

**RIVERTON CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
MAY 28, 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
Crystal Keele
Gary Cannon
Evan Matheson
Shelly Cluff
Monique Beck
Joe Marzo

Staff:

Tim Prestwich, City Planner
Lisa Halversen, City Planner
Ryan Carter, City Attorney

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Chair Darren Park called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at approximately 6:30 p.m. 19th Special Forces Group Master Sergeant, Dylan Tolley led the Pledge of Allegiance.

2. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. “MERACAKESS LLC,” PLZ-26-2022, AN APPLICATION FOR A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR A HOME OCCUPATION SELLING CAKES AND DESSERTS FROM A HOME LOCATED AT 13528 SOUTH COMMODUS DRIVE, APT# L102. APPLICANT – ADEMARYS RAMIREZ

Lisa Halversen, Planner, presented the Staff Report and indicated that the applicant, Ademarys Ramirez, lives in a three-story townhome in Mountain Ridge Phase 17 in the SLR Zone. She intended to bake and sell special cakes from her home. Customers will order online via social media and schedule a pick-up or delivery time. Ms. Ramirez anticipated baking no more than three cakes per day, most of which would be delivered to customers. There will be no deliveries to her home, and only the kitchen and driveway will be used for the Home Occupation.

Photographs and a site plan were reviewed. Per Riverton City Home Occupation Code, all applications involving food or drink must receive Planning Commission approval. The applicant would also be required to obtain approval from the Utah Department of Health.

Notice was sent to property owners within 300 feet of the subject property. Two emailed comments and one phone call were received expressing concerns about traffic and parking. To address those concerns, Staff spoke with the applicant and discussed the

importance of scheduling appointments one at a time and designating a customer parking area in her driveway.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Cannon, Ms. Halversen reported that the applicant had provided a letter of permission from the HOA to do the home business.

Chair Park asked if the business was already in operation, and if the City allowed Home Occupations in condominiums. Ms. Halversen clarified that it was a new application, and any such restrictions would be placed by the HOA.

Jose Ramirez translated for the applicant. Her family business will operate online. She makes cakes and desserts, which are picked up or delivered by appointment. Orders are placed via text or social media.

Commissioner Cannon asked if the customers would come to the door to pick up their orders or wait in their cars. It was confirmed that cakes will be brought to customers' cars.

Commissioner Marzo asked if customers would be informed that they must park in the driveway. It was reported that all customers are informed of the policy, but they sometimes wait in the street. Chair Park clarified that, if the Home Occupation was approved, all customers must park in the driveway. The applicant confirmed that the condition would be met.

Chair Park opened the public hearing.

Randy Staples reported that he owns a condominium within 300 feet of the subject property. He asked if the applicant was the property owner or a tenant. He said that parking can be difficult if you own two cars because one must be parked in the driveway. He also asked if there would be any advertising on the delivery vehicle and if HOA approval had been obtained to operate a commercial business in a residential unit.

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

Ms. Halversen indicated that the applicant, Ademarys Ramirez, is the homeowner. Only one parking space was required for the business and this is available in the driveway. The applicant had submitted a letter of approval from the HOA.

Commissioner Cannon asked if the applicant could be required to place a small sign in front of their garage indicating that it was the pickup location. Ms. Halversen stated that signage would be at the applicant's discretion, but she was aware that driveway pickup was a condition of approval. Chair Park noted that the HOA may prohibit signage.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Marzo, Ms. Halversen confirmed that guest parking was available nearby. One written comment suggested that the applicant

instruct customers to use guest parking, which she was free to do. The City's concern was that they not be allowed to park on the street.

Commissioner Cluff moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE Application PLZ-26-2022 "Meracakess LLC," at 13528 South Commodus Drive, subject to the following:

Conditions:

- 1. The site, structures, and use shall remain in compliance with any and all applicable Riverton City Standards and Ordinances, specifically the City Home Occupation Ordinance (18.190) and applicable Building and Fire Codes.**
- 2. Applicant must obtain and maintain a Riverton City business license.**
- 3. Applicant must obtain and maintain applicable State and other outside agency approvals.**
- 4. Home Occupation must operate within the Fixed Standards, and applicable Qualifications and Conditions as outlined in the Home Occupation Ordinance and with this approval.**
- 5. Applicant may use up to 25% of the main floor for the business.**
- 6. Order pickups will be scheduled one at a time and customers will be provided driveway parking space.**

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

B. "COMPASS INSURANCE," PLZ-26-8001, AN APPLICATION FOR A FINAL COMMERCIAL SITE PLAN FOR AN OFFICE BUILDING TO BE LOCATED AT 13083 SOUTH REDWOOD ROAD. APPLICANT – COURTNEY JENSEN

City Planner, Tim Prestwich, presented the Staff Report and reviewed the aerial, General Plan, and Zoning Maps. The subject property is south of City Hall. It is zoned C-PO and surrounded by RR-22 properties.

