements would need to be addressed as part of future infrastructure planning.

A commissioner suggested the possibility of changing the general plan designation to A2, which would allow two-acre lots, as a middle approach between the current five-acre minimum and the proposed half-acre minimum under RE20. The commissioner asked whether such an option was available.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING VICE CHAIR FARR SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KOTTER

Steve Collier 1630 W Pleasant view drive – Opposed

He really liked the presentation and appreciates what they are trying to do but it worried about the density change from A-5 to RE-20. He likes the current general plan. He would like to see more of a city initiative and public involvement.

Sara Urry council member

Mentions that the petitioners have been great to work with, they have been thoughtful about the project. She loves the idea of the land being developed as a master plan community vs. having the lots sold off separately and having different lots everywhere. There's a concern by commissioner Nef about the word "density" itself because it could lead to uncertainty about what will actually be built, and the speaker wonders what the final result will look like. Sara reminds commissioners that they don't have to agree or say Yes to anything.

Comment from the next petitioner:

He emphasizes that the property in question is private property, indicating that the landowners have certain rights and responsibilities regarding what happens on that land but are trying to develop the land in a responsible and beneficial way. They are trying to work in collaboration with the city and stakeholders to get it right. He mentions there are other steps, including zoning, site plans and subdivision plans but that will come at a later time. He encourages approving the general plan amendment as a first step to an ongoing collaborative relationship with the city and that the city will have oversight and input at various stages.

Jason Chugg – 3367 N 175 W – Opposed

Would like to keep the density low. Understands that there are State demands and does not like the scare tactics. Mentions most people move to an area like pleasant view is because of the low density. He expresses concern about the water infrastructure required for the development. They mention that the issue of getting water to the area is significant, as it would likely require a large investment to bring water to the site, especially if the property is located far from existing water infrastructure. He suggests that a discussion about density could help determine how to cover the cost of bringing utilities to the area. For example, if the development density is higher (more homes), there might be economies of scale that would help pay for the utilities. The speaker is not entirely opposed to development but is cautious about the proposed density.

Member of the community and real estate broker.

Talks about how there's no options for people to downsize their homes. Doesn't understand why the amendment is an issue if half the city is already zoned for one third or half acre lots. Mentions the difficulty Ogden city is having after rezoning for 5 acres due to the costs of buying and building on such a large lot. He feels that development is going to happen regardless but would rather plan for it and do what's best for the community.

Jill Nicholson - 4415 N 400 W - Opposed

She acknowledges the desire for more housing for the younger generation and empathizes with people who want to buy homes and start families since she has children herself. However, she also points out that many in the community are concerned about the potential consequences of high-density development, such as the construction of 300 homes in that area. She brings up a previous discussion in regards to the area above 4300 and how that area was recommended to stay at 5 acres due to the wetlands and animals found up there.

Citizen Comment: Opposed

She likes the general plan as it is. Feels a lot of thought and consideration went into it and that changing it is not beneficial. She feels like it's a dramatic amendment and needs to have more public input.

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

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION

Vice Chair Farr expressed support for the idea of a master-planned community but stated concerns that the proposed density does not align with the city's general plan or the community's stated vision. She noted that frequent amendments to the general plan undermine its intent. Vice Chair Farr emphasized the importance of community involvement before making such changes. She suggested waiting until the city adopts an overlay for hillside and sensitive lands before considering density changes of this scale.

Staff responded that while there is no specific timeline, the overlay is on the city's work plan. Staff also explained that the patio home ordinance is under legal review and is anticipated to come before the Planning Commission in January. Vice Chair Farr cautioned that approving this general plan amendment would likely lead to rezoning requests and set a precedent for similar proposals in surrounding areas.

Another commissioner stated concern with the scale of the proposed change, noting it was a large jump from one home per five acres to half-acre lots. The commissioner suggested a possible transition such as one home per two acres, which has been discussed in past general plan reviews, as a more balanced approach.

The commissioner asked staff whether the adoption of a master plan overlay would provide more flexibility for both the city and the developer, particularly in clustering areas to preserve open space while still allowing development. The commissioner expressed that while many citizens value large-lot zoning and open space, the city should also allow some opportunities for developers, provided the changes are carefully managed.

A commissioner asked if the Master Plan development could include more zoning options beyond A5 or A2. The concern expressed was that currently the city only has those two choices, which may be limiting. Staff clarified that the plan so far has focused more on functional elements and components of development rather than density and also explained that if the commission wants density to be considered, that direction could be included as part of a motion, specifying what level of density would be desirable.

