

Notice and Agenda

The Plain City Planning Commission/City Council Regular/Work Meeting

will convene in a regular/work meeting Thursday October 22, 2026 in Council Chambers at Plain City Hall - 4160 West 2200 North, which meeting shall begin at 7:00pm. This meeting will also be accessible via ZOOM.

The agenda shall be as follows:

Regular meeting

1. Approval of Minutes for October 8, 2026

7:10 PM – Work Meeting (Mike Hansen)

3. Adjournment:

City Council Meeting: November 5– Chairman Maw

The City of Plain City in compliance with the Americans Disabilities Act provides accommodations and auxiliary communicative aids and services for all those citizens in need of assistance. Persons requesting these accommodations for City-sponsored public meetings, services, programs, or events should call Diane Hirschi at 801-731-4908 giving her at least twenty-four (24) hours' notice before the meeting. The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing Notice and Agenda was posted at the Plain City Hall, Plain City website www.plaincityutah.gov and the Utah Public Notice Website at www.utah.gov/pmn October 20, 2026

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89156390928>

Meeting ID: 891 5639 0928

Tammy Folkman

Land Use Specialist

Plain City Planning Commission + Council
(c/o Tammy Folkman, tammyf@plaincityutah.gov)

October 19, 2026

RE: PLAIN CITY GENERAL PLAN (and CODE): TOP TEN DISCUSSION ISSUES

Purpose and Schedule

This memo identifies ten issues in the draft General Plan and land use code that most need direction from the Planning Commission and City Council. Each issue includes a citation so leaders can go directly to the relevant section of the draft documents.

The schedule is influenced by the moratorium on rezones and overlay zones (Ordinance 2026-09). That ordinance suspends rezone and overlay approvals until the General Plan update is complete.

Adopting the plan on January 7 puts the new policy in place before the moratorium ends, so rezone requests submitted afterward are reviewed against the updated plan and code.

DATE	BODY	PURPOSE
Jul 16, 2026	City Council	Ordinance 2026-09 adopted (3–2), suspending rezones and overlay approvals
Oct 22	Joint PC and CC	Work meeting on the issues in this memo
Oct 26	Public	Open house on the General Plan and the Pleasant Plains MDA
Nov 12	Planning Commission	Hearing on Pleasant Plains; set the hearing for plan adoption
Nov 19	City Council	Decision on Pleasant Plains (required by Nov 23 under the 45-day rule)
Dec 8	Planning Commission	Public hearing and recommendation on the General Plan
Jan 7, 2027	City Council	General Plan adoption, with priority code amendments
~Jan 16, 2027	—	Moratorium ends
Feb 2027 (optional)	City Council	Remaining code amendments

Draft Plan Link

<https://tinyurl.com/DraftPlainCityPlan>

Top Ten Issues

The first two issues are the most significant, because together they shape how the City's western area and its future interchange will develop.

#	ISSUE	WHAT IS UNRESOLVED	QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION	WHERE TO FIND IT
1	West Weber Concept District	Covers large tracts in the western area, roughly half the City's land. Sets principles for master-planned proposals rather than a density. No implementing zone exists in the code yet.	Are the eligibility tests right (100+ contiguous acres, north of the Little Mountain Rail Trail)? Should an independent fiscal impact analysis be a condition of approval?	GP §2.2.2 (p. 69); §2.3.3 (p. 79); Goal LU-5
2	Mixed Residential	Allows 5 to 8 units per acre with at least two housing types. The cap on any one housing type is still a placeholder (60 percent). Overlaps with the Mixed Use Overlay (8.5 units per acre) and High Density Residential (10 units per acre).	What cap should apply to a single housing type? Should the category be limited to the City Center and West Weber areas? Should the housing mix be mapped by sub-area within a master plan?	GP §2.2.2 (p. 47); Title 10 Ch. 19
3	Draft Future Land Use Map	The map is still in progress. Commercial locations under review include the Fremont intersection, both sides of 4700 West, and the area near Kent's. Neighborhood Commercial and Manufacturing Commercial are not yet mapped.	Which commercial nodes should be shown? Should higher densities be placed around those nodes, stepping down to rural areas?	GP Fig. 2.2.3.b (p. 74); Fig. E.4.3.a (p. 174)
4	Plan and Code Alignment	The code has no zones for Mixed Residential, High Density Residential, City Center, or the West Weber Concept District. The Residential Overlay allows 3, 4, and 5 units per acre in MDR 1 to 3 areas, above the plan's 2.4, 3, and 4. The code still refers to the "Town Center."	Which code amendments should be adopted with the plan on January 7, and which can follow in February (if not all at the same time)?	Title 10 §10-3-1; §10-20-2 and -3; §10-6-2; §10-19-3

