

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
CITY COUNCIL OF PLEASANT VIEW CITY, UTAH**

September 8, 2026

The public meeting was held at City Hall, 520 W Elberta Drive, Pleasant View, Utah, commencing at 6:02 P.M.

MAYOR:

Steve Gibson

COUNCILMEMBERS:

Ann Arrington

Johnny Ferry (*absent during items 1-2, then Zoom attendance, then in attendance*)

David Marriott (*absent*)

Sara Urry

Sean Wilkinson

STAFF:

Andrea Z Steiniger

Laurie Hellstrom

Tyson Jackson

Stetson Talbot

Braxton Lucas

Brody Flint-attorney

VISITORS:

Brandon Jones

Tim Watkins

Paulo Agrilera

Brian Gray

Roger Jensen

Sarah Ellis

Mason Ellis

Stacey Dixon

Sonny Thompson

Monica Kirkham

Holly Homan

1. Introduction.

- a. **Pledge of Allegiance and Opening Prayer, Reading, or Expression of Thought: (*Councilmember Ann Arrington*).**
- b. **Declaration of Conflicts of Interest.** None were given.
- c. **Public Comments/Questions for the Mayor & Council (limited to 3 minutes).**
None were given

2. Consent Items. Minutes of August 11, 2026, August 20, 2026 and August 25, 2026 (open & closed) and Bills of Pleasant View City.

Motion was made by CM Arrington to approve the minutes of August 11, 2026, August 20, 2026 and August 25, 2026 (open & closed) and the bills of Pleasant View City. 2nd by CM Urry.
Voting Aye: CM Arrington, CM Urry and CM Wilkinson. 3-0.

3. General Plan. Presentation from Wasatch Regional Front Council (WRFC) regarding the city's General Plan update.

Tim Watkins and Paul Agrilera with Wasatch Front Regional Council gave a slide presentation on the city's General Plan update (slide presentation attached).

4. Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) – Public Hearing. Consideration of new zoning regulations regarding standards for Accessory Dwelling Units in residential zones, Ordinance 2026-24. (Presenter: Andrea Steiniger)

Andrea Steiniger: presented the proposed amendments to the City's AAA-Chapter 18.66 for Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) regulations in response to Senate Bill 284, which requires municipalities to permit detached ADUs on lots or parcels of 11,000 square feet or larger containing a permitted single-family dwelling. The City must have regulations in place by the state-mandated deadline. The proposed ordinance would consolidate regulations for internal, attached, and detached ADUs. One ADU would be permitted per lot, whether internal, attached, or detached. The property owner would be required to occupy either the primary dwelling or one of the permitted ADUs. ADUs could not be used as short-term rentals; rentals would require a minimum term of 90 consecutive days. One additional off-street parking space would be required for each ADU. ADUs would be subject to applicable building, fire, permitting, and inspection requirements. Attached or detached ADUs visible from the primary dwelling would be required to be compatible in design and structure with the existing home. A detached ADU could not exceed the size of the primary dwelling. Staff noted that the ordinance may need to clarify whether "size" refers to square footage, building footprint, or another measurement. Applications would be reviewed to ensure adequate infrastructure capacity exists to serve the additional dwelling unit. Existing accessory structures could be converted to ADUs if they comply with applicable setbacks and building codes. Impact fees would need to be supported by appropriate studies. Internal ADUs would not be subject to impact fees where prohibited by state law. The Planning Commission held a public hearing and recommended approval by a 5–2 vote. Commissioners raised concerns and suggestions regarding the 90-day minimum rental period and the complexity of the permitting process. One member of the public spoke in support of the proposal. The ordinance could be revised based on Council direction and brought back for consideration at a subsequent meeting, if necessary.

Motion was made by CM Wilkinson to go into a public hearing to consider a new zoning regulations regarding standards for Accessory Dwelling Units in residential zones. 2nd by CM Urry. Voting aye: CM Arrington, CM Ferry, CM Urry and CM Wilkinson. 4-0

Brian Gray: it seems to shut-out short-term rentals. In my experience short-term rentals generally resulted in fewer property-management problems than long-term rentals. Short-term rentals serve visitors for family events, reunions, college returns, funerals, and home purchases. I guess there are approximately 15 short-term rentals currently operating in Pleasant View. Do short-term rental fall under this proposed regulation?

