

**RIVERTON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
FEBRUARY 26, 2026**

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:

Darren Park, Chair
Monique Beck
Gary Cannon
Crystal Keele
Evan Matheson
Joe Marzo

Staff:

Jason Lethbridge, Development Services Director
Tim Prestwich, City Planner
Ryan Carter, City Attorney
Matt Cassel, City Engineer
Lisa Halversen, City Planner

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Chair Darren Park called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. Commissioner Marzo led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. "TIMBERLINE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT," PLZ-25-4009, A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT, GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT, AND REZONE OF APPROXIMATELY 4.24 ACRES LOCATED AT 13518 SOUTH REDWOOD ROAD. APPLICANT – RANDY SMITH, FIELDSTONE HOMES.

Development Services Director, Jason Lethbridge, reported that significant changes had been made to the Development Agreement since it was last presented to the Planning Commission. A Development Agreement functions differently from other land use changes as it provides for standards other than what currently exists in the property's zone.

The 4.24-acre subject property was identified on the Vicinity Map, and Mr. Lethbridge reported that the existing zoning was Commercial Neighborhood ("CN") and Rural Residential ("RR-22"). The City Council previously considered an application for a large-animal veterinary clinic on one parcel and approved its rezoning to CN, but that project did not move forward. CN is the City's most restrictive commercial zone; most uses are conditional and limited to those that are more compatible with residential areas. The proposed zone was RM-8.

The General Plan designates the property Medium-Density Residential (0.25-acre minimum lot size) and Estate-Density Residential (0.50-acre minimum lot size). Mr. Lethbridge reported that the General Plan is an advisory guide for land use decisions but is not a binding document. The application included a request to designate the subject property Medium-High Density Residential.

Mr. Lethbridge reported that comments had been received about an existing house in the project area. Based on the submitted Site Plan, the house would be demolished and replaced with an access road. It was brought to the City's attention that the home was placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1992. However, the registry is a tracking device and does not restrict property owners' rights. If federal funding was received for the property, there may be additional requirements, but there were no specific restrictions against demolishing the structure. The Riverton City Historic Preservation Commission requires a 10-day grace period to document the location prior to demolition. An advantage of being on the National Register is that a great deal of information about the property had been preserved.

The original Concept Plan was reviewed indicating two stub roads into the property, one each from the west and north. The original concept showed 1775 West as a public right-of-way connecting to Redwood Road. An existing cul-de-sac would not connect to the project, but space would be left available to connect to the property to the south. The Planning Commission previously heard and tabled the item pending further discussion by the City Council. The applicant subsequently modified the site layout based on direction from the Council and consultation with Staff. The roadway to the west will remain unchanged, and 1775 West will be extended to provide a compliant turnaround for emergency vehicles and become part of the public right-of-way. Walkways that connect to other neighborhoods were also included in the Concept Plan. Mr. Lethbridge displayed photographs of a neighborhood with a similar configuration as that planned for 1775 West.

A total of 30 units on approximately 3,000-square-foot lots was proposed. The internal alleyway will be 20-feet wide on its northern and southern ends and expand to 28 feet adjacent to the fire hydrant. Current City Code only allows narrow widths on private lanes serving two lots or less. Because the proposal was outside of City standard, the applicant provided renderings showing full driveway widths off of the 20-foot alleyway. Mr. Lethbridge also presented aerial photographs of the 20-foot private lanes in Daybreak.

The Development Agreement proposed the following minimums:

- Lot size: 3,000 square feet
- Front setback: 20 feet (home and garage)
- Side setback: 5 feet
- Rear setback: 8 feet
- Private road width: 20 feet

The RR-4 Zone specifies the following minimums:

- Lot size: 10,000 square feet
- Front setback: 15 feet home, 25 feet garage
- Side setback: 8 feet (10 feet on garage side)
- Rear setback: 25 feet
- Private road width: 25 feet

The RM-6 Zone is limited to single-family detached homes. RM-8 allows attached, multi-family homes. The minimums for those zones are:

- Lot size: 5,000 square feet
- Front setback: 15 feet home, 20 feet garage
- Side setback: 5 feet
- Rear setback: 15 feet
- Private road width: 26 to 28 feet

Masonry fencing was proposed along Redwood Road, with six-foot vinyl fencing for the remainder of the project perimeter. Mr. Lethbridge reported that whether the turnaround area is fenced off from the rest of the development or left open was not addressed in the Development Agreement.