#	ISSUE	WHAT IS UNRESOLVED	QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION	WHERE TO FIND IT
5	Rural Edge and Large Lots	Rural Residential requires one-acre lots and Low Density Residential 30,000 square feet. Public comment suggests a larger rural minimum. It is unclear whether MDR 1 (18,500 square feet) should accommodate horses exclusively.	Is one acre the right rural minimum? Is MDR 1 intended for equestrian use?	GP §2.2.2 (pp. 32–40); §2.2.5 (p. 75); Action LU-2.A; App. G
6	Commercial Location and Corridor Protection	General Commercial is directed to "major corridors," which are not defined. The difference between City Center and Neighborhood Commercial is unclear. The plan would review requests near likely interchange sites for whether they block future commercial uses.	Which corridors qualify? How firmly should the City protect likely interchange areas before UDOT sets the alignment?	GP §2.2.2 (pp. 53–62); §2.3.3 (p. 79); §3.3.2 (p. 86)
7	Growth Paying Its Own Way	Standards for Public Infrastructure Districts and fiscal impact analyses are drafted but untested. The annexation policy plan dates from 2003 (amended 2019). Qualifying unincorporated islands annex automatically on July 1, 2027, unless Weber County exempts them.	Are the PID standards appropriate? When should the annexation policy plan be updated?	GP §3.2.2 (p. 85); §2.3.1 (p. 76); Actions LU-4.A and LU-5.B
8	Water Coordination	The secondary water provider map needs correction. Water districts have not yet reviewed the water chapter. Every residential profile relies on Bona Vista's 1.69 units per acre benchmark.	Should the City commit to promoting provider conservation programs? Should the plan explain in plain terms how water share dedication works?	GP Fig. 8.1.2.b (p. 126); §8.2.2 (p. 130); §2.2.2 profiles

#	ISSUE	WHAT IS UNRESOLVED	QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION	WHERE TO FIND IT
9	Group Living and Fair Housing	Legal review flagged code provisions that screen or certify residents of group living facilities. Other standards may also draw scrutiny, such as 10 parking spaces per unit and one-mile spacing between facilities.	Should staff and the City Attorney revise these chapters before January 7?	Title 10 §10-17-4; §10-23-2; §10-24-1; §10-25-1
10	Civic Land in Growth Areas	Northern and western areas will need sites for schools, a fire station, City facilities, a cemetery, and a community park or sports complex. The plan only says master plans "should identify" candidate sites.	Should civic site identification be required in master plans and development agreements?	GP §2.2.2 Municipal (p. 66) and Parks (p. 63); §7.1.7 (p. 120)

Respectfully,



Mike Hansen, Hansen Planning Group

Plain City Planning Commission + Council
 (c/o Tammy Folkman, tammyf@plainscityutah.gov)

October 19, 2026

RE: DRAFT PLEASANT PLAINS MDA – WORKSHOP DISCUSSION GUIDE

DECISION DATE CERTAIN

The City Council must take final action on the MDA by Nov 23, 2026. Cole West served a 45-day final-action request on October 7, 2026, under Utah Code 10-20-905(2)(b). Staff recommends treating Nov 20, 2026 as the working deadline.

- Final action means approve, approve with changes, or deny. The statute forces a decision, not an approval.
- City Code §11-9-5.A.2 and §11-9-9 require a Planning Commission public hearing and recommendation before the Council acts. Holding that hearing inside the 45-day window avoids a conflict between state law and City Code.
- The Commission's recommendation may be for, against, or for with modifications (§11-9-9.A).

