

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

MEMBERS PRESENT

Andy Nef
Dean Stokes
John Morris
Manya Speelman
David Gossner

Excused

Julie Farr
Chad Kotter
Jeff Bolingbroke

STAFF PRESENT

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

VISITORS

Craig Erickson
Geneva Blanchard
Jim Flint
Carson Jones
Brent Bailey
Shawn Hart

MINUTES PREPARED BY:

Janitza Osuna (with AI Assistance)

MINUTES APPROVED:

1) CALL TO ORDER

- a. Pledge of Allegiance and Opening Prayer, Reading or Expression of Thought. (Commissioner Sean Wilkinson)
- b. **Declaration of Conflicts of Interest.** *Commissioner Bolingbroke declared a conflict of interest for Item 2C on the Agenda.*

2) ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

2) ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

- a. ***Subdivision Plat Amendment: Consideration and amendment to an approved subdivision plat located at 1373 W 4050 N, in the Deer Crest Phase 4 1st Amendment subdivision. – Public Hearing (Presenter: Tammy Eveson)***

PETITIONER COMMENTS – Carson Jones

- It was explained that under the current plan, the petitioner is requesting a 30-foot easement in that area. However, the suggested plan includes an easement ranging from 40 to 45 feet.
- The petitioner’s goal is to reduce the easement width, particularly since a pipe that previously ran through that area has already been removed and no longer exists.
- It was also noted that the petitioner has reviewed the layout provided by the city but does not agree with it and is seeking further adjustments.
- Concern was raised that if the easement remains at 45 feet, the petitioner would not be able to use any of the additional ground.
- It was further discussed that a 45-foot easement may not be necessary, as many residents have easements around their homes that restrict certain types of construction, such as retaining walls.

- However, it was pointed out that, in practice, approximately 90% of hillside residents in Pleasant View have constructed retaining walls on top of easements. This discrepancy contributed to the issue, as the petitioner had designed a retaining wall extending roughly 20 feet back, which the city ultimately did not approve due to its placement on an easement.

A question was directed to Carson regarding whether Dana has been contacted about Tiner's request to make the proposed change. Carson responded that there has been no contact.

It was then stated that this situation is entirely new to the city. The chair was addressed and acknowledged.

Carson explained that, from his perspective, the matter appears to be a relatively quick discussion between the parties and the engineer, and that it could be resolved in a timely manner.

However, concern was expressed that the specifics of the new proposed change are still unclear. It was stated that without reviewing the details, there is uncertainty about approving the change, which is the primary issue at hand. Carson agreed with this concern.

It was then suggested that the item be tabled until the next planning commission meeting, and there was agreement to proceed with that course of action.

MOTION

A motion to **Table** was made by Commissioner Bolingbroke

The motion was **Seconded** by Commissioner Speelman

Vote: Unanimous

Conditions: pending updated maps and coordination between the petitioner and the engineer.

b. Subdivision Plat Amendment: Consideration and amendment to an approved subdivision plat located at 1276 W and 1306 W Fallow Way, in the Deer Crest Phase 4 1st Amendment and Deer Crest 6A subdivisions. – Public Hearing (Presenter: Tammy Eveson)

This application was presented to staff as a request for a subdivision plat amendment. The petitioner is seeking to adjust the boundary lines on his property. He owns two adjacent lots, and his request is to shift the property line between them in order to provide greater access to the lot where his house is located, particularly for driveway access and related uses. It was noted that an easement exists between the two parcels. Specifically, there is an easement located along the original boundary line that would need to be vacated. This requirement has been identified in the engineer's notes, which have been provided to the petitioner.

The Public Works Director has reviewed the location of utilities intended to serve Lot 75 and determined that they are positioned in a way that would still allow for use if the lot were to be developed in the future. Therefore, utility placement was not identified as an issue. It was further noted that redline changes have been made to the plat by engineering and public works. These items will need to be addressed before the final plat can be recorded and approved.