Roger Jensen: I like short-term rentals. I find I get better clientele. I am in support of the proposal.

Stacey Dixon: I haven't been able to review a copy of the draft. I feel unprepared to provide detailed comments. Can each request for an ADUs be considered on a case-by-case basis and ask for a variance? The number of ADUs allowed should be based on lot size/square footage, rather than a fixed number per property, so larger parcels could be considered for additional units.

Motion was made by CM Urry to end the public hearing. 2nd by CM Arrington. Voting aye: CM Arrington, CM Ferry, CM Urry and CM Wilkinson. 4-0

Council discussion: Short-term rentals: Council expressed that the ADU ordinance is intended to promote housing affordability rather than profitability. Members generally supported addressing short-term rentals through a separate ordinance or broader general-plan discussion. Rental duration: Council discussed maintaining a 90-day minimum rental period, noting

concerns regarding neighborhood impacts from shorter-term occupancy. The 90-day period was identified as the maximum allowed under the applicable legislation. Fire access: Council discussed the required 16-foot access route for fire apparatus to detached ADUs and requested clarification of the ordinance language to address properties with long driveways or detached structures located toward the rear of a lot. ADU size: Council requested clarification regarding whether the requirement that an ADU not exceed the size of the primary dwelling would be measured by square footage or building footprint, and asked staff to confirm applicable minimum-size requirements. Occupancy and infrastructure: Council discussed limiting properties to an owner-occupied dwelling plus one ADU and raised concerns about impacts on existing utility and infrastructure capacity. Utilities: Staff was directed to clarify that ADUs must be evaluated for adequate infrastructure and to address whether ADU utilities must connect through the primary dwelling's existing service rather than through separate meters. Permitting: Council discussed a three-year renewal process and approximately \$25 renewal fee. Staff noted that permitting ADUs helps the City meet state moderate-income housing requirements and that the process should remain straightforward. Enforcement and appeals: Council requested further legal review of penalties for noncompliance and clarification of the appropriate appeal authority to ensure consistency with state law.

Motion was made by CM Arrington to table and address the 150' and 16' width for fire access, minimum size, utilities, legal enforcement and footprint. 2nd by CM Wilkinson. Voting aye: CM Arrington, CM Ferry, CM Urry and CM Wilkinson. 4-0

5. Vehicle replacement proposal. Discussion and consideration to purchase two new police vehicles. (Presenter: Stetson Talbot)

Stetson Talbot reviewed his staff report on the purchase of two police vehicles.

Motion was made by CM Arrington to purchase two new police vehicles as presented. 2nd by CM Wilkinson. Voting aye: CM Arrington, CM Ferry, CM Urry and CM Wilkinson. 4-0

6. Flock Camera. Discussion on Flock camera. (Presenter: Stetson Talbot)

Stetson Talbot: the plan is to installation five FLOCK cameras in Pleasant View and I wanted the council to confirm that everyone remains comfortable moving forward. The city has signed up for a 30-day trial. Permitting is underway, and the cameras are already budgeted. The city gets 30 days after the final camera is installed to decide whether to proceed with a three-year contract. I support the FLOCK cameras and believe they are valuable law-enforcement tools, but we are hesitant to proceed immediately because cameras in other places are reportedly being vandalized or torn down and the city would be responsible for repairs. FLOCK is revising an insurance/coverage option that would cost about \$500 per camera per year (\$2,500 annually for five cameras). There are several proposed Utah laws being considered on the camera and I want to see what legislation passes before committing to a three-year contract. There are law-enforcement benefits and successful uses of the cameras and solving major crimes and lives. I don't personally believe that the cameras inherently violate people's rights, but the department needs strict policies to prevent misuse. Currently those who can access the data are Utah law-enforcement agencies who can request access, but outside-state and federal agencies cannot directly request it. Braxten Lucas: outside agencies could potentially receive information through a case-by-case basis. We would vet the request rather than giving unrestricted access. There needs to be clear rules. The retainage of footage/data is 7 days. I favor 30 days because crimes are sometimes reported weeks after they occur, while others liked seven days as a stronger privacy protection. Stetson Talbot: the five cameras are license-plate capture cameras, not general live-video cameras. I want our contract with FLOCK to protect the city if Utah law changes, particularly if new laws require cameras to be moved or restrict how they can be used.

This is an informational discussion. Unless the council takes action later, the project can continue moving forward.

