

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR PLEASANT VIEW CITY  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD  
May 5<sup>th</sup> , 2025, at 6:00 P.M.**

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

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Julie Farr  
Jeff Bolingbroke  
David Gossner  
Chad Kotter  
Dean Stokes  
John Morris

**EXCUSED**

Andy Nef  
Manya Stolrow  
Sean Wilkinson

**STAFF PRESENT**

Tammy Eveson, Planner I  
Janitza Osuna, Planner Tech

**VISITORS**

Brad Brown – Stuart Land Company  
Clark Conway  
Landon Hall

**MINUTES PREPARED BY:**

Janitza Osuna (with AI Assistance)

**MINUTES APPROVED:**

January 8<sup>th</sup> 2026

**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) ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

- a. ***Vacate Public Utility Easement*** – *Consideration to vacate a public utility easement on a residential property located at 3060 N 825 W*

An application was received to vacate a public utility easement. The applicant completed the required checklist by contacting all entities with access to the easement and obtained letters of release from each. The City has no intention of using the utility easement for municipal purposes. The property is located in the RE-15 zone, and the easement is situated at the rear of the lot. Based on the letters of release and staff findings, staff recommended approval of the easement vacation.

It was noted that some of the releases provided were allowances for encroachment rather than actual abandonment of the easement. Staff clarified that there is also an easement along one side of the property, but only the rear easement is proposed to be vacated.

Council discussed whether similar issues might arise on other lots, such as Lots 22 and 21, since utilities are now located in the park. Staff explained that at this time only one residence has requested the easement vacation, although the easement does continue further north and additional requests may be possible in the future.

Landon Hall (Applicant) – No comments

***MOTION TO APPROVE***

**MOTION:** Commissioner Kotter

**SECOND:** Commissioner Stokes

**VOTE:** Unanimous

- a. ***Conditional Use Permit*** - Consideration of a Conditional Use Permit for a pole sign for a fast-food restaurant to be located at 1496 W 2700 N. (Presenter: Tammy Eveson)

An application was presented for a conditional use permit for the Chick-fil-A that will be located on the corner of 2700 North and Rulon White. The sign package is currently in the building permit process, pending approval of the conditional use for the pole sign. Staff reviewed the commercial zoning requirements and confirmed that the proposed sign meets all requirements set forth in the C2 zone. A conditional use permit is required to be approved through the Planning Commission, after which the remainder of the process will proceed through the building permit process. Staff noted that the height, setbacks, and square footage meet the requirements of the zone and recommended approval of the conditional use permit.

A commissioner asked whether the sign would be electronic, and another commissioner inquired if it met all illumination requirements.

Staff confirmed that they do meet all requirements.

There was no representative from Chic fil A in attendance.

***MOTION TO APPROVE***

**MOTION:** Commissioner Bolingbroke

**SECOND:** Commissioner Gossner

**VOTE:** Unanimous

- b. ***Site Plan Amendment*** – Consideration of a Site Plan Amendment to an existing business on approximately 1.14 acres, located at 1464 W Stonefield Way. (Presenter: Tammy Eveson)

An application was presented for a site plan amendment for an existing business on Stonefield Way. The applicant is proposing to add a second building on the site, which requires a site plan amendment. Plans have been submitted and reviewed. The proposal meets zoning requirements with the exception of the front yard setback. The zone requires a 20-foot front yard setback, plus an additional foot of setback for every foot of building height above 20 feet. The proposed building height is 24 feet, requiring a 24-foot setback. The applicant will provide an updated site plan reflecting this correction.

A few additional red-line comments from the City Engineer and Public Works Director are also being addressed, and final approval will be conditional upon those corrections. Parking requirements for the proposed warehouse use are met. Staff recommended approval of the site plan amendment subject to the noted conditions.

A commissioner noted uncertainty regarding the parking requirements in the ordinance, stating that the code specifies requirements for up to 20,000 square feet and for over 40,000 square feet, but does not appear to address buildings between 20,000 and 40,000 square feet. The commissioner indicated they would need to verify this, but noted that the information was taken directly from the code.

Applicant was not present.

***MOTION TO APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS***— *Approve site plan amendment with conditions as noted by staff on the staff report and that public works redlines on the site plan are addressed. Also confirm the building setbacks are adjusted based on the height of the building as noted.*

**MOTION:** Commissioner Bollingbroke

**SECOND:** Commissioner Stokes

**VOTE:** Unanimous

### 3) LEGISLATIVE ITEMS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CITY COUNCIL

- a. **Public Hearing Tabled February 6, 2025: Rezone from RE-20 to RE5- Consideration of a rezone for approximately 8.127 acres of land, located at approximately 3885 N Highway 89, from RE-20 Very Low Density Residential to RE-5 High Density Residential. (Presenter: Tammy Eveson)**

This item previously came before the Commission on February 6 along with a zone text amendment, which included a draft ordinance for potential townhome development. The zone text amendment had been reviewed by staff and revised through several iterations with the developers. At that meeting, the rezone request was tabled, while the zone text amendment moved forward to City Council.