Mr. Lethbridge reported that Riverton Cove, located west of City Hall, was developed as RM-6 with lot sizes between 5,000 and 6,000 square feet. It meets all setback requirements of the zone. The private lane is 28 feet of asphalt width with sidewalk on one side. Another project near 3600 West and Water Street was also developed under RM-6 and has road widths between 25 and 32 feet.

The Planning Commission had the option to recommend approval of the application with the proposed conditions outlined in the Staff Report, recommend denial, or recommend approval with modifications. The previous public hearing was closed, but City Attorney, Ryan Carter recommended that it be opened for additional comment.

Chair Park referred to Section 4.1.3 of the Development Agreement, which specifies an eight-foot front setback. Mr. Lethbridge reported that there was a discrepancy between the written agreement and the Site Plan, which indicates a 20-foot setback. He spoke with the applicant, and it was confirmed that the intended front setback is 20 feet. That was corrected in the file copy of the Development Agreement.

Commissioner Cannon expressed concern about the narrow private lane and the lack of sidewalks in the interior of the project. He liked that the access to 1775 West had been changed, but believed the roads were too narrow. He was on the Planning Commission at the time the 28-foot road was approved, and the approval was conditioned on gates being installed. The applicant then wanted to eliminate the gate on the grounds that the roads were too narrow. The subject property is one of the last parcels on Redwood Road that could support larger lots, and Mr. Nokes had indicated that he would entertain an offer to extend the road onto his property. That road could then be stubbed to the south and back to Redwood Road, which could potentially create one to two more lots in the subdivision.

Commissioner Matheson asked if any development was projected to the south. Mr. Lethbridge stated that equipment has been on the property for some time, but he was not aware of any active construction or development plans.

Commissioner Matheson stated that 13550 South is designated as a future through street, which he understood many residents were opposed to. He was pleased to see that the proposed roadways had been modified. Mr. Lethbridge reported that the direction provided by the City Council was not in deference to either the developer or neighboring property owners. Rather, the connection of the roadways to Redwood Road created as many problems as it would have solved, and it was best decision for both the existing road network and future development.

Chair Park asked if “no parking” signage would be required on the 20-foot alleyway. Mr. Lethbridge reported that both the City and Fire Code require parking to be prohibited. Staff had concerns about how the narrow roadways would function even without parking.

In response to a follow-up question from Chair Park, Mr. Lethbridge reported that any change to the General Plan must first be considered by the Planning Commission prior to action by the City Council. Applicants have the right to request amendments to the General Plan.

The applicant, Randy Smith with Fieldstone Homes, stated that he believes the new Site Plan works well. They had no opinion on whether to connect the roads, and the plan was modified at the City Council’s direction. The 20-foot private road was necessary due to site constraints and to provide for the 20-foot front setback. The Development Agreement originally specified eight-foot front setbacks and a wider road. To address parking concerns, the setback was increased to allow for full driveways. The opportunity existed to widen the roads if the front setbacks were reduced. However, they have built 20-foot roads in Daybreak and Bluffdale, and they do work. They originally intended to build townhomes on the property but Staff requested that they consider a single-family detached product.

Commissioner Beck asked about snow removal on the narrow roads. Mr. Smith stated that snow would be pushed to the open areas of the site. As it is a private road, the Homeowners’ Association (“HOA”) will be responsible for snow removal.

Commissioner Matheson asked if the applicant had considered rezoning the property to RM-6. Mr. Smith stated that RM-6 would only allow half as many units, which would double the land and infrastructure costs for every unit. The proposed Site Plan allows for homes on both sides of a looped road, which is very efficient and creates a product that he believes is of value in Riverton. The homes will sell for over \$500,000.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Keele, Mr. Smith stated that it would be possible to add sidewalks if the front setbacks were reduced. It will be a small community, and traffic is slower on narrow roads. The setback required for sidewalks may prevent residents from parking in their driveways, but the homes will have two-car garages, and additional guest parking will be provided. Chair Park stated that he was initially concerned about parking, but the 20-foot setback would allow for parking of two cars in the garage and two in the driveway.

Mr. Smith stated that they had conversations with the Nokes family, but they are not ready to sell their property. They also had pre-application meetings with UDOT, and the access road was moved to the south at their request. UDOT had no concerns about the amount of traffic that would be added to Redwood Road. Chair Park remarked that the Planning Commission's initial traffic concerns were in regard to residents turning left into and out of the development, but that is a UDOT issue.

Prior to opening the public hearing, Chair Park indicated that all emailed comments received for both public hearings had been reviewed by the Planning Commission.

