

**RIVERTON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES  
OCTOBER 9, 2025**

**The Riverton City Planning Commission convened at approximately 6:30 PM in the Riverton City Hall, 12830 South Redwood Road, Riverton, Utah.**

**Planning Commission Members:**

Monique Beck, Vice-Chair  
Crystal Keele  
Troy Rushton  
Evan Matheson  
Shelly Cluff  
Chris Knudsen (Alternate)

**Staff:**

Matt Cassel, City Engineer  
Tim Prestwich, City Planner  
Lisa Halversen, City Planner  
Ryan Carter, City Attorney

**1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL**

In the absence of Chair Darren Park, Vice-Chair Monique Beck called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Mark Machlis led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**2. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**A. “BARROS CONDITIONAL USE – SHORT-TERM RENTAL PERMIT,”  
PLZ-25-2040, AN APPLICATION TO RENT THE PROPERTY AT 1357  
MIDAS POINT COVE AS A SHORT-TERM RENTAL. APPLICANT –  
KATHERIN BARROS.**

Lisa Halversen, Planner, presented the Staff Report and stated that this is an application for a Short-Term Rental Permit. The applicant property is located at 1357 Midas Point Cove. The neighborhood is zoned R-3, which is single-family residential with 14,000 square foot lots. The subject property is 0.44 acres. The existing house was built in 2017, and it is a two-story home with approximately 2,816 square feet above grade and 1,400 square feet finished in the basement. The house has a three-car attached garage. Ms. Halversen explained that the lot is somewhat triangular and has a 117-foot driveway and approximately 40 feet of frontage on Midas Point Cove. The lot is 363 feet deep from the frontage to the back corner. The applicant, Katherin Barros, works out of State for a number of days each month and plans to rent out the unit during the time that she is gone. An agent has been hired to manage the property in her absence. Ms. Halversen reported that this home is the primary residence for Ms. Barros. The applicant is aware of the short-term rental restrictions and ordinances in Riverton City and intends to abide by them.

Ms. Halversen reported that the applicant is out of State currently, but the Owner's Affidavit and Owner Occupancy Affidavit were shared with the Planning Commission. The agent who has been hired to manage the property has been asked to address the

Commission. Ms. Halversen shared the Parking Plan and pointed out that there is a long driveway with plenty of space to park. Images of the home were shared for reference, as well as a copy of the mailer that went out. Ms. Halversen stated that one comment was received previously and another was received earlier in the day. Both comments expressed opposition to short-term rentals in the neighborhood. The requirements for short-term rentals include the following:

- The applicant must own the home and live there;
- Rentals are limited to 150 nights per year;
- Only one rental agreement at a time;
- The owner must give a contact number to neighbors within 300 feet;
- A rental agreement must be for a minimum of two nights and cannot exceed 29 days;
- No more than eight renters at any one time;
- Off-street parking must be provided and used;
- The renter information packet must be posted with contact information;
- The address must be clearly visible on the front of the house;
- The backyard must be fenced;
- Obtain a Conditional Use Permit and a Riverton Business License;
- Comply with Riverton City Noise Ordinance; and
- Property is to be maintained according to Riverton Ordinance.

Ms. Halversen shared the example motion language included in the Meeting Materials Packet. She noted that the Conditions of Approval relate to the number of combined guests and renters. There can be only one rental agreement at a time. Commissioner Troy Rushton asked about the number of days the owner has to occupy the home per year. Ms. Halversen reported that it is 185 days per year, which is just over half the year. Commissioner Shelly Cluff asked how that will be enforced. Ms. Halversen clarified that the City will not monitor how many nights the owner is there, but if the neighbors notice the owner is not around, it is possible for the Code Enforcement Officer to look into the situation. Commissioner Cluff wondered whether data from rental companies is allowed to be requested and used. Ms. Halversen mentioned Condition of Approval #5, which states the applicant shall disclose all advertising materials and shall semi-annually update City Staff about any changes to those.

Commissioner Evan Matheson believed that if there was a call for non-compliance, the rental would be terminated, but if there were three instances of non-compliance, the permit would be revoked. Ms. Halversen explained that there would need to be three instances within a certain timeframe. Commissioner Cluff asked for additional information about violations. For instance, if the violation specifically needs to apply to short-term rental-related activities. Ms. Halversen noted that for a Home Occupation, it comes down to whether there are three violations of the conditions within one year. It was added that the one-year timeframe starts with the commencement of the first violation.