The Final Site Plan was reviewed by all City Departments and determined to meet City Code. Mr. Prestwich reported that the existing building at the rear of the property would be removed. The office building would be at the front of the property, close to Redwood Road, with a driveway to the north and parking at the rear.

Mr. Prestwich reported that when plans are submitted, he first confirms that the building meets all setback requirements. The proposed building met all setbacks, including the special additional distance from the adjacent residential property to the south.

He next confirms that the plans include a boundary strip to adequately buffer between uses. The required size of the strip changes based on use. For example, a store with parking at the front would require a wider boundary strip on that frontage. If it was adjacent to another commercial property, that boundary strip could be narrower. The subject property would have a seven-foot boundary strip along all shared boundaries.

Next, parking count and landscaping percentage are confirmed. All commercial zones require 20% landscaping, which is typically easy to meet due to setback and boundary strip specifications. Parking is outlined in the adopted parking tables and based on the square footage and use of the building. The subject property would have one stall more than required, which was atypical for small parcels, as they generally struggle to meet parking requirements.

The Site Plan is then reviewed for compliance with circulation, fire access, and Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA") standards. Mr. Prestwich reported that the initial Site Plan showed a straight sidewalk from the west, but had to be rerouted to comply with the ADA. When building commences, the City Building Official visits the site to help set the grade for ADA parking stalls before the hard surface is laid. Most businesses use concrete for ADA stalls to ensure that grade requirements are met.

Parking stalls must be nine-and-a-half feet wide. Stalls that abut curbs must be 18 feet long, and nose-to-nose stalls must be 20 feet long. Parking islands must typically be full-size, but the Planning Commission had the authority to grant an exception if necessary for traffic flow and safety. Staff recommended granting an exception for the subject property, as requiring the standard size would eliminate parking stalls and cause issues with traffic flow and snowplowing.

Mr. Prestwich reported that public comments had been received expressing concern about the potential dumpster location. The dumpster location was not dictated by ordinance but was required to be out of public view, walled, and gated.

The Landscape Plan was reviewed. A low-impact design was proposed. The City requires 20 trees per acre, but no specific amount of grass or shrubs. The proposed park strip was narrow and had no trees, as power and water lines prevented their installation. There will be trees, grass, and rock along the entryway, and the majority of the trees will be placed at the rear to shield the adjoining residential property. An eight-foot masonry wall will be between the property and all incompatible zoning. The parking lot grade is approximately two feet higher than the wall, so the fence in that area will effectively be six feet tall.

The Lighting Plan was reviewed, and Mr. Prestwich reported that no direct light would leave the site. Lighting fixtures must shine straight down, and the light source must be shielded. The proposed fixtures had been used elsewhere in the City and met all requirements.

Mr. Prestwich reported that the proposed building design has been reviewed for compliance with the City's new standards. At least two materials must be used, but no more than five. At least two and no more than five colors must also be used, not including trim. Two main colors and black accents were proposed. The proposed materials were stacked white stone with concrete block and Hardie Board planks. Rooftop mechanical equipment would be screened by parapets.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Matheson, Mr. Prestwich reported that the boundary strip will be landscaped. Some businesses place their dumpster within the boundary strip, which is allowed by code. The columnar trees in the boundary strip will grow taller to screen the property but not overhang the property line. Commissioner Matheson asked if there were any concerns about the line of sight for vehicles exiting the property. Mr. Prestwich stated that it is a Utah Department of Transportation ("UDOT") controlled access, and their final approval is required prior to issuance of a building permit. The application included an exhibit verifying that all sight lines meet UDOT standards.

Chair Park stated that vehicles exiting left from the property would cross three traffic lanes in a school zone and asked whether left turns would be prohibited. Mr. Prestwich stated that no turn island was proposed, and UDOT had approved full access. However, he believes that they will eventually extend the island the length of Redwood Road.