HOW TO USE THIS GUIDE

Each row below is one discussion issue, with the place to read more and a few questions to settle. Issues are listed roughly in order of importance; the starred rows (★) were raised by Commission members in their October comments. The goal is to give the Planning Commission and Council clear direction on each issue, not to re-read the full documents. *It should be clear that this document just clarifies and reorganizes existing comments - it should not be seen as a new TRC report.*

Code	Document
TRC	Pleasant Plains MDA – Plain City TRC Response to Sept 1st Redline (Sept 24, 2026) https://tinyurl.com/PlainsTRC-Sept-24
MDA	CW PPR MDA Redline 10.2.26 – TRC outstanding issues (highlighted items and TRC comments) https://tinyurl.com/Plains-OutstandingIssues
GP	Plain City General Plan – West Weber Concept District, draft v.1, pp. 67–70 (also Staff Report Exhibit C) https://tinyurl.com/GP-NewDistrict
SR	Staff Report – Pleasant Plains MDA (Oct 6, 2026, prepared for the Oct 8 Commission meeting) https://tinyurl.com/PlainsStaffRpt-Oct6
Code	Plain City Code Title 11, Chapter 9 (Development Agreements) https://tinyurl.com/CurrentCode-DevtAgree

EXTREME BENEFITS: OFFERED VS. EXPECTED

The developer has described the benefits it believes the project offers, but the City has not stated what “extreme benefits” it expects from a project of this scale. City Code §11-9-1.A.3 makes extreme benefits a condition for any development agreement, without defining the term. The TRC Report evaluates “desirability” against this standard, but no City document formally sets a benchmark. The **draft** General Plan gives the closest guidance.

BENEFIT TYPE	WHAT THE DEVELOPER OFFERS (OCT 2 MDA AND AUG 21 SUMMARY)	WHAT THE CITY HAS IDENTIFIED SO FAR
General claim	Recitals cite “significant planning and economic benefits,” new sales and property tax, and new jobs. The Aug 21 density summary says density creates opportunities for public benefits.	Code §11-9-1.A.3 states the requirement only. No list of expected benefits has been adopted or given to the applicant.
Parks and trails	Two public parks (about 20 acres combined), the Dixie Creek Trail, and one year of park maintenance (MDA §5.02).	No acreage target. About 20 acres is roughly 1.7 acres per 1,000 future residents (TRC §5.02). GP p. 69 (Priority F) expects a community-scale park.
Civic sites	5 acres for a recreation center and 17.5 acres for a sewer treatment site (MDA §5.01(b), §5.02).	GP p. 69 (Priority F) lists sites for schools, a fire station, and City facilities. None are offered.
Commercial tax base	Up to 300 acres of commercial use. The guaranteed minimum is unsettled ([160] vs. 25 acres) (MDA §4.07).	TRC treats the commercial tax base as a primary public benefit (TRC §3.15, §4.05). No minimum has been adopted.
Fiscal impact	A fiscal analysis is promised but deferred to a later stage (MDA §5.05).	GP p. 69 calls an independent fiscal analysis a “threshold requirement for approval.” It has not been delivered to-date (SR p. 4).
Housing choice	The housing mix is said to implement the Moderate Income Housing Plan, with no deed-restricted units (MDA §8.01).	GP p. 69 expects a demonstrated contribution, with housing types, unit counts, and phasing.

Two provisions affect how these benefits should be weighed. Many dedications may earn impact fee credits (MDA §5.05–5.06), so the City pays for part of them through fees it does not collect. MDA §12.18 also states that donations to the City are not consideration for the agreement.

Discussion questions:

1. What should a project of this size provide beyond what any large subdivision must?
2. Should the Council give the applicant a written list of expected benefits before the hearing and/or make them conditions of approval?
3. Should benefits that earn impact fee credits count toward “extreme benefits”?