Commissioner Cluff believed the violations have to specifically relate to the conditions of the short-term rental, which was confirmed.

The applicant representative, Mark Machlis, stated that this is a unique house. Ms. Barro travels every so often, so she has a maintenance person on call. Green Ivory Realty handles the rentals and tenants. The house will be managed closely and he believes the neighborhood concerns can be mitigated. Mr. Machlis likes the licensing requirement in Riverton because it provides enforcement tools for everyone. One common concern about short-term rentals has to do with on-street parking. However, this property has a lot of parking on the site. There is room for three vehicles in the garage and five on the driveway.

Commissioner Matheson does not like short-term rentals, as he had one in his neighborhood that was very noisy. He acknowledged the conditions associated with the use of this property and asked how soon someone from the Green Ivory Realty team could get to the site. Mr. Machlis stated that there is someone approximately 10 minutes away from the property. It is a hands-on property management company that ensures tenant issues are handled. All neighbors will be given information cards for Green Ivory Realty, so it is possible for issues to be addressed immediately. He noted that it is also possible to contact the City. Mr. Machlis agreed that short-term rentals can be difficult when there is no licensing in place. When something is licensed, it is possible to ensure that rental rules are followed.

Commissioner Cluff asked if Mr. Machlis will manage the listing, which was confirmed. She asked how the 150 nights per year maximum will be honored. Mr. Machlis explained that there will not be that many opportunities to rent out the home given the schedule of the applicant. The home is her primary residence and she will be there a lot of the time. He added that there is quarterly reporting done. Commissioner Cluff asked if there is an approximation of how often the applicant will be away. Mr. Machlis believes the applicant is away for a week and a half per month at most. There were no further questions.

Vice-Chair Beck opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Matheson noted that while he does not like short-term rentals, it is not possible for him to deny an application for that reason. He is pleased that there are requirements that must be met and that the use can be stopped if the requirements are not met.

**Commissioner Matheson moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE PLZ-25-2040, “Barros Conditional Use - Short-Term Rental,” to be located at 1357 Midas Point Cove, with the following conditions:**

- 1. The site, structures, and use shall remain in compliance with any and all applicable Riverton City standards and ordinances, specifically the**

**City Home Occupation Ordinance (18.190) and applicable Building and Fire Codes.**

2. **Short-term rental must be operated within the rules and regulations for Short-Term Rentals as described in Riverton City Code 18.190.051.**
3. **Applicant must obtain and maintain a Riverton City Business License.**
4. **Applicant shall surrender applicant's Conditional Use Permit for short-term rental use of the subject property in the event the applicant undertakes any other business activity on the subject property, or the applicant shall reapply for a Conditional Use Permit for a short-term rental in a manner, which takes into account the other business activity.**
5. **Applicant shall disclose all Applicant's advertising materials, whether provided to listing agencies or otherwise made available to potential customers and shall semi-annually update City Staff of any changes to said advertising materials.**
6. **There may be no more than 8 combined renters and guests (non-permanent residents) on the property at any given time.**
7. **There may be no more than one rental contract at any given time.**

**The motion was seconded by Commissioner Rushton. Vote on Motion: Vice-Chair Beck – Yes, Commissioner Keele – Yes, Commissioner Rushton – Yes, Commissioner Matheson – Yes, Commissioner Cluff – Yes, Commissioner Knudsen – Yes. The motion passed unanimously.**

- B. **“READER CONDITIONAL USE – SHORT-TERM RENTAL PERMIT,” PLZ-25-2042, AN APPLICATION TO RENT THE PROPERTY AT 4851 MURDOCH PEAK CIRCLE AS A SHORT-TERM RENTAL. APPLICANT – EUGENE READER.**

Ms. Halversen presented the Staff Report and stated that the application is for a Short-Term Rental Permit. The applicant property is located at 4851 Murdoch Peak Circle, which is in the southwest corner of the City. The neighborhood is zoned R-4, which is single-family residential with 10,000 square foot lots. The applicant is Eugene Reader, and the subject property is 0.21 acres. The existing house was built in 1998 and is a rambler with 1,226 square feet above grade and 1,123 square feet finished in the basement. The house has a two-car attached garage. The lot is rectangular with 80 feet of frontage on Murdoch Peak Circle and is 113 feet deep. Ms. Halversen reported that the applicant would like to rent the property out as a short-term rental. When the application materials were submitted, everything was reviewed and verified. There was

some confusion, but that was resolved yesterday. That was the reason for the delay in sharing some of the materials.