MOTION

- A motion to **RECOMMEND DENIAL** was made by **VICE CHAIR FARR**
- The motion was **seconded** by **COMMISSIONER GOSSNER**
- Vote was 5/2
- YAY – Gossner, Kotter, Stokes, Nef and Farr
- NAY – Wilkinson and Morris

- c. General Plan Amendment. Consideration of a petition for a General Plan amendment for 97.7 acres of land from Rural Residential (Current Applicable Zones A-2 and A-5) to Low Density Residential (Current Applicable Zones RE20 and RE-15) at approximately 1950 West Pleasant View Drive.

General Plan Amendment for Hillside Villages was presented. The applicant and owner is Cecil Satterthwaite. The property encompasses approximately 97.7 acres located at 1950 West Pleasant View Drive with multiple parcels included. The current general plan designation is rural residential, allowing one dwelling unit per two to five acres. The proposal requests a change to low density residential allowing two to three dwelling units per acre. The current zoning designations are A2 and A5 and the proposed zoning designations would align with RE20 and RE15. Staff noted the importance of the mapping since the property ownership covers various designations. The proposal is a developer request to establish a uniform footprint designation across all adjacent land under the same ownership. The developer described the project as a master planned community with integrated open space, trail systems, and clustered density designs that maintain rural character and support completion of Skyline Drive.

The applicant participated in a public open house on July 16, 2024 to gather input on the proposal and community impacts. The proposed community is primarily located south of 4300 North which aligns with the intent of the low density residential designation in the general plan. A portion of 5.26 acres extends north of 4300 North, though most of the land lies south. The designation criteria describe areas south of the Ogden Brigham Canal, east of Highway 89, and north of the 2700 North corridor. This proposal generally meets those criteria with the noted exception. The land is also included in the city's annexation plan. Any future development will be required to protect watersheds, limit disturbance of sensitive lands, preserve natural features such as geologic formations and slopes, and incorporate trail systems. It was emphasized that the current request is only a preliminary proposal for a general plan amendment and not a subdivision application. Subdivision level considerations would occur later.

The portion of the property within the annexation plan is currently used as a gravel mining operation. This use would be deemed incompatible with low density residential and would become nonconforming upon annexation until a new use is applied for. State law regarding mining operations was noted as a separate matter. The development group has indicated plans to close the mining operation and convert the site into clustered residential units. The proposal addresses roadway planning related to Skyline Drive. This item was noticed for a public hearing and no public comments were received. Staff recommended forwarding the request to the city council.

PETITIONER

The applicant presented the history of the property beginning with the 2009 general plan, which had allocated RE20 and RE15 zoning. Slides showed the 2009 plan, the current plan, and vicinity maps with reference to Highway 89 and Skyline Drive. It was noted that Skyline Drive crosses through the property and staff and the development team have worked together to align the project with the roadway plan. The applicant stated the proposal is essentially to return to the 2009 general plan designations with RE20 and RE15 zoning, starting with a single zone but allowing for a development agreement. The development agreement would include commitments such as trails, a possible trailhead for the bike

park, parks, and other amenities. The design would allow clustering to preserve open space while still achieving the overall density levels anticipated in the 2009 plan.

The applicant emphasized benefits including public access to open space, trail systems, and parks without HOA restrictions, attainable housing through smaller clustered lots, water efficiency with reduced landscaping demands, and a range of housing options including single-level and more affordable homes. Architectural design was highlighted as a key feature, with smaller homes designed with quality details, variety, and timeless style. Storyboards from the public presentation illustrated proposed concepts for parks, trails, streetscapes, and housing types.

Commissioners asked questions about housing density, whether the conceptual drawings reflected the actual mix of units, and whether designs would include homes for seniors. The applicant clarified that the intent is to provide a mix of housing types rather than large blocks of identical units, and adjustments had been made after feedback from a neighborhood meeting. Questions were asked about whether the homes would be rentals or owner-occupied, with the applicant clarifying they are not apartments and that final details may depend on contracts. Commissioners also asked whether the Skyline Drive alignment in the concept plan was final, and staff confirmed it matches the master street plan, though iterations have changed over time to address terrain and feasibility. The applicant and staff stated they have worked closely to understand what the roadway alignment means for the property.

MOTION TO OPEN PUBLIC HEARING COMMISSIONER STOKES
SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KOTTER

Resident - had a question regarding which gravel pit was being talked about in the presentation.

Steve Collier – he doesn't like the idea of multi-family dwellings

Cecil Satterthwaite - stated that the request is to return to the 2009 general plan designation, which the property previously had. The change occurred when the Skyline Drive alignment was modified. The applicant explained that new geotechnical studies have been completed and the current alignment of Skyline Drive, as adopted by the city, has been incorporated into their planning. They emphasized that the design works with the new alignment and allows the property to be used productively. The applicant noted that significant private investment will be required to create a quality project and expressed willingness to work with the city throughout the process. They clarified that this request represents the first step and is simply asking to restore the 2009 general plan designation.

