

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR PLEASANT VIEW CITY  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING HELD  
October 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2025, at 6:00 P.M.  
[Planning Commission \(youtube.com\)](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=...)**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Andy Nef  
Julie Farr  
David Gossner  
John Morris  
Manya Speelman  
Sean Wilkinson

**EXCUSED**

Jeff Bolingbroke  
Chad Kotter  
Dean Stokes

**STAFF PRESENT**

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

**VISITORS**

Jordan Cullimore  
Elizabeth Werra  
J Werra  
Bryan Stein  
Jeanine Stein  
Jaycelyn Stein  
Alex Munos  
Diane Budge  
Caleb Stoker  
Jordan Watson  
Sebastion Sarap  
Sara Urry  
Rich Combe

**MINUTES PREPARED BY:**

Janitza Osuna (with AI Assistance)

**MINUTES APPROVED:**

March 26<sup>th</sup>, 2026

**1) CALL TO ORDER**

- a. Pledge of Allegiance and Opening Prayer, Reading or Expression of Thought. (Commissioner Manya Speelman)
- b. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest. *NONE DECLARED*

**2) MINUTES**

- a. Review and consideration of the Planning Commission meeting minutes prepared for September 4<sup>th</sup>, 2024 and December 5<sup>th</sup>, 2024.

**MOTIONS:**

Motion to **APPROVE** by Vice Chair Farr  
Seconded by Commissioner Wilson

**3) PLANNING COMMISSION TRAINING**

Jordan Cullimore – Office of the Utah Property Rights Ombudsman  
Training regarding Development Agreements

**4) ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

- a. **Conditional Use Permit: Consideration and action on a Conditional Use Permit for Steinvue Event Venue at 1587 W 2740 N. – Public Hearing (Presenter:**

**Tammy Eveson)**

A conditional use application was presented for a proposed business located in the MP1 (Planned Manufacturing) Zone. The Planning Commission was informed that they would need to determine whether the proposal qualifies for a Conditional Use Permit.

The application is for an event venue. Included in the meeting packet was the definition and intent of the MP1 Zone, which is to permit the establishment of well-designed manufacturing facilities that minimize traffic congestion on surrounding public streets and fit the general environment and land use pattern of the area.

Staff explained how the code applies to conditional uses within the MP1 Zone. If a use is permitted in the C2 Zone, it may be considered as a conditional use in the MP1 Zone. The proposed event venue is listed as a permitted use in the C2 Zone and may fall under the “community uses” category.

Staff reported that the proposed use would not require any changes to the currently approved site plan. There would be no exterior modifications to the building, landscaping, utilities, or parking lot.

Parking requirements were reviewed. Staff indicated that parking is shared with other businesses within the development and that there are three sections of the building operating under a shared parking agreement. Based on comparable parking requirements for restaurants and recreational places of assembly, one parking space is required per 200 square feet of floor space or per two employees. The space is about 10,000 sq feet and After reviewing the floor plan, staff determined that sufficient parking exists for the proposed use.

Any desired signage would require a building permit and would be reviewed through the normal permitting process.

Comments were provided by the Building Official, requiring the applicant to submit fire and life safety plans prepared by a licensed design professional, obtain building permits for signage and any tenant improvements, and provide calculations for occupancy load. These comments have been forwarded to the applicant and are in progress.

The Planning Commission was advised that they would determine whether the proposed use is appropriate for the MP1 Zone under the “community uses” category. Final approval, based on the Building Official’s comments, would be addressed through the Development Review Committee (DRC). Staff noted that no public comments had been received.

Vice Chair Farr asked about parking and traffic flow, noting concern that event venues typically bring a large number of people in a short period of time. The commissioner requested clarification regarding traffic flow, parking layout, and the maximum occupancy of the venue.

Staff responded that determining the occupancy limit is part of the Building Official’s request and would be established through submitted calculations. Staff reiterated that occupancy information would be required before final approval.

Staff referenced the original site plan to illustrate traffic flow. The complex has two driveway entrances. The proposed venue is located in the upper section of the building. There are roll-up doors on the back side of the building, though it is unknown whether those will be utilized. Parking is available along the sides of the building as well as in the main parking areas.

Staff stated there were no concerns raised regarding traffic flow during review by the Development Review Committee, including engineering review.

**PETITIONER- Jeanine Stein**

Commission Chair Nef asked whether most events would occur during daytime or nighttime hours, noting that the shared parking agreement with other businesses could be beneficial if those businesses are typically closed when events are held.

The applicant indicated that most events would likely occur after regular business hours, when the other businesses in the development would be closed, allowing for greater parking availability.

A commissioner asked about the anticipated number of attendees at events. The applicant responded that events would typically host around 100 but not exactly sure.