Ms. Halversen explained that there was a question about whether the applicant will be living in the home. Mr. Reader has another home in Nevada, so there was some extra documentation requested to make sure this would be his primary residence. Last night, tax documents and a driver's license were submitted that showed that this was listed as the primary residence. His home insurance needs to be modified because currently, the Nevada residence is claimed as the primary residence, and the property in Utah is claimed as a vacation home. According to the applicant, he is in the process of having that changed.

The applicant is aware of short-term rental restrictions and ordinances in Riverton City and intends to abide by them. Ms. Halversen shared the mailer that was sent out. There were several neighbors who expressed concerns about a short-term rental. The qualifications for a short-term rental were reviewed. One of the concerns that was raised with this application was how the applicant could respond to an issue or emergency within an hour if he were in Nevada. The applicant provided a name and phone number of an agent who would respond, but that agent is not present at the Planning Commission Meeting and could not be verified from the information submitted. It is possible for the Commission to further clarify who the agent is and what the response time will look like.

The sample motion language was reviewed. Ms. Halversen informed the Commission that there will need to be a discussion with the applicant to ensure that the Code requirements are met. Based on what has been submitted to Staff, it appears the application meets the requirements. She reiterated that the concerns relate to primary residency and timely response to complaints. There were also issues raised in the submitted public comments.

Commissioner Cluff reported that several of the public comments received referenced multiple police visits to the property. She asked if there is anything in the Code that prohibits a property from being used as a short-term rental if there is a certain level of police activity. Ms. Halversen noted that in the Home Occupation Code, it states that an inordinate amount of City resources cannot be used. She is not sure that police visits would fall under that.

City Attorney, Ryan Carter, reported that there was an allegation about repeat violations of the City parking ordinances because vehicles were parked on the street for extended periods of time. He stated that when a property is operating illegally before coming to the City, the applicant is put on a path to obtain a Conditional Use Permit and have the conditions explained to them. From that point forward, there is monitoring of the operation. Someone having a parking violation in the past does not necessarily mean there is a valid basis to deny an application. However, there might be more to examine here. The Planning Commission can take public comment, continue the public hearing

to the next meeting, and direct Staff to review any law enforcement activity at this residence.

Commissioner Cluff mentioned the three Code violations within a one-year period. If there was a noise problem at 2:00 a.m. and the police were called to handle the situation, she wanted to know whether that report would come to the City as a Code violation. Mr. Carter explained that the City would need to monitor that to make sure there was an awareness of violations at short-term rental properties. There would need to be a periodic check-in to see whether or not there were relevant police reports. Commissioner Cluff asked if this is something that is currently being done. Mr. Carter stated that this is something the City should be doing internally, but he would need to review the extent it is happening right now.

Commissioner Matheson asked about documentation that showed there were three episodes in a prior year. He wanted to know if that provided any grounds to deny a short-term rental application. Mr. Carter was hesitant to answer that question without knowing the direct history of the property. The applicant was asked to address the Commission.

The applicant, Eugene Reader, introduced himself to the Planning Commission. He discussed an instance where there were trash cans in the road, as well as an instance where there was a winter storm and the vehicle on the side of the road was unable to start. The trash cans in the road happened a few years back. He was unsure whether that incident pertains to this application. Mr. Reader discussed the agent who will take care of the property and confirmed that someone can reach the home within the hour. If there is an inappropriate activity taking place at the site, there is a fine system in place and the customer would not be able to rent through the Evolve rental website. As for the Nevada property, he clarified that it is a vacation home. The home he owns in Riverton is his permanent residence.

