

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
CITY COUNCIL OF PLEASANT VIEW CITY, UTAH**

September 23, 2025

The public meeting was held at City Hall, 520 W Elberta Drive, Pleasant View, Utah, commencing at 6:00 P.M.

MAYOR:

Leonard Call

COUNCILMEMBERS:

Ann Arrington
Steve Gibson
David Marriott
Philip Nelsen
Sara Urry

STAFF:

Andrea Z Steiniger
Laurie Hellstrom
Tyson Jackson
Stetson Talbot

VISITORS:

David Laloli	Meredith Aardema
Johnny Ferry	

1. Introduction.

- a. **Pledge of Allegiance and Opening Prayer, Reading or Expression of Thought: (Councilmember Phil Nelsen)**
- b. **Declaration of Conflicts of Interest.** None given.
- c. **Public Comments/Questions for the Mayor & Council (limited to 3 minutes).**
None given.

2. Consent Items.

a. Minutes of September 9, 2025, and the bills of Pleasant View City.

Motion was made by CM Gibson to approve the minutes of September 9, 2025, and the bills of Pleasant View City. 2nd by CM Urry. Voting Aye: CM Arrington, CM Gibson, CM Marriott, CM Nelsen and CM Urry. 5-0

3. Zone Text Amendment – Public Hearing. Discussion and consideration to amend the RE-20 Residential Zone and the Definitions of Chapter 18 by adding cemetery as a conditional use and adding the definition of cemetery, Ordinance 2025-21. (Presenter: Tammy Eveson)

Motion was made by CM Arrington to go into a public hearing to consider amending the RE-20 Residential Zone and the Definitions of Chapter 18 by adding cemetery as a conditional use and adding the definition of cemetery. 2nd by CM Marriott. Voting Aye: CM Arrington, CM Gibson, CM Marriott, CM Nelsen and CM Urry. 5-0

Andrea Steiniger: we are working in partnership with Ben Lomond Cemetery on the property on 1000 W. In order to add a cemetery, we either need to change the zone or add cemetery in the current zone (RE-20). The planning commission was concerned with personal use of a

cemetery and then added the 5 acres as a condition for the use. Andrea Steiniger read the proposed definition of cemetery and listed the zones that currently allow it. The planning commission also wanted to add community use in the definition, but we are not sure how to incorporate it. CM Urry: it could be unnecessary. Mayor Call asked for comments from the public. None were given.

Motion was made by CM Urry to end the public hearing. 2nd by CM Gibson. Voting Aye: CM Arrington, CM Gibson, CM Marriott, CM Nelsen and CM Urry. 5-0

CM Gibson: is a private cemetery already against the law? CM Nelsen: yes, not on private property, but I could start a cemetery. CM Arrington: why add it to the zone? Andrea Steiniger: this is the current zone of the property. CM Urry: we are putting in the restriction of 5 acres. CM Nelsen: that doesn't bother me to add cemetery to zone. Mayor Call: there were a lot more items in the definition that we took out. CM Gibson: will they allow head stones? Andrea Steiniger: it is not a restriction here. Mayor Call: Ben Lomond Cemetery prefers not to have them because it is easier to mow. Andrea Steiniger: that is not part of this. We only added the 5-acre restriction.

Motion was made by CM Gibson to approve Ordinance 2025-21 (amending the RE-20 Residential Zone and the Definitions of Chapter 18 by adding cemetery as a conditional use and adding the definition of cemetery) but take out 'community use'. 2nd by CM Urry. Voting Aye: CM Arrington, CM Gibson, CM Marriott, CM Nelsen and CM Urry. 5-0

4. Hillsborough Drive Funding Participation. Discussion and consideration to participate in the funding of Hillsborough Drive. (Presenter: Andrea Steiniger)

Summary:

Background:

- Hillsborough Drive is a privately-owned road (currently by Sean Myers) but has been used and maintained by the city (plowing, repairs).
- The road is substandard and needs upgrades if the proposed subdivision and hotel development move forward.
- The road is on the city's Master Road Plan, meaning future plans expect it to become a public road.