Jason Chugg - He asked for clarification on the Skyline Drive alignment, and staff confirmed it matches the current master streets plan. Mr. Chugg noted that this situation is different because of the scale of a major roadway cutting through private property and commended the applicant for their patience, calling it a significant sacrifice. Mr. Chugg reiterated earlier concerns about density, explaining that perceptions of low and high density can vary based on personal background and experience. He requested discussion about whether Pleasant View City code provides a structure that allows or requires master planned developments, rather than simply permitting projects under existing RE20 or RE15 zoning standards. He emphasized that it would be more beneficial for citizens to see well-thought-out master plans, including clustering options, rather than only by-right development at maximum densities. The concern was raised that without such a process, developers may pursue the maximum number of lots allowed under zoning, which could create conflicts or legal disputes. The commissioner

asked whether an intermediate process exists that would encourage or require master planning when communities of this size are proposed.

Staff - responded that the city is working on an ordinance to create a master plan community overlay. This effort began with the patio home ordinance for smaller single-family lots but has since expanded to address larger community planning goals. Staff noted that developers involved in this process have shown patience and partnership as the city works through the details. Under current state law, the city cannot require development agreements through regular zoning, but with a master plan community overlay, the city would have the ability to require specific elements and collaborate with developers to achieve desired outcomes. This proposal represents an initial step in that direction.

Resident – Gave some history on the nearby roads

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

COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION

A commissioner stated appreciation for the clustered design concept and how it integrates into Pleasant View. However, they reiterated concerns regarding density, referencing the city's land study. They cited page 15, section 7, which specifies that although individual lot sizes may vary, the overall density for a parcel of land must not exceed the levels shown on the city's adopted future land use map. The commissioner emphasized the importance of adhering to this standard in evaluating the proposal.

A commissioner commented that the concern in the community is not with RE20 or RE15 zoning, since those lot sizes are already common in the area, but with the possibility of introducing townhomes, duplexes, or similar housing types. They stated that such housing is not popular in Pleasant View and would face significant opposition. The commissioner noted that residents would likely accept additional RE20 lots more readily than denser housing types. They added that a mix of larger lots, smaller lots, and patio homes could be advantageous and more positively received than duplexes. The commissioner concluded that density is the key issue where the city and residents want to have input and influence.

MOTION

- A motion to **RECOMMEND APPROVAL** was made by commissioner **WILKINSON**
Motion: Recommend to the City Council approval of a change from Rural Residential to Low Density Residential in the General Plan at approximately 1950 West Pleasant View Drive, as presented.
- The motion was seconded by Commissioner **STOKES**
- Vote was 5/2
- YAY- Morris, Nef, Kotter, Wilkinson, Stokes
- NAY – Gossner, Farr

Motion discussion

Vice chair Farr - stated that a master plan community overlay could be applicable to this property, along with a sensitive lands overlay that has been under discussion for two years. They clarified that this was not part of the motion but their personal opinion. The commissioner expressed support for keeping development closer to an RE20 standard, emphasizing a preference for larger lots and less overall density while still incorporating open space. They noted that this would be their personal recommendation for the city council to consider as the project moves forward to the development stage. The commissioner invited other commissioners to share additional reasoning or comments.

Chair Nef - added a personal recommendation for the record, emphasizing a preference to keep the project closer to an RE20 standard. They stressed the importance of maintaining larger lots and higher density control, with the suggestion that future development should prioritize more RE20-style lots even while incorporating open space. This recommendation was noted separately from the motion itself for the city council's consideration.

3. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

Annual Meeting Schedule. Consideration of the annual Planning Commission meeting schedule for 2025 (as listed below).

- January 9, 2025
- February 6, 2025
- March 6, 2025
- April 10, 2025
- May 1, 2025
- June 5, 2025
- July 10, 2025
- August 7, 2025
- September 4, 2025
- October 2, 2025
- November 6, 2025
- December 4, 2025

MOTION

- A motion to **Accept** was made by commissioner **KOTTER**
- The motion was **seconded** by Commissioner **STOKES**
- Vote was **UNANIMOUS**

4. OTHER BUSINESS

Reminder 2025 Planning Commission leadership will be appointed by the Planning Commission on January 9, 2025.

5. ADJOURNMENT

A formal thank you was expressed to the city administration for providing a dinner for the commission. Additional thanks were given to Dave Park for bringing pie, which was enjoyed by the commissioners. The commission also expressed appreciation for the staff reports provided, acknowledging the amount of work that went into preparing them.

The meeting was adjourned with no further items discussed.