A Commissioner asked whether the interior of the building would be remodeled, noting that the current space has a warehouse appearance. The applicant responded that while no major structural changes would be made, décor and interior updates would be completed to create a more modern event-style atmosphere.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

*OPEN* Public Hearing by Commissioner Speelman  
Seconded by Commissioner Morris

NO PUBLIC COMMENTS

*CLOSE* Public Hearing by Commissioner Wilkinson  
Seconded by Commissioner Speelman

**MOTION:**

Motion to **APPROVE with Conditions** by Commissioner Vice Chair Farr  
Seconded by Commissioner Gossner

Unanimous

Conditions:

- Submission of fire and life safety plans prepared by a licensed design professional.
- Obtaining building permits for tenant improvements.
- Providing calculations for the occupancy load, as recommended.

**b. Vacate Easement: Consideration and action on an application to Vacate/Amend a Utility Easement located at 1084 W 4275 N. Public Hearing (Presenter: Tammy Eveson)**

Staff presented an application to modify, but not fully vacate, an existing 20-foot public utility easement. The original easement width was intended to accommodate both a slope easement and utility easement.

The petitioners are proposing to construct a retaining wall, which requires the installation of structural landscaping fabric (geo grid) extending into the hillside. Concerns were raised that if utilities were installed within the area where the geo grid is placed, future drilling or excavation could damage the material and compromise the retaining wall.

The petitioners have worked with the City Engineer to develop a compromise that would reduce the easement width while maintaining the utility easement. Under this proposal, the petitioners would assume responsibility for the grading and slope portion within the adjusted area. The City Engineer indicated this was a reasonable solution.

The applicants have obtained most of the required utility release letters. Comcast has provided approval as of the day of the planning commission meeting. Documentation was also provided showing attempts to contact CenturyLink and Optic Loop, though no responses had been received at that time.

Rocky Mountain Power submitted an email indicating they were not willing to release the full 20-foot easement. This issue arose the day prior to the meeting. The City Engineer has contacted Rocky Mountain Power to further explain the proposal and seek resolution. The City Attorney has also been contacted for guidance.

Staff advised the Planning Commission that they could either table the item until the issue with Rocky Mountain Power is resolved or make a motion to approve the modification contingent upon approval from Rocky Mountain Power and review by the City Engineer or City Attorney.

A commissioner asked for clarification regarding Rocky Mountain Power's concern, noting that their power lines are overhead. Staff explained that Rocky Mountain Power's concern involves the reach of the cross arms on the poles into the easement area and the possibility of future underground installation, which could require use of the full easement width.

Discussion followed regarding the need for written approvals from all affected utilities before proceeding. Staff reiterated that each utility must provide confirmation that they will not object to the modification of the easement.

**PETITIONER – J Werra**

A commissioner expressed concern about maintaining uniform easement widths along 4300 North for adjacent properties. The petitioner stated that neighboring properties have already completed landscaping and fencing up to their property lines, while their

request is only to reduce the easement by 10 feet on their side to allow for installation of the geo grid supporting the retaining wall.

The petitioner explained that the retaining wall itself would remain outside of the easement area and that the requested modification is solely to allow for the underground geo grid installation necessary to support the structure.

Commissioners discussed that while other properties may have landscaped into easement areas, that does not necessarily indicate formal approval and may place those property owners at risk if utilities ever need to access the area.

The petitioner noted that they had been informed that no roadway improvements were anticipated in the foreseeable future and expressed a desire to complete backyard landscaping rather than wait many years. The petitioner stated their intent was to work cooperatively with the City and utilities to resolve the matter properly.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

*OPEN* Public Hearing by Vice Chair Farr  
Seconded by Commissioner Speelman

*NO PUBLIC COMMENTS*

*CLOSE* Public Hearing by Commissioner Speelman  
Seconded by Commissioner Wilkinson

**MOTION:**

Motion to **APPROVE with Conditions** by Commissioner Wilkinson  
Seconded by Commissioner Morris  
Unanimous

Conditions: **contingent upon approval from CenturyLink, Lumen, Optic Loop, Rocky Mountain Power, and any additional recommendations provided by the City Engineer.**

**c. Subdivision Plat Amendment: Consideration and action on a Subdivision Plat Amendment located at 3076 N 325 W. – Public Hearing (Presenter: Tammy Eveson)**

Staff presented a request for a plat amendment for property located at Pleasant View Drive and 325 West. This item had previously come before the Commission as a site plan for the development of residential lots, which received site plan approval at the end of 2024. The property owner has since requested that the property lines be adjusted and redrawn, prompting the need for the plat amendment.

Staff reported that the revised plat meets all requirements of the RE-20 zoning district. Staff and the City Engineer worked with the petitioner and contractor through several revisions to address requested changes. A corrected plat reflecting all staff and engineering comments was received the day prior to the meeting.

The amendment affects three lots:

- Lot 1 contains an existing home and is approximately 44,732 square feet.
- Lot 2 is approximately 20,000 square feet.
- Lot 3 is approximately 20,269 square feet.