7. Land Use Code Updates. Discussion and direction for land use and code updates (minor subdivision requirements, compliance with State Code, timelines in State Code and give direction to the planning commission).

Mayor Gibson: I raised concerns about the city's land-use codes, particularly minor subdivisions. There are requirements that may no longer be necessary or may be unnecessarily slowing applications. I want to explore different categories or approaches that could make the process faster, simpler, and more practical. Brody Flint: the land use code needs to be updated. This is the most difficult of law. In talking with the Mayor, the discussion was to review the subdivision ordinances and all the codes. There are new state codes that we are not compliant with. How does the city want to address this. I can work on it, but it will be a coordinated effort and will take time and a big effort. It would be a large task for staff. I suggest starting with the council discussion and establishing priorities and guidance. CM Wilkinson: we need to make a more efficient checklist. A checklist is a basic thing. Mayor Gibson: it will make it easier for the end user to go through the process. CM Wilkinson: a checklist is how to follow the process and some may not like it. Brody Flint: compliance is the first issue and a daunting task. CM Wilkinson: compliance should be the first step and then we address other codes. CM Arrington: I agree. Mayor Gibson: thanks Andrea for holding all together.

8. Planning Commission Members. Discussion and direction for the Planning Commission on the reduction of planning commission members.

Mayor Gibson: we need comments from the city council on reducing planning commission members. Andrea Steiniger: if you want to address it, it needs to be in the ordinance. The city council would have to be the ones to decide who was removed from the from the planning commission. Mayor Gibson: currently we have a 7-member with 2-alternative member board. I am proposing a 5 member with 1 alternative member board. CM Arrington: I am in support of the 5 members and 1 alternative. There could be two meeting a month, but I would stick with one a month and a second meeting if needed. Andrea Steiniger: with a 7 & 2 member board there are lengthy discussions with less productivity.

9. Engineering Services. Discussion and direction for an RFP for city engineering services.

Mayor Gibson: I would like the city to put out an RFP (Request for Proposal) for engineering services to find out what other engineering companies charge and what services they could provide. An RFP is essentially an opportunity for firms to sell their services to the city by submitting proposals. Jones & Associates should also be invited to submit a proposal. There may be a 90-day notice period associated with the current contract. The main objective is exploratory to see what other firms are available and what they can offer, regardless of whether the city ultimately stays with Jones. CM Arrington: it is worthwhile to look at alternatives. It is always useful to look around at other options, even if the city ultimately continues with Jones. CM Wilkinson: I support the discussion. Apologies to Andrea for not having given her enough time to research the issue. Apparently, Jones & Associates does more than traditional engineering, including surveying and other services. I work for the county and oversee an engineering division. Even though the county has five people on staff, it still contracts out certain specialized work. Would it be financially advantageous for Pleasant View to hire a full-time city engineer? Under this idea, a city employee might handle roughly 75% of the work, while the city could continue contracting out the remaining 25% or other specialized portions. A contracted engineering rates are substantially higher than the cost of an employee, so there may be an opportunity for savings. Could the city calculate whether bringing some engineering work in-