Chair Park opened the public hearing.

Donna Kessler stated that she lives on 13550 South. Children walking to and from the elementary school cross at 13400 South and walk down 13550 South, and she believes that needs to be taken into consideration if the City is considering allowing 13550 South to be a through road. She was also concerned that allowing higher-density housing would affect property values for the larger lot properties in the area.

Judy Lloyd stated that she has lived in the area for 62 years and seen many changes in that time. She was very concerned about children's safety. She worked for the Jordan School District and knows how many units will affect schools. Statistics indicate that each unit has 2.5 children of school age, which would add 60 children to local schools. The development will also not have anywhere for them to play. She was also concerned about infrastructure because Redwood Road already has traffic all day and night, and is dangerous for children walking to and from school.

Ellen Ford stated that she has lived in Riverton for 42 years. She then read a letter from the Riverton Heritage Group in opposition to the application. They oppose any zoning or General Plan changes regarding the subject 4.24 acres. They reject the notion that the current zoning and land use for the area must be changed to accommodate those who purchase land with the intent to develop it, contrary to current zoning and land use. Speculators feel they can exert pressure on the City to effect changes that would yield them significant profits at the expense of the integrity of Riverton neighborhoods, and greater consideration should be given to citizens than speculators. They are prepared to gather signatures to ensure that the current General Plan remains unchanged until a specific plan can be created by a citizen committee. Members of the Planning Commission previously suggested a median to ensure safe access, but they disagreed with the suggestion and created a presentation indicating that it would not be safer.

Randy Christensen asked about the lack of sidewalks in the neighborhood. There were also only eight visitor parking stalls, which is not enough parking. He believes they should extend the road south so people can avoid Redwood Road because it is already too congested. The streets are also too narrow.

John Katsanevas stated that he lives in an older home on 13400 South. He likes that the development will modernize the neighborhood. He understands safety concerns but

believes something can be done to accommodate them. The development may lead to modernizing areas to the north as well.

Dave Kennedy stated that he lives in front of the proposed development. He believes it has too many units. Masonry fencing was proposed along Redwood Road. His bedroom is beside the entrance, and he preferred the plan with two entrances. He would appreciate a masonry fence along his property line. He is concerned that construction crews will be allowed to park in front of his home and throw garbage in his yard, as well as materials deliveries near his bedroom. He was told that there would be a cleaning station, but he did not know if it would work well. He believes he will be surrounded by high-density housing, and no one will purchase his property. He asked if the road would be paved prior to moving equipment and materials into the development.

Simon Raubenheimer stated that he lives on 1775 West and has lived in Riverton for almost 20 years. He was pleased that there would not be an entrance from his road, although he understood the issues Mr. Kennedy would face. He believes the developer should construct a masonry fence in front of Mr. Kennedy's property. He is not against modernization, but 30 homes are too many, and the development will not match the area. Thirty houses mean 60 children and 80 motor vehicles, and traffic is already crazy. He believes 20 houses would be a better option.

Juan Cardenas stated that he lives on South Redwood Road, north of the proposed subdivision. He did not have an issue with the proposal because it would make the neighborhood look nice. Some yards in the area are unkempt, and the new development will look like the rest of Riverton.

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

Commissioner Matheson stated that he toured homes with his son earlier in the week, and his son finally found a townhome for just under \$500,000. He works in construction and has an F-350, which stuck out into the road from the 20-foot driveway, and Commissioner Matheson's F-150 Super Cab would barely fit. Trucks will not be able to turn right into the driveways in the development. He believes it is a great project, but 30 homes is too many on four acres. He knows the builder would lose six homes if the property was zoned RM-6, but he believes those requirements would better fit the area.

Chair Park clarified for the public that the Planning Commission was not considering turning 13550 into a through road, although that could happen in the future. An average car can fit in a 20-foot driveway, but a truck will not. To Commissioner Matheson's point, most people in Utah drive trucks. However, there will be 18 additional parking spaces available.

In response to a question raised by Chair Park, Mr. Lethbridge confirmed that all infrastructure typically must be installed prior to home construction, although there are some allowances for certain hard surfaces.

Chair Park remarked that the developer should be required to wrap the masonry fence along the Kennedy property. The vinyl fencing should be brought into the area of the hammerhead with a gap for the sidewalk. That will provide separation between the neighborhoods and create a pathway for children to walk to the elementary school. He likes the project and does not know if too many homes would be lost if the property was zoned RM-6. Development will happen, and the City must find the best way in which to let it happen. There is not a lot of land left in Riverton, and infill parcels will be developed. It is difficult to manage the best interests of the City and surrounding homeowners.