Staff explained that one lot will front on Pleasant View Drive, and another will front on 325 West. Discussion occurred regarding a small section of frontage on Pleasant View Drive. Staff clarified that an earlier design proposed a diagonal property line; however, City code requires property lines to be as perpendicular to the frontage as possible. The current jog in the boundary was created to comply with this requirement.

Commissioners discussed the configuration of the larger lot, noting the presence of a creek, trees, and wet ground in the lower portion of the property. Staff indicated this area is intended to remain in a natural state and does not have sufficient frontage for additional development.

PETITIONER's Contractor – Caleb Stoker

The representative explained that the primary reason for the amendment was to adjust the property lines to provide additional backyard space. The property owner felt the existing boundary was too close to an existing fence and wanted more room.

The representative noted that the previous layout made it challenging to achieve compliant angles at the corner of the lot, but adjustments were made to reconfigure the lines in a way that met City requirements while accommodating the owner's request

**PUBLIC HEARING**

*OPEN* Public Hearing by Commissioner Speelman

Seconded by Commissioner Gossner

*NO PUBLIC COMMENTS*

*CLOSE* Public Hearing by Commissioner Gossner

Seconded by Commissioner Morris

**MOTION**

Motion to **Recommend APPROVAL** by Vice Chair Farr

Seconded by Commissioner Speelman

Unanimous

**5) ITEMS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CITY COUNCIL**

- a. **General Plan Amendment: Consideration of a proposed amendment to the General Plan zoning designation of 8.12 acres of land located at approximately 3917 N Capstone Way, from high Density Residential to Employment & Business Park.**
- b. **Zone Change: Consideration of a proposed zone change to 8.12 acres of land located at approximately 39174 N capstone Way, from RE-5(High Density Residential) to MCM, Manufacturing Commercial Mixed (Employment & Business Park).**

The Commission considered an application requesting two actions: a General Plan amendment and a rezoning for property located on Capstone Way. Staff noted that the property had previously come before the Commission and had recently undergone a zone change, including a zone text amendment approved in February, at which time the property was rezoned from RE-20 to RE-5, a newly created zone.

Staff explained that the development project had changed hands, or was in the process of changing hands, with a new developer initially proposing a townhome community. The proposal was later revised to a cottage home community. During review of the RE-5 zone, discrepancies were identified in the newly adopted ordinance regarding setbacks and lot sizes for cottage homes classified as single-family dwellings. Due to these inconsistencies and challenges in moving the project forward under the existing regulations, the new developers chose not to proceed, and the project reverted to the original developers.

The original developers have now presented a new concept proposing a business park-type development for the property. Staff explained that this proposal would require a change to the General Plan designation from residential and high-density residential to an Employment Business Park designation. Additionally, the applicants are requesting that the property be rezoned to the MCM zone, identified as Manufacturing Commercial Mixed.

The Commission's consideration for the evening included a recommendation on the proposed General Plan amendment and a potential recommendation to the City Council regarding the requested rezoning.

#### **PETITIONER COMMENTS – Jordan Watson**

The applicant believes the request is appropriate as it aligns with the surrounding MCM and MP-1 zones. It was noted that the property's location west of Highway 89 and its proximity to the railway.

The applicant addressed the Commission and stated that their company specializes in flex space developments of this nature. They noted that a similar project is currently under construction in Farr West across from Cal Ranch. The applicant reminded the Commission that approximately one year ago they had initially presented a proposal for a similar commercial concept on this property but ultimately shifted to a residential proposal.

The applicant explained that the shift to residential was influenced in part by the need to meet moderate-income housing requirements. They further stated that during

discussions with Planning staff and the City Council, feedback was received indicating that the property was not ideally suited for residential development. Although the RE-5 zoning was ultimately approved, the applicant expressed a desire to move forward with a commercial use, which they believe is more consistent with the surrounding area and would result in a more successful project.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

*OPEN* Public Hearing by Vice Chair Farr  
Seconded by Commissioner Speelman

*NO PUBLIC COMMENTS*

*CLOSE* Public Hearing by Commissioner Wilkinson  
Seconded by Commissioner Gossner

Commissioner Discussion

A Commissioner inquired about authority over the railroad track and specifically who determines the location of a rail crossing. Staff responded that the railroad company has primary authority in determining crossing locations. The railroad has provided the City with a designated window identifying where a crossing may be permitted. Staff further explained that efforts have been underway, including coordination with Dana, the city engineer, to align the roadway appropriately. This includes ensuring that the curvature of the road meets required standards and safety considerations. The exact location of the rail crossing has not yet been finalized, as it must accommodate the necessary road curvature within the window provided by the railroad. Staff emphasized that while the railroad establishes the allowable crossing area, the City must ensure that the final design meets safety requirements.

**MOTION Item A**

Motion to **Recommend Approval** by Commissioner Morris  
Seconded by Commissioner Wilkinson  
Unanimous

**MOTION Item B**

Motion to **Recommend Approval** by Commissioner Morris  
Seconded by Commissioner Gossner  
Unanimous

**6) ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned with no further items discussed.