Commissioner Rushton noted that the Meeting Materials Packet indicates that the primary residence was initially identified as the Nevada property. Mr. Reader clarified that there was some confusion and reiterated that the home in Riverton is his permanent residence. Commissioner Rushton asked if he is at the home in Riverton more than 185 days per year, which was confirmed. Commissioner Ruston next asked for additional information about the agent. Mr. Reader explained that he received updated information from the agent recently. Commissioner Rushton wanted to know if the plan is to rent the Riverton home when he is not there. Mr. Reader confirmed this. He will not be in the home when it is rented.

Commissioner Cluff asked how often Mr. Reader is away from the residence and how often he expects to be renting out the property. Mr. Reader reported that it will be about three weeks at a time. Commissioner Matheson wanted more clarity about how many days the home would be rented out. Mr. Reader explained that the number is uncertain. He does not believe it will be close to three months because he will be in the area frequently.

Vice-Chair Beck opened the public hearing.

*Steven Braithwaite* lives across the street from the subject property. The applicant told his insurance company that his primary residence is in Nevada but informed the City that his primary residence is in Riverton. He knows that this is his primary residence because he is here most of the time. As for the agent, there is no evidence of one. The applicant told someone in the neighborhood that his intention is to rent the home for six months. Mr. Braithwaite does not feel Mr. Reader is being forthright with the Commission.

*Marcia Jensen* lives near the subject property and the seven years she has lived in the City have been interesting. There have been a lot of police officers at this home due to various matters, including constant parking issues. A vehicle is often parked in front of the applicant's home for long periods of time. Other neighbors have expressed reluctance to attend this Planning Commission Meeting due to possible retaliation. The applicant stated to another neighbor that he plans to live in the home for six months and rent it out for six months. That is clearly over the 150 days that are allowed under the Code. Ms. Jensen shared information about how residency is changed and noted that neighbors will ultimately be the ones who monitor how often the applicant is at his home.

There were no further comments. The public hearing was continued.

Commissioner Matheson reported that there were comments submitted by neighbors but some asked that their names not be included for fear of retaliation. It seems like there are major issues that need to be considered. Ms. Halversen clarified that she asked for more documentation from the applicant related to primary residency and an agent who could respond within one hour. The applicant sent an email with a tax document and a Utah driver's license that showed this address as his primary residence. In addition, the name and phone number of an agent were provided. She looked into the property management company, but could not determine whether it was based in Utah. That information came in late last night.

Mr. Carter stated that based on the information presented at the meeting, there has not been clarity provided that an agent exists. As a result, he does not believe there is a complete application at this time. Staff was unable to verify the records that were submitted. The records that were submitted seem to be inconsistent with the testimony from the applicant. The Planning Commission has some options. It is possible to deny the application because there is insufficient proof of an agent. If that is the case, the applicant can obtain an agent and refile the application. The second option is to continue the matter to another meeting and give the applicant another opportunity to produce sufficient evidence that there is a complete application for the Planning Commission to review. Currently, he does not believe there is someone who can be identified as an agent and no one came forward during the meeting.

Commissioner Rushton believes this application should be continued or denied. There are a number of questions that need to be answered. He asked that due diligence be done to determine where the primary residence is located. In addition, an agent needs to be disclosed. Commissioner Rushton suggested that the City Council look at short-term rentals as far as the three violations within one year. There needs to be more clarity about what that actually looks like. It is not a right to have a home-based business, but a privilege. If a resident is using City resources because of police calls or enforcement issues, he does not feel that privilege should be granted. This is something the Council could weigh in on.

Mr. Carter explained that to vote for denial at this stage, there would need to be a better record about the criminal history at this property and how it connects to a proposed short-term rental. His recommendation would be for a continuance so Staff can report back.

Commissioner Rushton wanted additional information about the primary residence and the agent of record. In addition, he would like Staff to ask the City Council for additional information about the meaning of the three violations.

Mr. Carter did not have an issue with an ongoing conversation with the City Council about short-term rentals in the City. He reported that Murray City previously changed its Short-Term, Rental Code, where it is required that the property owner cohabit with the tenant while they are staying at the property. When this happened, information was brought to the City Council, and Council Members were asked if there was interest in following this example. Ultimately, the City Council was not interested in following the example that was set in Murray. The conversation that Commissioner Rushton is encouraging Staff to have with the City Council can happen, but it would not have any impact on the application before the Commission.