Chair Park stated that all three sides of the subject property that bordered residential zoning had existing vinyl fencing, but a solid eight-foot wall was required. He asked what efforts were being taken to avoid having a fence within a fence. Mr. Prestwich reported that the applicant has the right to fence their property. If the neighboring property owners objected to the solid fence, the applicant could apply for a Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") to move it completely onto their property. The boundary survey will be re-staked prior to construction, and any conflicts that arise must be resolved between property owners prior to moving forward. In response to a follow-up question, he clarified that a fence within a fence is only allowed with a CUP. The City Council was concerned with ensuring that the area between the fences is treated to prevent it from becoming a fire hazard.

Chair Park stated that the City was aware of the elevation issues on the east property line as modifications were needed at the property across the street to prevent headlights from shining into residents' homes. He asked how the City would ensure that homes to the east of the subject property would be protected from similar issues. Mr. Prestwich reported that he spoke with the applicant about the issue. The plan was designed to accommodate the slope, and the fence will be six feet above final grade in that area. Fencing is measured five feet in from the property line.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Beck, City Attorney, Ryan Carter, reported that “fence within a fence” means two fences that are within one foot of each other and parallel.

Commissioner Marzo asked if there had been a discussion about moving the dumpster as requested in a public comment. Mr. Prestwich reported that a specific location was not required by City ordinance, and moving the dumpster would place it within proximity of a different neighbor. The proposed location provided direct access for trash removal, which would mean less noise generated from the vehicle backing up. Professional Office is a permitted use in the C-PO Zone, and the dumpster location is not dictated by ordinance. If the dumpster location or other impacts were a concern, it would be a conditional use. For example, because grocery stores are conditional in the zone, the City was able to limit the times of day the dumpster could be emptied. The same requirement could not be placed on the subject property because it was a permitted use.

Commissioner Cannon stated that the zone restricts the types of uses in the area. There was a deficit of office space in old Riverton, so he was encouraged to see some going in. In response to his question, Mr. Prestwich stated that some retail would be allowed, but it would be limited by available parking. C-PO is the City’s second most restrictive zone and is a good fit for the subject property as it is surrounded by residential parcels.

The applicant, Laurel Bevans with RDGM Construction, introduced business owner Courtney Jensen. Ms. Bevans reported that they suggested a right-in/right-out entry, but UDOT denied the request. The dumpster location was chosen to maximize available parking and provide easy access for the garbage truck. If it were moved, several parking stalls would be eliminated.

Mr. Jensen reported that his business is a professional office that does not generate a lot of garbage, and the eight-foot wall should block the dumpster from sight. He had been in business for 27 years, selling health, dental, and vision insurance for small businesses and individuals, and had outgrown the current location in South Jordan. In response to a question raised by Chair Park, he reported that he may sublease space to other insurance agents within the agency, but he planned to eventually occupy the entire space.

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-26-8001, “Compass Insurance,” a Commercial Site Plan to be located at 13083 South Redwood Road, subject to the following:

Conditions:

- 1. Site Improvements and the Building, including the exterior finish, dumpster enclosures, and landscaping, and all other improvements shall be consistent with the plans presented to the Planning Commission except where otherwise noted.**
- 2. Applicant shall correct or resolve the remaining staff redlines.**
- 3. Site Landscaping shall include 20 trees per acre counted for the entire site.**
- 4. Building and Site lighting shall be installed and screened according to Riverton City Standards.**
- 5. The rooftop mechanical shall be screened from view according to the ordinance.**
- 6. Wall-mounted service panels shall be painted to match the building.**
- 7. The site and structures shall comply with any and all applicable Riverton City Standards and Ordinances, including the International Building and Fire Codes.**
- 8. Storm drainage systems and accommodations shall comply with Riverton City Standards and Ordinances, and with the recommendations of the Riverton City Engineering Division. An offsite Storm Drain Pond must be built by others prior to this site getting occupancy from Riverton City.**
- 9. The Applicant must create and agree to follow a Long-Term Storm Water Management Plan according to Riverton City Standards and Ordinances prior to receiving building occupancy.**
- 10. A Land Disturbance Permit must be issued by the City prior to any construction grading on the site.**
- 11. The applicant must obtain final approval from utility providers.**

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

Mr. Prestwich informed the applicant that they could now submit their building permit application for review.

