MT. PLEASANT CITY
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes
September 15, 2026 – 12:00 p.m.
Mt. Pleasant City Council Room
115 West Main Street
Mount Pleasant, Utah

Planning Commission Members

- Bridger Varga
- Bret Mikkelsen
- Ron Richmond
- Brooke Allred

1. Call to Order

Bret Mikkelsen called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.

2. Roll Call – Secretary

Present: Brooke Allred, Bridger Varga, Bret Mikkelsen

Excused: Ron Richmond

Planning & Zoning Administrator Dave Oxman recognized and thanked Dave Ames for his years of service on the Planning Commission following his resignation.

3. Approval of Minutes

The Planning Commission reviewed the previous meeting minutes.

Motion: To approve the Planning Commission meeting minutes as presented.

Moved by Bridger Varga, seconded by Brooke Allred.

Motion carried unanimously.

4. Public Hearings – As Posted

4.1 Planned Unit Development (PUD) Overlay Zone Change

A public hearing was held regarding a request to apply the Planned Unit Development (PUD) Overlay Zone to property generally located south of Aspen Village Mobile Home Park, from approximately 300 South to 700 South and 700 East to 900 East, containing approximately 60.64 acres.

No public comments were received.

4.2 Public Facility (PF) Zone Ordinance Amendment

A public hearing was held regarding a proposed amendment to the Mt. Pleasant City Land Use Ordinance to add Community Center, Meeting Hall, Civic Center, or Convention Hall as a conditional use within the Public Facility (PF) Zone. The proposed amendment would allow such facilities to be publicly or privately owned and operated and would establish a minimum building size of 5,000 square feet.

No public comments were received.

4.3 Residential Agricultural (R-A) Zone Ordinance Amendment

A public hearing was held regarding a proposed amendment to the Mt. Pleasant City Land Use Ordinance to allow Horseback Riding Lessons or Instruction as a conditional use within the Residential Agricultural (R-A) Zone.

The proposed amendment included standards relating to off-street parking, animal allowances, residential screening, liability insurance, hours of operation, outdoor lighting, trailers and loading, property maintenance, and other measures intended to protect surrounding properties.

No public comments were received.

5. Lot Split Request – Steve Despain

The Planning Commission considered a Lot Split Request submitted by Steve Despain for property located at 1762 W. Lindberg Lane.

Discussion occurred between the property owner and the Planning Commission regarding the proposed lot split. The Commission discussed whether the required setbacks could continue to be met following the lot split and asked questions regarding the availability of sewer service to the property.

Motion: To approve the Lot Split Request for Steve Despain at 1762 W. Lindberg Lane.

Moved by Bridger Varga, seconded by Bret Mikkelsen.

Motion carried unanimously.

6. Residential Agricultural (R-A) Zone Ordinance Amendment – Horseback Riding Lessons

The Planning Commission discussed the proposed amendment to allow Horseback Riding Lessons or Instruction as a conditional use within the Residential Agricultural (R-A) Zone.

The Commission's primary concern was the enforcement of some of the proposed requirements. Brooke Allred expressed concern that the fencing requirement was not sufficiently defined. Discussion occurred regarding what type of fencing should be required and how the requirement would be enforced.

The Commission discussed forwarding the proposed amendment to the City Council with a request that the Council consider whether a privacy fencing requirement should be included.

Motion: To recommend approval of the proposed Residential Agricultural (R-A) Zone Ordinance Amendment to the City Council, with consideration given to a privacy fencing requirement.

Moved by Bridger Varga, seconded by Brooke Allred.

Motion carried unanimously.

7. Planned Unit Development (PUD) Overlay Zone Change

The Planning Commission discussed the requested PUD Overlay Zone for approximately 60.64 acres generally located south of Aspen Village Mobile Home Park, including consideration of the concept plan.

Scott Carlson and Ben Carson presented the proposed development to the Planning Commission. Mr. Carlson stated that he had met with Public Works, the Mayor, and other City staff regarding the concept plan and the goal of providing housing that remains affordable. Three different concepts were presented showing possible options for the development.

Mr. Carlson explained that a project of this size would take several years to complete and would be developed in phases. He anticipated that the first phase could be completed next year.

The Commission discussed concerns regarding the City's water capacity and the potential impact of a development of this size. Brooke Allred expressed concern that the City may not currently have the water capacity necessary to support the entire proposed development.

Mr. Carlson clarified that the current request was for the PUD Overlay Zone change. He stated that the development would be broken into phases and that the individual phases would return to the Planning Commission for additional review as the project progressed.

Brooke Allred expressed concern regarding the long-term commitment associated with applying the overlay to the entire property when questions regarding water availability remained.

Bret Mikkelsen stated that the property, as currently zoned, could already accommodate building lots that meet existing requirements. He stated that the overall size of the requested overlay was a concern and asked whether the overlay could be applied to smaller portions of the property as the development progressed.

Mr. Carlson explained that dividing the overlay into smaller areas could create difficulties for both City planning and the developer's infrastructure planning. He stated that the expense of infrastructure necessary for the overall development could not reasonably be paid for through the first phase alone. He explained that the developer would need to know that the overall project could eventually move forward in order for the infrastructure investment to be economically feasible.

The Commission and applicants discussed the development process and ways to avoid issues the City has experienced with other developments. Mr. Carlson stated that the proposed development would include a homeowners association (HOA), which could assist in addressing some of those concerns.

Dave Oxman stated that a roadway had been added to the concept plan to allow County traffic to remain within the County.

The Commission discussed that the current request was for the PUD Overlay Zone and that approval of the overlay would allow development under the applicable PUD standards, including smaller lot sizes.

Bret Mikkelsen reiterated his concern regarding the size of the proposed overlay area and again asked whether the overlay could be completed in smaller sections.

Motion: To recommend approval to the City Council of the requested PUD Overlay Zone for approximately 60.64 acres generally located south of Aspen Village Mobile Home Park, contingent upon review of the concept plan by the City Attorney.

Moved by Bridger Varga, seconded by Bret Mikkelsen.

Motion carried unanimously.

8. Public Facility (PF) Zone Ordinance Amendment

The Planning Commission discussed the proposed amendment to allow Community Center, Meeting Hall, Civic Center, or Convention Hall as a conditional use within the Public Facility (PF) Zone.

Motion: To recommend approval to the City Council of the proposed amendment allowing Community Center, Meeting Hall, Civic Center, or Convention Hall as a conditional use within the Public Facility (PF) Zone.

Moved by Brooke Allred, seconded by Bridger Varga.

Motion carried unanimously.

9. Public Participation

Brooke Allred asked for clarification regarding the Planning and Zoning process when developers approach the City with proposed projects. She questioned whether the City should have additional ordinances and standards in place before development proposals are received.

Ms. Allred also expressed concern that impact fees may not address all of the impacts associated with new development and stated that she would like to see a clear and consistent process in place to help development applications move through the City smoothly.

Discussion occurred regarding the development review process and the respective roles of the Planning Commission and City Council, including which body has final decision-making authority on various land use matters.

Ms. Allred expressed concern that some of the City's actions regarding development have been reactive rather than proactive and stated that she would like to see the City better prepared for future growth and development.

10. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

Natalie Crosby
Recorder