

**DRAFT MINUTES OF THE
BOUNTIFUL CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**

Tuesday, September 15, 2026, at 6:30 p.m.

Official notice of the Planning Commission meeting was given by posting the agenda at City Hall, on the Bountiful City website, and on the Utah Public Notice Website.

City Hall - Council Chambers
795 South Main Street
Bountiful, Utah 84010

Present:

Planning Commissioners:	Jamie Welch Jaro, Darrin Perkes, Beverly Ward, and Beth Child Excused: Chair Alan Bott, Vice Chair Krissy Gilmore, and Aaron Arbuckle
Planning Director:	Francisco Astorga
City Engineer:	Lloyd Cheney
City Attorney:	Brad Jeppsen
Recording Secretary:	Rachel Coleman

1. Welcome

Planning Director Astorga called the meeting to order at 6:34 p.m. and noted that no members of the public were in attendance. Mr. Astorga recommended that a Chair Pro Tem be appointed.

Commissioner Child moved to appoint Commissioner Ward to Chair Pro Tem. Commissioner Perkes seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioners Ward, Welch Jaro, Perkes, and Child voting “aye.”

Chair Pro Tem Ward conducted a roll call of the Commissioners and Staff in attendance and excused Chair Bott, Vice Chair Gilmore, and Commissioner Arbuckle.

2. Meeting Minutes from September 01, 2026

Commissioner Child moved to approve the minutes. Commissioner Welch Jaro seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with Commissioners Ward, Welch Jaro, Perkes, and Child voting “aye.”

3. Land Use Terminology and Definitions Update

Mr. Astorga stated that the public hearing for the item had been continued to this meeting.

26 Mr. Astorga stated that Staff had several items that needed further refinement and recommended
27 continuing the item unless the Commission chose to proceed with the discussion.

28 Chair Pro Tem Ward recommended proceeding with the discussion to allow the Commissioners
29 in attendance to ask questions, with the option to continue the item afterward so the excused
30 Commissioners could participate, and additional public input could be received. The
31 Commissioners agreed to proceed.

32 Mr. Astorga presented the item outlined in the packet.

33 Mr. Astorga discussed several items requiring further refinement, including the distinction
34 between “Professional Office” and “Professional Services,” the treatment of “Public Schools,”
35 and clarification that “Fast-Food w/ pick-up” in the Downtown Zone should refer to a “walk-up
36 window.” He also noted that a Shooting Range had previously been created as a separate use for
37 an application that did not move forward and suggested incorporating it under “Public
38 Recreational Facility.”

39 Commissioner Perkes expressed concern that the definition of “Professional Services” was too
40 broad and overlapped with other licensed professions. Mr. Astorga explained that some uses
41 serve as broader categories with more specific sub-uses and noted that the City’s land use
42 definitions can vary if each use is clearly defined and identified as permitted, conditional, or
43 prohibited by zone. Commissioner Perkes thanked Mr. Astorga for the clarification.

44 Commissioner Child asked where aesthetician businesses would fall within the “Professional
45 Services” land use category. Mr. Astorga explained that aestheticians are included under “Beauty
46 and Cosmetology,” while tattoo and body art establishments are a separate use allowed
47 conditionally in the Commercial Zone. Commissioner Welch Jaro asked how businesses
48 distinguish between permanent makeup and tattoo/body art services, and Mr. Astorga noted that
49 Staff had conducted extensive research to clarify that distinction.

50 Mr. Astorga asked whether there were any additional items the Commission wished to discuss.

51 Commissioner Child asked why “Kennel/Animal Boarding” is prohibited in all zones and when
52 it would be appropriate to reconsider allowing the use. Mr. Astorga explained that the prohibition
53 was intended to avoid ambiguity and that a broader discussion would be more appropriate during
54 future zoning amendments, after Staff has had time to research the issue. Mr. Astorga noted that
55 some existing veterinary clinics provide boarding services, making the distinction between
56 veterinary and kennel uses difficult, and Chair Pro Tem Ward and Commissioner Child agreed
57 that kennels warranted future discussion.