A question was raised regarding the easement: since the plan involves vacating a portion, it was asked whether the easement could simply be shifted along the new boundary line. Additionally, clarification was requested on whether utility company signatures would still be required to vacate the easement.

In response, it was stated that the easement vacation process was not included in the current application. Instead, it would need to be completed separately through a different application at a later time. Therefore, the easement will remain in place for now.

PETITIONER COMMENTS – Shawn Hart

The petitioner stated that he was under the impression that if the lot line were adjusted as discussed, the public utility easement (PUE) would move with the property line. He noted that he had recently spoken with Dana, who indicated that this could occur, but would require approval through the city.

The petitioner indicated that he could have the plans redrawn to reflect the easement adjustment, or that it could be incorporated into the final plat. He also stated that he is not significantly concerned about the PUE, as he was informed that he could pursue a separate process to vacate the easement with approval and signatures from the utility companies. He clarified that he does not intend to construct any structures that would obstruct the easement. His primary goal is to improve driveway access. He explained that his current driveway is steep, and without use of the adjacent property, he is unable to accommodate trailers.

*Motion to OPEN public hearing by Commissioner Wilkinson
SECOND by Commissioner Morris*

NO COMMENTS

*Motion to CLOSE public hearing by Commissioner Bolingbroke
SECONDED by Commissioner Speelman*

MOTION

A motion for **Approval** was made by Commissioner Bolingbroke
The motion was **Seconded** by Commissioner Wilkinson
Vote: Unanimous

Conditions: Review redlines as outlined by staff and City Engineer

c. Site Plan: Consideration of a site plan for the development of a business/office yard and shop area for a constructions business headquarters located at approximately 3280 N Highway 89. (presenter: Tammy Eveson)

The Planning Commission discussed and considered approval of a site plan for the development of a business and office building. The proposal includes employee and visitor parking, as well as a yard and shop area to support the daily operations of a construction business headquarters.

It was noted that the applicants also have a minor subdivision application running concurrently with this request. As a minor subdivision, the Development Review Committee (DRC) is the approval authority, which is why this item was not included in the commission's meeting packets. The subdivision includes three parcels owned by the petitioner, as well as an additional parcel owned by the city. Staff is currently working on obtaining an appraisal and coordinating with the petitioner on a potential land swap as part of the subdivision process. The proposal would combine all parcels into a single lot. City Council has approved moving forward with the appraisal, and that process is underway.

The site plan has received an initial review from the DRC, including input from the city engineer and Public Works Director. Commissioners were provided with an engineer's memo containing redline corrections. The proposed building meets all applicable requirements for height, setbacks, and site development standards outlined in city code.

The civil and site plans illustrate the building layout, parking areas, driveways, traffic flow, and open space. The proposal includes approximately 97 standard parking stalls. Comments from the engineer's memo note that additional accessible (ADA) parking stalls are required, including proper placement and quantity, and these must be added to the site plan.

The proposed ingress and egress from Highway 89 includes a southbound deceleration lane into the site, along with designated left-turn and right-turn lanes for both ingress and egress.

A cross-access agreement is proposed along the east side of the property to allow shared ingress and egress. This access would ultimately connect to the city sports park located north of the site. Instead of direct access from Highway 89 to the sports park, traffic would enter through the development's driveway and continue north via the shared access. While the driveway is owned by the development, the agreement would allow public use for access to the sports park.

Additionally, the agreement includes provisions for shared parking. During events at the sports park, such as weekend or sporting events, the site's parking area may be used for overflow parking.

It was noted that all comments and required revisions outlined in the engineer's memo must be addressed prior to final approval.

The landscaping plan currently reflects limited landscaping due to challenges with obtaining secondary water service. Final approval will require resolution of this issue, including securing appropriate water service ("will-serve" letters).

Staff recommended approval of the site plan, contingent upon addressing all outstanding items and requirements prior to final approval.

Concern was raised regarding the landscaping plan, specifically the lack of secondary irrigation. It was noted that while the current plan reflects no secondary irrigation, the city does require a minimum amount of landscaping, including greenery and trees.