Commissioner Rushton wondered whether the application should be denied based on the fact that the primary residence has not been fully disclosed and because no agent has been clearly documented. Commissioner Matheson thought it made sense to continue the application so the applicant has an opportunity to produce that information. Commissioner Rushton reiterated that there should be a City Council discussion about residences with a history of police calls and whether a home-based business is appropriate. He noted that Riverton has one of the better short-term rental policies in place, given the various requirements. However, the City Council needs to discuss situations where incidents occur and whether those incidents should impact the ability to have a home-based business.

There was additional discussion about the best path forward. Commissioner Rushton expressed support for a denial based on what has been presented. This is the first application he has seen with this kind of police activity. Commissioner Cluff had a question for Staff about the primary residence. She asked if there were grounds to question that based on the potential conflict that exists. Ms. Halversen reported that the documents that the applicant submitted the previous night were compelling, as they

included a tax return and a driver's license. Commissioner Cluff mentioned the comments made during the public hearing about the applicant planning to be away from the property for six months. She wanted to know if that was something the neighbors would have to monitor. Ms. Halversen explained that the City will not monitor the number of nights the applicant is physically residing in the home. Mr. Carter pointed out that there can be a Condition of Approval that the property manager issue a report to the City that outlines the days the property manager took care of the property. He reiterated that there is currently no clarity about whether there is an agent.

Commissioner Cluff believes this application should be continued based on some of the missing information. There could be a request for a letter from the agent to verify that they will be handling the property and will be able to respond to complaints within an hour. She would also like a report from Staff on any Code violations at the property so the Planning Commission can properly evaluate how those violations might impact the issuance of a Conditional Use Permit. Commissioner Keele agreed that it is appropriate to continue this application based on the issues that have been raised by others.

Commissioner Rushton asked about the police activity at the subject property and the relevance in relation to the current application. Mr. Carter could not speak to that until he sees the records. Commissioner Rushton questioned whether it would be possible for Staff to look into police activity at residences for future short-term rental applications. He would like that kind of information to be disclosed. Mr. Carter explained that this has not been done previously and there is no Code requirement for that. He shared some sample scenarios and outlined some of the potential limitations.

**Commissioner Cluff moved that the Planning Commission CONTINUE Application PLZ-25-2042, "Reader Short-Term Rental," to be located at 4851 Murdoch Peak Circle, with the following directions to the applicant and Staff:**

1. **Further documentation verifying that an agent has been acquired and will be available within a one-hour timeframe to respond to complaints.**
2. **A report from Staff looking into the criminal record of the applicant and any Code violation records at the property in question.**

**The motion was seconded by Commissioner Keele. Vote on Motion: Vice-Chair Beck – Yes, Commissioner Keele – Yes, Commissioner Rushton – Yes, Commissioner Matheson – Yes, Commissioner Cluff – Yes, Commissioner Knudsen – Yes. The motion passed unanimously.**

**C. “WILLARD’S FARM SUBDIVISION” – PLZ 25-1006, A PRELIMINARY PLAN  
FOR A SUBDIVISION TO BE LOCATED NEAR 3100 WEST 13400 SOUTH.  
APPLICANT – ALAN PRINCE.**

City Planner, Tim Prestwich, presented the Staff Report and stated that the application is for a Preliminary Subdivision Plan. This item is familiar to the Planning Commission as it was continued a few weeks ago. It was noticed for the September 25, 2025, Planning Commission Meeting. The application and the notice that were sent out were shared with Commissioners for reference, as well as the Subdivision Plat. The subdivision is to be located near 3100 West 13400 South. The City Council approved a rezone of the property from RR-22 to R-3 on July 15, 2025. The Planning Commission approved a Conditional Use for a private lane on the property on August 14, 2025. The applicant applied for a subdivision shortly after the Planning Commission approved the use of a private lane.