**C. “RIVER HAVEN AMENDED, LOTS 45 AND 46 (TOLLEY LOT LINE),”
PLZ-25-1009, AN APPLICATION TO AMEND THE SHARED LOT LINE
BETWEEN LOTS 45 AND 46 OF RIVER HAVEN ESTATES PHASE 2.
APPLICANT – DYLAN TOLLEY.**

Mr. Prestwich reported that the State Legislature recently changed how boundary adjustments within subdivisions are handled, and the parties must now apply for a Plat Amendment. The items were previously handled at the administrative level but now require Planning Commission approval.

Zoning, Land Use, and aerial maps were reviewed. Mr. Prestwich reported that the fence between the properties did not match the recorded lot lines, and the Plat Amendment would move the parcel boundary to match the fence line. He noted that several properties in the subdivision had similar issues. A survey had been submitted showing existing conditions and proposed lot lines, and Staff verified that all setback and lot size requirements were met. Staff recommended approval.

In response to a question raised by Chair Park, Mr. Prestwich confirmed that the new boundary line would roughly follow the driveway but was modified slightly to meet lot size requirements. The accessory structure met the five-foot setback requirement. In response to a follow-up question, he reported that ownership affidavits were submitted by both owners as both parties are required to change the boundary line. The properties would still meet minimum lot size requirements.

The applicant, Dylan Tolley, stated that when he purchased his home, he was not aware that the fence did not follow the lot line. It came to his attention when he applied for a building permit for a planned garage. His neighbor agreed with the change.

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

Commissioner Cluff moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE Application PLZ-25-1009, “River Haven Estates Phase 2 Amended Subdivision (Tolley Lot Line Adjustment),” subject to the following:

Conditions:

- 1. Subdivision Amendment lot and layout shall be consistent with the plans presented to the Planning Commission except where otherwise noted.**
- 2. Final Amended Plat must be recorded with Salt Lake County.**

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

D. “WALMART EV CHARGING STATIONS,” PLZ-26-8019, AN APPLICATION TO AMEND A COMMERCIAL SITE PLAN LOCATED AT 13502 SOUTH HAMILTON VIEW DRIVE BY ADDING ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING STATIONS. APPLICANT – JULIE HEKKING, KIMLEY-HORN ENGINEERING.

Mr. Prestwich reported that a Building Permit was issued to Walmart for the pick-up area modifications that were recently approved by the Planning Commission. The new application was to install electric vehicle (“EV”) charging stations. Notices were sent to property owners within 300 feet of the subject property but no comments were received.

The aerial map was reviewed, as well as photographs and diagrams of the proposed charging stations. The charging area will be located adjacent to Hamilton View Drive. Some parking islands will be removed and striping reconfigured to accommodate the EV charging stations, and portions of four islands will also be removed to install an ADA-accessible walking path to the storefront. All trees in the area will remain and provide adequate screening.

Mr. Prestwich reported that the Landscape Plan was submitted late and not included in the meeting packet. Sod in the area will be replaced with rock and shrubs, and additional shrubs will be installed to screen the switchboard and transformer.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Cluff, Mr. Prestwich reported that electric charging stations are heavily regulated, and compliance with the electric code is verified by the City’s Commercial Plans Examiner.

Chair Park asked why the EV charging stations were not placed near the fuel station. Mr. Prestwich reported that the Building Code requires one charging station to be ADA accessible, and ADA requires an accessible walking route to the storefront. The proposed location met those requirements. Mountain View Village was also installing charging stations, and the Building Official spent a large amount of time working on the ADA and electrical requirements for that site.

In response to a question from Commissioner Cannon, Mr. Prestwich stated that he had no information on a potential EV charging station at the Bangerter Highway onramp, but he occasionally hears speculation about that property.

Joanna Graham of Kimley-Horn spoke on behalf of the applicant. They planned to install four level three chargers for customers to charge their vehicles while they shop. There will be eight total charging stalls. She apologized for the delay in submitting the Landscape Plan but indicated that it addressed Mr. Prestwich’s concerns about screening the equipment. Both the transformer and switchboard would be screened with waterwise landscaping, and no trees would be removed.