house could reduce the city's overall costs. Obtaining proposals from several companies would be useful because it would give the city a benchmark—and would also give Jones an opportunity to demonstrate why the city should continue using them. The goal is not necessarily to replace Jones, but to compare the alternatives objectively. I acknowledge that Jones has a significant advantage because of its long history with the city and familiarity with its projects and infrastructure. Any competing firm would have to learn that institutional history. The loss of institutional knowledge should be considered as part of evaluating proposals. Andrea Steiniger: would the in-house engineer be a 1099 engineer or a benefited employee? CM Urry: the city has been short on experienced planners, which has caused the city to rely heavily on Jones for work that might otherwise be performed internally. The engineer's hourly rate is much higher than the cost of some other city staff positions. Simply comparing the amount currently paid to Jones with the salary of a city employee could be misleading. The city is currently asking Jones to perform tasks that, under a fully staffed organization, might otherwise be handled by planners or other employees. The point is that some of Jones's costs are effectively compensating for staffing shortages elsewhere in the city's organization. Mayor Gibson: this may be an especially good time to evaluate the arrangement because the city is revamping its department structure. I don't expect significant organizational changes until that restructuring is completed. The city should understand its future internal staffing structure before deciding how much engineering work should remain outsourced. Andrea Steiniger: in referring back the new planner job description. There are several responsibilities that properly belong under a planner that are currently being handled by public works, engineering, and the treasurer. The city is trying to move those responsibilities back to the planner position. The goal is partly to reduce costs and improve organizational efficiency. This reinforces the argument that the city should first understand what its internal staff will be responsible for before deciding exactly what engineering services need to be contracted. Mayor Gibson: thanks Andrea for taking on the difficult task of reorganizing responsibilities and bringing work back in-house. I that process will happen. The city is not necessarily making an immediate decision to terminate Jones rather the proposal would begin a process in which engineering companies submit their best proposals so the city can evaluate its options. I want to know what firms can offer during that 90-day period and use that information to make a more informed decision. Andrea Steiniger: the RFP must be structured carefully. The city cannot simply tell companies to "send us a proposal" without first specifying what services the city wants them to provide. The city needs to identify the engineering services it is requesting so firms can respond meaningfully. The RFP should identify the scope of services the city needs. Mayor Gibson: I want the RFP to encompass the full range of Jones's current services. I want multiple firms to respond with an objective comparison. I believe other options exist. CM Wilkinson: staff members who work directly with these services, specifically Andrea and Tyson, should help write the scope. Staff members understand the city's needs better than outside firms do. Their input would help ensure that the RFP reflects the actual services the city requires rather than an overly generic engineering request. Tyson Jackson: as an overwhelmed staff the major concern is the city's approximately 20 major projects currently underway and the fact that Jones is already deeply involved in many of these projects. The city cannot simply switch firms without considering what happens to ongoing projects. The proposals should therefore address how a new firm would handle or complete existing projects and transition responsibilities. The transition period would need to be considered. CM Wilkinson: I am concerned about moving too quickly. The given complexity raised by Tyson and others, I would prefer to have more time to discuss and structure the process before directing staff to issue anything. Issuing an RFP is more than simply asking companies to submit proposals. There is likely a formal purchasing/procurement process governing how proposals are solicited, evaluated, and scored. The city needs to understand that process before proceeding. If the city asks multiple engineering firms to spend substantial time preparing proposals, the city should be genuinely prepared to consider changing firms. It would

be unfair or ineffective to ask companies to invest time and resources preparing bids if the city has already decided to stay with Jones. Based on my experience, firms will not take the process seriously if the city is merely conducting a superficial comparison. Therefore, the city needs to be clear about whether it is genuinely considering a change. Mayor Gibson: I am serious about making a change, if the proposals and staff recommendations indicate that a change is appropriate. The final decision should not be based solely on their personal preference. I want staff analysis and the actual proposals to inform the decision. Brandon Jones: we have been the city engineer for about 20 years. CM Arrington: It may be better to wait and gather more information. It is always beneficial to know what is available in the marketplace. However, the city could delay the RFP discussion until a future meeting and gather more information first and get the new planner in place. Having the planner onboard could change the city's internal workload and reduce the amount of work currently being outsourced. That could materially affect what engineering services the city actually needs to contract for. CM Urry: that is a good plan. CM Ferry: hold off.

10. Other Business.

Tyson Jackson: the Decant Facility is moving along. They are pouring footings. It should be done by December 31st. There have been some snags with the 500 W project and detours. It should be completed by the end of September. The snowplows are on the trucks.

Stetson Talbot: we did upgrades to our interview room and patrol room. I have finished the Lexipol policy updates. There were 170 updates. The officers are watching the school crossing areas and 500 W.

Andrea Steiniger: the General Plan is moving ahead. The General Code is being indexed. We are working on the personnel policy. We may have stumped Timeclock Plus. I received a notice from North Ogden on an annexation. The North View Fire District is going out for bonding. September 18th is the first review for the hiring of a city planner.

CM Ferry: I met with a multi-city economic development committee and traffic flows. I am involved with the Utah Remembers 911. It is its 25th anniversary.

CM Arrington: we have the EZ Grant rebound equipment for pickleball. I am waiting for the tax exempt status and can the youth city council help with sending out the flyers.

CM Urry: Youth City Council begins this Thursday. We have 20 participants so far. Mayor Gibson: they need to find other kids being caught doing good. CM Urry: Pumpkin Palooza is October 24th. Do we have RAMP grant ideas?

11. Adjournment: 8:36 P.M.