Key Issues Discussed:

1. Engineer Estimate & Cost Sharing:
 - Updated engineering estimates were presented, excluding private lateral connections but including public infrastructure improvements.
 - Total improvement cost is approximately \$284,489.
 - City is considering contributing a flat amount of \$50,000 rather than a percentage.
2. Ownership & Development:
 - Sean Myers owns the road and adjacent land; developers want to subdivide and build a Microtel Hotel (approx. 60–65 rooms).
 - Developers and Sean Myers will cover road upgrade cost but are asking for a contribution.
 - City's participation is not legally required but the city feels they should contribute something because it has been used by the city.
3. Public vs Private Road Debate:
 - Some members questioned whether the road must be public or if it could stay private with public access (similar to the nearby Rush development).
 - Arguments for keeping it private:
 - City avoids costs (no maintenance or snow plowing).
 - Road still provides cross-access.
 - Arguments for making it public:
 - Already used as a public road.

- On the master road plan.
- Improves emergency response access.
- Future traffic will increase due to hotel and surrounding development.

4. Prescriptive Use and Legal Considerations:

- The city may have a prescriptive use claim, but legal counsel needs to confirm whether this obligates the city to make the road public or upgrade it.

5. Traffic Concerns and Data:

- Several officials suggested gathering traffic counts to determine how heavily the road is currently used and how future development will impact usage.
- A traffic counter will be deployed to collect data.
- No formal study is planned.

Motion was made by CM Arrington to table any participation in funding of Hillsborough Drive for traffic count data done by the police department for 2 weeks and check the prescriptive easement with legal. 2nd by CM Nelsen. Voting Aye: CM Arrington, CM Gibson, CM Marriott, CM Nelsen and CM Urry. 5-0

5. Budget Amendment – Public Hearing. Discussion and consideration to amend the 2025-2026 fiscal year budget, Resolution 2025-O. (Presenter: Laurie Hellstrom)

Motion was made by CM Urry to go into a public hearing to consider amending the 2025-2026 fiscal year budget. 2nd CM Arrington. Voting Aye: CM Arrington, CM Gibson, CM Marriott, CM Nelsen and CM Urry. 5-0

Summary Budget Amendment for the creation of a CRA:

Main Topics Discussed:

1. Budget Amendment for CRA Consultant

- A consultant is needed to explore creating a CRA (Community Reinvestment Area) for Wise Bakery.
- Consultant cost estimated between \$4,500–\$25,000.
- The budget currently does not include RDA (Redevelopment Agency) funds, only general funds.
- Suggestion: Hold a public hearing next meeting to amend the RDA budget instead, which is the more appropriate funding source.

2. Reimbursement Concerns

- Consultant believes costs can be reimbursed by the developer through CRA creation fees and ultimately recouped via Tax Increment Financing (TIF).
- City would initially pay upfront, and developer would eventually pay back using tax revenues from the project.

3. TIF Concerns & Equity

- Criticism of TIFs:
 - Shifts tax burden to residents and existing businesses.
 - Potential loss of future tax revenue that could otherwise offset city tax increases.
 - Risk of multiple taxing entities (e.g. schools, fire districts) giving away their portions and raising taxes later to make up the loss.
 - Seen by some as unfair and harmful, benefiting one company at the public's expense.
- Defense of TIFs:
 - It can help transform vacant land into high-value developments, increasing long-term tax base.
 - Previous RDA projects resulted in significant city gains.
 - Must include strong performance clauses (e.g. job creation, environmental benefits).

- CRA agreements can be structured with reversion clauses if terms aren't met.

4. Key Disagreements

- Some members believe:
 - The Rise Company is building with or without TIF, so the incentive may be unnecessary.
 - TIF might not deliver tangible infrastructure benefits to Pleasant View.
- Others argue:
 - It's a small short-term sacrifice for a large long-term gain in tax revenue and city growth.
 - Pleasant View is one of the few cities not using CRAs, possibly missing out on development opportunities.