Mr. Prestwich shared example images of the property and further discussed the private lane. There was a slight bend added to the road due to utility conflicts. He noted that this shift provides screening and makes it feel more like a private lane rather than a public road. Mr. Prestwich pointed out the purple tanks shown on the map and explained that the water will be stored underground. The private lane is 26 feet wide, which allows for parking on one side. All five lots meet the minimum lot size for the zone, which is 14,000 square feet. On a private lane, the lane can be included as part of the lot. All of the utilities and the private lane are private, and the City will not handle maintenance. The homeowners will form an association so the access and maintenance responsibilities can be shared.

There have been some questions about fencing. Mr. Prestwich reported that there is an existing six-foot masonry fence. To the east, there is an existing six-foot vinyl fence and a new six-foot vinyl fence is proposed along the south line of Lot 5 and the east lines of Lots 1, 2, and 3. On the west, there is a new six-foot vinyl fence proposed to match. He reviewed a map of the area and explained that City Ordinance 18.155.080 states that fencing surrounding new developments shall consist of a six-foot masonry fence between non-compatible zones. However, the City Ordinance also provides for small infill developments of less than two acres to request exceptions to solid masonry requirements between non-compatible zones by allowing existing fencing to remain or to waive all or a portion of the fencing requirement. The developer is proposing the fencing described as follows:

- North property line, existing six-foot masonry to remain;
- Lot 5 east property line, existing six-foot vinyl to remain;
- Lot 5 south property line, new six-foot vinyl to match existing;
- Lots 1, 2, and 3 east property line, new six-foot vinyl to match existing; and
- Lots 1, 2, 3, and 4 west property line, new six-foot vinyl to match existing.

The developer is requesting that the Planning Commission allow an exception and that the existing six-foot vinyl fence remain. The fence is valuable to the neighbor because it

is a newer fence. The neighbors do not have animal rights because there is not half an acre, so there is no conflict there. It seems like a reasonable request, but that is something the Planning Commission can determine. Mr. Prestwich reviewed some of the other fences in the area and discussed the nearby zoning. He clarified that the motion in the Meeting Materials Packet is incorrect because there is a reference to Bergstrom Estates. If the Planning Commission makes a motion, he asked that the following language be considered:

- Existing perimeter fencing may remain on the north and the Lot 5 east property line. New solid six-foot vinyl is required along the south property line of Lot 5, the east property line of Lots 1, 2, and 3, and the west property line of Lots 1, 2, 3, and 4.

During the rezone hearing, the neighbors to the west submitted a letter requesting that there be eight-foot masonry because they intend to continue using their animal rights. That letter was not resubmitted but the neighbors were informed that this would be reconveyed to the Planning Commission when it came back. Mr. Prestwich offered to answer questions.

Commissioner Cluff asked about the fencing on the west side. It appeared that the Code specifies that there needs to be written consent from those owners, and she wondered whether that has been received. Mr. Prestwich explained that, based on previous discussions, not receiving that written consent would not preclude the Planning Commission from considering the matter. No written consent was received from the neighbors who wanted the eight-foot masonry fence. Commissioner Cluff pointed out that not only is there no written consent in this case but there is a specific request to do something different. Mr. Prestwich reported that the Planning Commission can weigh all of the evidence and make a decision.

Commissioner Cluff believed that part of the rationale behind a masonry fence when there are animal rights involved has to do with safety. Mr. Prestwich clarified that solid masonry is not required, as there could be hollow or foam core. Some argue that vinyl fences can be reinforced and have equal protection. Commissioner Matheson stated that to the west, horses are there now. If this were a vinyl fence and the horses destroyed it, he wondered whether the animal owners would be liable. Mr. Prestwich explained that the Code does not specify who would replace the fence. Mr. Carter reviewed some possible solutions.

The applicant, Alan Prince, introduced himself and stated that the only question seems to be related to fencing. All of the other items are compliant or exceed the minimum regulations. There are several ways the fencing can be looked at. Mr. Prince mentioned the financial impact of an ordinance that contains blanket policies. There is a difference of approximately \$10,000 per lot based on the fencing. Mr. Prince discussed the neighborhood on the right side of the image shown. There is an existing two-toned vinyl fence. The posts and rails are white, and the body of the fence is taupe. He would like to build a continuation of the same fence. As for the neighbor who has written in about

animals, there is a willingness to put in a six-foot masonry fence coming off the north boundary and down the back side of Lot 4. That is the only place that an animal could gain access to the fence. The two-toned vinyl fence could be continued for the rest of its length.