Commissioner Matheson asked if the Planning Commission would prefer to recommend RM-6 Zoning, understanding that it would be a recommendation to the City Council and not a final decision. Chair Park stated that the City Council reads the transcripts and listens to the meetings, and they take the Planning Commission's comments into consideration. He liked the idea of RM-6, but restrictions can sometimes make a project unfeasible. Everyone wants a nice subdivision, but the question is how that looks. Commissioner Matheson stated that the lots are just too small. He understands the developer's desires, but eight homes is too many for one acre.

Commissioner Matheson moved that the Planning Commission recommend APPROVAL of the proposed Timberline Development Agreement for property located at 13518 and 13506 South Redwood Road as presented, subject to the following amendments/conditions:

Conditions:

- 1. Zoning for the project shall be RM-6 with lot sizes, setbacks, and road widths compliant with that zone.**
- 2. The Site Plan shall be subject to Final Site Plan review and approval in accordance with Riverton City Code.**
- 3. No vehicular access to 13550 South and 1775 West shall be made, with 1775 West terminating in a turnaround as shown and as approved during final Site Plan.**
- 4. Perimeter fencing shall consist of vinyl and shall include the turnaround space on 1775 West. Fencing on Redwood Road shall be compliant with Riverton City Code. Fencing along the north line of the Kennedy property adjacent to the road entrance shall be masonry.**

Commissioner Beck seconded the motion.

Commissioner Cannon offered a friendly amendment that the applicant be required to consult with the Nokes family regarding the creation of a single access onto Redwood Road. In response to a question, Mr. Carter reported that the request could be made, but it could not be required. The amendment was discussed, and it was clarified that Mr. Nokes' was

interested in creating a single point of access to both properties, which would remove the access adjacent to Mr. Kennedy's property and create more space in the development. Commissioner Matheson accepted the amendment.

The following Condition was added to the motion:

- 5. The applicant should consult with the property owner to the south regarding a potential single access onto Redwood Road.**

The motion passed with unanimous consent of the Commission.

Chair Park encouraged members of the public to reach out to the City Council representative and attend the City Council meeting for the item.

- B. "MY STORAGE AMENDED," PLZ-26-8002, AN APPLICATION TO AMEND A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT AND COMMERCIAL SITE PLAN LOCATED AT 13487 SOUTH 5600 WEST. APPLICANT – STEVE SCOVILLE.**

City Planner, Tim Prestwich, presented the Staff Report and indicated that the amended Conditional Use Permit and Commercial Site Plan were for storage units near the intersection of 13400 South and 5600 West. The Planning Commission had reviewed applications for the site several times. The applicant was ready to move forward with the project, but wanted to add a second story to a previously approved one-story building. Notices were sent to property owners within 300 feet of the subject property, and no public comments were received.

Mr. Prestwich reviewed the aerial map and Site Plans and noted that a lot of work was done to ensure that fire trucks can access the property and that there is appropriate screening for the neighboring homes to the south and park to the east. After the initial Site Plan was approved, the applicant returned with a request to remove the second story from Building 200 in the center of the property. That amendment was also approved. However, when the developer applied for a building permit, the Site Plan had been modified to add a second story to Building 300.

The new proposed Site Plan included the following changes:

- A maximum building height of 32 feet, 11 inches for Building 300.
- A small sidewalk was added from the public right-of-way to meet ADA compliance requirements.
- The driveway was shortened slightly.

Mr. Prestwich reviewed the approved and proposed elevations and reported that the proposed front elevation for Building 300 is approximately 22 feet from the grade on 5600 West to the peak of the roof and 19 feet to the top of the wall. The rear of the building is

higher but still within City Code. The fence on the south property line runs along the natural grade and will provide adequate screening.

Staff had noted that the previous motion required screening around the rooftop mechanical equipment, but it had been removed from the Site Plan. Mr. Prestwich indicated that the requirement would need to be restated in the motion. The wind-rated wire screens are attached to the roof and provide a safe working area for maintenance in addition to screening the equipment from view. It was a good project, and he hoped to see construction begin soon.

Commissioner Matheson asked if any windows or lights from the proposed second story would negatively affect neighboring residential properties. Mr. Prestwich reported that no lights were indicated for that side of the building, but any lights would need to be screened and shielded.