5. Next Steps

- Decision postponed.
- Plan to revisit at the next meeting after setting a public hearing to amend the RDA budget.

6. General Sentiment

- The council is cautious about overusing TIFs but also recognizing their potential benefits if used responsibly.
- Broad consensus that any CRA/TIF agreement must be transparent, limited in scope, and tied to measurable outcomes.

Summary of Other Budget Adjustments:

1. Storm Surf Fund – Vehicle Maintenance Increase

- Request: Increase expenditure by \$50,000 for street sweeper repair.
- Reason: An incident involving unleaded fuel being put into a diesel engine, causing significant engine damage.
- Estimated Costs: Fuel system needs to be drained; injectors and pumps replaced.
- Vehicle Value: Originally purchased for \$300K–\$350K around 2018–2019; still considered worth repairing.
- Insurance: City is investigating insurance coverage but must budget for full cost regardless.

2. CIP (Capital Improvement Plan) Budget

- Mostly involves carrying over items from the previous fiscal year.
- No major new projects introduced—just continuation of existing ones.

3. Pickleball Court Refurbishment

- Original Budget: \$500
- Actual Cost: Just under \$1,100
- Issue due to a misunderstanding or miscommunication—possibly the vendor thought \$500 each, not total.
- The overage may be covered by a population grant fund, but it still needs to be formally budgeted.

Motion was made by CM Gibson to end the public hearing. 2nd by CM Nelsen. Voting Aye: CM Arrington, CM Gibson, CM Marriott, CM Nelsen and CM Urry. 5-0

Motion was made by CM Gibson to adopt Ordinance 2025-O, amending the budget and the section for the CRA amendment. 2nd by CM Arrington. Voting Aye: CM Arrington, CM Gibson, CM Marriott, CM Nelsen and CM Urry. 5-0

6. Speed Limits and Traffic Safety. General discussion on speed limits and traffic safety. (Presenter: Mayor Call)

Summary: The city council engaged in a broad discussion regarding speed limits and traffic safety, focusing on consistency, safety near schools, and problematic intersections.

Key Points:

1. Inconsistent Speed Limits on Collector Roads:

- Multiple roads (e.g. 600 West, 500 West, 4300 North, 1000 West) have inconsistent speed limits (ranging from 25 to 40 mph), creating confusion.
- There was support for standardizing minor collector roads to 35 mph, but also recognition that context matters (e.g., proximity to schools, housing density, and street width).
- Some roads (e.g., 4300 North) were seen as too slow at 25 mph, with no nearby homes.

2. Specific Roads and Concerns:

- 2550 Road: Suggested speed reduction to 35 mph (from 40) due to narrowness, parked cars, and school traffic.
- 1000 West: Has variable speeds (30 to 40 mph) and school crossings; discussion about possibly lowering to 30 mph in some segments.
- 500 West & Shady Lane: Mentioned as roads where drivers must ride brakes due to overly low speed limits.

3. Need for Traffic Studies:

- Council acknowledged past speed studies done on roads like 1000 West and 600 West.
- Requested that staff revisit the data to inform decisions rather than apply a blanket policy.
- Emphasized that each road may require case-by-case analysis due to multiple factors (e.g., truck routes, school zones, curves, and blind spots).

4. Intersection Safety – 600 West & Elberta:

- Public requests for a roundabout or traffic light.
- Council and police were skeptical, citing that signage (e.g., "cross traffic does not stop") might be a better solution.
- Since changes 10 years ago, there were only 33 accidents total (about 3/year), not enough to justify major changes.
- Most incidents attributed to driver distraction, not intersection design.

5. Accepted Speeds & Enforcement Realities:

- Police typically don't ticket until a driver exceeds the posted limit by 7 mph (e.g., 37 in a 30 zone).
- Higher posted limits effectively raise the "real" speed drivers can travel without penalty.
- Caution urged when increasing limits, as accepted speeds could become unsafe (e.g., 47 mph on a 40 mph road).

6. Other Points Raised:

- Pleasant View Drive & 600 West was highlighted as a more problematic intersection than 600 & Elberta due to offset alignment and poor visibility.
- Suggestion to rename Hillsborough Drive if it becomes a full city street, for consistency with surrounding development.