The hope was that there could be an entry on either side of the road to further distinguish that there is not a public road, but a private road. This entry would also beautify the area further. However, if the fencing must all be masonry, then it will not be possible to include that. Commissioner Matheson asked about the area where the road moves away from the fence. Mr. Prince explained that it will be landscaped to add to the aesthetics of the subdivision.

Vice-Chair Beck opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Rushton stated that the ordinance is clear on the fence requirements. The position of the residents seems to be clear as well. He believes what moves ahead should meet the requirements. Commissioner Matheson reported that he has horses and if he were the property owner, he would not have a problem with a vinyl fence as long as it was masonry in the further north section. If the applicant can obtain a letter of agreement from the property owners expressing support for this hybrid proposal, that would be beneficial. He wondered if it was possible to have approval contingent on an agreement with the adjacent property owner. Mr. Prince pointed out that the Planning Commission has the authority to decide on the fencing due to the small nature of the parcel of land. If it is under two acres, the Planning Commission can make a decision about an exception. He would prefer that the fence match from one end to another, but as a compromise for a concerned neighbor, there is a willingness to have a masonry wall for the portion of Lot 4 that abuts the neighboring property. That seems to address the issue well.

Commissioner Rushton asked if the applicant had spoken to the neighbor about this option, but was denied. Mr. Prince was aware that a letter was submitted to the City requesting an eight-foot masonry wall, but if a masonry wall is required, it would only need to be six feet. He reiterated his earlier proposal to have a portion be masonry with the rest as a vinyl fence.

There was discussion about the hybrid fence proposal, where a portion would be masonry and a portion would be vinyl. There was some support for this proposal expressed by Commissioners. Commissioner Matheson thought the compromise proposed made sense. Commissioner Knudsen stated that the neighbor who lives next door has expressed a preference for a masonry fence. His position has to do with the fact that there are two different zones abutting. He recognizes that there are only horses on one lot, but based on the fact that there are two different zones, he feels it is appropriate to have a masonry fence from Lot 1 through Lot 4. Commissioner Rushton likes the hybrid solution proposed. It was pointed out that \$10,000 could be added to home purchase prices because of the fencing.

**Commissioner Cluff moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE PLZ-25-1006, "Willard's Farm Subdivision," with the following conditions:**

1. **Subdivision lots and private land layout shall be consistent with the plans presented to the Planning Commission except where otherwise noted.**
2. **Applicant must apply for Final Plat approval.**
3. **Final Plan and Plat to be reviewed and approved by City Staff.**
4. **Final Plat must be recorded with Salt Lake County.**
5. **Applicant must fix any outstanding Riverton City Staff redline comments on the plat and plans.**
6. **The applicant must obtain any necessary approvals or permits from applicable outside agencies or jurisdictions.**
7. **Private lane and turnaround must meet City and Fire Department requirements.**
8. **Storm drainage systems and accommodations comply with the Riverton City standards and ordinances, and with the recommendations of the Riverton City Engineering Division.**
9. **The Applicant must create and agree to follow a Long-Term Storm Water Management Plan according to Riverton City standards and ordinances.**
10. **A Land Disturbance Permit must be issued by the City prior to any construction grading on the site.**
11. **The site and structures shall comply with any and all applicable Riverton City standards and ordinances, including the International Building and Fire Codes.**
12. **The private lane and utilities in the private lane are to be owned and maintained by the property owners. No City maintenance will take place on infrastructure outside the public right-of-way or outside a recorded City easement.**
13. **Private lane must be installed before Building Permits are issued.**

**14. Masonry fencing to be required on the west lot line of Lot 4, and the remainder of the proposed fencing be approved, as presented.**

**The motion was seconded by Commissioner Matheson. Vote on Motion: Vice-Chair Beck – Yes, Commissioner Keele – Yes, Commissioner Rushton – Yes, Commissioner Matheson – Yes, Commissioner Cluff – Yes, Commissioner Knudsen – No. The motion passed 5-to-1.**

