

MINUTES OF A REGULAR PLEASANT VIEW CITY  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD  
JULY 10<sup>TH</sup>, 2025

[Planning Commission Meeting \(youtube.com\)](#)

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Andy Nef  
Jeff Bolingbroke  
Manya Stolrow  
David Gossner  
Dean Stokes  
Chad Kotter

Excused

Julie Farr  
Sean Wilkinson  
John Morris

**STAFF PRESENT**

Tammy Eveson, Planner I  
Andrea Steineger, City Administrator  
Nitza Osuna, Planner Tech

**VISITORS**

Paul Pitcher – Fox Meadows HOA  
Mary Williams  
Elaine Pitcher  
Richard Saunders  
Jason Thompson  
Matt McBride  
Tami McBride  
Allen Dye

**MINUTES PREPARED BY:**

Nitza Osuna (with the help of AI)

**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 Nef*)  
Declaration of Conflicts of Interest. (*NONE*)

**2. MINUTES**

- a.* Review and consideration to approve the Planning Commission meeting minutes prepared for November 7, 2024, November 21, 2024, and April 17, 2025.

**MOTIONS**

- *Motion to APPROVE minutes by Commissioner Stokes*
- *Seconded by Commissioner Kotter*

**3. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

- a.* Simple Boundary Adjustment: Public Meeting- Consideration of a Simple Boundary Adjustment located at approximately 1594 W Park Circle. (*Presenter: Tammy Eveson*)

It was clarified that there were two parts to this item. Item 3a and 3b are two parts for the same lot.

It was explained that the petitioner was purchasing a portion of the adjacent property to expand their business and the parking lot. There were no comments from engineering or public works, and it did not involve any changes to an easement. The recommendation for that item was to approve.

**MOTION**

- *Motion to APPROVE by Commissioner Stokes*
- *Seconded by Commissioner Bolingbroke*
- *Unanimous*

- b.** *Site Plan Amendment: Public Hearing* – Consideration of a Site Plan Amendment for an addition to an existing business on approximately 2.07 acres, located at 1594 W Park Circle. (Presenter: Tammy Eveson)

The second part of the item was a site plan amendment associated with the business. It was explained that ARW Engineering was proposing an expansion to their facility, adding a new section to the building and an additional parking area. Staff stated that the DRC group had reviewed the proposal to verify that parking requirements for office space were met. Setbacks were also confirmed to be compliant based on surrounding properties, the zone, and building height. The site included proper screening around the dumpsters. Staff noted that it was a clean application with no significant comments or questions. A memo had been sent to the petitioner regarding a few engineering items needing additional information as requested by the city engineer, but nothing major. Everything else appeared to be in order.

Commissioner Neff asked if this item needed a public hearing to which staff member Tammy confirmed that a public hearing was not needed.

The petitioner was asked to come forward.

*Petitioner Questions/comments:*

*The petitioner stated that the proposal was straightforward. A portion of the property was underused due to the shape of the land. With the addition to the existing building and the need for more parking, it made sense to utilize the portion of the property and add the additional parking stalls needed to support the building expansion.*

**MOTION**

- *Motion to APPROVE by Commissioner Kotter \*with recommended conditions from engineering and staff.*
- *Seconded by Commissioner Stokes*
- *Unanimous*

**4. LEGISLATIVE ITEMS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CITY COUNCIL**

- a.** *Rezone: Public Hearing*- Consideration of a rezone for approximately .29 acres of land located at 624 W Fox Meadows Drive, from CP-1 (Planned Commercial) to LSFR – Limited Single Family Residential (Residential) (Presenter: Tammy Eveson)

Staff explained that this item originally came before the commission at the April 17th meeting, along with a general plan amendment to change the zoning designation for the lot in question.

The planning commission had recommended denial of the general plan amendment but it was subsequently approved by the city council on May 27<sup>th</sup>. Staff noted that when the two proposals were first presented to the planning commission, there had been no discussion regarding the rezone application. The rezone application was now being brought back for consideration, using all the information from the original staff report. With the general plan amendment now approved by the city council, the rezone would comply with the updated general plan.

Petitioner Comments/Questions

*Paul Pitcher, a resident of Fox Meadows, stated that Lot 21 is located on the very east end of their retirement community, near the mailbox side. He reported that the residents of the community, as well as residents on the north side of Lot 21, had been surveyed, resulting in over 40 signatures in favor of rezoning to allow a residence to be built on the lot. Mr. Pitcher expressed that the community believed adding a home would enhance the neighborhood rather than allowing other uses. He stated confidence that the rezoning would benefit both the community and the city, including providing a consistent source of utility income from the new residence.*

PUBLIC HEARING

*Motion to OPEN public hearing by Commissioner Stokes  
Seconded to Commissioner Kotter*

*Richard Saunders – Homeowner/business owner in Pleasant View*

*The resident stated that the lot is currently zoned for business, but it is too small to function as a business, with no room for parking and a difficult road turn that would make parking hazardous. The resident noted that if a home is not built or the lot sold for residential use, it would likely become an unsightly weed patch. They emphasized that developing the lot with a home would clean it up, make it presentable, and benefit both the city and the homeowners, describing it as a matter of common sense.*

*Motions to CLOSE public hearing by Commissioner Stokes  
Seconded by Commissioner Bolingbroke*

A commissioner asked staff whether, given the setbacks and the size and shape of the property, the lot would meet the required setback requirements, noting it was a concern. Staff responded that they believed it would, explaining that the lot is about a third of an acre. She noted that the front property line is aligned with the rest of the homes, with a slight angle, and from her review, it appeared that the setbacks could be met. The commissioner confirmed that meeting those setback requirements would be a condition if the lot were approved.