Commissioner Matheson asked if the chargers would be free to the public. Ms. Graham reported that there is a fee for use. She did not have specific information on how payment would be handled or the different types of chargers available. However, she could obtain that information and forward it to Mr. Prestwich.

In response to a question from Chair Park, Ms. Graham confirmed that her firm also installed the EV charging stations at the South Jordan Walmart and other locations in Utah. Stations had been installed at approximately 10 locations in Utah over the past year, and 14 were in process. It is a nationwide program.

Chair Park stated that photographs included with the application were of visually appealing equipment, but large blue stations were installed in South Jordan. Ms. Graham reported that blue is the Walmart standard and was the proposed color for the stations. Chair Park stated that the other side of the parking lot near Bangerter Highway would be a better location because nobody would care what they look like, but the proposed location was at the main entrance. Ms. Graham stated that the location is chosen based on a formula. They do not use the stalls directly in front of the building, but there must be an ADA path to the storefront, and all ADA stalls must be as close to the building as possible.

Chair Park asked if the applicant could install a different color charging station than the one proposed in the application. Mr. Prestwich reported that the submitted plan set included a specific charging station, and that specific station must be installed. Otherwise, the applicant would be denied occupancy, and an amended Site Plan would be required. Chair Park stated that he believed the Planning Commission was comfortable with the charging station submitted with the application, but Ms. Graham would need to inform her client that they were required to install that specific station and not a large blue one.

In response to a question raised by Commissioner Cluff, Ms. Graham confirmed that yellow bollards were proposed around the charging stations. Yellow is a typical color for safety bollards, but it is not specified in code.

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

Chair Park stated that the South Jordan Walmart is in a more industrial area, whereas the Riverton Walmart is adjacent to residential properties. The specified charging station is unobtrusive and a better fit for the City. People who drive electric vehicles will know that the charging area is there, but it will not be obvious from the road, which he believes is appropriate for the location.

Commissioner Cluff moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE Application PLZ-26-8019, "Walmart EV Stations 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. Existing trees shall be protected during construction. Trees removed shall be replaced with a similar species tree with a caliper of two inches or greater.**
- 3. Landscaping shall be installed as presented.**
- 4. Charging stations shall match the plans presented.**

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

3. MINUTES

A. MINUTES FROM THE MAY 14, 2026, PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING.

Commissioner Keele moved that the Planning Commission APPROVE the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of May 14, 2026, as presented. Commissioner Matheson seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

Mr. Carter reported that he intended to conduct training at the meeting, but the item was not publicly noticed on the agenda. He had emailed the Planning Commission earlier in the week but only received one response, and he reminded the Commission that their official email addresses must be a functional communication channel. The email included basic instructions on how to review two hours of training online. One site requires each Commissioner to set up an account that would also be used for future training. The Planning Commission is required to complete four hours of training annually. He had intended to have a question-and-answer session about the videos, after which their training time could be logged.

Mr. Carter would be forwarding recent Private Property Rights Ombudsman's Office advisory opinions to the Commission. These opinions are part of an online library that is very educational, as they address real conflicts that occurred between developers and planning staff, planning commissions, or city councils. The Ombudsman is the land use expert and a quasi-judicial body that issues advisory opinions on disputes that either confirm or reject actions taken by a city. If the Ombudsman disagrees with a city's actions and the city fights the case in court and loses, the developer is awarded attorney's fees. City Staff speaks with the Ombudsman regularly. He is very knowledgeable and well-

respected, and has helped the city with difficult issues like purchasing a sidewalk strip from a property owner with schizophrenia.

Mr. Carter instructed the Planning Commissioners to check their email and notify his office if they did not receive the instructions. They should review the two videos prior to the next meeting, where they will review the Ombudsman's opinions and complete their training requirement.

Commissioner Matheson stated that he would be out of town for the next meeting. Mr. Carter stated that he should complete the online training and could make up the additional hour. Consistent meeting attendance constitutes one hour of training, so only three hours were needed.

Commissioner Marzo stated that he completed both training sessions and asked if he should forward the certificate of completion from the first session to Staff. Mr. Carter reported that the meeting minutes for the question-and-answer session will confirm the training hours, and that item will be included on the next agenda.

In response to a question from Chair Park, Mr. Carter reported that the Information Technology Department would contact those Commissioners who could not access their email accounts.

It was noted that the only Planning Commission meeting in July would be held on July 9.

4. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:58 PM.