**D. “12600 SOUTH RETAIL FAÇADE UPGRADE,” PLZ-25-8016, AN AMENDED SITE PLAN APPLICATION TO UPGRADE THE FACADES ON PETERSON’S MARKET, LITTLE CAESARS, AND A STRIP MALL. APPLICANT – COURTNEY TAYLOR.**

Mr. Prestwich presented the Staff Report and stated that the application relates to façade upgrades on a major retail center in the downtown area, including Peterson’s Market, the adjoining strip mall, and the Little Caesars buildings. These were originally built in 1985 and have been remodeled and renovated several times over the years. Mr. Prestwich shared images of the area and discussed the current design style. The City recently updated the Commercial Architectural Standards in the Commercial Downtown Zone and the newly proposed renovation for the exteriors is subject to this. He shared renderings that illustrate what is currently proposed. There will be a variation on each storefront to highlight the entrances. There is a sense of place created for each of the businesses. There are fairly substantial updates proposed, as well as meaningful modernization. The west and north sides of the building will be painted the same colors as the front. The existing beige color, which is the overall color of the building, will remain the same moving forward. That color will be accented with the other colors that are shown in the submitted materials.

Mr. Prestwich identified the roofline that corresponds with the rooftop, which sits 2.18 feet below the parapet. There is uncertainty about whether this roofline sits below or is equivalent to the parapet line. He shared information about the design of the Little Caesars building as well as the exterior building materials and colors. He explained that this zone requires brick on the buildings. On the Peterson’s Market building, it is prominent on the columns, which are made out of brick. The Planning Commission can discuss what the brick should look like based on the architectural requirements related to cohesion and consistency. Mr. Prestwich reported that there is a sample motion included in the Meeting Materials Packet. Neighborhood notices were sent out, and there was one call of inquiry received.

Commissioner Cluff asked about the brick that is proposed. She wanted to know if it will be new brick or if the existing brick will be used. It was clarified that the existing brick is anticipated to remain. Information about the roofing area was shared with the Commission. Commissioner Matheson wondered if the equipment on the roof will be visible. He asked the applicant to speak to this and also asked if it needs to be shielded in the back.

The applicant, Scott Irvine, introduced himself to the Planning Commission. He explained that this process began several years back when there were City discussions about improving this area of downtown Riverton. There were some plans created, which have now been presented to the Planning Commission. As far as the parapet wall, it will stay the same on Little Caesars. The brick on the Peterson's Market building will remain. On Little Caesars, it will be covered because the existing brick would look dated. Commissioner Rushton asked to review the photograph from the back of the Peterson's Market building. He acknowledged that the residences were built after this building, but asked about possible screening in the back. Mr. Prince explained that there is no structure being changed. None of the work is structural, as it is all façade-related work. A parapet wall on the back would be structural, and there is no willingness to move forward with something like that.

Vice-Chair Beck opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was closed.

**Commissioner Rushton moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE PLZ-25-8016, "126<sup>th</sup> Retail Façade Upgrade," Amending the Site Plan of the Existing Commercial Buildings, located at 1722 to 1774 West 12600 South with the following conditions:**

1. **Building materials and color will match the submitted plans, as shown and approved by the Planning Commission.**
2. **Any landscaping changes must be submitted to City Staff for review for compliance with existing Code requirements.**

**The motion was seconded by Vice-Chair Beck. Vote on Motion: Vice-Chair Beck – Yes, Commissioner Keele – Yes, Commissioner Rushton – Yes, Commissioner Matheson – Yes, Commissioner Cluff – Yes, Commissioner Knudsen – Yes. The motion passed unanimously.**

Commissioner Rushton mentioned the earlier comment from the applicant that there was work done for a number of years with the City. Information about that process was shared.

**3. DECISION ITEMS**

- A. **NONE.**

**4. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

- A. **NONE.**

**5. MINUTES**

**A. PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES FROM THE SEPTEMBER 25, 2025, MEETING.**

Commissioner Matheson moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE the Minutes from the Planning Commission Meeting on September 25, 2025, as reported. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Keele. Vote on Motion: Vice-Chair Beck – Yes, Commissioner Keele – Yes, Commissioner Rushton – Yes, Commissioner Matheson – Yes, Commissioner Cluff – Yes, Commissioner Knudsen – Yes. The motion passed unanimously.

**6. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:18 p.m.