A commissioner expressed appreciation for another building completed by the same developer nearby, noting that both the building design and landscaping were well done. However, it was emphasized that even with current constraints, the project should still meet minimum landscaping requirements. The commissioner indicated a desire to see the applicant incorporate some trees and minor irrigation, and to continue working with the irrigation provider to address this issue.

Discussion then shifted to traffic concerns. It was noted that while some aspects fall under city jurisdiction, much of the traffic control is governed by UDOT. Concerns were expressed about increased traffic in the area, particularly with truck activity and peak-time congestion. Reference was made to existing traffic impacts in the area, including nearby developments such as the Jacobs Mill Subdivision, as well as local business activity contributing to congestion.

It was noted that turning movements—particularly left-hand turns into the site and right-hand turns into the lot—could create potential traffic issues. A question was raised as to whether additional measures would be required to address these concerns.

In response, it was confirmed that the project has been reviewed by Utah Department of Transportation. As part of UDOT's requirements, direct access from Highway 89 to the multi-sport park will be eliminated and replaced with the proposed shared access through the development. This shared access arrangement was required by UDOT as part of their approval process.

PETITIONER COMMENTS – Geneva Blanchard

The petitioner clarified that there may have been a miscommunication regarding landscaping and irrigation. He stated that secondary water is being provided and that a full landscape plan was included in the submitted materials. A will-serve letter has been obtained from Pineview Water Systems, and the project is currently pending installation of a one-inch secondary water

line beneath Highway 89 to support the planned green space. He noted that this item is included among the conditions to be addressed.

The petitioner further confirmed that approval has been obtained from Utah Department of Transportation, with final documentation and easement recording to be completed following plat cleanup.

Additional discussion addressed traffic concerns. A commissioner expressed appreciation for prior responsiveness in redirecting dump truck traffic that had been traveling across railroad tracks and through local streets. Concern was raised that nearby areas, including the Jacobs Mill Subdivision, could become unintended cut-through routes for truck traffic accessing other destinations such as gravel pits. It was requested that such patterns be avoided if possible. A response was given indicating that this was not expected to become an issue.

A question was asked regarding outdoor storage and parking of construction vehicles. The petitioner confirmed that equipment and vehicles will be stored in the rear gravel area of the site. It was noted that the engineer's memo includes a requirement to screen outdoor storage areas, and the petitioner acknowledged this, stating that it will be addressed. The memo had only recently been received, and all comments are in the process of being reviewed and incorporated.

Clarification was provided that outdoor storage areas must be screened from view using solid fencing. Discussion followed regarding the type of fencing required, including a six-foot fence, and whether flexibility exists in design. It was noted that code requires screening with durable materials, though questions were raised about balancing screening requirements with visibility for safety and security purposes, particularly in industrial areas where limited visibility could create concealment concerns.

*Motion to OPEN public hearing by Commissioner Morris
SECOND by Commissioner Wilkinson*

- Craig Erickson- A public comment was received from Craig Eric, who stated he has known Brad for a long time and owns property south of the project area. He acknowledged that Brent has constructed several well-built warehouse buildings in the area and described them as high quality.
- He encouraged more consideration of landscaping and water use, suggesting the use of low-water landscaping such as rocks and drought-tolerant trees. He expressed concern about long-term water availability and future impacts on the area.
- He also raised concerns about security, stating that trespassing continues to occur on nearby properties despite posted restrictions. He shared that he has experienced ongoing issues on his own property, including police involvement,

and expressed concern that similar issues could occur at the subject site due to access routes through surrounding areas.

- He emphasized the importance of allowing property owners to secure equipment and materials, noting the value of construction equipment stored on site.
- He added that he and the petitioner are familiar with one another, have a long-standing relationship, and communicate regularly, and he expressed appreciation for neighboring property owners working together cooperatively.
- He further expressed concern about water management in the area, stating that drainage patterns along Highway 89 have been altered over time, resulting in water runoff impacting private properties. He noted ongoing issues with water flow and referenced prior UDOT drainage work, stating that in his view some drainage improvements have not functioned effectively due to surrounding grading.