Commission Chair Nef explained that when the entire area was originally developed, there had been extensive discussion and strong community involvement. Many residents had wanted the corridor to remain commercial, but it was ultimately approved for RE5 residential zoning. Part of the negotiations for that RE5 designation involved leaving some areas for commercial use. Staff noted that the bend in the road had not been part of the negotiated plan, which created some conflicts. He added that small commercial uses like a coffee shop have been placed on similar sized lots and would like

to observe how a developer ultimately develops the entire area before making further decisions.

Regarding the bend in the road, a commissioner asked whether the height requirement was due to a UDOT regulation. Staff confirmed that the bend in the road was necessary to maintain the required setback of a certain number of feet from the corner.

A commissioner commented that the lot would make an awkward residential lot, not only because of its shape but also due to a driveway potentially intersecting with nearby commercial space. The commissioner asked if there could be any liability for the city, given that it is a public or private road, in the event of an accident resulting from the mix of residential and commercial use

Staff did not have an answer to the question regarding potential city liability. However, input from another commissioner indicated that the city would likely not be liable and that any accidents would probably be handled by the HOA or other responsible parties. The commissioner also confirmed that the road in question is private.

A commissioner asked a further question about the property south of the lot in question, inquiring where the entrance would be if it were commercially developed, given its proximity to 2700 South. It was clarified that any access to the property would come from Fox Meadow, not 600 West.

#### **MOTION**

- *Motion to recommend APPROVAL by Commissioner Kotter \*with condition that staff review lot lines and setbacks to make sure they meet LSRF requirements.*
- *Seconded by Commissioner Stokes*
- *5 yay / 1 Nay*

#### *Additional Comments*

A commissioner stated that the constraints of the specific lot under discussion need to be considered. They emphasized that these constraints cannot be ignored, acknowledged the original intent of that piece staying commercial, but noted that the limitations are clear and that the city council had voted accordingly with a plan in mind.

A commissioner expressed concern that the original approval had caused considerable controversy, and people had been told that certain concessions were agreed upon. They stated that changing those concessions could affect the community's trust in the city. The commissioner clarified that their concern was not about whether a house would be a good fit, but rather about the implications of altering a concession that had been made originally.

Commission Chair Nef acknowledged that the general plan had been changed and agreed that votes should be based on the general plan. They noted, however, that the decision might not reflect what citizens would have recommended based on past hearings when the plan was first approved. Another Commissioner added that, regarding citizen input, the petitioner had

presented signatures from members of the community indicating support for the proposed change.

The petitioner questioned how Lot 22, now under contract, could claim access to Fox Drive, noting that it is a private street. Staff responded that it depends on how the property was recorded and explained that when Fox Meadow was developed, it was established as a private drive. Any access would need to be negotiated with the HOA, and the city does not get involved in HOA matters. Staff clarified that unless access is specifically recorded in the deed, Lot 22 would not automatically have rights to use the private street. When asked about ingress and egress from 600 West, staff indicated they were not certain but noted that UDOT had specified there was no access from that road, though they did not want to state this definitively for the record.

- b. General Plan Amendment: Public Hearing – Consideration of an application to amend the General Plan to modify the density for a .17 acre portion of 6.31 acres of land located at approximately 475 West Pleasant View Drive, with this modification changing from the current designation of Agricultural (A-2, 1 dwelling unit per 2 acres) to Medium to Low Density Residential (4-8 dwelling units per acre). (*Presenter: Tammy Eveson*)

Staff explained that this a clean-up item. It was originally brought to the commission in September of the previous year. When the general plan amendment and rezone were ultimately approved, there had been discrepancies in the legal description of the boundary lines separating the two zoning designations. This current application was submitted to correct those discrepancies and to include the further north parcel as a potential lot for the LSFR designation.

*No comments from the petitioner Jeff Lee*

PUBLIC HEARING

*Motion to OPEN public hearing by Commissioner Stokes*

*Seconded by Commissioner Stolrow*

*NO COMMENTS*

*Motion to CLOSE public hearing by Commissioner Stokes*

*Seconded by Commissioner Kotter*

MOTION

- *Motion to recommend APPROVAL by Commissioner Kotter*
- *Seconded by Commissioner Stokes*
- *Unanimous*

- c. Rezone: Public Hearing – Consideration of a rezone for approximately .17 acres of land located at 475 West Pleasant View Drive, from A-2 (Agricultural) to LSFR – Limited Single Family Residential (Residential). (Presenter: Tammy Eveson)

PUBLIC HEARING

Motion to OPEN public hearing by Commissioner Stokes  
Seconded by Commissioner Stolrow

NO COMMENTS

Motion to CLOSE public hearing by Commissioner Stokes  
Seconded by Commissioner Stolrow

MOTION

- Motion to recommend APPROVAL by Commissioner Gossner
- Seconded by Commissioner Stokes
- Unanimous

**Additional Items**

A question was raised by Commission Chair Nef about reviewing the LSFR standards to confirm whether maximum and minimum home sizes are specified. It was noted that while maximum size limits may exist, a minimum home size requirement is unclear. One participant stated that a minimum square footage requirement applies to accessory dwelling units, but not to primary residences.

There was discussion about whether the city should require a minimum size for primary homes, with concern expressed about allowing tiny homes throughout the city. It was noted that accessory dwelling units are permitted due to state mandates, but that the city is not required to allow tiny primary homes. It was suggested that restrictions on minimum home size could be addressed through a development's CC&Rs rather than city regulations.

Others expressed concern that imposing a minimum size requirement could infringe on property owners' rights to establish their own CC&Rs. The discussion concluded with a question about whether the city can or should stipulate a minimum size requirement for primary residences.

**5. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned with no further items discussed.