Conclusions & Next Steps:

- General support for simplifying and standardizing speed limits where appropriate.
- Emphasis on data-driven decisions rather than blanket changes.
- City staff to pull previous traffic studies and revisit key roads and intersections.
- More community input and formal proposals expected in future meetings.

7. Sewer Easement Encroachment Agreement. Discussion and consideration to approve a Sewer Easement Encroachment Agreement with MHP#1, LLC and Ashely Smith in the Wasatch Estates Mobile Home Park. (Presenter: Mayor Call)

Summary: The city council discussed and approved a sewer easement encroachment agreement involving MHP #1 LLC and Ashley Smith for Lot 31 in the Wasatch Estates Mobile Home Park.

Background:

- A permit was issued for placing a mobile home on Lot 31 based on a hand-drawn site plan that indicated the home would be 10 feet away from the city-owned sewer easement.
- Upon inspection, it was found that the mobile home was placed within the easement, which is typically not allowed.
- The homeowner, Ashley Smith, had already sold her previous home, making her essentially homeless.

Agreement Terms:

- After discussions with legal teams, the city, MHP LLC, and Ashley Smith reached an agreement allowing the home to remain encroaching on the easement.
- The agreement holds the city and Ashley Smith harmless:
 - If emergency or routine sewer work is required and the home needs to be moved, the trailer park is responsible for all costs (estimated at \$30,000).
 - The agreement is temporary and terminates once the home is moved—no future homes may encroach on the easement.
 - The agreement will be recorded with-the-land, so it applies to future owners as well.

Additional Context:

- City staff and legal reviewed and supported the agreement as a reasonable compromise under the circumstances.
- It was noted that the likelihood of needing to access the sewer line is very low, but not impossible.
- Some sewer line segments are older, though future maintenance could include U-lining to avoid excavation.

Motion was made by CM Marriott to adopt the Sewer Easement Encroachment Agreement with MHP#1, LLC and Ashely Smith in the Wasatch Estates Mobile Home Park. 2nd by CM Nelsen. Voting Aye: CM Arrington, CM Gibson, CM Marriott, CM Nelsen and CM Urry. 5-0

8. Other Business.

Tyson Jackson: thanks to all the staff and everyone with all our projects going on. We are down three positions.

Stetson Talbot: we are fully staffed. We hired a new officer with 30 years, Kevin Smith. All the officers seem to be doing well after all the events. We may be going back to having shotguns with bean bags which is less lethal. Our detectives are doing good. We generally have 80 – 130 cases and we are down to 12. The part-time officers are filling in shifts. I am uncomfortable without double coverage. I watch our pay scales and how competitive we are, but some officers are topping out and I don't want them to top out.

Andrea Steiniger: public works also have the same pay scale problems. If you have been watching the news, I just want to say that we have really great police officers at Pleasant View and I would hope that any interaction between them and any councilmember would be civil and professional.

CM Nelsen: when will Chick-Fil-A be opening? CM Urry: before Thanksgiving.

CM Urry: Food Trucks ended last night. We have a good YCC crew. October 25th is the Pumpkin Palooza.

Mayor Call: there is a public hearing on the closure of Lomond View Elementary October 1st.

CM Marriott: I had a meeting with Stetson, and this is because he made goals. We need a meeting with the North Ogden Canal. There are issues west of 1100 W and in Rocky Meadow Subdivision. CM Arrington: we wanted them to come back and let us know what improvements they have made. Mayor Call: they don't have directives, and the members are getting older.

CM Gibson: how is the policing of the crosswalks? Stetson Jackson: there is a - no tolerance there. CM Gibson: there is a Meet the Candidates on September 29th, can we advertise? Andrea Steiniger: it was in the newsletter.

9. Closed Meeting. Consideration for a closed meeting pursuant to one or more of the provisions of the Utah Open and Public Meetings Law, Utah Code § 52-4-205(1).

None.

10. Adjournment: 7:53 P.M.