Chair Park asked about the steep slope shown on the south elevation and how the property would be screened from the neighbor to the south. Mr. Prestwich reported that the retaining wall was previously located to the west, which exaggerated the grade difference. It had been moved to the east, which would reduce the impact. The fence along the property line would follow the natural grade.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Cannon, Mr. Prestwich reported that the Planning Commission last considered the site in October 2024. Commissioner Cannon stated that a lot of neighboring residents spoke in opposition to the project and asked if the public notice for this meeting specified the elevation change request. Mr. Prestwich clarified that the notice shown in the Staff Report was sent to noticing area. The first public hearing was for the Conditional Use Permit, and many residents spoke in opposition. The first iteration of the Site Plan also drew a lot of attention. The final approval of the first Site Plan, which included a second story on Building 200, did not have as many comments. He did not recall anyone speaking to the first proposed amendment, and no one had submitted a comment on the current application. However, there may be residents present to speak on the item. Chair Park remarked that neighbors' concerns were addressed as the project progressed.

Jeffrey Bernson, applicant, stated that Building 200 was originally three levels. They then bifurcated the building and brought the eastern building to two levels. They held neighborhood meetings to hear and address area residents' concerns, and windows were removed from the plan as a result of those discussions. Issues related to COVID prevented them from constructing a multi-story building. It became one level because it made more economic sense. Due to the slope near Building 300, they decided to add a second floor with an interior stairway and handicap access to 5600 West. The other buildings will be one level, and they believe the site is extremely well-screened. He remarked that neighbors had expressed concerns that the required street trees will not live very long because the soil is not conducive to trees. They believe the project will be very successful. It will have 403 units, primarily 10-foot-by-10-foot and 10-foot-by-15-foot units. Buildings 200 and 300 will be climate controlled.

In response to a question raised by Chair Park, Mr. Bernson stated that the office will be located in Building 100 near the entry gate. The door on the south end of Building 300 is to access storage units. All lights will be downlit, and there will be 35 infrared cameras onsite.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Matheson, Mr. Bernson confirmed that Building 300 will not have an elevator, but there will be an interior stairway, and an ADA-compliant door will provide access to the first floor.

Chair Park opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Keele moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE Application #PLZ 26-8002 “My Storage Riverton” Final Site Plan and Conditional Use Permit, subject to the following:

Conditions:

- 1. Site Plan and Building Architecture may be amended as shown.**
- 2. Rooftop mechanical must be screened.**
- 3. All other Site Plan Improvements shall be consistent with the plans and amendments previously approved by the Planning Commission.**

Commissioner Beck seconded the motion. The motion passed with unanimous consent of the Commission.

- C. "WALMART FUEL CENTER AMENDED," PLZ-25-8023, AN APPLICATION TO AMEND A COMMERCIAL SITE PLAN LOCATED AT 3823 WEST 13400 SOUTH. APPLICANT – ANDRIY GRYGORENKO.**

Mr. Prestwich presented the Staff Report and indicated that it was the first of two applications for updated branding at Walmart. The amendment would change the exterior colors of the building and the gas canopy. Notice was sent to nearby property owners and no comments were received.

The Site Plan was reviewed. Mr. Prestwich reported that a number of exterior modifications had been completed since Walmart was initially constructed, but they have maintained the primarily brick-and-stone façade that was a major component of the initial approval.

Phillip Scoville spoke on behalf of the applicant. Walmart and its fuel centers will be painted with updated branding colors, which are slightly darker shades of blue and gray.

Chair Park opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Matheson moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE Application PLZ-26-8023, "Walmart Fuel Center Amended Site Plan", subject to the following:

Conditions:

- 1. Site Plan Improvements shall be consistent with the plans presented to the Planning Commission except where otherwise noted.**

Commissioner Marzo seconded the motion. The motion passed with unanimous consent of the Commission.

- D. "WALMART SUPERCENTER AMENDED," PLZ-25-8024, AN APPLICATION TO AMEND A COMMERCIAL SITE PLAN LOCATED AT 13502 SOUTH HAMILTON VIEW DRIVE. APPLICANT – ANDRIY GRYGORENKO.**

Mr. Prestwich reviewed the elevations and reported that the amendment would address the following:

- Update exterior colors as indicated in Item C.
- A 4,133-square-foot addition for customer pickup will be added on the west side, replacing the current customer parking location on the east side of the building.
- The existing canopy at the current pick-up area will be removed, and the area currently being used for outdoor garden center storage will be converted into 23 new parking stalls.
- Lube Center parking will also be shifted to the south.

Notice was sent to nearby property owners and no comments were received. Mr. Prestwich reported that all modifications meet ordinance, and Staff recommended approval.