DISCUSSION ISSUES

#	DISCUSSION ISSUE	REFERENCE	DISCUSSION QUESTIONS
1	General Plan alignment and overall outcome ★ An MDA must align with the General Plan (Code §11-9-1.A.1). The draft plan expects proposals to name the City zone they most resemble and justify each departure. <i>Status: open.</i>	Code §11-9-1.A, §11-9-4.A-B; GP p. 67 (D-E), p. 69 (Priority D); SR p. 2	1) Does the MDA explain where and why it departs from City zones, as GP p. 67 expects? Is this a helpful requirement? 2) Is the preferred outcome approval with City changes, or denial? (See also the extreme benefits section above.)
2	Total units and housing mix ★ Up to 3,500 units. Caps allow 1,000 flats and 1,000 townhomes, limited to 45% combined (1,575 units). The applicant's prototype is 2.3 homes per gross acre. <i>Status: open.</i>	MDA §4.02, §4.04; TRC §4.02-4.04, §4.09; GP p. 67 (Typical Development); SR p. 3	1) The draft plan expects aggregate density "similar to the existing community." Does 3,500 units meet that? 2) Should the caps be lower, or should minimums be set for larger lots? 3) Should the maximum rest on a stated developable acreage?
3	Where the higher intensity goes Flats and 80% of townhomes go in the Village Center; land within 300 feet of existing homes is limited to the two lowest densities. <i>Status: open.</i>	MDA §4.03 (MH2); TRC §4.02-4.03; GP p. 67 (Typical Development), p. 70 (Priority H); SR p. 3	1) Is a 300-foot buffer enough, or should the Village Center sit at least one-half mile from existing homes, as the applicant's summary showed? 2) Should the Village Center be tied to the future interchange, as the draft plan expects?
4	Wetlands and unbuildable land ★ No Corps of Engineers finding may reduce the 3,500-unit maximum or the caps. <i>Status: open.</i>	MDA §5.03, §5.07, §5.08 (MH9, MH13); TRC §5.03; SR p. 3	1) Should the unit count drop in proportion when land proves unbuildable? 2) Should a project-wide wetland delineation be a required study? 3) At what stage: preliminary or final plat?
5	Phasing, pace, and the West Weber Corridor ★ The Developer controls phase size and order. The corridor reservation	MDA §4.03, §4.06 (MH3, MH4), §7.01; TRC §4.06, §7.01;	1) Should commercial and high-density phases wait for the corridor? 2) The draft plan calls for protecting the corridor study area.

#	DISCUSSION ISSUE	REFERENCE	DISCUSSION QUESTIONS
	expires after 5 years, after which a collector road is built instead. <i>Status: open.</i>	GP p. 68 (Assumption B), p. 69 (Priority E); SR p. 3	Should the reservation expire at all? 3) Should phases be capped in size or tied to unit thresholds and second access? 4) How will the City coordinate right-of-way width with UDOT and neighboring cities?
6	Off-site roads and traffic ★ The Developer pays only for project improvements and a proportionate share of system improvements. <i>Status: open.</i>	MDA §5.01(c), §5.04, §5.07(a), §7.01; TRC §5.01(c), §7.01; GP p. 68 (Assumption C), p. 69 (Priority C)	1) Which existing City roads will need upgrades, and who pays? 2) Is a traffic study update every 1,000 units often enough? 3) Should impacted collectors outside the project be counted in fee calculations?
7	Sewer capacity and treatment site ★ The Developer dedicates 17.5 acres for a treatment facility. The site does not adjoin the existing plant. <i>Status: study requirements open.</i>	MDA §5.01(b), §5.05, §5.07(b); TRC §5.01(b); GP p. 69 (Water Impact D)	1) Should service through Central Weber Sewer be evaluated, as the draft plan suggests? 2) If the state requires a mechanical plant, who pays?
8	Culinary and secondary water ★ Water sufficiency rests on will-serve letters from providers. The source and type of water shares has been questioned. <i>Status: open.</i>	MDA §5.01(a)(i)–(iv) (MH7); TRC §5.01(a); GP p. 69 (Water Impact A–B); SR p. 4	1) Should the City confirm capacity independently?
9	Financing, credits, and fiscal analysis ★ Includes upsizing reimbursement, impact fee credits, a possible PID, and “density bonuses” for dedications to other entities. <i>Status: open.</i>	MDA §5.04(a)–(f) (MH10, MH11), §5.05 (MH12), §5.06; TRC §5.04–5.06; GP p. 69 (Fiscal Impact A–C, Priority B);	1) The draft plan calls a fiscal analysis a threshold for approval. Must it be delivered before the hearing? 2) Is the Council open to a PID at all? 3) Should density bonuses be removed?