58 Chair Pro Tem Ward questioned the “Vehicle Sales” definition, particularly the phrase “where
59 no work is done,” noting that large dealerships commonly provide parts, service, and minor
60 repairs. Commissioners Welch Jaro and Perkes discussed how the language might apply
61 differently to large dealerships and smaller vehicle sales lots that perform repairs onsite. Mr.

62 Astorga suggested creating a separate dealership use that could encompass vehicle sales, parts,
63 repair, and service while still allowing the City to regulate smaller dealers appropriately. The
64 Commission agreed that revised terminology should be brought back for future discussion.

65 Chair Pro Tem Ward asked whether the land use tables could be organized by categories rather
66 than alphabetically. Mr. Astorga agreed that categorization could be helpful but noted that
67 determining categories could be subjective. Commissioner Perkes suggested broader headings,
68 such as “Animals,” with related uses listed underneath, while acknowledging that categorization
69 could create arbitrary distinctions. Chair Pro Tem Ward also noted that some existing categories,
70 such as “Pawnshop or Secondhand Merchandise” and “Thrift Shop,” were difficult to
71 distinguish.

72 Chair Pro Tem Ward asked why “Residential Accessory Structure” is listed as both a permitted
73 and conditional use in the Single Family Residential Zone. Mr. Astorga explained that an
74 accessory structure may be permitted when the applicable overall lot coverage remains within
75 10%, while coverage exceeding 10% and up to a maximum of 15% may require conditional use
76 approval.

77 Chair Pro Tem Ward expressed concern that the dwelling categories in the Single Family
78 Residential land use table were confusing. Mr. Astorga explained that certain existing dwelling
79 types, including two-family dwellings, may continue as permitted existing uses, while new such
80 uses are prohibited. Commissioner Perkes questioned why one type of nonconforming use would
81 be specifically identified while others are not.

82 Commissioner Child asked what is included under “Telecommunication Facilities.” Mr. Astorga
83 explained that the use includes facilities such as cell towers and that they are permitted when
84 located on City-owned or other public property, such as schools or public facilities, and
85 conditional use if located on private property.

86 Chair Pro Tem Ward asked about single-family dwellings in the Downtown Zone and clarified
87 that they are not permitted along Main Street.

88 Commissioner Child asked why “Pharmacy,” “Optical Shop,” and “Assisted Living Facility” are
89 listed as conditional uses in the Hospital Zone. Mr. Astorga said he was unsure of the reason for
90 the existing classifications and noted that the Hospital Zone may eventually be eliminated as part
91 of future zoning changes.

92 Mr. Astorga encouraged the Commissioners to send Staff any additional items they identified
93 after the meeting so they could be addressed at the next meeting.

94 Chair Pro Tem Ward asked whether the public hearing should still be opened and closed even
95 though the item would be continued and no members of the public were in attendance. City
96 Attorney Jeppsen recommended proceeding with opening and closing the public hearing.

97 Chair Pro Tem Ward opened the Public Hearing at 7:18 p.m.

98 Chair Pro Tem Ward closed the Public Hearing at 7:18 p.m.

99 Commissioner Perkes moved to continue the consideration of the Land Use Terminology and
100 Definitions Amendment to the next meeting. Commissioner Child seconded the motion. The
101 motion passed unanimously with Commissioners Ward, Welch Jaro, Perkes, and Child voting
102 “aye.”

103 **4. Director’s Report**

104 Mr. Astorga informed the Commission that, beginning October 6, future meetings will include
105 educational discussions regarding South Davis Greenway. He clarified that the Commission will
106 not be asked to make any approvals or recommendations regarding the project.

107 Mr. Astorga also reminded Commissioners who attended the APA conference that Wendy
108 Schneider will send them information regarding reporting their conference hours.

109 **5. Adjourn**

110 Chair Pro Tem Ward adjourned the meeting at 7:20 p.m.