*Motion to CLOSE public hearing by Commissioner Speelman
SECONDED by Commissioner Wilkinson*

Commissioner Discussion

Discussion was held regarding coordination with UTA on the FrontRunner corridor to the north. A question was raised as to whether UTA's alignment is now planned on the west side of the tracks, noting that significant development is occurring on the east side up to the corridor line.

It was stated that a meeting was held with UTA on Monday, during which the subject property was specifically identified and discussed. UTA confirmed that no elements of the current site plan interfere with their proposed plans. Contact information was exchanged, and UTA has been in communication with Geneva regarding the matter.

Concern was expressed about the possibility of UTA needing to acquire already-developed property in the future. It was noted that securing the corridor through currently undeveloped property would be preferable and beneficial to all parties.

Further discussion referenced prior conversations about the rear portion of the warehouse property, where it had previously been indicated that development restrictions might apply. Staff reported that earlier communication with UTA (via Gale) indicated there was no funding for the project at that time and that it should not be a concern. However, upon learning of UTA's recent meeting with the City, follow-up communication indicated that design work is now being considered.

A question was raised regarding whether adequate space has been preserved on the west side of the warehouse to accommodate the corridor, or if sufficient room remains for UTA to incorporate it into future plans. It was acknowledged that while space may have been informally considered, the final determination was not within the applicant's authority.

MOTION

A motion for **Approval** was made by commissioner
The motion was seconded by Commissioner
Vote: Unanimous
Note: Commissioner Bolingbroke abstained from this item.

Conditions: contingent upon compliance with item-specific requirements identified in the subdivision review, including conditions set forth by the City Engineering Department and staff. The motion also included a condition that staff review and approve the final landscaping plan.

3) LEGISLATIVE ITEMS

a. General Plan Amendment: Consideration of a City proposed amendment to the General Plan to include a Water Use and Conservation Element in accordance with Utah Senate Bill 110 (2022 General Session). (Presenter: Andrea Steiniger)

Chair Nef requested a recess to review the material as it seemed some items were missing.

Seconded by Commissioner Gossner

Discussion was held regarding water supply and conservation planning. A member noted that, in the past, concerns about water scarcity seemed overstated; however, participation in a recent watershed tour conducted by Weber Basin Water Conservancy District provided a clearer understanding of current and future water supply challenges.

It was explained that recent state legislation requires each municipality to incorporate a water conservation element into its general plan. Staff presented the proposed water conservation element and apologized that the document had not been included in the original staff report packet.

The proposed element outlines measures the City can and should implement to support water conservation efforts. It includes information on current and future water sources, noting that the City currently relies on wells and a small allocation from Weber Basin, with the ability to obtain additional water under an existing contract if necessary.

Staff reported that the City's existing water conservation plan, previously approved by the City Council, has been incorporated into the proposed element. The plan includes metrics such as gallons per capita per day (GPCD), with the City currently at approximately 57.47 gallons per capita per day based on a 2024 study.

Concerns were raised by Weber Basin regarding this figure, as it reflects only indoor (culinary) water use and does not account for secondary irrigation water. The state's conservation goals require total water use, including outdoor consumption, to be considered. Staff noted that future efforts will need to include evaluation and tracking of secondary water usage, as outdoor use represents a significant portion of total consumption.

Population projections were discussed, with the general plan estimating a population of approximately 21,282 by the year 2050, compared to the current population of approximately 12,000.

Staff stated that the proposed element meets all statutory requirements. However, future policy considerations may include updates to water-wise ordinances, landscaping requirements, and other conservation measures. Current conservation efforts were outlined, including public education and outreach, a tiered water rate structure, advanced metering and leak detection systems, and municipal initiatives such as smart irrigation timers, water-efficient plumbing fixtures, and other conservation technologies.

Staff recommended approval of the water conservation element and noted that a public hearing is scheduled, as the item constitutes an amendment to the general plan.