In response to a question from Chair Park, Mr. Scoville stated that construction would begin in August or September 2026.

Commissioner Marzo stated that he was happy to see the change, as more pickup stalls were needed.

In response to a question from Commissioner Matheson, Mr. Scoville agreed that employees will need to walk farther as orders will be stored in the addition. However, there was not enough room for an addition on the east side. It is a very high-volume store that fills between 500 and 1,500 orders per day.

Chair Park opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Beck moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE Application PLZ-25-804, "Walmart Supercenter Amended Site Plan", subject to the following:

Conditions:

- 1. Site Plan Improvements shall be consistent with the plans presented to the Planning Commission except where otherwise noted.**
- 2. Applicant shall correct or resolve any staff redlines on the civil site plans.**

Commissioner Marzo seconded the motion. The motion passed with unanimous consent of the Commission.

3. DECISION ITEMS

- A. "MOUNTAIN VIEW VILLAGE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT 2ND AMENDMENT, VILLAGE LOFTS APARTMENTS BY SALT DEVELOPMENT," A REVISION TO A PREVIOUSLY APPROVED AMENDMENT TO THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT, INCREASING THE RESIDENTIAL UNIT COUNT FROM 288 TO 302.**

Mr. Prestwich presented the Staff Report and indicated that when Mountain View Village was approved in 2015, the Conceptual Plan included residential apartments at the northeast corner of Phase 2.

The Site Plan, aerial images, and renderings were reviewed. The original Development Agreement with CenterCal, the master developer, was approved in 2016. The apartment parcel was subsequently sold to Salt Development. The original Site Plan was approved with 250 total units, which was later amended to 288 units to remove first-floor commercial space. The developer now requested to replace some co-working space with residential units, bringing the total number of units to 302. No exterior changes were proposed, and the Master Site Plan did not need to be updated. Staff recommended approval.

Mr. Prestwich reported that the development group was in the final stage of a development in Lehi. Emails related to a Tuesday tour of that site may not have been delivered, and he apologize if anyone did not receive an invitation. The developer had indicated that a new tour could be arranged for anyone interested in visiting the site.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Matheson, Mr. Prestwich confirmed that there would be no retail space in the apartment building. Chair Park stated that retail space was eliminated in the first and second amendments. The current amendment would eliminate communal office space.

The applicant, Ethan Bedingfield stated that they had hoped to break ground in June 2025, but market conditions delayed construction. Lenders were currently opposed to office

space, and removing it would allow them to secure financing and begin construction. In response to a question from Commissioner Matheson, he reported that they plan to break ground in May or June. It will be a 28-month build and will be the tallest building in Riverton.

Chair Park asked about the company's other projects. Mr. Bedingfield reported that they have four projects downtown and one in Lehi that just opened. Projects in Reno, Nevada, and Anaheim, California, were under construction. All their developments have similar amenities and style. They target young professionals but also attract retirees. Existing buildings average between 95% and 98% occupancy.

Commissioner Park moved that the Planning Commission recommend APPROVAL of the amended 2nd Amendment to the Mountain View Place Development Agreement, subject to the following:

Conditions:

- 1. The Development Agreement be amended to allow a total of 302 residential units.**

Commissioner Matheson seconded the motion. The motion passed with unanimous consent of the Commission.

4. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. PC TRAINING.

The above item was discussed after Item 5.

Mr. Carter reported that the Utah Open and Public Meetings Act requires public bodies such as the Riverton City Planning Commission to undergo annual training to maintain compliance with the Act. An email would be sent to each Planning Commission Member with instructions on how to access the Utah Legislative Auditor's Office training video on the topic. Once the training is completed, the certificate of completion should be forwarded to the City Recorder. Mr. Carter could answer any questions about the training at the next Planning Commission meeting.

B. ELECTIONS FOR PC CHAIR, VICE-CHAIR.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Matheson, Mr. Carter confirmed that the City Council recently amended City Code to allow the Chair to serve for more than one year.

Commissioner Matheson nominated Darren Park to serve as Planning Commission Chair. Commissioner Cannon seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

Commissioner Keele nominated Monique Beck as Planning Commission Vice-Chair. Commissioner Park seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

5. MINUTES

A. MINUTES FROM THE 2/12/26 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING.

Commissioner Matheson moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of February 12, 2026, with the following modification:

- 1. The spelling of Mayor Buroker's name to be corrected in the heading.**

Commissioner Beck seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

6. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:10 PM.