#	DISCUSSION ISSUE	REFERENCE	DISCUSSION QUESTIONS
		SR p. 4	4) Should reimbursable costs be verified by an independent third party?
10	Parks, trails, and open space ★ Two parks totaling about 20 acres, 5 acres for a recreation center, and the Dixie Creek Trail. First park by the 500th permit. <i>Status: open.</i>	MDA §5.02 (MH8), §7.01; TRC §5.02; GP p. 67 (Typical Development), p. 69 (Priority F); SR p. 3	1) Is this enough for about 11,500 residents? 2) Should the first park come sooner? 3) Should only public parks count toward the level of service?
11	Commercial land and uses ★ Up to 300 acres of broadly defined commercial uses, including industrial. The minimum is unsettled ([160] vs. 25 acres). <i>Status: open.</i>	MDA §3.17, §4.05, §4.07 (MH5); TRC §3.15, §4.05–4.06; GP p. 69 (Priority E), p.70 (Priority H); SR p. 3	1) What minimum commercial acreage should be guaranteed? 2) Should data centers or other uses be excluded? 3) Is a masonry wall required next to homes?
12	Lots, setbacks, parking, ADUs, and CC&Rs ★ 12-foot front setback, garages at 15 feet (TRC: 20), detached ADUs on 8,000 sq. ft. lots. <i>Status: open.</i>	MDA §4.08–4.10 (MH6), §5.01(e); TRC §4.07–4.09; GP p. 67 (D); SR p. 3	1) Should garages be set back 20 feet? 2) Do the setbacks leave room for 10-foot utility easements and offsets? 3) Should ADUs follow existing City ordinances? 4) Should the City review HOA maintenance provisions in the CC&Rs?
13	Moderate-income housing The MDA says the housing mix supports the implementation of the City’s plan, but commits to no unit counts or phasing. <i>Status: not flagged as open.</i>	MDA §8.01; TRC §8.01; GP p. 69 (Moderate-Income Housing A–C), p. 70 (Priority G)	1) The draft plan expects a “demonstrated, not aspirational” contribution. Should the MDA state unit counts and phasing for moderate-income housing?
14	Term and renewal ★	MDA §12.01;	1) Is the Council comfortable with automatic renewals, or should

#	DISCUSSION ISSUE	REFERENCE	DISCUSSION QUESTIONS
	10 years, renewing automatically up to 30 years. City Code caps agreements at 10 years. <i>Status: resolved at TRC and attorney level (SR p. 3).</i>	Code §11-9-4.E; TRC §12.01	renewal require a Council vote tied to milestones?
15	Which rules apply over time The MDA freezes City code as of April 1, 2026, and allows assignment without consent when 50% of ownership is unchanged. <i>Status: mostly resolved (SR p. 3); §3.03 still noted (MH1).</i>	MDA §3.03 (MH1), §8.01, §12.17; TRC §8.01, §12.17; Code §11-9-4.C-D	1) Should gaps be governed by the new code as amended over time? 2) What City consent is needed before Master Developer duties transfer to a new owner?

★ = raised in Commission member comments (October 2026). “MH#” = TRC comment number in the October 2 redline. “Open” = listed as unresolved between the TRC and the applicant (SR p. 3).

The Commission and Council may reopen any item, including those resolved at staff level.

RELATED GENERAL PLAN AND CODE QUESTIONS

These items came up in Commission comments but belong in the General Plan or land use code rather than the MDA. They can be noted on Oct 22 and scheduled for the plan and code discussion.

DISCUSSION ISSUE	REFERENCE	DISCUSSION QUESTIONS
Corridor-first policy ★	GP p. 67 (Typical Development), p. 68 (Assumption B), p. 69 (Priority E)	The draft protects the corridor study area but does not tie buildout timing to the corridor. Should it say that large-scale buildout should follow corridor construction?
Defining “extreme benefits”	Code §11-9-1.A.3; GP p. 69 (Priorities B, F, G)	Should the General Plan or code describe the benefits the City expects from large development agreements, so future applicants know the standard in advance?
Data centers ★	Draft land use code; MDA §3.17	Does the City want to define, limit, or exclude data centers citywide? What would be the justification?
Ability to deny an MDA vs. other applications ★	Code §11-9-4.A-B; GP p. 67 (E)	An MDA may be rejected “for any reason” before approval, and the land then keeps its existing zoning. Overlays and conditional uses follow

		different state rules. What standards should the new code use for overlays such as senior housing?
Zoning map ★	Draft land use code; GP p. 70 (Priority H)	When and how will the zoning map be drafted: in a work session, or by a working group?
TRC membership and process ★	Code §11-9-8	Should an elected or appointed official sit on the TRC, and should TRC reports reach the Commission before meetings with the applicant?
Hearing from the broader community	Code §11-9-9, §11-9-10	How will the Commission gather views from residents who do not attend meetings, so the record reflects the whole community?

Respectfully,



Mike Hansen, Hansen Planning Group