Clarification was provided that only the highlighted sections of the document (identified as green pages) would be formally adopted into the general plan, while supporting analysis would not be included. It was further noted that the general plan serves as a guiding document rather than a regulatory ordinance, with implementation to occur through future ordinance updates.

Staff confirmed that the element was developed internally, with reference to the City's existing water conservation plan and examples from other municipalities, in order to create a balanced and context-appropriate document.

Discussion continued regarding proposed water conservation policies within the general plan element.

A Commissioner expressed concern with Policy 3, specifically the provision requiring new development to contribute water to increase overall supply. Clarification was requested as to how such contributions would be implemented. Staff explained that, in practice, developers are typically required to dedicate or transfer water rights to the system in order to obtain service connections, including connections to the Pineview system. It was noted that this requirement may involve either existing water rights associated with the property or the acquisition of additional water shares by the developer.

Further discussion addressed Policy 4, relating to reducing water use in park strip irrigation. A Commissioner voiced opposition to language suggesting a reduction in irrigation, citing concerns about the aesthetic and maintenance challenges associated with alternative landscaping such as rock-based designs. The Commissioner indicated a preference for striking or revising that portion of the policy. Additional comments noted that similar approaches have, in some cases, failed to reduce overall water usage and have resulted in maintenance issues, including weed proliferation.

Discussion also included broader considerations of irrigation practices, with examples provided of underperforming irrigation systems in public areas leading to poor landscape conditions. Suggestions were raised regarding alternative stormwater management approaches, such as underground detention systems, which could reduce irrigated turf areas, though cost considerations were acknowledged.

A Commissioner raised concerns regarding Policy 5 language referencing “promoting strategies,” questioning the extent of the City’s obligation if such language were adopted. It was suggested that the term “encourage” may be more appropriate to reflect intent without implying a formal obligation to actively advertise or implement specific programs. Staff indicated openness to revising terminology for clarity. Additional discussion addressed the identification of high water-use land uses. Examples were provided suggesting that unusually high water consumption by certain commercial users could warrant further evaluation and outreach to determine causes and potential conservation measures.

General observations were made regarding community landscaping practices, including the prevalence of high water-use turf such as Kentucky bluegrass, which is not well-suited to arid climates. Commissioners expressed interest in promoting more water-efficient landscaping alternatives and referenced educational resources, including demonstration gardens and programs offered by Weber Basin. It was also noted that inclusion of secondary water usage in total consumption calculations would significantly increase reported per capita water use, providing a more accurate representation of overall demand.

Positive remarks were made regarding the quality and taste of the City’s water supply. Further discussion addressed Policy 3 language encouraging decreased lot sizes and configuration standards for secondary water efficiency. Concern was raised that such language could conflict with the City’s broader general plan goals and potentially encourage higher-density development inconsistent with community objectives. Several Commissioners expressed support for striking or revising this language. The discussion concluded with general agreement that water conservation efforts should focus not only on reducing turf areas but also on encouraging alternative, efficient land uses such as orchards or other low-water landscaping approaches, while maintaining compatibility with the City’s overall planning goals.

*Motion to OPEN public hearing by Commissioner Gossner
SECOND by Commissioner Bolingbroke*

Craig Erickson - noted that prior development practices requiring proof of water availability as a condition of building did not effectively encourage conservation and may have inadvertently contributed to excessive water use. He emphasized the need to reverse this trend and adopt more conservation-oriented practices moving forward. It was further stated that future generations are likely to experience significantly increased water costs, with water becoming an increasingly valuable and limited resource.

*Motion to CLOSE public hearing by Commissioner Bolingbroke
SECONDED by Commissioner Speelman
Vote: Unanimous*

MOTION

A motion to recommend **Approval** was made by Commissioner Bolingbroke
The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wilkinson
Vote: Unanimous

Conditions: amended with the noted changes discussed during the meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Discussion was held regarding a holiday gathering

Commissioner Wilkins was recognized for his upcoming transition to the City Council, and appreciation was expressed for his service.

The meeting was adjourned with no further items discussed.