City Council reviewed the proposal on April 8 and approved it with modifications, including adoption of several red-line revisions. Changes included adjusting the setback requirement from highways and active railroad rights-of-way from 50 feet to 20 feet, and increasing the parking requirement from 2.25 stalls per unit to 3.25 stalls per unit. The petitioner is now returning to the Commission with the rezone request, applying the new RE-5 zone to the area.

A commissioner asked what the maximum number of residential units could be under the proposed ordinance. Staff responded that the ordinance allows a maximum of eight units per acre, which would result in approximately 64 units on the site. It was noted that while this represents the maximum, the actual number could be lower depending on the site plan. Commissioners also commented that the updated parking requirement is an improvement over the previous version.

One commissioner reiterated concerns about the location of residential development in this area, noting that it is adjacent to the rail line and that the city's master plan

designates different areas for specific uses. The commissioner stated that, while the City Council has already approved the ordinance, they still felt the proposal was out of place and inconsistent with the city's overall planning. They expressed concern that the property had originally been rezoned to accommodate a charter school, and that further residential use represented a "slippery slope."

The commissioner further stated the property might be better suited for commercial use along Highway 89, observing that most surrounding properties in that corridor are commercial or industrial. They acknowledged the need for housing but felt this development would stand out in the future as inconsistent with the city's planning vision.

A commissioner expressed concern that many of the issues with this proposal had not been addressed previously and that changes to the general plan should take into account the entire city and involve citizen input. The commissioner stated that, despite this, the matter is now at its current stage for consideration.

The commissioner noted they had visited the property, walking along the public areas to view the site. They observed that the property presents potential challenges due to its proximity to the railway tracks and surrounding development. They questioned how likely future commercial growth in that area would be and asked if the city is continuing to see new commercial applicants or if growth has begun to stabilize.

#### APPLICANT COMMENTS

##### *Brad Brown – Applicant/Stewart Land Company*

The applicant expressed appreciation for the Commission's consideration and noted that they view the city as a great place to build. They stated that the proposed project would be a positive addition and a benefit to the community, and they are pleased to be moving forward here.

A commissioner asked about safety considerations related to Highway 89, noting the road's high traffic volumes and the potential impact of 64 new residential units. The commissioner inquired whether the applicant had worked with UDOT and what issues had been resolved.

The applicant responded that no new information had been provided by UDOT. They stated that UDOT requested outreach regarding buffer zones but offered no additional recommendations. City Council members had reviewed comparable sites and consulted with planners. The applicant added that UDOT typically relies on established standards for access points, distances, and traffic slowdowns, and compliance with those standards is expected.

A commissioner asked whether the project would have ingress/egress directly onto Highway 89 or if access would be through Capstone.

The applicant responded that both options are being considered. They explained that access through Capstone is planned, but a future roadway is also expected near the site that could provide additional access. At present, UDOT has not granted direct

access to Highway 89. The applicant noted that while a direct connection to 89 may be possible, no site plan has been submitted to that level of detail. The expectation is that any interim access would eventually be replaced by the new roadway once it is constructed, subject to staff approval.

The applicant stated that the target market for the development is first-time homebuyers, such as single professionals, couples, or small families. Many potential residents are local individuals who have grown up in the area, attended college, and wish to return to Pleasant View but cannot yet afford a full-priced home. The applicant emphasized efforts to keep the homes as affordable as possible, noting alignment with broader housing goals set by the governor.

A commissioner revisited the question of ingress and egress, noting that under RE-5 zoning, high-density developments require access to an arterial street system. The commissioner expressed concern that the proposed access may not meet this requirement, suggesting that direct access to an arterial road should be a stipulation before recommending approval.

Staff and the city administrator responded that access requirements are part of both the site plan review and the zoning ordinance, as well as the Fire Marshal's requirements. The intent has been for access to come off Highway 89 via the new road, with Skyline Drive connecting and crossing the railroad tracks. Staff noted that the current access at this location is on property owned by another party and that further verification regarding compliance with arterial access requirements would be conducted.

MOTION TO OPEN PUBLIC HEARING: Commissioner Stokes  
SECOND: Commission Morris

*NO PUBLIC COMMENTS*

MOTION TO CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING: Commissioner Stokes  
SECOND: Commissioner Kotter

***MOTION TO RECOMMEND APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS*** – Motion to recommend approval as presented by staff with verification of ingress/egress requirements from Highway 89 (arterial road) based on the number of units with additional consideration of number of units being over 50.

**MOTION: Commissioner Stokes**  
**SECOND: Commissioner Gossner**  
**VOTE: Unanimous**

#### **4) ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned with no further items discussed.